Pragmatic Failures in Movie Subtitles: The Case of Kurdish Subtitles of Treasure Island

Barzan Sabah Muhammad[1] - Ismail Abdulrahman Abdulla[2]

barzan.muhammad@su.edu.krd   esmael.abdulla@epu.edu.iq

[1]English Department, College of Basic Education, Salahaddin University, Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

[2]Department of Translation Techniques, Erbil Technical Administration Institute, Erbil Polytechnic University, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

Abstract

Pragmatic failures are critical in movie translation as they affect the message of the movie. Pragmatic failure refers to the mismatches that may occur between speakers' intended meaning and translators' constructed meaning. The paper aims to investigate the nature of pragmatic failures in translating movie subtitles from English into Kurdish. It attempts to identify the factors that cause pragmatic failures and find out the types of failures in the selected movie. The data of the study are taken from the transcripts of the English adventure movie *Treasure Island* which has been translated into Kurdish. The English source text and the Kurdish subtitles were compared to find out the types and identify the causes of pragmatic failures. The paper draws upon Thomas's (1983) category to classify pragmatic failures. The results of the study show that both types of pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure are found in the movie which resulted from a lack of translator's qualification in translation, a lack of pragmatic as well as cultural knowledge of both the source and target languages. It has also been found that pragmatic failures are failures of transferring speech acts from the source language to the target language that cause a lack of proper understanding of the source message. In other words, pragmatic failures are the result of mistranslation, under-translation, and over-translation errors which cause non-equivalency between the message in the source language and the one in the target language.

Keywords: Pragmatic Failures, Subtitling, Movie Translation, English-Kurdish Subtitles, Treasure Island

1. Introduction

The concept of pragmatic failure was introduced by Thomas (1983: 91) who defines it as "the inability to understand what is meant by what is said". So, pragmatic failure in translation is the failure of the translator to transfer the pragmatic message effectively from the source text to the target text. Further, Thomas (ibid) classifies pragmatic failures into two types, namely pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure. In line with this, Wu (2007: 52) states that pragmalinguistic failure is the translator's failure in conveying the intended meaning of the message due to the inappropriate use of language. Additionally, Wu (ibid:53) states that sociopragmatic failure is a failure that stems from the translator's unawareness of the different sociocultural rules in the target and source languages.

Pragmatic failures are critical in movie translation as they affect the message of the movie. The idea of translation was emerged to solve the problems encountered by people when trying to understand a product text in a different language. In the world of multimedia, translation is the main tool for understanding foreign products. So, the only tool which is eagerly used by people to understand foreign products is translation. Nowadays, translation is a must for audiovisual products. Audiovisual products include movies, children's cartoons, documentaries, plays, and various TV programs. One of the most translated texts in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq is movie subtitles. In the last two decades, subtitling which is regarded as a form of audiovisual translation has become very common due to the increasing demand for movie production (Crane, 2014: 336). According to Karamitroglou (2000: 5), subtitling is an interlingual process in which the spoken source text in a movie is replaced by a written target text and shown simultaneously at the bottom of the screen. In movie subtitling, both the mode and the language will be changed from one language into another both as well as from spoken to written. Hamad and Sabir (2022: 458) state that an accurate subtitle is deemed necessary to deliver the message of the source language which is the pragmatic message and the main element in audio-visual subtitling. Pragmatic failures in movie translation are very common and sometimes inevitable in one way or another. Therefore, the present study investigates the nature of pragmatic failures in movie subtitles and the causes behind them.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The lack of a special government agency to observe movie translation has led to a situation where private agencies translate movies from different languages, particularly English into Kurdish, regardless the quality of the translation. Partially, the translated movies in the Kurdistan region are full of pragmatic failures. This produces a Kurdish subtitle that does not have the same effect on the target audience as the original does. However, the problem arises from the fact that the pragmatic aspects are not taken into consideration in movie translation by translators which resulted in pragmatic failures. Pragmatic failures affect the story of the movie and provide Kurdish viewers with inaccurate information because the subtitle mismatches with the context of the movie. However, to date, no serious research studies have been conducted on this phenomenon in the Region in order to identify pragmatic failures in movie translation and the underlying causes behind them, or to identify the gap. Therefore, this study is an attempt to provide a comprehensive profile of pragmatic failures in movie subtitles through a descriptive qualitative method.

1.2 Research Questions

To solve the problem, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. Why do pragmatic failures occur in movie translation from English into Kurdish?
2. What types of pragmatic failures do exist in the Kurdish subtitle of the movie *Treasure Island*?
3. What are the pragmatic aspects that are mostly involved in pragmatic failure in the selected movie?

1.3 The Aims of the Study

This study aims to:

1. Identify the underlying factors that cause pragmatic failures in the Kurdish subtitle of the movie *Treasure Island* which has been translated from English.

1. Find out the types of pragmatic failures that exist in the translation of the selected movie subtitles.

3. Find out the pragmatic aspects that are mostly involved in pragmatic failure in the selected movie.

1.4 Methodology

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach, specifically the content analysis type of the qualitative approach. According to Berelson (1952: 181) content analysis is a

research technique that is used to describe the content of communication in a systematic way. In line with this, Krippendorff (2004: 18) states that content analysis is a research method used for making valid and replicable inferences from data to their context of usage. Taylor and Bogdan (1998: 7) state that a qualitative methodology refers to research procedures that produce descriptive data from people's written or oral speech and observable behavior. A descriptive qualitative approach was adopted in describing the data in words or interpreting the findings. The nature of the data requires this approach so as to identify pragmatic failures and the causes behind them. Moreover, this study basically adopts Baker's (2018: 11) typology of equivalence. This theory has been selected because it is the most relevant theory. Baker (ibid) discusses exhaustively equivalence and non-equivalence problems at linguistic different levels; however, this study refers to equivalence and non-equivalence specifically at the pragmatic level.

1.5 The Significance of the Study

This study will have theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, the findings of this study are important for readers, especially for linguistic students to have a better understanding of the concept of pragmatic failure. Practically, the findings of the study will be valuable for the translators and to those who work in the process of subtitle translation, more specifically movie subtitlers to use as a guide for movie subtitling from English into Kurdish. In addition to that, it provides awareness about the pragmatic failures in the English adventure movie *Treasure Island*, while being translated into the Kurdish language. This study can also be regarded as an introduction to pragmatic translation criticism in the region. This study shows the necessity of establishing a professional translation agency to observe movie translations in Kurdistan. It also paves the way to start researching other translated movies into Kurdish to discover other pragmatic aspects that help translators give a better shape in the process of subtitling in Kurdistan. To sum up, this study will be of great significance for researchers, translators, and translation agencies.

1.6 The Scope of the Study

The study is limited to only one movie subtitle because of the large amount of data which consists of 2044 subtitle captions and is quite enough for this study to answer the research questions. This study is restricted to pragmatic failures in movie translation. The study adopts Thomas's (1983) category to classify pragmatic failures. All pragmatic aspects are liable to be involved in pragmatic failures, but this study mainly focuses on speech acts

which are mostly involved in pragmatic failures in the selected movie. Consequently, the focus of the study is on the pragmatic transfer of speech acts from English into Kurdish.

2. Subtitling

Audiovisual translation is a branch of translation in which the data is transmitted from oral to written mode or from oral to oral. Chaume (2013: 105) defines audiovisual translation as a "mode of translation which is characterized by the transfer of audiovisual texts either interlingually or intralingual". Compared with literary translation, audiovisual translation is a new field in translation studies. Nowadays, this type of translation has changed drastically, and more experts are interested in exploring this area, due to major technological developments in the TV industries and movie production. The growth of audiovisual translation has started with a parallel increase in movie production. So this fast-growing area in the field of translation studies began to gain scholarly prominence.

There are various types of audiovisual products such as films, series, documentaries, or interviews. So, many methods are used for the translation of these products, such as subtitling, dubbing, or voiceover. Subtitling and dubbing are the most popular, widespread, and highly used modes of audiovisual translation. Dubbing and voiceover are considered oral language transfer in audiovisual translation and are known as revoicing because the data is transmitted from an oral source language to an oral target language. Baker and Hochel (2001: 74) distinguish between dubbing and voiceover; dubbing is the replacement of the original speech by a voice track along with matching the lip movements with the audio scripts, whereas voiceover is the reading of the target text over the original speech without matching the lip movements with the audio scripts. Concerning subtitling, it is the replacement of the original speech by a written text placed at the bottom of the screen which appears and disappears simultaneously with the original dialogue (Luyken and Herbst, 1991: 31). Accordingly, Cintas (2003: 196) states that subtitling is the most economical and widely used method at the expense of dubbing. Subtitling, along with dubbing and voiceover are the major modes of audiovisual translation, but this study mainly sheds light on subtitling in movie translation.

Additionally, Cintas and Ramael (2021: 11) distinguish between two types of subtitling, linguistically, subtitles can be either intralingual or interlingual. Intralingual is a type of subtitle which remains within the same language; both the target language and the source language are the same. Interlingual subtitle, on the other hand, occurs between two

languages, and from spoken into written text. That is, there is a change both in the mode and the language. According to Cintas and Ramael (ibid: 26), technically there are two types of subtitles: open subtitles, and closed subtitles. The open subtitle is part of the original film, inseparable and not optional. It accompanies the movie without the viewers' ability to choose its presence. This type of subtitling always remains and displays with film on the screen. A closed subtitle is optional and it is not part of the film. It is separately broadcasted from the audiovisual products. In this kind of subtitling, the viewers are free to watch the movie with or without the subtitle.

Based on the above classifications, movie subtitling is interlingual and open in which both the mode and the language will be changed from one language into another and it is different from captioning because captions remain in the same language.

3. Pragmatic Failure

Pragmatic failure is a misunderstanding that may occur in communication or translation due to the improper use of language or cultural constraints. Thomas (1983: 94) argues that pragmatic failure occurs when the hearer fails to recognize the intention of the speaker. Accordingly, Thomas (Ibid) points out that pragmatic failure occurs on any occasion on which the hearer perceives the force of the speaker's utterance rather than the speaker's intention that he or she should perceive it. So, she offers the following examples to illustrate the concept of pragmatic failure (p.94). For example, if:

a. The hearer perceives the speaker's utterance as an order that the speaker intended as a request.
b. The hearer perceives the force of the speaker's utterance as stronger or weaker than the speaker's intention.
c. The hearer perceives the speaker's utterance as ambivalent where the speaker intended no ambivalent.
d. The speaker expects that the hearer will be able to infer the force of his or her utterance when they do not share the system of knowledge that they rely on.
It can be clear that, pragmatic failures mostly occur due to the failure of the hearer in recognizing the speaker's intention. This could be related to the lack of pragmatic competence on the part of the hearer.

3.1 Types of Pragmatic Failure

Thomas (1983: 99) classifies pragmatic failure into two types: pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. Thomas (ibid) uses the two terms to refer to the mismatches which may occur between the speaker's intended meaning and the hearer's constructed meaning.

3.1.1 Pragmalinguistic Failure

Pragmalinguistic failure is a linguistic failure that may occur due to the difference of the pragmatic force mapped by a speaker on a given utterance from the one assigned to it by the hearer (Thomas, 1983: 99). Additionally, Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that pragmalinguistic failure happens when speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from the source language into the target language. For instance, when the utterance *Can you X?* is used as a request by a speaker, but interpreted as a question by a listener, thus a pragmatic failure would occur. It can be said that pragmalinguistic failure is closely related to linguistics which happens due to the different systems of the source language and the target language.

3.1.2 Sociopragmatic Failure

Sociopragmatic failure is a failure that may occur due to the placing cultural constraints on language in use (Thomas, 1983: 99). According to Gunduz (2016: 54), "sociopragmatics is a culture-specific science that studies the cultural elements of communities". She also adds that sociopragmatic elements are of various types, such as idioms, proverbs, slang, cliché, and the like, as well as paralinguistics, kinesics, proxemics, and superstitions. Misjudging these elements would lead to sociopragmatic failure in communication. It can be said that sociopragmatic failure is related to cultural norms which happens due to the cultural differences of the source and the target languages.

In sum, pragmalinguistic failure is language-specific which mainly occurs due to the improper use of language, whereas sociopragmatic failure is culture-specific which mainly occurs due to the differences in culture.

4. Pragmatic Failure in Subtitling

In interlingual movie subtitling, pragmatic failure whether pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic occurs due to the mistranslating of pragmatic aspects from the source language into the target language. A translator should understand the pragmatic meaning of an utterance in order to produce an effective translation. While translating a text, pragmatic aspects must be taken into consideration by the translator so that the intended

meaning could be effectively conveyed from the source language to the target language. The pragmatic transfer is very important in subtitling. Even small discourse units such as nouns, verbs, words, and clauses are important in subtitling. Kopczyński (1994: 189) confirms that the translation quality and its process could be evaluated from pragmatic and linguistic perspectives. In English movies that are subtitled into Kurdish, pragmatic and linguistic problems of non-equivalence are most likely to be challenging. This is due to the differences between the two languages as well as subtitling constraints. Therefore, translators need to be grounded in translation theories so as to understand how functional equivalence or formal equivalence interacts with context, techniques, and multimedia technologies (Werner, 2001: 52). Subtitlers should select proper equivalents, especially functional ones so that they could transfer all the pragmatic and cultural components to the target language. During the process of subtitling from English into Kurdish, thousands of messages are transferred to Kurdish viewers who are not familiar with the source culture. This happens due to the cultural differences between the two languages which lead to arising of non-equivalence problems. Accordingly, cross-cultural problems occur if the specificities of the target culture are not taken into account during movie subtitling. A significant aspect that is treated in this study during movie subtitling is the transfer of pragmatic aspects. Newmark (1988: 9) states that in the translation process, it is important to consider all the factors within or outside the text. Factors within the text include linguistic aspects, whereas factors outside the text require pragmatic and sociocultural knowledge attributes in the target language. The external factors help translators to recognize the intended meaning of utterances. Because if the intended meaning is not transferred during the translation process, it causes pragmatic failure in the target language. Sometimes, subtitlers fail in transferring the pragmatic meaning of the utterance, resulting in pragmatic failure. Muhammad (2017: 2) argues that meaning loss occurs due to the mistranslation, and superficial translation of the pragmatic, and semantic equivalents. Mistranslating the intention in the illocutionary force is the major cause of pragmatic failure. Fawcett (2001: 124) states that pragmatic differences are part of the translators' competence. They have to consider areas of pragmatic differences between the two languages. Thomas (1983: 94) states that pragmatic failure may occur when an utterance fails to achieve the sender's intended meaning. Hassan (2011: 18) argues that pragmatic failures occur in translation in the case of applying pragmatic aspects such as speech acts, deictic expressions, politeness and implicatures. El-Shiyab et al. (2000: 276-277) argue that a translator is required to transfer the implicit meaning of the original text. Transferring the explicit meaning is not enough to translate a text pragmatically successfully Thus,

neglecting implicit meaning, and any mistranslation of speech acts will lead to pragmatic failure.

In this study, pragmatic failure refers to the translator's failure or inability to transfer the intended meaning and functions of the pragmatic aspects from the source text as effectively as to the target text. Overall, Xia (2015: 2093) confirms that pragmatic study in translation mainly focuses on pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic equivalence by comparing two languages. Accordingly, Thomas (1999, cited in Mahniza 2020:39) states that pragmalinguistic failure is the translator's failure in conveying the pragmatic force of an utterance from the source language to the target language. Sociopragmatic failure is the translator's failure in transferring the cultural and social message of the source text to the target text (ibid: 50). So, to achieve pragmatically equivalent effect in translation, more specifically in subtitling, both the utterance and the context should be taken into consideration by translators.

Failures can be of various types but two of them can be easily categorized. The first one is the must-failure failures which occur due to the different systems of the two languages. The second is related to the translators' incompetence who fail to find the appropriate equivalence. Both kinds of failures can be seen in all pragmatic aspects, the main focus will be on pragmatic elements which are involved in pragmatic failures during transferring the meaning from English into Kurdish.

5. Pragmatic Aspects

Failures can mostly be seen in pragmatic aspects, such as deixis, politeness principles, implicatures, presuppositions and speech acts. Politeness, implicature and presupposition element failures lie outside the domain of this study. The main focus of the study will be on speech acts which are mostly involved in pragmatic failure in the selected movie.

5.1 Speech Acts

There are different classifications of speech acts by scholars. This study depends on Searle's (1979) category of speech acts for the purpose of analysing pragmatic failures. Searle (1979) classifies speech acts into five categories, namely: declarative, representative, expressive, directive and commissive. Searle (ibid) states that speech acts are the smallest linguistic units and messages of communication which are produced under specific rules, such as *stating, asking*, *promising* and *ordering.* Accordingly, Yule (1996: 47) and Aitchison (1999: 126) argue that a speech act is an action performed by a speaker via an utterance. They are utterances that involve some kind of action. When a speaker uses

a language, he/she performs certain kinds of actions which are recognized by the hearer. The actions are *promises, commands, requests, statements, questions, greetings,* etc. For instance, when a speaker says, *I'll be there by four*, he/she is not just speaking, but performing the action of promising.

6. Data Collection Method

For the data of the study, the English and Kurdish subtitle scripts of the English movie *Treasure Island* a 2012 production have been selected which have been translated from English into Kurdish more specifically central Kurdish. Due to the lack of a professional movie translation agency in Kurdistan or the copyright issue, finding valid data was the problem of this study. Therefore, the researcher selected the best movie subtitle among those on the internet. The movie was chosen from a translation agency on the internet that is highly rated by Kurdish viewers. The movie is the most watchable one by Kurdish viewers, more specifically by twelfth-grade students because it is based on the story *Treasure Island* which is a literary reader section in *Sunrise 12*. It was difficult to obtain a representative sample of the movie scripts, especially the Kurdish subtitle. At first, the researcher attempted to get the Kurdish subtitle directly from the translation agency, but they refused to give a copy on the pretext of being the private property of the translator. So, the researcher contacted the translator directly and he was glad to give a copy of his work. After obtaining the movie scripts, the researcher watched the movie and the subtitles carefully. Then, the researcher made a comparison between the English script and the Kurdish subtitle so as to find pragmatic failures that have occurred during translating speech acts from English into Kurdish.

7. Data Analysis and Discussion

In this section, the data of the study is presented in three tables before being described and analyzed in detail. A purposive sample which contains speech acts has been used for the analysis of pragmatic failures in the selected movie *Treasure Island*. The English and Kurdish subtitles were compared for identifying the pragmatic failures which result from translation errors such as mistranslation, under-translation and over-translation. The samples are organized according to the translation errors respectively. Then, the representative samples are analyzed and discussed separately along with identifying the pragmatic failure. For the process of describing and analyzing, the English scripts have been *italicized* and followed by a back-translation to English whenever necessary which have been put in square brackets.

7.1 Pragmatic Failure in Transferring Speech Acts

The data in this section is presented through tables, described in detail then analyzed. The three tables show representative samples of speech acts which contain pragmatic failures. The speech acts are identified in the selected movie *Treasure Island*. It can be seen that speech acts of the English scripts are not equivalent with the speech acts of Kurdish translation. Translation errors lead to such differences in speech acts between the two languages, thus resulting in a pragmatic failure. It can also be observed that speech acts have five types, which are directive, representative, expressive, commissive and declarative which will be explained and analyzed in more detail in the following tables. For the process of describing and analyzing, the samples of speech acts are classified according to translation errors: mistranslation (MIS), under-translation (UT), and over-translation (OT). It can also be observed that in many cases the speech acts have been changed from one speech act type to another, which produces a different illocutionary force from that intended by the original English utterances. There are some other cases in which subtitles have an interrogative structure in English, but they do not have an interrogative structure in the Kurdish subtitle. For example, in some cases, the sentences are just provided with or without question marks, and declarative structure with question marks. It is also clear that the number of speech acts and error types is not the same due to the fact that some speech acts share more than one type of error. In other words, they have mistranslation, under-translation and over-translation at the same time in the same utterances.

7.2 Mistranslations

As for the samples of mistranslations which are mostly due to translators' incompetency in selecting proper equivalents for many utterances and might be due to a lack of cultural background in both languages, especially the foreign language.

The table below presents speech acts that are involved in pragmatic failures due to mistranslations.

Table 1 Mistranslation Samples of Speech Acts

No	Time	Movie Scripts	Speech Acts	Kurdish Subtitle	Failure Type
1	00:05:37	Having it now	Directive	ئێستا دەیکەینەوە	Pragmalinguistic failure

2	00:14:55	Come back, I will kill you!	Commissive	بگەڕێوە، دەتکوژم	Pragmalinguistic failure
3	00:22:44	That's it, reports are coming	Directive	ئەوە تەواوە، پەیامەکان دێن	Pragmalinguistic failure
4	00:25:20	My mother would want for nothing	Commissive	دایکمی بۆ هیچ دەوێ	Sociopragmatic failure
5	00:37:50	My time is my money, Smollett	Representative	پارەکەم سەردەمی منە (سمۆڵێت)	Sociopragmatic failure
6	00:37:53	What I don't accept is learning from the hands	Commissive	ئەوەی من ڕەتیدەکەمەوە فێربوونی دەستە	Pragmalinguistic failure
7	01:06:20	What course, sir?	Directive	ئەوە چییە، گەورەم؟	Pragmalinguistic failure
8	01:11:36	Mr Arrow is to be disciplined	Declarative	بەڕێز (ئارۆ) دەبێ چاودێری بکرێ	Pragmalinguistic failure
9	01:18:11	To give these men extra rations of grog	Representative	بڕی خواردنی زیاتریان بدەنێ	Pragmalinguistic failure
10	01:31:01	You have a piece of heaven on you?	Directive	تۆ باوەڕت بە بەهەشت هەیە؟	Sociopragmatic failure
11	01:33:45	In God's name, please strike the colours, Captain Smollett	Directive	بەناوی خودا، تکایە ڕەنگەکەی دیاریبکە، کاپتن (سمۆڵێت)	Sociopragmatic failure
12	01:36:57	See your paws	Directive	چرنوکەکانت ببینە	Pragmalinguistic failure
13	01:37:08	Bloody unanimous	Declarative	بەتەواوی سەیرە	Pragmalinguistic failure
14	01:47:00	You stay alive and you'll see that now	Commissive	تۆ بە زیندویی بمێنەوە، ئەوە دەبینی	Pragmalinguistic failure
15	01:56:14	Don't shot Smollett	Directive	تەقە مەکە (سمۆڵێت)	Pragmalinguistic failure
16	02:04:49	Raising all the money we need	Representative	تەواوی ئەو پارەیەی پێویستمانە دایبنێ	Pragmalinguistic failure
17	02:15:36	They're hitting the bottle	Representative	ئەوان لە بوتڵەکە دەدەن	Sociopragmatic failure

18	02:27:04	Look lively there, lad	Directive	کوڕە ڕێك دیاری	Sociopragmatic failure
19	02:31:48	Well, bully for you	Expressive	باشە، تۆ پیاوێکی خراپی	Sociopragmatic failure
20	02:32:11	If you've got an ace in your collar, now's the time to reveal it, boy.	Representative	ئەگەر لەناو یاخەکەت بەفر هەبێ ئێستا کاتی ئەوەیە دەریبخەی، کوڕە	Sociopragmatic failure

It can be noticed in table (1) that, there are twenty samples of speech acts which have been involved in pragmatic failures by mistranslation. It can also be observed that mistranslation is the most common type of error which leads to creating non-equivalency between the original utterance and the Kurdish translation.

In sample (1), *Having it now* is translated as ئێستا دەیکەینەوە[We're opening it now]. This translation is considered as a pragmalinguistic failure because the resultant translation is linguistically inaccurate in the Kurdish. In the source language, the word *having* here in this context means *want* or *drink*. The speaker intends to say *I want to drink the rum right now*. The correct translation is ئێستا دەمەوێت. However, this intention was erroneously transferred into the target language, as it is clear in the back-translation. Moreover, there is a change in the speech act type from directive to representative. Consequently, the illocutionary force shifted from ordering to informing. It is clear that the translator has failed in transferring the given text linguistically acceptable to the target text. This creates confusion for the target audience and provides them with inaccurate information.

In sample (2), *Come back, I will kill you!* is translated as بگەڕێوە، دەتکوژم [Return, I kill you]. The English utterance is a commissive speech act with the illocutionary force of threatening and warning. The speaker was threatening the hearer, *if you come back, I will kill him*. The correct translation is بگەڕێیتەوە، دەتکوژم. However, this message has reversely transferred into the target text because there is a change of speech act from commissive to directive. The intention of the speaker was not transferred into the target language, instead, a different intention was produced in the Kurdish subtitle. This produces ambiguity for the target audience and results in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (3), *That's it, reports are coming* is translated as ئەوە تەواوە، پەیامەکان دێن [That's it, messages are coming]. The English utterance is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of order and warning. In this context, Jim was warning and ordering his

mother by saying, *that's enough, the police officers are coming*. The word *reports* here is used to mean *police officers*. However, this intention is mistranslated and the illocutionary force was erroneously transferred into the target language since there is a change of speech act from directive to representative. Consequently, the illocutionary force has shifted from a warning to a mere assertion. Mistranslation of an illocutionary force is likely to result in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (4), *My mother would want for nothing* is translated as دایکمی بۆ هیچ دەوێ [He wants my mother for anything]. The English utterance is a commissive speech act with the illocutionary force of refusing. The speaker intends to say that *his mother needs nothing*. By doing so, the translator has shifted the focus from a commissive speech act with the communicative purpose of refusing to a representative speech act that has the pragmatic force of asserting. The translator has failed to infer the implied meaning of the original utterance and consequently, a pragmatic failure has occurred since such translation does not make sense in the given context.

In sample (5), *My time is my money, Smollett* is translated as پارەکەم سەردەمی منه (سمۆڵێت) [My money is my era, Smollett]. The English speech act is a representative type which is used to mean that *my time is valuable*. The Kurdish equivalent is کات به نرخه لای من. This intention was not transferred correctly into the Kurdish subtitle and instead, a literal translation was produced in the target text by transferring the secondary illocutionary point of the original utterance. There is a pragmatic failure because the speech act is literally translated into Kurdish without inferring the intended meaning. So the translator has failed in finding a Kurdish equivalent that can create a similar effect. The literal translation resulted in pragmatic failure because it creates confusion for the target audience. It is apparent that the translator has insufficient knowledge about idiomatic expressions because, throughout the movie, the translator seems to have failed in translating idiomatic expressions.

In sample (6), *What I don't accept is learning from the hands* is translated as ئەوەی من ڕەتیدەکەمەوە فێربونی دەسته [What I refuse is learning hand] which is not acceptable as the intention of the speaker is lost due to the influence of mistranslation. The speaker intends to say that *what he does not accept is to get knowledge, orders and information from sailors* because the word *hands* here means *sailors*. This intention was not transferred into the Kurdish subtitle, resulting in a meaningless translation produced through the literal translation of the secondary illocutionary point of the original utterance. The connotative

meaning of the word *hands* is not transferred which creates a mismatch between what is said and what is seen on screen and subsequently causes a pragmatic failure.

In sample (7), *What course, sir?* is translated as ئەوه چییه، گەورەم؟ [What is that, sir?]. This translation is considered a pragmalinguistic failure as the resultant translation is linguistically inaccurate. The word *course* here is used to mean *direction* as the speaker is asking for direction- *to what direction we should go?* The correct translation is بە چ ئاراستەیەك، گەورەم؟. However, this intention has been mistranslated and erroneously transferred into the Kurdish subtitle by selecting the wrong lexical choice. In the Kurdish subtitle, the appropriate meaning of the word *course* was not inferred as it was decontextualized and consequently caused a mismatch between what is said by the actor and what is seen on screen. Therefore, in order for the target audience to infer the exact intended meaning of the polysemous words, the translator has to consider the context of the situation in which they are used or resort to dictionaries to find the exact meaning of the words.

In sample (8), *Mr Arrow is to be disciplined* is translated as بەڕێز (ئارۆ) دەبێ چاودێری بکرێ [Mr Arrow is to be observed] which has led to losing the pragmatic meaning of the original speech act. In English utterance, the word *disciplined* here is used to mean *punish*. So, the English speech act means that *Mr Arrow must be punished*. The Kurdish equivalent is بەڕێز ئارۆ دەبێت سزا بدرێت.However, this intention was not transferred into the Kurdish subtitle, and instead, a different intention was produced in the target text due to the mistranslation influence. The context plays a crucial role in selecting the right equivalent, but the translator has failed in choosing the proper equivalent for this context. This could be attributed to doing the translation in a hurry or not watching the movie very well or related to translator's incompetence in English.

In sample (9), *To give these men extra rations of grog* is translated as بری خواردنی زیاتریان بدەنێ [Feed them extra food]. The English utterance is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of asserting. The speaker intends to say that *the crew need a rest in order to take extra wine and food*. The illocutionary force was erroneously transferred into the target language since there is a change of speech act category from representative to the directive. Consequently, the illocutionary force has shifted from assertive to imperative. This creates confusion for the target audience and results in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (10), *You have a piece of heaven on you?* is translated as تۆ باوەڕت به بەهەشت هەیه؟ [You believe in heaven?]. The English speech act is of a directive type. The speaker, Ben

Gunn was asking Jim *whether he has got a piece of cheese*. The correct translation is تۆ.
پارچەیەك پەنیرت پێیە؟The metaphorical meaning of the expression *a piece of heaven* here means *a piece of cheese*. However, this intention was erroneously transferred into the Kurdish subtitle, and instead a totally different intention was produced in the target text through a literal translation of the metaphor. The Kurdish translation is not pragmatically and functionally equivalent to the English utterance since the translator has failed in conveying the right intention of the speaker, thus resulting in a pragmatic failure. This is clearly an indication of misunderstanding the metaphorical meaning of original expressions.

In sample (11), *In God's name, please strike the colours, Captain Smollett* is translated as بەناوی خودا، تکایە ڕەنگەکەی دیاریبکە، کاپتن (سمۆڵێت)[In God's name, please select the colours, Captain Smollett]. This translation is considered as sociopragmatic failure as the message transferred to the target language is unacceptable. The idiomatic expression *strike the colours* is used to mean *lowering the flag*. The correct translation is تۆ ناوی خوا، تکایە ئاڵایەکە دابگرە.However, this intention was erroneously transferred into Kurdish through a literal translation without inferring the pragmatic meaning. This translation is not comprehensible and acceptable as it is devoid of any cultural equivalence and the sense of the idiom was obviously lost. The translation is irrelevant to the context of the movie which creates confusion for the target audience and affects the movie story as well as providing the audience with inaccurate information. Ramiere (2006: 160) states that in screen translation, context plays a crucial role; contextual elements include verbal and non-verbal signs.

In sample (12), *See your paws* is translated as چرنوکەکانت ببینە[See your paws] which has led to losing the pragmatic meaning of the speech act due to mistranslation. The speaker intends to say *let me see your hands*. In Kurdish we say با دەستەکانتان ببینم. The English utterance is a directive speech with the illocutionary force of suggesting. The speaker, John Silver, intends to know his crew's opinion, so he suggests *a raise hand voting* by a show of hands in order to get their support again through voting. However, this intention was erroneously transferred into the Kurdish subtitle since there is a shift of illocutionary force from a suggestion to an order. A meaningless translation was produced in the target text through a literal translation without inferring the intended meaning. So, the translation is irrelevant to the context of the movie since the Kurdish translation does not make sense and might confuse the target audience, thus resulting in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (13), *Bloody unanimous* is translated as بەتەواوی سەیرە[It is totally unusual]. This English utterance is a declarative speech act with the illocutionary force of announcing.

The speaker, John Silver intends to say that the decision of reselecting him as a captain was passed and accepted by a majority vote. The expression *bloody unanimous* means *total voting.* In Kurdish we say, به کۆی دەنگ. This intention was erroneously transferred into the Kurdish subtitle as there is a change of speech act type from declarative to expressive. Consequently, the illocutionary force has been shifted from announcing to surprising. Here, the mistranslation of the utterance has led to changing the declarative speech act of announcing into expressive speech act of surprising. This error might be attributed to the translators' incompetence or lack of proofreading by another translator or not resorting to dictionaries to get the exact meaning of the expression.

In sample (14), *You stay alive and you'll see that now* is translated as تۆ به زیندوویی بمێنەوە، ئەوه دەبینی[You live on. You see that]. The English utterance is a commissive speech act with the illocutionary force of threatening. The speaker threats the hearer *if you do not give me the map, you do not stay alive*. This intention was inaccurately transferred into the target text since there is a change of speech act category from commissive to directive. Consequently, the illocutionary force has shifted from a warning to an order. The translator has failed in recognizing the intention of the speaker, which led to mistranslating the utterance and resulting in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (15), *Don't shoot Smollett* is translated as تەقه مەکه (سمۆڵێت) [Don't shoot Smollett]. The English utterance is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of order. The speaker orders the hearer *not to shoot Smollett*. The correct translation is تەقه له سمۆڵێت مەکه However, this intention was mistakenly transferred into the Kurdish subtitle, and the pragmatic meaning in the Kurdish subtitle is not equivalent to the English utterance. The translation has reversed the intention and the role of the interlocutor. This leads to a pragmatic failure because the target audience might think that the speaker talks to Smollett.

In sample (16), *Raising all the money we need* is translated as تەواوی ئەو پارەیەی پێویستمانه داینێ[Put all the money we need]. The English utterance is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of asserting. The speaker, Jim's mother, was asserting that *his son could make and raise all the money that we need*. The correct translation is تەواوی پارەکه کۆدەکاتەوه که پێویستمانه But, this intention was not transferred appropriately into the Kurdish subtitle because there is a change of speech act type from representative to the directive. Consequently, the illocutionary force has been shifted from an assertion to an order. Subtitles are liable to such kinds of errors and the cases of mistranslations might be due to translating a sample of subtitles in isolation without taking into account the preceding illocutionary forces. Therefore, the context of the situation as well as the preceding and

following utterances should be taken into consideration by the translator during the process of translation.

In sample (17), *They're hitting the bottle* is translated as ئەوان لە بوتڵەکە دەدەن[They're hitting the bottle]. This is a representative speech act uttered through an idiomatic expression. The idiom is used to mean *they are busy with drinking excessively*. In Kurdish we have an equivalent which says ئەوان بوتڵی لە بوتڵی دەدەنەوە. However, this intention was not transferred into the Kurdish subtitle as a literal meaningless translation has been produced in the target language. This translation error is devoid of any cultural equivalence as the meaning of the idiom is totally lost. What is transferred into Kurdish is the literal meaning of English utterance, the secondary illocutionary point, not the primary one. Al Abwaini (2013: 34) states that the difficulty in translating culturally bound expressions occurs either because of unfamiliarity with the culturally bound expressions or inability to find an equivalent in the target language.

In sample (18), *Look lively there, lad* is translated as کوڕە ڕێک دیاری [You look handsome, lad] which has led to losing the intention of the speaker as the English utterance is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of order. The speaker was ordering his men who were looking for someone *to go quickly over there*. The correct translation is بەخێرای کوڕە، بۆ ئەوێ.However, the translator was not successful in transferring this intention into the Kurdish subtitle as there is a change of directive speech act functioning as ordering into expressive functioning as a compliment. This mistranslation indicates that the translator has failed in transferring the pragmatic meaning of the English utterance and consequently, shifted the intention of the speaker from order to compliment, thus leading to a pragmatic failure.

In sample (19), *Well, bully for you* is translated as باشە، تۆ پیاوێکی خراپی[Well, you're a bad man] This translation is considered a sociopragmatic failure. This is because the intention of the speaker transferred to the target language is inaccurate. In the source language, the idiomatic expression *bully for you* is used to praise someone, meaning *well done*. In Kurdish we say ئافەرین بۆ تۆ.The original English expressive speech act has the illocutionary force of praising. But, while subtitling literally, the illocutionary force of praise has become a complaint in the Kurdish subtitle. Hence, the intended meaning of praise conveyed by the English idiomatic expression has been lost in the translation. It is likely that the translator is not familiar with English culture-bound expressions alone, and not that of Kurdish. This creates confusion for the target audience and guides them to inaccurate information.

In sample (20), *If you've got an ace in your collar, now's the time to reveal it boy* is translated as ئەگەر لەناو یاخەکەت بەفر هەبێ ئێستا کاتی ئەوەیە دەریبخەی، کوڕە [If there is an ice in your collar, now's the time to reveal it, boy]. The English utterance is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of order. The speaker, John Silver, was ordering Jim, *if you have kept a secret, it's the time to open it*. In Kurdish we say شتێکت لە ژێر سەری دایه. This intention was not transferred into the Kurdish subtitle and instead, a meaningless translation was produced in the target text through a literal translation. The illocutionary force of order has become meaningless in the Kurdish subtitle for it is not an accurate equivalent which has led to losing the intended meaning of order conveyed by the idiomatic expression. This mostly happens due to the structure and cultural differences between the English and Kurdish languages and partly due to the lack of experience on the part of translators of the English culture.

It can be concluded that mistranslation can lead to pragmatic failures while translating movies from English into Kurdish. It can be clear that the translator has failed to convey the intended pragmatic meaning of the speech acts which are different from the ones uttered by the actors in the movie. Consequently, the failure of understanding the implicit meaning of the utterances or the culturally bound expressions made the translator choose the wrong translation strategies which resulted in pragmatic failures.

7.3 Under-translations

Under-translation includes the omission of any item from the source language which leads to the shortage of the original message and non-equivalency between the two texts as well as affecting the message.

The table below presents speech acts that are involved in pragmatic failures due to under-translation.

Table 2 Under-translation Samples of Speech Acts

No	Time	Movie Scripts	Speech Acts	Kurdish Subtitle	Failure Type
1	00:10:20	Is that my mate Billy's?	Directive	ئایە ئەوە هاورێکەمه (بیڵ)؟	Pragmalinguistic failure
2	00:12:03	I've heard from many a mouth the old man's dead, truth in that?	Representative	بیستومه که پیاوه پیرەکه مردوه، ئەوه ڕاسته؟	Pragmalinguistic failure

3	00:19:06	They'll come back and kill us, if they find us thieving the chest	Commissive	ئەوان دەگەڕێنەوە و دەمانکوژن ئەگەر بزانن دزی دەکەین	Pragmalinguistic failure
4	00:47:02	Yeah, died skint in a Yankee brothel	Representative	بەڵێ ئەو لە مەیخانەیەکی ئەمریکی مردوه	Sociopragmatic failure
5	00:52:58	Till he looks a Frenchie or a Spaniard in the face.	Representative	تا ئەوکاتەی سەیری ڕوخساری دەکات	Pragmalinguistic failure
6	00:54:00	The boy is budgeted for a wage too.	Declarative	کوڕەکەش بەهەمان شێوە	Pragmalinguistic failure
7	01:02:31	Put deep for his maker	Directive	بەرەو قوڵای	Pragmalinguistic failure
8	01:04:31	What you call that then, Silver?	Directive	کەوایە ناوی لێنێ، (سیلڤەر)؟	Pragmalinguistic failure
9	01:18:38	May I pass on the boy's thanks for your excellent seamanship.	Expressive	دەمەوێ سوپاستان بکەم کوڕینە بۆ ئەو یارمەتیدانه	Pragmalinguistic failure
10	01:26:38	Some kind of a stronghold on this side of the island	Representative	لایەکی بەهێزی دورگەکەیه	Pragmalinguistic failure
11	01:32:18	Especially knocking back the rum, boys.	Representative	بەتایبەتی بۆ گەڕانەوه، کوڕەکان	Sociopragmatic failure
12	01:41:18	Bind him to the post	Directive	بیبەستەوه	Pragmalinguistic failure
13	01:43:06	Because, Mrs Silver, my son is on an expedition with the Squire himself	Representative	لەبەرئەوەی، خاتو (سیلڤەر) کوڕەکەم خۆی لەگەڵ (سکوئ) ه	Pragmalinguistic failure
14	02:32:15	Cos God help me; I don't want to see you die.	Expressive	لەبەرئەوەی ودا خودا یارمەتیم بدات نامەوئ تۆ بمری	Sociopragmatic failure
15	02:43:27	Get that man in irons, Livesey	Directive	ئەو پیاوه بێنە (لیڤسی)	Pragmalinguistic failure

It can be noticed in table (2) that, there are fifteen samples of speech acts which have been involved in pragmatic failures by under-translation. Under-translation is another source of pragmatic failure which leads to creating non-equivalency between the original utterance and the Kurdish translation. It is the second most common type of error when it comes to translating speech acts.

In sample (1), *Is that my mate Billy's?* is translated as ئایە ئەوە هاورێکەمە (بێل)؟ [Is that my mate Bill]. This is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of asking. The speaker asks Jim about *Billy's sword* that Jim was using for training. The correct Kurdish translation is ئایە ئەوە هی هاورێیەکەم (بێل)ە؟.However, this intention was not transferred to the Kurdish subtitle due to the influence of under-translation and consequently, the intention of the speaker was partially lost in the target text. It can be seen that the translator has underestimated the significance and the real function of the possessive 's'. This indicates that even small units will affect the message of the utterance, therefore it is necessary to be transferred to the target text.

In sample (2), *I've heard from many a mouth the old man's dead, truth in that?* is translated as بیستومە کە پیاوە پیرەکە مردوە، ئەوە ڕاستە؟ [I've heard that the old man's dead, truth in that?]. The English speech act is of a representative type. The speaker intends to say that *he has heard from many people that the old man's dead.* The accurate translation is لە زۆر کەسم بیستوە پیاوە پیرەکە مردوە.The word *many a mouth* which means *many people* has been omitted. This creates non-equivalency between the original speech act and the translated one. The intention of the speaker was not completely transferred into the Kurdish subtitle due to the under-translation and instead, a partial intention was produced in the target language. This provides the audience with insufficient information and consequently a pragmatic failure will occur.

In sample (3), *They'll come back and kill us, if they find us thieving the chest* is translated as ئەوان دەگەڕێنەوە و دەمانکوژن ئەگەر بزانن دزی دەکەین [They'll come back and kill us, if they find us thieving]. This is a commissive speech act type with the illocutionary force of warning. The speaker, Jim was warning his mother that *the pirates will come back and kill them if they find them thieving the box of money*. This intention was partially lost in the Kurdish subtitle due to under-translation. Though both speech acts are commissive with the same intention that is, to warn the hearer about danger, the two utterances are not totally equivalent due to deletion. As it is clear in the back translation, the word *chest* has not been translated at all There is no need for such deletions as there is space and time as well as it

may affect the message and create confusion for the target audience which may result in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (4), *Yeah, died skint in a Yankee brothel* is translated as بەڵێ ئەو لە مەیخانەیەکی ئەمریکی مردوه [Yeah, he died at an American inn]. The English utterance is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of asserting. The speaker asserts that *Mr Arrow died in poverty in an American brothel*. However, this intention was not completely conveyed in the Kurdish subtitle and consequently, the two utterances were not equivalent because of the under-translation error. In addition to that, the subtitler has used a general word in the target text for the word *brothel*. The translator might be incompetent in the target language and therefore has not used the right equivalent. More plausibly, the subtitler was aware that mentioning brothel is a taboo in the Kurdish culture, therefore he has replaced it with a more general term. In both cases, sociocultural or human constraints cause a pragmatic failure.

In sample (5), *Till he looks a Frenchie or a Spaniard in the face* is translated as تا ئەوکاتەی سەیری ڕوخساری دەکات[Till he looks at his face]. The English utterance is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of describing. The speaker describes Dr. Livesey that *he looks like a French or Spanish person in the face*. In Kurdish we say ئەو بە ڕوخسار وه کەسێکی فەرەنسی یاخود ئیسپانی دەچێت. However, this intention was not completely transferred into the Kurdish subtitle since there is a change of illocutionary force from describing to asserting. Here, the pragmatic meaning is affected by means of under-translation. Here, the pragmatic failure stems from non-equivalency between the original speech act and the translated one.

In sample (6), *The boy is budgeted for a wage* is translated as کوڕەکەش بەهەمان شێوه [The boy is so]. The English utterance is a declarative speech act with the illocutionary force of declaring. The speaker declares *a weekly budget for Jim as a cabin boy*. This intention was incompletely transferred into the Kurdish subtitle as there is a change of speech act from declarative to representative due to under-translation. Consequently, the illocutionary force has been shifted from declaring to asserting. This entails an inequivalent intention from that of the original utterance which results in a pragmalinguistic failure.

In sample (7), *Put deep for his maker* is translated as بەرەو قوڵای [To the depth]. The English utterance is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of order. The speaker orders the crew to *bury the corpse deep for his God*. This intention was insufficiently transferred into the Kurdish subtitle due to the influence of under-translation. This could be attributed

to misunderstanding the metaphorical meaning of the expressions as the word *maker* here refers to *God*. Every word, whether it is a function word or a content word, has its own significance therefore they are necessary to be transferred to the target text. This indicates that the semantic meaning of a speech act is as important as the pragmatic ones to produce pragmatic equivalence. This might also be related to the translator's limited knowledge of the two cultures especially dealing with religious terms.

In sample (8), *What you call that then, Silver?* is translated as کەوایە ناوی لێنێ، (سیلڤەر)؟ [Then, you call it, Silver?]. The English utterance is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of asking. The speaker was asking about the name of a thing and he asked Silver *what that thing is called then*. The correct Kurdish translation is کەوایە چی بەوە دەڵێیت، سیلڤەر؟. This intention was incompletely transferred into the Kurdish subtitle since there is a change of the sentence structure from interrogative to imperative only provided with a question mark. Consequently, the illocutionary force has been shifted from asking to order. This might be related to a lack of attention from the translator or doing the translation in a hurry and a lack of revision by a second translator.

In sample (9), *May I pass on the boy's thanks for your excellent seamanship* is translated as دەمەوێ سوپاستان بکەم کورینە بۆ ئەو یارمەتیدانە [I want to thank you for such helping]. The English utterance is an expressive speech act with the illocutionary force of thanking. The speaker, John Silver was intending to *deliver his men's gratitude to Captain Smollett for such excellent captaincy*. The correct translation is دەتوانم سوپاسی پیاوایەکانت پێڕابگەیەنم بۆ ئەو دەریاوانییە نایەبەت. However, this intention was incompletely and reversely transferred into the Kurdish subtitle due to an under-translation error. The message was not completely conveyed as some items are omitted in the target text. This creates confusion for the target audience and results in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (10), *Some kind of a stronghold on this side of the island* is translated as لایێکی بەهێزی دورگەکەیە [A strong side of the island]. In this sample, the pragmatic meaning is affected by means of under-translation. The English utterance is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of describing. Dr. Livesey was *describing a stockade for Squire on a map that was a castle alike on one side of the island*. Suggested translation is شێوە قەلایەکە کەوتووتە لایەکی دورگەکە. But, this intention was not completely rendered in the Kurdish subtitle because of the under-translation error. This will affect the message due to the production of an inequivalent intention in the target text and result in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (11), *Especially knocking back the rum, boys* is translated as بەتایبەتی بۆ گەڕانەوە،
کوڕەکان [Especially for taking back the boys] which is not an accurate equivalent because
the intended meaning of the English speech act conveyed by the idiomatic expression is
lost in translation. The idiomatic expression *knocking back the rum* is used to mean
drinking alcohol in large amounts. Suggested translation is بەتایبەتی بە قوم لێدان لە شەڕابەکە،
کوڕینە. But, this intention was not transferred into the Kurdish subtitle at all due to the
influence of under-translation. This could be related to translators' lack of cultural
background and limited knowledge on culturally bound expressions of the two languages.
In this case, sociocultural constraints cause a sociopragmatic failure.

In sample (12), *Bind him to the post* is translated as بیبەستنەوە[Bind him]. The English
utterance is of a directive speech act type. The speaker orders the hearer to *bind Jim to the
post*. The correct translation is لە ستونەکە بیبەستنەوە . However, this intention was not
completely transferred to the Kurdish subtitle due to under-translation error. The phrase *to
the post* has not been transferred to the target language. The intended meaning of the
original utterance is not equivalent to the Kurdish translation. The reason behind such
deletion is not clear, but it will definitely affect the message as well as provide the target
audience with insufficient information, and subsequently, there is a mismatch between
what is said and what is seen on screen.

In sample (13), *Because, Mrs Silver, my son is on an expedition with the Squire himself* is
translated as لەبەرئەوەی، خاتو (سیلڤەر) کوڕەکەم خۆی لەگەڵ (سکوێ) ه [Because Mrs Silver, my son
himself is with the Squire]. This representative speech act is uttered by Jim's mother who
says that *her son is with the Squire on a voyage*. The correct translation is چونکە، خاتو سیلڤەر،
کوڕەکەم خۆی لەگەڵ سکوایەر لە گەشتدایە. However, this intention was not completely transferred
into the Kurdish subtitle and instead, a partial translation was produced in the target text
by under-translating the original utterance. As it is clear from the back translation, the word
expedition has not been transferred to the target language. This affects the message of the
utterance and consequently, a pragmalinguistic failure may occur.

In sample (14), *Cos God help me; I don't want to see you die* is translated as لەبەرئەوەی ودا
خودا یارمەتیم بدات نامەوێ تۆ بمری[Cos God help me I don't want you to die]. The English
utterance is an expressive speech act with the illocutionary force of stating fear. The
speaker expresses his fear to Jim that *he does not want to see him die*. In Kurdish we say
لەبەر ئەوەی خودا شاهێدە، نامەوێت مەرگی تۆ ببینم. This intention was incompletely transferred into
the Kurdish subtitle due to under-translation. The word *see* has been removed from the
Kurdish subtitle. Even deleting a single word would affect the whole message and create

non-equivalency between the original utterance and the Kurdish translation as well as result in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (15), *Get that man in irons, Livesey* is translated as (ئەو پیاوە بێنە (لیڤسی[Get that man, Livesey]. This is a directive speech act with the illocutionary force of ordering. The speaker, Captain Smollett orders Dr. Livesey to arrest John Silver and put him in chains. The Kurdish equivalent utterance is ئەو پیاوە قۆڵبەست بکەن. The expression *get in irons* is used to mean *arrest or chain someone as a prisoner*. This produces a pragmatic failure because this intention was under-translated into a Kurdish subtitle by means of deletion strategy without inferring the complete implied meaning. This is not the right equivalent as the intended meaning of order conveyed by the original utterance is lost in the Kurdish translation due to omitting the phrase *in irons*, leading to a pragmatic failure.

It can be concluded that whenever the translator has failed in finding out the proper equivalent, he has resorted to under-translating the utterance. This creates non-equivalency in the translation of the speech acts and leads to a pragmatic failure.

7.4 Over-translations

Over-translation includes the addition of extra information to the target text which is not present in the source text. This might be due to having cultural differences and requiring further explanation as well as elaboration in order make the message more comprehensible for the target audience.

The table below presents speech acts that are involved in pragmatic failures due to over-translation.

Table 3 Over-translation Samples of Speech Acts

No	Time	Movie Scripts	Speech Acts	Kurdish Subtitle	Failure Type
1	00:01:14	How much?	Directive	ژمارەیان چەندە؟	Pragmalinguistic failure
2	00:08:13	Served with Captain Flint, I did	Representative	لەگەڵ کاپتن (فلینت) خزمەتم کردوه وامکردوه	Pragmalinguistic failure
3	00:52:22	Stewed cabbage to go with the pork belly	Representative	کەلەرمی کۆڵاو ڕاستەوخۆ بۆ سکە برسییەکانتان	Pragmalinguistic failure
4	00:53:02	I know many a man who's bravery	Representative	زۆر شت دەزانم سەبارەت بە پیاوی ئازا	Pragmalinguistic failure

| 5 | 00:55:13 | Shows our port of call | Representative | ئەوە نیشان دەدات کەشتییەکە لەژێر مەترسیدایە | Sociopragmatic failure |
| 6 | 01:49:26 | And that was thievery! | Representative | ئەی دزییەکە چی بوو؟ | Pragmalinguistic failure |

It can be noticed in table (3) that, there are six samples of speech acts which have been involved in pragmatic failures by over-translation. It can also be observed that over-translation is the least common type of error which leads to creating differences in speech acts between the two languages, thus a pragmatic failure would occur.

In sample (1), *How much?* is translated as ژمارەیان چەندە؟[how many are they]. This is a directive speech act type with the illocutionary force of asking. The speaker, Captain Flint asks John Silver about *the amount of the money in the wallet*. The Kurdish equivalence is چەندە؟.However, this intention was over-translated in the Kurdish subtitle and a different intention was produced in the target text by over-translating the original utterance. Subsequently, there is a mismatch between the Kurdish subtitle and the corresponding movie image as well as the context. There is no need for such additions where the message is already clear. This creates confusion for the target audience and leads to a pragmatic failure.

In sample (2), *served with Captain Flint, I did* is translated as لەگەڵ کاپتن (فلینت) خزمەتم کردوه وامکردوه[I have served with Captain Flint, I have]. This is a representative speech act type with the illocutionary force of informing. The speaker intends to say that *I did serve with Captain Flint*. In Kurdish we can say لەگەڵ کاپتن فلینت خزمەتم کردیە. This intention was over-translated due to adding extra words in the Kurdish subtitle. A more successful equivalent would be '*I served with Captain Flint*'. The translator was not successful in preserving the equivalency between the two utterances. There is also a structural distortion in which the Kurdish translation does not sound natural because this is not how the Kurdish language is used, and the arrangement of the words does not comply with acceptable Kurdish grammar. This addition seems to be redundant in this context, additionally, it might confuse the audience and result in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (3), *Stewed cabbage to go with the pork belly* is translated as کەلەرمی کوڵاو ڕاستەوخۆ بۆ سکە برسییەکانتان[Stewed cabbage is direct to your hungry bellies]. The English utterance is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of describing. John Silver, the sea cook, while serving the food and saying *stewed cabbage with pig meat*. The

correct translation is كەلەرمى كولاو لەگەل گۆشتى بەراز. However, the illocutionary force was over-translated and erroneously transferred into the Kurdish subtitle since there is a change of speech act category from representative to directive. Consequently, the illocutionary force has been shifted from describing to ordering. Any addition which leads to a change to speech acts will result in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (4) *I know many a man who's bravery* is translated as زۆر شت دەزانم سەبارەت به پیاوی ئازا[I know many things about bravery men]. This representative speech act is uttered by John Silver, who says that *I know many bravery men*. The correct translation is زۆر پیاوی ئازا دەناسم.This intention was over-translated in the Kurdish subtitle due to adding extra information to the target text. There is no need for such additions as the message is already clear. We can assert that any addition will be at the expense of the message. Here, pragmatic failure stems from over-translation.

In sample (5), *Shows our port of call* is translated ئەوه نیشان دەدات کەشتییەکە لەژێر مەترسیدایه [This indicates that the ship is in danger]. This is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of asserting. The speaker intends to assert that *the map shows our port of call*. The correct translation is بەندەرەکەمان پیشان دەدات.The expression *port of call* refers to *a place where a ship stops*. This intention was over-translated due to adding extra information to the target text which is not present in the source text. The translator has resorted to the addition strategy in order to make the message clear, but this created non-equivalency between the two utterances. This shows the cultural differences between Kurdish and English because the existence of *port of call* is very common in the English culture, but it is not usually found in the Kurdish culture. So, the translator has failed in achieving pragmatic equivalence for this context, thus resulting in a pragmatic failure.

In sample (6), *And that was thievery*! is translated as ئەی دزییەکه چی بو؟[What was the thievery?]. The English utterance is a representative speech act with the illocutionary force of concluding. The speaker accuses the hearer that *it was a thievery*. Suggested translation is ئەوه دزی بو!.However, this intention was erroneously transferred into the Kurdish subtitle since there is a change of speech act type from the representative of accusing to the directive of asking due to the addition of a question mark to the target text. Consequently, the structure of the sentence has been shifted from declarative to interrogative. The translator could not carefully handle the original speech act as he was not successful in preserving the illocutionary effect. Hence, the target audience might not understand the pragmatic meaning of the utterance and thus a pragmatic failure would occur.

It is found out the failure of the translator in selecting proper equivalents as well as the lack of understanding of the intended pragmatic meaning of utterances have made the translator choose the wrong translation strategies. As it can be noticed in the above tables, the majority of errors are mistranslations. Then, under-translation comes in second place. Finally, the least common type of translation error is over-translation. Accordingly, Baker (2018) confirms that omissions and additions are not used in translation haphazardly. They are rather used in some specific context, more specifically with redundancies and repetitions that they do not have any effect on the intended meaning.

8. Discussion

It can be observed that the frequencies of the mistranslations and under-translations are much higher than the over-translations. The examples have revealed that pragmatic aspects should be dealt with skillfully while translating movies because mistranslating, under-translating, or over-translating of these aspects would lead to pragmatic failures, and make the target audience could not capture the intention of the speaker. The analysis of the data has also revealed that pragmatic equivalence is achievable if the translator applies the right translation strategy that fits the context.

As for the factors of pragmatic failures, they are of various and multiple factors. They could be attributed to the existence of culturally bound expressions in the source text, lack of pragmatic and cultural knowledge of the translator, transferring only propositional content of the source language rather than its pragmatic content, focusing only on the explicit meaning of the source utterances rather than their implied meaning, metaphorical meanings of utterances, the absence of some equivalents in the target text, the structural differences between the English and the Kurdish languages, subtitling constraints imposed on the translator.

Some of the failures are related to the pragmatic meaning in that specific context where the translator was not successful in finding the intended meaning and decides to transfer only the explicit meaning of the utterance without inferring the implicit meaning. Larson (1984: 41) argues that translators must be aware of both implicit and explicit meaning because what is being communicated in the source language text is not only stated overtly but it is stated covertly as well.

Some other failures can be attributed to lexical choices or lack of lexical equivalents. Languages have different lexicons. So it is normal to have a concept in English which is not found in Kurdish. In this case, the translator would face difficulty in choosing the right

lexical equivalent. Lack of lexicalization in the target language has forced the translator to use the nearest word which is not equivalent. Malangwa (2016: 131) confirms that whenever translators face a term that has no equivalent in the target language and they could not establish its meaning, they often resort to mistranslating or under-translating it in the target text. Accordingly, Palmer (2005: 22) asserts that lexical choices which are chosen by the subtitler do not always appear to preserve the movie's pragmatic meaning.

Some of the failures are due to the transferring of the propositional content of the English utterances. The translator has only focused on the propositional content of the message without inferring the pragmatic content. Searle and Vanderveken (1985: 8) point out that a speech act consists of an illocutionary force and a propositional content. The interpretation of the whole speech act is basically determined by its illocutionary force and propositional content. A good translator will not simply concern with the propositional content of the text but with its pragmatic content in order to produce pragmatic equivalence.

Some of the failures are related to the existence of culturally bound expressions in the English text This will definitely affect the intended meaning of the utterances as the translator is obliged to find a solution. He will be either successful or fail in his attempt. The solutions could be transferring the pragmatic meaning by using the nearest equivalent or through a literal translation. The latest is the most common one adopted in this movie and the most confusing one to the target audience as they have no idea what the Black Spot is, for instance. Newmark (1988: 95) implies that culturally bound expressions cannot be translated literally as they are related to a particular language. He confirms that wherever there is a cultural focus, there will be a translation problem. Gamal (2009: 10) states that literal translation is due to a narrow focusing on the dialogue scripts and applying the wrong translation strategy by the subtitler.

9. Conclusions

It can be observed that pragmatic failures in movie translation are very common and sometimes inevitable due to the differences between English and Kurdish languages. As far as the chosen movie is concerned, most utterances in English are not compatible with the translated Kurdish utterances. There are no pragmatic equivalents between the original utterances and their translation due to translation errors. This could be resulting from mistranslating, under-translating, or over-translating the meaning of a word, a phrase, an expression, or an utterance. It has been concluded that pragmatic failures occur in movie translation due to the lack of a translator's qualification in translation, and a lack of

pragmatic and cultural knowledge of the two languages. It can be found that there are 41 pragmatic failures of both types, namely pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure exist in the movie. The most recurrent type of failure is a pragmalinguistic failure. All pragmatic aspects are liable to be involved in pragmatic failures. The most common one observed in the chosen movie is the speech acts as there are many errors in their translations. The study has examined some major problems that translators might have encountered during transferring speech acts from English into Kurdish. The study has also shown that the translator failed in identifying the intended meaning of the English speech acts and was not successful in conveying the pragmatic meaning of the acts effectively to the target language and thus resulting in pragmatic failures.

هەڵەی پراگماتیکی لە ژێرنوسی فیلمدا: پرسی ژێرنوسی کوردی لە فیلمی دورگەی گەنجینەدا

بارزان صباح محمد¹   ئیسماعیل عبدالرحمن عبدالله²

¹بەشی زمانی ئینگلیزی، کۆلێژی پەروەردەی بنەڕەتی، زانکۆی سەلاحەددین-هەولێر، هەرێمی کوردستان-عێراق

²بەشی تەکنیکەکانی وەرگێڕان، پەیمانگای تەکنیکی کارگێڕی هەولێر، زانکۆی پۆلیتەکنیکی هەولێر، هەرێمی کوردستان-عێراق

پوختە

هەڵە پراگماتیکییەکان جێگەی هەلوێستە لەسەرکردن لە وەرگێڕانی فیلمدا چونکە کاریگەری لە پەیامی فیلمەکەدا دەکەن. هەڵەی پراگماتیکی ئاماژە بۆ ئەو ناهاوتاییە دەکات کە لە نێوان واتای مەبەستی قسەکەر و واتای سازدراوی وەرگێڕدا ڕودەدات. ئامانجی ئەم توێژینەوەیە بریتییە لە لێکۆڵینەوە لە هۆکار و ڕودانی هەڵەی پراگماتیکی لە ژێرنوسی فیلمی ئینگلیزی بۆ سەر زمانی کوردی. توێژینەوەکە هەوڵی دەست نیشانکردن هۆکارەکانی ڕودانی هەڵەی پراگماتیکی و دۆزینەوە جۆرەکانی دەدات لە فیلمی هەڵبژێردراودا. داتای توێژینەوەکە بریتییە لە تێکستی فیلمێکی سەرکێشی ئینگلیزی بە ناوی (دورگەی گەنجینە) کە وەرگێڕدراوەتە سەر زمانی کوردی. ژێرنوسە ئینگلیزی و کوردییەکە پێکەوە بەراوردکراون بۆ دۆزینەوەی جۆرەکانی هەڵەی پراگماتیکی و دەست نیشانکردنی هۆکارەکانی. توێژینەوەکە پشت دەبەستێت بە پۆڵێنی تۆماس (1983) بۆ پۆڵێنکردنی هەڵە پراگماتییەکان. ئەنجامی توێژینەوەکە نیشانی دەدات کە هەردو جۆری هەڵەی پراگماتیکی، پراگمالینگویستیک و سۆشیۆپراگماتیک لە فیلمەکەدا بونیان هەیە کە بۆ هۆکاری کەمی شارەزایی وەرگێڕ لە بواری وەرگێڕان و کەمی زانیاری پراگماتیکی و کەلتوری لەسەر هەردو زمانی

سەرچاوەو زمانی مەبەست دەگەڕێتەوە. هەروەها توێژینەوەکە دەریخست که هەڵەی پراگماتیکی بریتییە لە
بەهەڵە گواستنەوەی کرده قسەییەکان لە زمانی سەرچاوەوە بۆ سەر زمانی مەبەست بە شێوەیەک که
کاریگەری دەبێت لەسەر تێگەیشتن لە پەیام و مەبەستی فیلمەکە. بەواتایەکی تر، هەڵەی پراگماتیکی لە
ئەنجامی بەهەڵە وەرگێڕان و قرتاندن و خستنەسەر ڕودەدات که ناهاوتایی لە نێوان پەیامی زمانی سەرچاوە
و زمانی مەبەست دروست دەکات.

وشه کلیلیەکان: هەڵەی پراگماتیکی، ژێرنوسکردن، وەرگێڕانی فیلم، ژێرنوسی ئینگلیزی بۆ کوردی، دورگەی
گەنجینه

References:

Aitchison, J., 1999. *Linguistics: An introduction.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Al Abwaini, S. M., 2013. *Problems that Translators Face When They Subtitle Culturally-Bound Expressions from English Into Arabic.* Master's Thesis. Middle East University: Jordan.

Baker, M., 2018. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation.* 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. & Hochel, B., 2001. Dubbing. In: M. Baker, ed. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 74-76.

Berelson, B., 1952. *Content Analysis in Communications Research.* New York: Free Press.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C., 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chaume, F., 2013. The Turn of Audiovisual Translation: New Audiences and New Technologies Translation Spaces. *Translation Spaces,* Volume 2, pp. 105-123.

Cintas , J. D. & Remael, A., 2021. *Subtitling Concepts and Practices.* London and New York: Routledge.

Cintas, J. D., 2003. Audiovisual Translation in the Third Millennium. In: G. Anderman & M. Rogers, eds. *Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp. 192-204.

Crane, D., 2014. Cultural Globalization and the Dominance of the American Film Industry: Cultural Policies, National Film Industries, and Transnational Film. *International Journal of Cultural Policy,* 20(4), pp. 365-382.

El-Shiyab, S., Al-khanji, R. & Al-Abdullatif, M. A., 2000. Translation: The Translators Intuition and Senses. *Arab Journal for the Humanities,* 18(72), pp. 274-285.

Fawcett, P., 2001. Linguistic Approaches. In: M. Baker & G. Saldanha, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of translation studies.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 148-151.

Gamal, M., 2009. Adding Text to Image: Challenges of Subtitling Non-verbal Communication. *Journal of Multicultural Communication,* Volume 1, pp. 1-27.

Gunduz, N., 2016. Sociopragmatic Elements and Possible Failure in EFL Teaching. *Dil Dergisi,* pp. 49-66.

Hamad, A. H. & Sabir, M. A., 2022. Translating the Pragmatic Markers (just, but, oh, and, well) in the Movies The Dry and Taxi Driver 1976 from English into Kurdish. *Journal of University of Raparin,* 9(3), pp. 457-472.

Hassan, B.-E. A., 2011. *Literary Translation: Aspects of Pragmatic Meaning.* UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Karamitroglou, F., 2000. *Towards a Methodology for the Investigation of Norms in Audiovisual Translation.* Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V.

Kopczyński, A., 1994. Quality in Conference Interpreting: Some Pragmatic Problems. In: M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker & K. Kain, eds. *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins, pp. 189-198.

Krippendorff, K., 2004. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Larson, M., 1984. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence.* New York: University Press of America.

Luyken, G. M. & Herbst, T., 1991. *Overcoming Language Barriers in Television: Dubbing and Subtitling for the European Audience.* Manchester: European Institute for the Media.

Mahniza, M., 2020. Pragmatic Failure in the Subtitles of Moonlight Movie. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics,* 5(3), p. 405-420

Malangwa, P. S., 2016. Terminological Challenges and Their Impact on the Translation of Specialized Texts: An Analysis of Pharmaceutical Translations from English into Kiswahili. (2016). *Kioo cha Lugha,* 16(1), pp. 125-138.

Muhammad, H. A., 2017. Semantic Loss in Translating Movie Subtitles from English into Kurdish (Witch Hunter as a Sample). *Journal of Raparin University,* 4(11).

Newmark, P., 1988. *A Textbook of Translation.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Palmer, A., 2005. *Upgrading Film Subtitling to the Level of Literacy Translation.* Master's Thesis. University of Birmingham, UK.

Ramière , N., 2006. Reaching a Foreign Audience: Cultural Transfers in Audiovisual Translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation,* Issue 6, pp. 152-166.

Searle, J. R., 1979. *Expression and Meaning.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. & Vanderveken, D., 1985. *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, S. J. & Bogdan, R., 1998. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource.* 3rd ed. New York: Wiley.

Thomas, J., 1983. Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure. *Applied Linguistics,* 4(2), pp. 91-112.

Thomas , J., 1999. Pragmatics and English Language Teaching. In: C. Ward & W. Renanyda , eds. *Language Teachaing: New Insights for the Language Teacher.* Singapore: SEAMEO RELC, pp. 148-179.

Werner, J. R., 2001. Text and Context in Multimedia Translation. In: Y. Gambier & H. Gottlieb, eds. *(Multi) Media Translation: Concepts, Practices, and Research.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins, pp. 51-64.

Wu, S., 2007. Pragmatic Failure in Consecutive Interpreting. *Canadian Social Science,* 3(4), pp. 51-54.

Xia , M., 2015. Translation and Culture in the View of Contemporary Chinese Scholars. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences,* Volume 12, pp. 2901-2907.

Yule, G., 1996. *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.