

A Systemic Analysis of Two Turkish Translations of Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*

Öğr. Gör. Harika KARAVIN¹

Abstract

This study aims to provide a systematic and objective translation criticism, benefiting mainly from Van den Broeck's "systemic model of translation criticism". Instead of searching for errors in translations, the textual and extra-textual features of the source and target texts have been tried to be defined and "the shifts of expressions" have been identified by linking each text to their social contexts. For the analysis and description of the translator's strategies on macro level, Venuti's concepts of domestication and foreignization have been used as analytical categories. For micro level analysis, on the other hand, Vinay and Darbalnet's translation procedures have been applied, providing relevant examples on different levels.

Keywords: *translation criticism, systemic model, shifts of expressions, domestication and foreignization*

Özet

Bu çalışma temel olarak Van den Broeck'ün dizgesel çeviri eleştiri modelinden faydalanarak sistematik ve objektif bir çeviri eleştirisi sunmayı hedeflemektedir. Çevirilerde hata aramak yerine, kaynak ve erek metinlerin metinsel ve metin dışı özellikleri tanımlanmaya çalışılmış, metinlerdeki "değiş kaydırmaları" metinlerin sosyal bağlamları göz önünde bulundurularak belirlenmiştir. Makro düzeyindeki çevirmen kararlarının incelenmesi ve tanımlanmasında analitik kategori olarak Venuti'nin *yerelleştirme ve yabancılaştırma* kavramları kullanılmıştır. Mikro düzey incelemelerde ise Vinay ve Darbalnet'in çeviri prosedürleri uygulanıp, farklı düzeylerde ilgili örnekler verilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *çeviri eleştirisi, dizgesel model, değiş kaydırmaları, yerelleştirme ve yabancılaştırma*

¹ Gelişim University, Applied English & Translation Department hkaravin@gelisim.edu.tr

Introduction

Since the establishment of the Translation Bureau in 1940, Turkish literary system has been extensively enriched by translations from various languages and the translation activity has been evaluated by writers, translators and critics. However, most of the evaluative practices have appeared in some particular forms such as translator's prefaces, annotations and book reviews. These practices have usually focused on the translated texts without paying attention to their source texts. Therefore, the criticism of translation in Turkey has been rarely productive and had a tendency to judge the translated texts on the basis of their defects. Even more recently, the majority of the critics have described translations with some commonplace statements such as "it reads well" or "it is bad" without supporting their remarks with objective and relevant criteria. These highly subjective appraisals have led some of the scholars to make a call for descriptive and systematic evaluations, which has consequently caused a paradigm change in Translation Studies. A number of prominent scholars including Itamar Even Zohar have had significant roles on this paradigm change with their emphasis that target text is at least as much important as the source text. In their "target oriented and systemic approach", the quality of translation is assessed according to the function of the translation in the system of the target literature. They have looked upon the literary translations as part of the polysystem of the target culture literature. In addition, Gideon Toury has put forward a methodology for descriptive translation studies and suggested that translators constantly take some decisions during their translation processes. He has attempted to examine them through the notion of "translational norms" (1978). In short, scholars working within this paradigm have claimed that translations should be described in accordance with the target norms that are valid at a specific time and place and compared with their original ones in order to produce an objective translation criticism supported by translation theories (Toury, 1980, p. 73).

In order to produce such kind of a systematic and objective translation criticism, I want to examine two Turkish translations of Hemingway's novella *the Old Man and the Sea* by adopting Van den Broeck's "systemic model of translation criticism and reviewing" (1985, p. 55). Before starting my analysis, I would like to give some information about the theoretical basis

on which this model is grounded. According to Van den Broeck, translation criticism can be an objective account if it is based on systematic description, which requires, as a first step, a comparative analysis of the source and target texts. The purpose of this kind of comparison is to determine the degree of “factual equivalence” between the source and target texts. To put it differently, one of the most important aims of this model is to find out what kind of relationship exists between these two texts without offering value judgments. However, it is not enough to restrict this comparison only to the text structures. He requires the critics to take into account the “multiple relations between the source text and the system of similar and/or other texts originating from the same language, culture and tradition; between the target and source systems; between the target text and its readers and so on” (p. 59). As he claims, the comparison of ST and TT should also identify the shifts of expressions in the translation. Incorporating Popovic’s notion of the “shifts of expressions” into his translation criticism model, he has managed to avoid defining every change in the target text as an “error”. As Popovic defines, “all that appears as new with respect to the original, or fails to appear where it might have been expected, may be interpreted as a shift. According to him, the differences in languages are unavoidable due to the “disparity and asymmetry in the development of two linguistic traditions. Therefore, any changes in the target text should not be interpreted as something negative that results from the translator’s desire to change the “semantic appeal” of the source text. As he argues, the translator sometimes resorts to shifts in their translations in order to “preserve the norm of the original” (1970, pp. 79-81). For this reason, determining the nature of the shifts in the translated texts (optional vs. obligatory) would enable the critic to evaluate the translator’s strategies as well as what is “lost” or “gained” in the translation process in a much more objective manner. Van den Broeck also adds that the critic should strive to “detect the translator’s norms and options, the conditions under which he works and the way in which they influence the translational process”. Above all, the critic should never confuse his own set of norms with those adopted by the translator (pp.59-61)

In the view of the information mentioned above, I will compare Hemingway’s novella with its two specific Turkish translations. One of them was translated by Ülkü Tamer and published by Varlık Publishing

House in 1969. The reason why I have chosen this version is my wide knowledge about the translator. Ülkü Tamer is a well-known poet, translator and actor who is famous for his simple and plain language style. He is one of the best representatives of the literary movement called İkinci Yeni. Tamer is usually defined as a poet who has admired the West and has been greatly influenced by its ideas (Mehmet Fuat, 1985). As a second option, I have chosen Orhan Azizoğlu's translation, published by Bilgi Publishing House in 1983, since it is the only one that still circulates in the market and is mostly read by the primary school students as one of the "100 Essential Works" recommended by the Ministry of Education.

1. Hemingway and His Style

Before carrying out a comparison of the source text with its two Turkish translations, I would like to study the author, his style and the content of the novella. Hemingway was born in Oak, Illinois, in 1899 and began his writing career for the *The Kansas City Star* in 1917. During the First World War, he volunteered as an ambulance driver on the Italian front and got seriously wounded while serving with the infantry. In 1921, Hemingway settled in Paris, where he joined the group formed by Gertrude Stein, F. Scott Fitzgerald and Ezra Pound. With the appearance of *the Sun Also Rises* in 1926, Hemingway became not only the voice of the "lost generation", but also the preeminent writer of his time. This was followed by his novel of the Italian front, *A Farewell to Arms*. He reported on the Spanish Civil War, which provided inspiration for his novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1939). In 1953, Hemingway's most popular novel called *the Old Man and the Sea* was awarded the Pulitzer Prize and in 1954 he won the Nobel Prize in literature for his powerful narration. "One of the most important influences on the development of the short story and novel in American fiction, Hemingway has seized the imagination of the American public like no other twentieth-century author". He died, by suicide, in Idaho in 1961 (Pearsall, 1973).

Since my analysis of the translations will also focus on the transference of the source text's stylistic elements, it is of high importance to study Hemingway's idiosyncratic language use. The main characteristic of his style is the pure language and simple language structures that he uses in his novels or short stories. As Nelson (1979) suggests, for Hemingway,

to write truly means to “describe life as it is, not as it ought to be” In one of his interviews, Hemingway explains that his style of writing was influenced by his early work as a cub reporter for the *Kansas City Star*. At that time, all young reporters had to follow a stylebook that included writing instructions such as “Use short sentences. Use short first paragraphs. Use vigorous English, not forgetting to strive for smoothness.”²

The simplicity of Hemingway’s language aims to create a space for every individual to project into the novella his own associations. Therefore, the reading process turns into a projective experience through images suggested by Hemingway, which fulfils the reader’s expectation and affects his mind with strong personal projection. As the reader projects his own experience into the texts, he creates a story that attracts him. Hemingway’s other language devices including the open end of the narration support this projective experience (Baker, 1969).

Another prominent aesthetic element of his style is his theory of omission. He is of the opinion that “to write with economy of language can create an impact on readers, which is more powerful than to expound”. He expresses his theory of omission by the analogy of an ice-berg in his book titled *Death in the Afternoon* (1932) as follows:

If a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer has stated them. The dignity of movement of an ice-berg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water. A writer who omits things because he does not know them only makes hollow places in his writing.

As is understood, the underlying meaning is often implied rather than stated explicitly in Hemingway’s writings and hence his works become “highly suggestive, revealing submerged levels of meaning for readers to discover by themselves Every reader connects the story with his own associations and understands it in accordance with his wishes, experiences and expectations” (Nelson, 1979, p.53).

² qtd. in Fisher, Jim. *Interview for the Kansas city Star*, 1940.

2. Plot Summary and Content Analysis

The Old Man and the Sea is the story of an old fisherman who is struggling against defeat in life. Santiago, an aged Cuban fisherman, has gone eighty-four days without catching a fish. His young apprentice and friend, Manolin, is forced by his parents to leave the old man in order to fish in a more prosperous boat. However, the boy still continues to help the old man by carrying his fishing stuffs from the boat to his house. Though he has failed for a long time, Santiago feels confident that he will soon catch a great fish and hence decides to sail into the Gulf Stream on the following day. He travels to the places where schools of bonito and albacore are, hoping to find a big fish there. At noon, a big fish, which he assumes to be a marlin, takes the bait that Santiago has dropped with his line into the water. The old man hooks the fish, but cannot pull it towards the boat. Within a short while, the fish starts to pull the boat. As a result, the old man begins to hold the line tight for a long time so that he can bring the marlin up to the surface. Until he manages it, Santiago endures constant pain caused by the fishing line. Whenever the fish lunges or leaps, the cord hurts Santiago's shoulders badly. On the third day, the fish becomes tired and Santiago manages to kill it with a harpoon thrust. Then he lashes it to his boat, raises the small mast, and sets sail for home. As Santiago sails on with the fish, its blood leaves a mark in the water and attracts the sharks. The old man fights with the sharks trying to steal his marlin. Although he kills several sharks, Santiago's continued fight against the sharks gets nowhere. He arrives home before daybreak, stumbles back to his shack, and sleeps very deeply. The next morning, a crowd of amazed fishermen gather around the skeletal carcass of the fish, which is still lashed to the boat. Knowing nothing of the old man's struggle, tourists at a nearby cafe observe the remains of the giant marlin and mistake it for a shark. Manolin, who has been worried about the old man's absence, is moved to tears when he finds Santiago safe in his bed.

Since Santiago is vulnerable against the sea creatures, some critics interpret the novella as a man's fight with the life. However, the others stress that it is the story of a man's place within nature. Both Santiago and the marlin have pride, honor and bravery and both are subject to the same fate: "they must kill or be killed". In Hemingway's view, death is inevitable, but the best men should battle against it, which is the only way one can prove himself

(Elizondo, 2011). Throughout the novella, Santiago is can be considered a representative of the fact that pride motivates men to greatness. As the old man assumes that he has killed the mighty marlin out of pride, it becomes the source of Santiago's greatest strength. Santiago's pride also motivates his desire to transcend the destructive forces of nature. Even though he encounters harsh conditions so many times, he never gives up his hope to catch a fish. It is this determination to act that eventually enables Santiago to avoid defeat. At the end of the novella, we become aware that a man's victory depends upon his pride and determination to fight regardless of the outcome.

3. Socio-cultural Context of the Source Text

Hemingway's famous novella, *the Old Man and the Sea*, was published by Scribner in 1952 and more than 50,000 copies were sold within 48 hours. It enabled Hemingway to win the Pulitzer Prize in fiction in 1953 and the Swedish Academy's Nobel Prize for Literature in 1954. It managed to gain its place among the canonized literary works of the American literature.

When the first edition of *the Old Man and the Sea* was released, Cuba was undergoing serious political changes. The Cuban government was in decline and the post-war Europe was living under the threat of a Cold war. What is more, the United Nations decided to become engaged with the Korean War. These changes had crucial effects on the lives of many people and the literature had been used as a tool to react to that terrible situation. Most of the post-war works expressed the brutality of the war. The feeling of fear, depression and vainness of life began to be incorporated in many existentialist works and absurd drama novels. In addition, rejection of current society and escape from reality were the common themes expressed by authors known as the "beat generation". Hemingway's novella represents the prevalent socio-cultural conditions of its time through a story of an old man living in a village on the Cuban shore, isolated from the world affairs.

In addition, at the time when this novella was published, Hemingway was suffering from serious pain in his legs, an old war injury. He was also depressed by the fear of growing old and the anxiety of losing his "will, "initiative" and the "masculine role". He was not interested in politics

or human relationships any longer. His main aim was to preserve his manhood through proper actions. For this reason, he decided to withdraw himself from the world, which is reflected in his novella that is mainly characterized by the theme of “isolation” (Cooperman, 1996:).

4. Socio-cultural Context of the Target Texts (1960-1980)

According to the descriptive and functional approaches, a translation should be evaluated in terms of its forms and functions in the receiving culture and literary system. Therefore, it is of high importance to contextualize the target text, adopting both a “longitudinal (temporal, diachronic) and a (synchronic) systemic perspective, considering the polysystemic relations” into which the translation enters with other texts in the target system (House 2001, p. 246). In other words, one should take into account the multiple relations between source and target systems, between target text and its receiving culture and so on because all kinds of relations between a target text and the processes involved in its production and reception should be analyzed in order to understand and define the translators’ strategies in a more objective way. It is equally important to know the function of the translated text within its receiving culture, for the “analysis of a translation is determined primarily its peculiar role in the literary movement, i.e. its relational function. This basic function of translation conditions the sense of aestheticism of a given translator and modifies in many respects also that accepted as a norm and valid in a national literature at a certain moment” (Durisin, 1974, p. 137). For these reasons, I would like to examine the historical moments at which two translations were produced, focusing on the translations’ role and the dominant discourse emerged around the translators.

During the period when these two translations were published, translation was used as both an ideological instrument to attain political goals and a tool for culture planning in Turkey. After the foundation of the Turkish republic, a new national identity based on a new language and culture was attempted to be built. As the Ottoman language and culture was considered deficient against the western cultural heritage, the aim was to establish a western-inspired, universalist and humanist culture (Tahir Gürçahlar, 2009, p. 41). As is seen, the Turkish literary repertoire was regarded “weak” and “poor” by the majority of the authorities. For this reason, translation was

one of the most important means of creating a new repertoire. Translated literature, therefore, maintained a primary position within the Turkish literary system, constituting an integral part of the “innovatory forces” (Even Zohar, 1978, p. 193).

When we look at the political situation of Turkey during that period, it is seen that Turkey became members of many international organizations such as the United Nations, NATO and the Council of Europe. During the 1950’s, the Democrat party formed close relations with the United States. Because of the oppressive political environment prevalent at that time, a military coup took place in 1960 and the Democrat party was overthrown. Then a new constitution was legislated and various political activities and opinions started to emerge more freely. Even though some political magazines had an active role in creating such an environment, they were deemed insufficient in terms of conveying western ideas to Turkey. Therefore, new magazines which included mainly translated materials started to be established. For instance, both *Yeni Dergi* and *Cep Dergisi* attempted to introduce a new mission for the translation, which required “reliance on imports rather than indigenous creation in the setting up of a sound intellectual infrastructure in Turkey” (Tahir Gürçahlar 2009: 48-49).

A number of articles published in *Yeni Dergi* give some clues regarding the general position of translation and the accepted translation strategies. In fact, a new translation model was introduced during that period, which required the translators to restrain their creativity in translations and preserve the style and “intention” of the source text writer as much as possible. In other words, “free” translations were condemned by the majority of the writers. According to Tahir Gürçağlar, it is possible to link this tendency to the journal’s emphasis on the importance of becoming familiar with the meaning and style of the source text so that we can gain a complete knowledge of the ideas mentioned (2002: p. 268).

However, after the 1960’s, implicit ideologies began to appear in translation activities, which had a crucial effect both on the production and reception of the translated texts. These ideologies mainly showed themselves through the islamicized translations of the children’s classics from western languages. These translations created an Islamic context that was not

present in the original work, adding some Islamic phrases and terms in the target text. Some publishing houses even had a religious agenda that shaped their publication processes. However, translations carried out by adopting such domestication strategies were severely criticized and attracted negative attention from the public. A huge number of columnists and translators condemned the Islamist interventions in the translated texts (2009, p. 53).

5. A Comparative Analysis of Source and Target Texts

In this part of the study, I will provide a comparative analysis of the source and target texts, focusing on both linguistic and extra-linguistic elements. My analysis will provide much space to examine how translators reflect Hemingway's lexical choices and stylistic elements. While defining the translators' strategies, I will benefit from Venuti's concepts of domestication and foreignization as analytical categories to describe two opposite ways of translating on the macro level. As is known, "*domestication* is used to refer to the adaptation of the culture context and culture specific items and foreignization to the preserving of the original cultural context" (Paloposki, 2011, p. 1). The reason why Venuti introduces these concepts is his desire to formulate an ethical agenda. He dismisses the domestication strategy since it involves "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target language cultural values" (1995, p. 20). This results in a transparent and fluent translation, which increases the invisibility of the translator by minimizing the foreignness of the source text. On the contrary, he is in favor of the foreignizing method that entails "choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant culture values in the target language". In this way, Venuti aims to put an ethnodeliant pressure on target-culture values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text and make visible the presence of the translator (ibid.).

For micro-level linguistic and stylistic analysis, I will use Vinay and Darbalnet's model which provides different translation strategies and procedures. Vinay and Darbalnet identify seven procedures, each of which is adopted in particular circumstances. For instance, *borrowing* refers to the usage of foreign words in target text in order to "introduce the flavor of the source language culture into a translation". *Calque* is defined "as a special

kind of borrowing” where source language structure or lexical element is transferred literally into target text. *Literal translation* is the direct transfer of SL text into an “idiomatically and grammatically appropriate” target text. *Transposition* refers to the change of word class with another; *modulation* to the changes in point of view of the source text; equivalence to the description of same situation by different stylistic and structural means; adaptation to changing the cultural references in target text when the situation of source text is unknown in the target culture (1958, pp. 85-93).

5.1 Lexical Elements

5.1.1 Translation of ideologically-laden words

As we know, every language use involves some kind of ideology, which can manifest itself through the selection of some specific lexical or grammatical items. Therefore, it is possible to determine an author’s ideological stance by studying the lexical units in the text. In order to evaluate the ideological aspect of the language use in this novella, it is important to know that Hemingway intentionally adds some Spanish words into his text to show his interest and familiarity with the people of Cuba where he lived for more than fourteen years. He uses lots of ideologically-laden words such as *bodega, salao, el mar, terrace, queva* etc. Even the name of the main character, Santiago, is a Spanish word that is commonly used to denote the Saint James. Now, I would like to give two examples to analyze how the translators deal with such words:

“But after forty days without a fish the boy’s parents had told him that the old man was now definitely and finally *salao*, which is the worst form of unlucky [...]” (p.9)

Tamer: “Ama balıksız geçen kırk gün sonunda, çocuğun ailesi, ihtiyar adamın artık düpedüz *salao* olduğunu, kör talihli olduğunu, söylemişti.” (p.7)

Azizoğlu: “Fakat birbiri ardından kırk gün eli boş döndükten sonra çocuğun ailesi, ihtiyar balıkçının artık talihsizlikten de beter bir **salao**’ya uğradığına inanmıştı.” (p.5)

Both of the translators adopt the *borrowing* method by preserving the foreign word in their translations so that they could reflect the ideology behind the author's decision to choose this Spanish word. Hemingway intentionally uses this word in the source text to imply the nationality of the boy in the novella and show his own familiarity with this language and the people of Spanish origin living in Cuba. Tamer both keeps the foreign word and explains it with a parenthetical statement in the TT. His expression "kör talihli" manages to render the high degree of unluckiness the old man experiences. On the other hand, Azizoğlu highlights its foreignness by writing it in bold. However, we observe a "negative shift" in his version. Though the word *salao* is defined as the worst form of unluckiness in the ST, he presents it as something different that is possible to be compared to the state of being unlucky in terms of its emotional intensity. Since he does not provide any explanation regarding the lexical meaning of this word, either within the same sentence or by using a footnote, it might be difficult for the readers to interpret it as "being very unlucky". The following example also deals with the translators' strategies to cope with a similar Spanish word:

"Some of the younger fishermen, those who used buoys as floats for their lines and had motorboats, bought when the shark livers had brought much money, spoke of her as *el mar* which is masculine." (p.30)

Tamer: "Genç balıkçılardan bazıları, ağları için mantar yerine şamandıra kullananlar, köpek balığı ciğerinin para ettiği zamanlar alınmış motorlarla balıkçılık edenler, erkeklik belirtisi olan *el'i* kullanırlardı: *el mar*." (p.27)

Azizoğlu: "Ağlarının başına şamandıra koyan, köpekbalığı ciğeri fazla para ettiği zaman motorlu kayık alan genç balıkçılardan bazıları, ondan, erkek olarak **El Mar** diye söz eder." (p.27)

Here, the author uses another Spanish word, *el mar*, which means the sea. *Mar* is an unusual noun in that it can be used either with masculine or feminine definite article. As is told in the story, the majority of the Spanish people describes the sea as feminine and hence uses the feminine definite article "la". However, some of the younger fishermen prefer to speak of it as masculine and therefore the masculine definite article "el" precedes the

word. When we look at the translations of the word “el mar,” we see that the translators again adopt the *borrowing* strategy, which helps them to reflect Hemingway’s ideological lexical choices in the translated versions. In both translations, it is easy to understand that people use “el mar” when they want to talk about the sea as masculine. However, it not so easy to determine whether it is really so or something made up by those people. Therefore, it would be useful to use a footnote that would both provide information about what “elmar” means and the function of the article “el”. In this way, it would be possible to solve the ambiguity that is apparent in Tamer’s explanatory phrase preceding this article. When “el” is defined as “erkeklik belirtisi”, the person reading Tamer’s translation may interpret it as a kind of feature belonging to men.

5.1.2 Translation of fishing terms

One of the unique characteristics of the novella results from Hemingway’s extensive use of fishing terms and details regarding fishing techniques. In other words, this novella can be considered a reflection of Hemingway’s expert knowledge and skill in fishing. As Gurko points out, “one reason that Hemingway’s stories are so crammed with technical details about fishing, hunting, bullfighting, boxing, and war is his belief that professional technique is the quickest and surest way of understanding the physical process of nature, of getting into the thing itself.” (1955, p. 15). For this reason, translators need to have enough knowledge on some basic fishing terminology and strategies. In addition, Hemingway includes various kinds of fish into his plot such as albacore, bonita, marlin and tuna, all of which have symbolic functions. Throughout the novella, a connection is usually formed between the old man and the fish in order to show his lack of control both on himself and the nature. Now, I would like to analyze what kinds of strategies the translators have adopted to render the parts that are closely related to fishing.

“[...] he had a big blue runner and a yellow jack that had been used before”(p.31)

Tamer: “Ötekilerde daha önce kullandığı kocaman mavi bir lüferle, sapsarı bir lapina takılıydı”. (p.29)

Azizoğlu: “Ötekilere bir gün evvel kullandığı yemleri takmıştı.” (p.28)

This sentence is taken from a scene where the narrator describes the fishing lines the old man and the little boy cast into the sea. The phrases “big blue runner” and “yellow jack” refer to the specific fishing terms that denote the replicas used as bait in order to attract the fish. Azizoğlu manages to understand this point and prefers to use a culturally-neutral word “yem”. On the other hand, Tamer also understands their function, but attempts to render all the lexical elements in his translation by *adapting* the names of the fish. Instead of preserving the “big blue runner” and “yellow jack”, which are distributed mainly across the Atlantic Ocean, he uses the names of other two fishes that are known to the Turkish culture. In his method of *adaptation*, he seems to pay attention to the fact that the fish types that he would use could be qualified with the adjectives “yellow” and “blue”. However, his version ends up creating a “negative shift”, resulting from the adjective “kocaman” that precedes the replicas which are, in fact, quite small in size.

In the following example, I will focus on the different lexical choices used for rendering some specific fishing terms:

“He shipped his oars and brought a small line from under the **bow**. It had a wire leader and a medium-sized hook and he baited it with one of the sardines. He let it go over the side and then made it fast to a ring bolt in the stern. Then he baited another line and left it coiled in the shade of the bow.” (p.34)

Tamer: “Kürekleri bırakıp küçük bir olta çıkardı başaltından. Orta boy iğnesine sardalyelerden birini taktı. Yandan suya bıraktı oltayı, kıçtaki halkalardan birine bağladı. Sonra bir başka oltaya daha yem takarak başaltında gölgeye koydu onu.” (p.31)

Azizoğlu: “Kürekleri bırakarak başaltından daha ince bir olta çıkardı. Tel bir kılavuzun ucundaki orta boy zokayı, sardalyelerden biriyle yemledikten sonra denize fırlatıp bodoslamadaki halkalardan birine sıkıca bağladı. Sonra bir başka olta daha hazırlayıp, pruvanın gölgesine bıraktı.” (p.31)

The fishing terms “bow,” “stern” and “hook” are translated with different words by the translators. As is seen, Azizoğlu has a tendency to use more technical words than those of Tamer’s. For instance, while Tamer renders “stern” as “kıç”, Azizoğlu uses “bodoslama”. Tamer seems to take the audience factor more into account, which is assumed to be mainly the primary-school children, with his preference for a more familiar word. When we look at the translation of “bow”, it is easily recognized that the translators become confused with the semantic nuance between “pruva” and “başaltı”. While “pruva” can be used to refer to the forward end of a small boat, “başaltı” denotes deck heads of the seamen in ships. In fact, the old man goes on fishing on a small boat and hence the choice of “başaltı” for “bow” creates a negative shift in both translations.

Another negative shift is evident in the following example:

“But he crowded the current a little so that he was still fishing correctly though faster than he would have fished if he was not trying to use the bird.” (p.33)

Tamer: Suları dalgalandırdı biraz, kuşu kullanmaya kalkmasa daha ağır giderdi, ama böylesi de iyiydi.” (p.31)

Azizoğlu: “Oltaların aynı gergin durumunu korumaya gayret ederek, kuşu görmeden evvelki hızından biraz daha çabuk gidiyordu.” (p.30)

In order to interpret the sentence accurately, it is important to know that birds are used by the fishermen “as an ally of catching a fish” because they have an extraordinary ability to detect their locations easily. In this example, Santiago sees a bird circling in the sky ahead of him and he begins to follow it, assuming that the bird has found a fish. For this reason, Santiago feels the need to move quickly on the sea, which eventually “crowds the current.” In other words, his quick movements cause the water to ruffle and create some bubbles. When we look at the translations, it is recognized that Tamer is much more aware of the contextual meaning of the expressions used by Hemingway, which becomes evident in his lexical choices such as “suyu dalgalandırmak” and “kuşu kullanmak”. Azizoğlu, on the other hand, omits the first part of the sentence and renders “use the

bird” as “kuşu görmek”. Even though the fisherman begins to follow the bird after seeing it, this expression falls short of stressing the importance of using a bird as a specific fishing strategy.

5.1.2 Translation of culture-specific items

As the distance between cultures and languages increases, rendering of culture-specific items becomes more problematic. Deficient familiarity with the cultural background of the source text usually causes “negative shifts” in translations. In order to deal with such words, translators develop strategies that can be identified, in general terms, by using Venuti’s concepts of domestication and foreignization. My analysis will include the rendering of the following two categories: (1) baseball terms, (2) biblical names.

The reason why I have chosen to analyze the baseball terms results from the intensity of the dialogues between Santiago and Marlin about American baseball and one of its players, Joe DiMaggio. At the beginning of the novella, an analogy is formed between Santiago and Joe DiMaggio, who is identified as a hero. Both men continue to put up a struggle no matter how worse the conditions are. As baseball is an unknown type of sport for Turkish readers, it would be interesting to analyze how the translators have rendered such parts. Let’s start with the translation of the word “baseball”:

“Go and play baseball” (p.12) / “When I come back you can tell me about the baseball” (p.17) / “[...] and I will read the baseball.” (p.17)

Tamer: “Git ve beyzbol oyna” (p.10) / “Dönünce beyzbolu anlattırın” / “Beyzbol haberlerini okurum” (p.14)

Azizoğlu: “Sen git topunu oyna.” (p.8) / Ben dönene kadar maçları oku da bana anlattırın.” (p.13) / “Maçları okurum” (p.13)

As is seen, Tamer adopts the *borrowing* method and transfers the foreign word into the target text. Tamer seems to be aware of the associations this term arouses in the representation of the content in that he adopts a foreignizing strategy whenever such terms appear in the novella. However, Azizoğlu displays an opposite tendency, adopting the method of

adaptation in rendering the word “baseball”. In each instance, he adapts the typically American sport “baseball” into a familiar sport “football” and renders the relevant terms accordingly. For instance, while translating the word “baseball” in the last sentence, Azizoğlu completely ignores its cultural attributes and present it with a culturally-neutral word “maç”. The reason behind Azizoğlu’s strategy might be his desire to enable the target readers to see and understand it within their own cultural context, without confusing their minds with something unknown to them.

Now, I would like to analyze a dialogue in which Santiago and Manolin has a conversation about some of the baseball teams:

“The Yankees cannot lose.”

“But I fear the Indians of Cleveland.”

“Have faith in the Yankees my son. Think of the great DiMaggio.”

“I fear both the Tigers of Detroit and the Indians of Cleveland.”

“Be careful or you will fear even the Reds of Cincinnati and the White Sox of Chicago.” (p.17)

Tamer:’s translation:

“Yankee yenilmez.”

“Ama Indias of Cleveland’dan korkarım ben.”

“Yankee’ye güven, oğlum. Büyük DiMaggio’yu düşünsene.”

“Ben hem Tigers of Detroit’ten, hem de Indians of Cleveland’dan korkarım.”

“Neredeyse Reds of Cincinnati’yle White Sox of Chicago’dan da korkacaksın. (p.15)

Azizoğlu’s translation:

“Bizim Yankee’ler nasıl olsa kazanmıştır.”

“Cleveland’lı Indian’lar beni korkutuyor doğrusunu istersen.”

“Sen niyetini bozma evlat. Bizim Yankee’ler iyidir. DiMaggio’yu düşünsene, aslan gibi oyuncu.”

“Detroit’li Tiger’lar da belalı.”

“Ha gayret, neredeyse Cincinnati’den, Chiacogo’lulardan da korkacaksın. Bu ne be!” (p.14)

Hemingway intentionally includes some team names into his plot because he wants to emphasize that the struggles of the game resemble those of the old man's. The excerpt given above can be examined within this framework, paying attention to the translators' translation strategies that differ from each other. On the one hand, Tamer transfers all the foreign names by using the *borrowing* method without changing their spelling. Though his choice can be justified by referring to his desire to keep proper names as they are, it is not obvious whether the names belong to a team or a player because within the same dialogue we also encounter the name of a famous player, Di Maggio. Therefore, Tamer might have avoided the confusion by adding the word "team" after the names. What is more, Tamer fails to recognize the play on the words. In fact, the teams are called 'the Cleveland Indians', 'the Cincinnati Reds', 'the Chicago White Sox', and 'the Detroit Tigers'. On the other hand, Azizoğlu translates the names *literally* into Turkish (e.g. Detroit'li Tiger'lar, Cleveland'li İndian'lar), which causes ambiguity in the target text. In his translation, it is possible to deduce that the names of the teams are Tiger and İndian and their preceding words are used just to explain their home towns. Ambiguity becomes more intense in the last sentence where Azizoğlu only transfers the city names. In order to avoid such problems, it would be better if the translators provided footnotes that specify what these names refer to.

Being a devout Catholic, Hemingway adds some biblical elements into his novella such as crucifixion imagery and some pictures of Christ. In the following example, I will examine how such culture-bound items are rendered into Turkish by the translators:

"On the brown walls of the flattened, overlapping leaves of the sturdy fibered *guano* there was a picture in color of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and another of the Virgin of Cobre."

Tamer: "Düzleşmiş, birbirine girmiş, sert guano yapraklarından yapılmış kahverengi duvarda Kutsal İsa ile Cobre Meryemi'nin renkli iki resmi asılıydı." (p.13)

Azizoğlu: “Tomruğun kahverengi püskülleri yolunarak olabildiğince düzeltilmeye çalışılmış; duvara da bir iki İsa ve Aziz suretleri asılmıştı.” (p.14)

The Sacred Heart of Jesus is one of the famous devotions that pictures Jesus’s physical heart and the Virgin of Cobre refers to a specific sacred picture of Virgin Mary, on which she carries the Christ child and a gold cross. When we analyze translation strategies of the translators, we see that Tamer uses the *literal translation* method in rendering “the Sacred Jesus” and “Virgin of Cobre”. However, neither of these expressions refers to the specific pictures mentioned in the source text. Therefore, the target readers cannot get the intended message the source text aims to convey as they are not provided with any information regarding the form and value of these pictures. In Azizoğlu’s translation, the point of view changes and the specific pictures are presented as any pictures of Christ and a sacred person. His choice of the word “Aziz” even creates a negative shift because what Hemingway mentions is a specific sacred picture rather than a general one. As a result, in order to render the actual semantic value of these items, it would be better to use some explanatory footnotes in the target texts.

5.2 Addition of Islamic elements in translation

Translators work in a specific socio-political contexts and generally produce target texts for specific purposes. As Shäffner mentions, social conditioning in translation is reflected in the linguistic structure of the target text. To put it differently, target texts can reveal the impact of social, ideological, discursive norms and constraints of the target system (2003, pp. 23-24). Azizoğlu’s translation is a perfect indicator demonstrating how a source text can be manipulated on different levels in translation activity. As mentioned above, the novella benefits from many biblical elements with an aim to create a Christian context in the source text. When we examine the translators’ strategies in (re) creating the religious context in the target text, we encounter obvious differences, which will be justified with some representative examples taken from both of the translations. Let’s first focus on the translation of the name of God:

“I could not fail myself and die on a fish like this,” he said. “Now that I have him coming so beautifully, God help me endure.” (p.87)

Tamer: “Böyle bir balık karşısında yenik düşüp ölemem,” dedi. “Ne güzel çıkıyor; Tanrım, güç ver bana, dayanayım.” (p.82)

Azizoğlu: Kendimi kaybedip balıkla birlikte ölmenin sırası mı,” diye söylendi. “Şimdiye kadar çok iyi idare ettik. Allahım sen bana kuvvet ver.” (p.90)

Here we see that Tamer’s version attempts to preserve the religious context of the source text by translating the name of God with a culturally-neutral expression “Tanrı.” On the contrary, Azizoğlu renders it as “Allah” and hence helps to create and Islamic context in the translation. Azizoğlu’s decision seems to have been influenced by the dominant discourse that has been shaped around the translation of classics since 1960’s. However, his contributions to create such a context in the target text do not only result from “God” as “Allah”, but he also attributes an Islamic aspect to some of the sentences that do not involve any ideological value. As such examples are quite high in number, it is possible to conclude that his translation strategies are dominated by the target culture norms. Among many others, the following examples are chosen to clarify the arguments made above:

(1) “Then live a long time and take care of yourself,” the old man said (p.19)

Tamer: “Öyleyse uzun ömürlü olmaya bak, kendine de dikkat et,” dedi ihtiyar. (p.17)

Azizoğlu: “Öyleyse Allah ömrünü uzun etsin, kısmetin bol olsun.” (p.16)

(2) “Good night then. I will wake you in the morning.” (p.24)

Tamer: “İyi geceler öyleyse. Sabahleyin uyandırırım seni.” (p.21)

Azizoğlu: “Öyleyse Allah rahatlık versin. Sabah seni uyandırırım.” (p.20)

The sentences are taken from dialogues between Santiago and the little boy. In the first instance, the boy says to the old man that as long as he is alive, he won't let the old man to spend a day without eating anything. Upon this statement, the old man utters the first sentence given above and wishes that the boy has a long life, which is translated as "Öyleyse uzun ömürlü olmaya bak" in Tamer's version. Though Tamer's translation seems to follow the norms of the source text more than that of Azizoğlu's, he fails to render the emotional element in his version by using an awkward expression in the translated text. When one wishes a long life for someone in Turkish, he/she does not normally say "uzun ömürlü ol". The expression "uzun ömürlü olmak" is usually used to qualify an object or plant. In Azizoğlu's translation, however, the affective quality is rendered appropriately, but he expresses this in accordance with the prevalent mode of making a wish in Islamic context, which requires starting the sentence by uttering the name of "Allah." The same tendency is also evident in the second example given above.

5.3 Stylistic elements

After analyzing some of the lexical choices of the translators, I would like to discuss how the translators transfer the idiosyncratic stylistic elements of Hemingway into the target texts. As Margherita Ulrych points out, a fundamental aspect of the translator's task in mediating between a source and target culture is to identify stylistic features adopted by the source text writer in order to intermingle form and content and recreate the "overall communicative effect" in the target language. (1996, p. 885). For this reason, the translators should pay attention to the stylistic choices the ST author has used in order to shape his/her message. In this way, he/she can both capture the ST author's intended meaning and even recreate the ST's stylistic constituents in the target text as effectively as possible.

5.3.1 Hemingway's use of details

Even though Hemingway uses short sentences that are written in simple and natural language, he forces the readers to focus on the components of each sentence and examine the details more closely. As a minimalist writer, Hemingway's strength lies in his short sentences that include specific details in themselves (Xie, 2008, p. 156). The following examples will attempt to show whether translators have paid attention to preserve the details of the source text in their translations:

“The successful fishermen of that day were already in and had butchered their marlin out and carried them laid full length across two planks, with two men staggering at the end of each plank, to the fish house where they waited for the ice truck to carry them to the market in Havana.” (p.11)

Tamer: “O günün başarılı balıkçıları dönmüşlerdi bile, yakaladıkları marlin’i karaya çekip iki kalasın üstüne boylu boyunca uzatmışlardı; birer adam kalasların ucuna yapışmış, Havana’daki pazara gidecek buz kamyonunu beklemek için balıkhaneye götürüyorlardı balığı.” (p.9)

Azizoğlu: “O günün şanslı balıkçıları dönmeye başlamışlardı bile. Uzun kalaslar üzerine yatırdıkları kılıç balıklarını Havana pazarına sevk edilmek üzere buzhaneye götürüyorlardı.” (p.7)

In this example, the narrator gives a detailed description of what is done after catching the marlin. Then, within the same paragraph, the narrator continues his/ her narration by adding another piece of detailed information regarding the handling process of sharks. As the differences in dealing with different types of fish are aimed to be shown, each details gains importance in this paragraph, all of which are tried to be kept in Tamer’s translation. He includes all the components of the source text into his translation and hence carries out a “faithful translation” in the sense of preserving all of the lexical elements within the constraints of the grammatical and lexical structures of the target language. In Azizoğlu’s translation, however, we see that he omits the specific parts written in bold from the sentence. The details regarding who carries the marlin and by which they are transported to the market are not mentioned in the TT. In the general sense, his translation strategy can be defined as a freer rendering of the source language text, having less concern to render each individual word. Due to such kind of reduction and simplification in the target text, Azizoğlu fails to reflect one of the stylistic elements of Hemingway in his translation.

The following excerpt also justifies the translators’ tendencies in reflecting Hemingway’s stylistic peculiarities:

“I can remember the tail slapping and banging and the thwart breaking and the noise of the clubbing. I can remember you throwing me into the bow

where the wet coiled lines were and feeling the whole boat shiver and the noise of you clubbing him like chopping a tree down and the sweet blood smell all over me.”(p.12)

Tamer: “Kuyruk atışını, çırpınısını, tahtaların kırılısını, sopa seslerini hep hatırlıyorum. Islak halatların yanına, sandalın burnuna fırlatmıştın beni, hatırlıyorum, bütün tekne sarsılıyordu, sen de ağaç keser gibi sopayla durmadan vuruyordun ona, her yanımda taze kan kokusuna bulanmıştı.” (p.10)

Azizoğlu: “Hatırlıyorum ya, hani kuyruğunu nasıl güm güm vuruyordu, burnuyla borda tahtalarını nasıl kazıyordu? Sen beni ıslak ağların durduğu pruvaya itmiştin. Tekne oyuncak gibi sallanıyor; sen de küfrede ede, odun yarar gibi parçalıyordun hayvanı. Üstün başım taptaze kana bulanmıştı.” (p.8)

This sentence is uttered by the little boy in which he mentions remembering how a caught fish tore the boat to pieces in the past. Here it is seen that Hemingway’s language is rich in sensuous imagery, which includes details appealing to all of our sense organs. In this way, he makes us hear, see, feel and smell something at the same time. Like the previous example given above, Tamer preserves all of the sensuous details in his translation except for the one that is rendered with an optional shift. While translating the expression “noise of you clubbing”, Tamer disregards the emphasis put on the word “noise” and focuses instead on the action, but does not distort the “message” of the source text. Azizoğlu, on the other hand, fails to create the similar sensuous richness in his translation, which mainly results from his tendency to reduce various lexical elements to a general one, which is evident in his choice of “güm güm vuruyordu” to render the tail’s slapping and banging. In addition, he completely omits the imagery of thwart breaking and the “smell” of the blood, preferring just to say “taptaze kan”.

5.3.2 Hemingway’s simple language

Hemingway’s idiosyncratic language use results mostly from its simplicity, directness, clarity and freshness. He almost always uses concrete, specific, more common, casual and conversational words in his works. He prefers

to use short sentences that rarely include adjectives and abstract nouns (2008: 157). However, he creates a particular tension and rhythm in these sentences, which becomes more of an issue in the translations. Now I would like to analyze how the translators reflect Hemingway's direct and simple language in their translations.

“The old man had thought the boy to fish and the boy loved him.”
(p.10)

Tamer: “Balık tutmayı ihtiyar adam öğretmişti ona; çocuk onu seviyordu.” (p.8)

Azizoğlu “Çocuğun delicesine sevdiği balıkçılığı ona ihtiyar öğretmişti.” (p.6)

The sentence in the source text is a perfect indicator of Hemingway's style. As is seen, the message is clear and direct. In Tamer's translation, we observe that he adopts a source oriented approach in terms of representing the particular stylistic features of the source text. In other words, Tamer seems to take into account the stylistic components of source text with regard to simple and direct language. Unlike Azizoğlu, he does not add or delete anything in his translation. When we look at Azizoğlu's translation, we begin to feel that this sentence has been uttered by someone else rather than Hemingway, which manifest itself on different levels. First of all, Azizoğlu translates the author's expression in one sentence while the statement in the source text consists of two clauses that are linked to each other in a sequential way. Secondly, the author's direct expression is turned into an indirect one, causing a shift in emphasis. In his translation, the emphasis is put on the fact that “the old man taught him to fish”. However, in Hemingway's sentence, that the old man taught him and he loved him is of equal importance. In addition, Azizoğlu's expression “çocuğun delice sevdiği balıkçılığı” causes a “negative shift”, resulting from a misinterpretation. It is not the fishing that the little boy loved, but the old man himself.

Another important point to be mentioned is that Azizoğlu moves away from representing Hemingway's style by including figurative expressions

in his translation, almost all of which can be defined as optional shifts. In the following example, it is easy to recognize that Tamer's translation follows a parallel structure with that of the original on semantic, lexical and stylistic levels. However, Azizoğlu produces a freer version that renders the source text without paying much attention to its stylistic elements. He incorporates the idiomatic expression "zehir gibi oyuncu" into the target text though it does not exist in the source text. In addition, his last sentence can be evaluated as creating a "negative shift" in the target text because "sopa tutuşu" refers to "the way a player holds a baseball bat". Nevertheless, the source text foregrounds the action of the player, which is rendered appropriately as "vuruş" in Tamer's translation.

"Naturally. But he makes the difference. In the other league, between Brooklyn and Philadelphia I must take Brooklyn. But then I think of Dick Sisler and those great drives in the old park." (p.21)

Tamer: "Tabii. Ama o oyunu etkiliyor. Öteki ligde, Brooklyn ile Philadelphia arasında Brooklyn'i tutarım ben. Ama Dick Sisler'i düşünüyorm bazen, eski staddaki o büyük vuruşlarını" (p.19)

Azizoğlu: "Var elbette ama o başka. Mesela öteki baseball kümesinde Brookly'i tutarım. Onlardaki Dick Sisler de zehir gibi bir oyuncu. Sopa tutuşu bile başka" (p.18)

5.3.2 Hemingway's use of repetition

Hemingway employs the technique of repetition to "convey action clearly to the reader and to create the impression that it is happening in the present" (2008: 157). That is to say, Hemingway usually resorts to repetition within the same sentence or paragraph in order to achieve a particular effect. This point gains significance when one is to judge the translation of a literary work. For this reason, I would like to examine whether the translators take into account this stylistic feature in their translations.

"And **maybe** he will **come up** before that. If he doesn't **maybe** he will **come up** with the moon. If he does not do that **maybe** he will **come up** with the sunrise." (p.46)

Tamer: “**Belki** o zamana kadar su yüzüne çıkar. Çıkmazsa **belki** ay doğunca çıkar. Ay ışığında da çıkmazsa güneş doğarken çıkar belki.” (p.43)

Azizoğlu: “O zamana kadar yüze çıkıverir bakarsın, **belli olmaz**. Olmazsa gece ay çıkınca **gelir belki**. Ya da güneş doğarken **yola getiririz**.” (p.44)

Here the narrator talks about the probability of encountering the marling by a certain time. Repeating the words “maybe” and “come up” three times within three successive sentences, Hemingway creates a kind of tension and rhythm in narration. Tamer shows a tendency to produce a target text that follows closely the “textual-linguistic norms” of the source text and culture. His translation manages to recreate the same impression in the target text by employing the author’s technique of repetition. As is clear, the words “maybe” and “come up” are rendered by “belki” and “çıkır” respectively, without using any other expressions. However, Azizoğlu prefers to use different words for them in each sentence (e.g. “çıkıverir”, “gelir” for the translation of “come up”). He does not even include one of the repeated elements in his translation (translation of “maybe” is omitted in the last sentence). As a result, he fails to recreate the intended rhythm in his version. In addition, he includes his own subjective interpretation by changing the content of the source text. Though the narrator speculates about the time when the marlin comes into sight within the whole excerpt, Azizoğlu introduces a different semantic context into the last sentence with his expression “yola getirmek”.

Let’s give another example that sheds light on the points stated above: “**What I will do** if he decides to go down, I don’t know. **What I’ll do** if he sounds and dies I don’t know. But I’ll do something.” (p.45)

“Ya dibe dalmaya karar verirse **ne yaparım bilmem**. Dibe dalıp ölüverirse **ne yaparım bilmem**. Ama yaparım bir şeyler.” (p.42)

“Dibe inmeye başlarsa **ne yaparım bilmem**. Ta dibe iner de orada ölüverirse **ne gelir elimden**. Ama ellerim böğrümde durmam a, bir şeyler yaparız elbet” (p.43)

6. Conclusion

In this study, I have attempted to provide a systematic and objective translation criticism, benefiting mainly from Van den Broeck's "systemic model of translation criticism". Instead of searching for errors in translations, I have tried to describe the textual and extra-textual features of the source and target texts and identify "the shifts of expressions" by linking each text to their social contexts. In order to define the translator's strategies on macro level, I have used Venuti's concepts of *domestication and foreignization* as analytical categories. For micro level analysis, on the other hand, I have made use of Vinay and Darbalnet's translation procedures whenever it is necessary and relevant. Even though I have encountered a huge number of examples that can be discussed within the framework of a negative shift, I have tried to restrict my analysis to Hemingway's lexical and stylistic features and their representation in the translations.

At the end of the study, I have gained significant information regarding the translators' translation strategies. In translating ideological words used by Hemingway, both of the translators have failed to convey the intended message because the target readers have not been provided with any relevant footnotes that would help them to understand them more appropriately. Though the translators have had a tendency to maintain the foreignness of the source text, they have not been always able to compensate for the cultural differences or make the text more intelligible for the target readers. Apart from that, Tamer has tried to produce a more "faithful" translation in terms of representing Hemingway's lexical and stylistic elements by using a simple Turkish as well as direct and short sentences. Considering this, we can say that Tamer was under the influence of the dominant translation discourse of his time which appreciated to reproduce the style and content of the author as faithfully as possible. On the other hand, Azizoğlu has adopted a freer approach and applied the strategies of addition, omission, modulation and expansion in his translation. In addition, Tamer has not included any ideological aspect in his translation whereas Azizoğlu has created a different religious context by including many Islamic elements into his translation. In such parts, I have observed the application of domestication strategy for an ideological purpose, which can be evaluated as a reflection of islamicization process occurring throughout the country since the 1960's. Finally, it is possible to mention that more negative shifts

have been encountered in Azizoğlu's translation, most of which have resulted from misinterpretation, lack of knowledge about fishing and lack of attention. Therefore, we can conclude that Azizoğlu has sometimes been less successful in reading the source text correctly.

REFERENCES

- Azizoğlu, Orhan, (trans. 1983). *İhtiyar Balıkçı*. by Ernest Hemingway. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Baker, Carlos. (1969). *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Durisin, D. (1974). *Sources and Systematics of Comparative Literature*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenskeho.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1978). "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem". J.S.holmes, J.Lambert, R.Van den Broek der. *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. Leuven: ACCO.
- Elizondo, Sonny. (2011). *GradeSaver(TM) Classic Notes: The Old Man and the Sea*. Available: <<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/160259273X/gradesaver-20>> (assessed 3 June 2013).
- Fuat, Mehmet. (1985). *Çağdaş Türk Şiiri Antolojisi*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
- Gurko, Leo. (1955). "The Old Man and the Sea", *College English* Vol. 17, No: 13, Oct 1955.
- Hemingway, Ernest. (1952). *The Old Man and the Sea*. New York: Scribner.
- House, Juliane. (2001). "Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation". *Meta*, Vol. 46, No: 2.

Nelson, R. S. (1979). *Hemingway: Expressionist artist*. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.

Paloposki, O. (2011). “Domestication and Foreignization” in *Handbook of Translation Studies*.

Pearsall, Robert Brainard. (1973). *The Life and Writings of Ernest Hemingway*. Amsterdam: Rodopi NV.

Popovic, Anton. (1970). “The Concept of ‘Shift of Expression’ in Translation Analysis”, *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, (ed.) James S. Holmes. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Schaffner, Christina. (2003). “Third Ways and New Centres” in Maria Calzada Perez, *Apropos of Ideology*, St. Jerome.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. (2009). *Translation, Presumed Innocent: Translation and Ideology in Turkey*. *The Translator*, Vol. 15, No: 1, 2009: Special Issue. *Nation and Translation in the Middle East*.

Tamer, Ülkü, trans. (1969). *İhtiyar Balıkçı*. by Ernest Hemingway. Ankara: Varlık Yayınları.

Toury, G. (1978). “The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation” in L. Venuti. (1980). *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute.

Ulrych, Margherita. (1996). “On Integrating Stylistics into the Translation Process”. *XIV World Congress of the FIT*. Proceedings 2. Melbourne, Australia: AUSIT, The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators.

Xie, Y. (2008). *Hemingway’s Language Style and Writing Techniques in The Old Man and the Sea*. *CCSE Journal*, Vol. 1, No:2, December 2008.

Van den Broeck, Raymond. (1985). "Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism: A Model of its Analytic Function" in T. Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature, Studies in Literary Translation*. London/ Sydney: Croom Helm.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vinay and Darbalnet. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.