

An examination of the extent of equivalence of an author's literary stylistic features in two Turkish translations of a short story in English

İhsan ÖZDEMİR¹

APA: Özdemir, İ. (2019). An examination of the extent of equivalence of an author's literary stylistic features in two Turkish translations of a short story in English. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö6), 517-532. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.649344

Abstract

A distinctive personal literary style, unique to every author, is the foremost characteristic that gives a literary work its literary quality. Each style is a composite of syntactic and semantic components that evidence the literary identity of an author. In Translation Studies, style is the element that poses a great difficulty to translators with regard to establishment of equivalence between the source text and its translation. Readers who are able to read a text both in its original language and its translation are well aware of this fact as they notice the degree of losses of the stylistic features of the original text in its translated version. Thus, inaccurate or inadequate transfer of stylistic elements leads to a decrease in the flavor of the original literary work. The problem arises from the fact that sometimes in the translation process, not all elements which altogether create the exclusive style of an author, are given the due attention by translators who do not primarily intend to achieve a reasonable level of stylistic equivalence between the two texts. In this study, two Turkish translations of a short story titled *The Denunciation* by the American author Ernest Miller Hemingway will be compared with the original text and with each other in respect to the level of stylistic equivalence. The two translations and the source-text will be subjected to a descriptive stylistic analysis to highlight the necessity of equivalent transfer of stylistic features of a literary text in the translation process in order to preserve the original literary savor.

Keywords: Literary, style, equivalence, translation.

İngilizce bir kısa hikâyenin Türkçe iki çevirisinde bir yazarın edebi üslup özelliklerinin eşdeğerlik derecesine yönelik bir inceleme

Öz

Her yazara özgü ayırt edici bir kişisel edebî üslup, bir edebî esere edebî niteliğini veren en önde gelen özelliktir. Her üslup bir yazarın edebî kimliğini açıkça ortaya koyan sözdizimsel ve anlamsal bileşenlerin bir birleşimidir. Çeviribilimde üslup, çevirmenlere kaynak metin ile çevirisi arasında bir eşdeğerlik kurulması konusunda büyük bir zorluk çıkaran unsurdur. Bir metni hem orijinal dilinden hem de çevirisinden okuyabilen okurlar, orijinal metnin üslup özelliklerinin çevrili halinde ne dereceye kadar kayba uğradığını gördükleri için, bu gerçeğin farkındadırlar. Bu nedenle, üsluba dair unsurların yanlış veya yetersiz aktarımı, orijinal edebî eserin lezzetinde bir azalmaya neden olur. Sorun bazen çeviri sürecinde, iki metin arasında makul bir üslup eşdeğerliği düzeyi elde etmeyi öncelikle amaçlamış olmayan çevirmenlerin, hep birlikte bir yazarın ayrıcalıklı üslubunu yaratan unsurların tamamına gerektiği gibi dikkat etmedikleri gerçeğinden kaynaklanmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Amerikalı yazar Ernest Miller Hemingway'in *İhbar* adlı bir kısa öyküsünün Türkçedeki iki

¹ Dr. Öğrencisi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çeviribilim ABD, Çeviribilim Bölümü (Sakarya, Türkiye), ihsanozdemir30@hotmail.com, ORCID ID:0000-0001-7410-0248 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 06.10.2019-kabul tarihi: 20.11.2019; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.649344]

çevirisi, orijinal metin ve kendi aralarında üslup eşdeğerliği düzeylerine göre karşılaştırılacaktır. Çeviri sürecinde orijinal edebî tadı korumak adına edebî bir metnin üslup özelliklerinin eşdeğer bir düzeyde aktarılmasının gerekliliğini vurgulamaya yönelik olarak, bu iki çeviri metin ile kaynak metin betimleyici bir üslup analizi yöntemi ile incelemeye tâbi tutulacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Edebî, üslup, eşdeğerlik, çeviri.

Introduction

As commonly defined, literature involves creative use of language, which means that language in literary texts is used in a rather unconventional or sometimes even ‘unnatural’ way. That is because every good writer tries to create a writing style of their own to distinguish themselves from many others.

Ahmet Cemal suggests that style of a literary work is what matters most in a translation and that a literary work cannot really be regarded to have been translated unless its particular style is properly translated into the target language (Cemal, 1986, p. 93 cited in Tanrıku, 2010). So, the distinctive literary style of an author is what gives a piece of writing its literariness and it is thus an element that needs to be reflected in the translation as much as possible.

A literary author will use the words in a way peculiar to himself to produce an artistically rich text that has the capacity to evoke certain associations in the reader. The translator, therefore, has to take into consideration all the stylistic features in his analysis that emerge from the complicated relationships among the words before setting out to translate it (Tanrıku, 2010). Then, the task whose responsibility the translator assumes for translating a literary text is a painstaking one, if it is to be carried out conscientiously.

In literature every distinguished writer is righteously acclaimed for the unique way they use the language to express the world. And writers exert deliberate effort to develop a writing style of their own that will create a specific effect on the reader and put them in a certain mood.

So, what are the characteristics that constitute an author's personal style? Simply put, style in writing is all about how something is told rather than what is told. It is composed of elements such as tone, word choice, sentence length, use of figurative language, dialogue, repetition, etc. It is the way a writer chooses to write. The text type and purpose of writing will most likely determine what is often called an expository, descriptive, persuasive or narrative style, each with a specific function. And the most noteworthy element – the distinctive feature - of a literary style is its originality.

On the originality of a literary style, which is a key component in stylistics, Mehmet Önal states the following:

While searching for the individual traces of an artist in a literary work, thousands of different nuances of existence are felt in a unity in the texture of the work along with the [author's] personal style. As man, by his nature, exhibits remarks and attitudes that may exist in every person, he also displays some attitudes and remarks unique to himself, which do not exist in everyone. It is then that it is possible to talk about an original style. (Önal, 2008, p. 33)

Originality involves creativity which is an essential part of authorship. Creating a novel style in literature and thriving in that style as an author is a demanding task only few inventive minds can accomplish. So, an artistic style thus formed is a rare thing that indeed deserves appreciation.

It is the need for preservation of precious artistic qualities of a source-text in the translation process that brings us to a central concept in the field of Translation Studies - *Equivalence*. It is within the scope and aims of this paper to discuss the concepts of literary style and the extent of its transfer through translation to a target culture within the framework of views on the translational term *Equivalence*. To this purpose, two Turkish translations of the short story 'Denunciation' by Ernest Hemingway, renowned for the plainness of his literary style, shall be subjected to a descriptive stylistic analysis, allowing a comparison to be made between the two target-texts as to the degree of stylistic equivalence realized.

The significance of this paper lies in the fact that the writer did not set out with an intention of directly applying or adapting any deductive systematics of comparative analysis of any distinguished scholar. Rather, the inductive method used in the analysis part, which principally constitutes the original side of this paper, takes its source from the writer's own experience of practicing and teaching literary translation. With the data gathered, in time, the writer aims to develop a scientific point of view / approach to evaluation of stylistic equivalence in translations of literary texts. This article is the first step in this endeavor.

Literary style

Definition

Literary style has various definitions. Basically, as Laurie Rozakis (2003) suggests, "A writer's *style* is his or her distinctive way of writing" and also "Style is a series of choices – words, sentence length and structure, figures of speech, tone, voice, diction, and overall structure" (p. 251). It is explicit that style in a literary work has an idiosyncratic character because it is an aesthetic creation of an author who makes conscious choices out of the linguistic materials available to compose his/her work.

Stylistic elements such as choice of words, sentence length, structure, etc., will differ from one author to another since every author tends to express themselves dissimilarly from others in a distinct way. Style is, therefore, the typical aspect of any remarkable piece of literary writing, as Rozakis (2003) further suggests, "All good writing shares one common quality: It has *style* – no matter what form the writing takes" (p. 251).

Geoffrey Leech and Mick Short (2007) define style as "[referring] to the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person, for a given purpose, and so on" (p. 9) by underlining a critical aspect - purpose. The style of a text will really crystallize in accordance with the requirements imposed by its purpose - a very decisive fact always to be kept in mind.

Önal (2008) states that, like poetry and art, style is already a difficult word to define. Yet, he gives a to-the-point definition of his own: "[the quality of] being peculiar to oneself arising from use of words in [a] literary work through relating them also to form and content and through extending to an original way of expression" (p. 33). Style in literature comes into existence out of the delicate, complicated and creative relationship between form and content as fittingly expressed below:

Style, rather as a characteristic of expression, may seem to concern the formal aspect of wording. Certainly, it is known that style emerges out of a wording, that it flows in a form into social life, yet the formal stylistic element has also to do with content. What reflects style is a wording based on form. The semantic and associative links that the words in the expression have both individually and

together, the way [those words] are expressed and arranged, also show [their] link[s] to the content.
(Önal, 2008, p. 33)

The close connection and even 'collaboration' between form and content to create a particular style is also highlighted by Ann Carr (2018) who suggests, "Style is the literary element that describes the ways that the author uses words – the author's word choice, sentence structure, figurative language, and sentence arrangement all work together to establish mood, images, and meaning in the text"(para. 8). So, this close link between these two essential constituents, which requires mastery to build and is somewhat mysterious, forms the unique texture of a specific literary style.

Style, as pointed out by Leech and Short (2007), is pertinent to *parole* as referring to the distinction drawn by Saussure between *langue* and *parole*, where *langue* is "the code or system of rules common to speakers of a language (such as English)" and *parole* is "the particular uses of this system, or selections from this system, that speakers or writers make on this or that occasion" (p. 9). So, every communicator in a language develops a personal way of communication utilizing the existing linguistic stock, namely the lexical items and grammatical rules, of that language that are supposedly available to everyone who communicates in that language.

Style as a term has also been employed to refer to an author's habitual way of using a language and also to how a language is used in a certain text type, a specific age, school of thought or some mixture of all. These usages all look reasonable and operative (Leech and Short, 2007).

Carr (2018) says "Your choice of words builds the fabric of your story" (para. 2) drawing special attention to an author's freedom of expression – free will – which should also naturally be extended to comprise the grammatical patterns involved in the process of writing. She also specifically mentions 'tone' as the element of literary style which reflects an author's stance – his/her emotional and intellectual standpoint governed by his/her mentality - in a text. She briefly explains what tone is, whether or not it varies in the text and how it is created as follows:

Tone is the way the author expresses his attitude through his writing. The tone can change very quickly or may remain the same throughout the story. Tone is expressed by your use of syntax, your point of view, your diction and the level of formality in your writing. (Carr, 2018, para. 7)

The three Cs of literary style

It is evident that the constituents that serve in the making of a style are quite similar: the author's word choice, preference over certain grammar structures, viewpoint, use of figurative language, level of formality/informality, etc. From a different perspective, however, Rozakis (2003) simply lists three characteristics, which she believes every quality writing has in common, as consistency, coherence and clarity and explicates them as elements of style in writing.

Consistency pertains to bringing about "a single effect" which "may be comedic or horrific, sorrowful or joyous, businesslike or personal". This allows the text to keep "the same tone or mood throughout" (Rozakis, 2003, p. 253).

Coherence is attained through writing in a "logical and unified" way ensuring that every single item contributes to elucidation of the main idea. Hints such as Transitions, Pronouns, Repetition and Parallel Structure are positioned in the text by the author to logically and easily link ideas to one another

(Rozakis, 2003, p. 255). She also shows how to compose a piece of writing that has coherence and emphasizes that “... one or more of these techniques [can be used] to create coherence” (p. 256).

As for clarity, Rozakis (2003) simply defines it as easiness with which to comprehend the meaning of a writing, and presents several rules formulated by Mark Twain, whom she calls “a master stylist much admired for his clear writing” to support her definition. Some of the rules, which she believes “serve as great guidelines for all writers today” (p. 257) are as follows:

a tale [should] accomplish something and arrive somewhere...

a tale [should have clear episodes] ... (p. 257).

...personages in a tale [should] be alive, except in the case of corpses
...personages in a tale, both dead and alive, shall exhibit a sufficient excuse for being there.

...when the personages of a tale deal in conversation, the talk [should] sound like human talk, and ... [fit] the given circumstances, and have a discoverable meaning, also a discoverable purpose, and ... relevancy, and remain in the neighborhood of the subject in hand, and be interesting to the reader, and help out the tale, and stop when the people cannot think of anything more to say (p. 258).

So far, some handy definitions have been introduced along with the elements that constitute literary style. It can be concluded that the most basic constituents of style are form and content as expressively suggested by Önal (2008) and Ann Carr (2018). Consistency, coherence and clarity have been put forth by Rozakis (2003) as the three Cs of style. Other factors that determine style such as words, sentence length and structure, figures of speech, tone, voice, diction, and overall structure as stated by Rozakis (2003) and word choice, sentence structure, figurative language, and sentence arrangement as expressed by Carr (2018) can be grouped under one umbrella term- Choice. Purpose, another key factor suggested by Leech and Short (2007), surely has an impact on choice which in turn brings about originality of style as referred to by Önal (2008). It is thus possible to describe a successful literary style: one which is consistent, coherent, clear, built upon a selection and original use of linguistic elements that serve the purpose.

Literary language and translation

Literary language necessitates literary style or vice versa. They both draw attention to characteristics of a text that distances itself from ordinariness. As it grows distant from commonplaceness, it unsurprisingly takes on a new function different than those that non-literary texts have; that of literariness, a particularity that manifests itself in its capacity to give pleasure. Literary works, then, are those writings readers read not just to learn something but to a great extent to enjoy themselves, just because they have gotten into a mental habit of taking delight in literary language. N. Berrin Aksoy expresses this fact plainly as follows:

... literary language contains meanings and structures that are quite different from [those in] daily language and conversations. [A] literary text not only conveys something to the reader but also evokes in him through a peculiar and creative use of language some emotions and thoughts. The target of literature is not to teach but entertain. In line with this purpose, [an] author uses a style that reflects his/her personality, likes and choices. The images, metaphors, rhymes and collocations the author uses are not found in ordinary texts. (Aksoy, 2002, p. 57)

It is true that literary language is uniquely personal and bears, as a matter of course, the traces of the author’s very personality. It is this uniqueness, of course, that makes a literary text distinct from others. And it is this distinctness of a particular text that ensures its literary quality and causes the complexity it has that causes its translation process to be troublesome, as indicated by Aksoy (2002) who maintains

that “The creativity and originality dimensions of [a] literary text cannot be denied. And the most important characteristics that render translation[s] of literary text[s] difficult are this original and creative use of language” (pp. 57-58).

A great hardship literary translation imposes is that it requires creativity and fidelity at the same time. The literary translator, while using his/her creativity, needs to stay within the limits of the source-text, that is, he/she needs to preserve the ties with the source-text, not loosen them, leave alone sever them, as hinted by Aksoy (2002): “... literary translation, by nature, ... forces [a] translator to be creative within the borders of the source-text” (p. 58). Hence, translating a literary text and preserving the flavor of the author's style all at once is an arduous task not every translator can or should undertake.

Stylistics

As it is the purpose of this paper to conduct a stylistic analysis on the translations of a short story, it makes sense to touch also on stylistics, as defined in basic terms by Leech and Short (2007), “... the (linguistic) study of style” (p. 11). Leech (2013) alone has an equally simplistic definition: “the linguistic study of literary texts” (Chp. I, Intro, p. 1), alongside a more extensive one: “In its broadest sense, stylistics is the study of *style*; of - how language use varies according to varying circumstances: e.g. circumstances of period, discourse situation or authorship” (Chp. V, p. 54).

Stylistics arose in the Western tradition as a result of the progresses in linguistics and literary theory, mostly through utilization of linguistic devices in literary texts. The rationale behind the emergence of stylistics is expressed by Leech (2013) in this way: “the justification for stylistics is in the application of *linguistic* methods and tools to *literature*” (Chp. I, Intro, p. 4).

Purpose, by nature, is fundamental to all scientific fields and studies. As regards the purpose of stylistics, it is articulated in an overall sense by Leech and Short (2007) in the following manner: “in general, literary stylistics has, implicitly or explicitly, the goal of explaining the relation between language and artistic function” (p. 11). It is possible, then, to say that literary stylistics deals with linguistic analysis of artistic aspects of literary texts.

In the last five decades, stylistics has evolved to a large extent out of work done in two disciplines as ascertained by Leech (2013): “... **stylistics** has developed from being a fledgling offshoot of linguistics and literary studies to being quite an established discipline – or perhaps we should call it an ‘interdiscipline’ – in its own right” (Chp. I, Intro, para. 1).

An interdiscipline, as we may call it, stylistics has incorporated a great deal from both disciplines into its research methods, thus devoting itself mainly to the kind of analysis that “... helps to *reveal* the literary qualities of texts – ... by applying techniques helping to bring out the (often latent) characteristics which people associate with literary texts and which they value” (Leech, 2013, Chp. I, Intro, para. 6).

In this study, effort will be put in identifying the literary or non-literary properties of two translations as compared with the original text.

Equivalence in Translation

Using 'equivalent' as a term in his "traditional definition", which is "...translation means the replacement, or substitution, of an utterance in one language by a formally or semantically or pragmatically equivalent utterance in another language", to exemplify such definitions of translation, Theo Hermans (2009) emphasizes the fact that equivalence is a disputed issue. He furthers his observation by saying that "The more closely one looks at what constitutes 'equivalence' in translation, the more problematical the notion becomes" (p. 47).

Indeed, equivalence is a highly controversial issue in Translation Studies even to the point of whether or not it actually exists. Jeremy Munday (2009) reports that academics have not reached an agreement as to effectiveness and practicality of the term, stating that some academics like Edwin Gentzler (2001) and Mary Snell-Hornby (1988/1995) dismiss the concept almost completely, whereas others like Mona Baker (1992) and Dorothy Kenny (1998) view it as a useful instrument in the theory and teaching of translation and still others like Eugene Albert Nida and Charles Russell Taber (1969/1974) and Werner Koller (1989/1995) think translation is impossible without it (p. 185).

Definition

Before introducing some of the views on the concept, it is instrumental to clarify what is meant by equivalence. The notion of equivalence in translation can be viewed as the relation between the source and target texts in terms of equality of the value or effect both texts are assumed to have with regard to each other. Equivalence, which is literally 'equal' + 'value' and means 'equalvalue' or 'equaleffect', is presumed to exist in "a good translation" that is described as follows:

That, in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language [so] as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs, as it is by those who speak the language of the original work. (Alexander Fraser Tytler, 1907, p. 8-9)

Three rules Tytler deduces from his description, which Munday (2009) indicates "... is close to Nida's later functional equivalence" (p. 23), are given below:

- I. That the Translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work.
- II. That the style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original.
- III. That the Translation should have all the ease of original composition. (Tytler, 1907, p. 9)

Tytler (1907), then, views a quality translation as one that preserves all the ideas, style and smooth flow of the source text, which, in fact, brings us close to how Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) regard equivalence: the reproduction of the original situation in the target text but with a dissimilar wording in such a way that retains the stylistic value of the source text, (cited in Munday, 2001).

John Cunnison Catford (1978) mentions the term 'equivalent' as a 'key term' declaring that the main issue in the practice of translating is that of coming up with 'TL equivalents' and a major responsibility of theory of translation is that of describing the character of equivalence and under which circumstances it exists (p. 21).

Katharina Reiss and Hans J. Vermeer (2014) define the term as follows: "**Equivalence** is the relationship between a target text and a source text which (can) achieve the same communicative

function at the same level in the two cultures involved" (p. 128), highlighting the fact that it is the *skopos* that stipulates attainment of the same function by both texts.

Wolfram Wilss (1982) refers to equivalence as he describes the translation process: "[Translation] leads from a source-language text to a target-language text which is as close an equivalent as possible and presupposes an understanding of the content and style of the original" (Cited in Anthony Pym, 2014, p. 27).

In sum, equivalence is a kind of 'sameness' in value or effect that is supposedly found between a ST and a TT which is accepted to be a 'translation' of the ST, since equivalence is peculiar only to 'translation' as a text type, which means that in no other types of text is it pursued.

Types and degrees of equivalence

As an indispensable element of translation approaches in the 1960s and 1970s, equivalence signified that ST and TT had something in common – a similarity. "The question was as to the kind and degree of sameness which gave birth to different kinds of equivalence" (Despoina Panou, 2013, p. 2). Thus, it is practical to face the tricky issue of equivalence in translation in types and degrees rather than as an absolute truth.

Stating that the inflexible ST-based kind of equivalence is practically unattainable, Kirsten Malmkjær (2013) suggests that:

...any text that is considered a translation can be compared to its ST to establish the actual, as opposed to the ideal equivalence relationships that obtain between them. It is then possible to study the type and degree of translation equivalence between the two texts...". (p. 34)

Thus, the aim to verify equivalence between a ST and TT can better be accomplished from a realistic viewpoint which involves its analysis according to type and degree.

Nida (1964) distinguished between 'formal' equivalence translation which "is basically source-oriented; that is, it is designed to reveal as much as possible of the form and content of the original message" (p. 165), whereas "In a [D-E (dynamic-equivalence)] translation the focus of attention is directed, not so much toward the source message, as toward the receptor response" (p. 166). So, in terms of extent of equivalence, Nida defines a D-E translation as 'the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message' which puts forth the likeness as "the highest degree of approximation" (p. 166).

Gideon Toury (2012), who, - as a target-culture-oriented theorist - refrains from relinquishing the concept of equivalence in translation theory, rather seeks a reconciliation between the idea of equivalence and requirements of the descriptive approach, which manifests itself in the following premise: "... the type and extent of equivalence actually exhibited by a translation vis-à-vis its source are determined by norms." Accordingly, he redefines equivalence as "any relation which is found to have characterized translation under a specified set of circumstances" in preference to "a single type of relationship, anchored in a recurring invariant" (p. 85). And, needless to say, it is the target culture that specifies the translational norms that, in turn, lay down the equivalence postulate.

Multiple examples of types and degrees of equivalence can be found in the works by Koller (1992) and Baker (2018). Hermans (2009) reports that "Koller [1992] himself broke up the concept into five different kinds: denotative, connotative, text-normative, pragmatic and formal-aesthetic equivalence"

(p. 48), whereas Baker (2018) presents six kinds of equivalence: equivalence at word level, equivalence above word level, grammatical equivalence, textual equivalence, pragmatic equivalence and semiotic equivalence.

It follows that expressing existent equivalence between a ST and TT in types and degrees will concretize the analysis to a certain extent, rendering the intricate (or even fuzzy to some) term a more solvable translational matter.

Difficulties with Equivalence

Snell-Hornby (1988) discarded equivalence judging it to be hardly “an illusion of symmetry between languages” (p. 22). The notion was subjected to so intense a criticism by the target-culture-based functionalist and descriptive approaches that uttering the term nearly became outlawed as Alev Bulut (2000) rightly expresses that “the concept of equivalence, as a criterion based on the source text, has somehow been tabooed” (p. 73).

Owing to certain linguistic and cultural restraints, equivalence, as various scholars indicate, cannot be achieved fully or perfectly. Therefore, it is proper to say that absolute equivalence between ST and TT is impossibly idealistic in most cases. In addition, it may not actually be what is sought, as Reiss (1971, 2000) points out, in situations where the function of TT is set differently than that of ST (Cited in Christiane Nord, 2018). In such circumstances, Nord infers that “the functional perspective takes precedence over the normal standards of equivalence” (p. 9), which is to say that exhibition of only the particular type of equivalence is necessary, namely, the type that fulfils the specific function designated in the target culture.

A simple truth about the nature of equivalence is stated in Reiss and Vermeer’s (2014) plain assertion that “We cannot ‘translate equivalently’. Rather, a target text *can be considered* equivalent (or, as we usually say, is equivalent) to a source text” (p. 128), which is justifiable in the light of the fact that, except for the artificially formed terminological items, natural equivalents (to a great extent) do not exist across languages (Pym, 2014). Therefore, (most of the time) a 100 % equivalence cannot be realized; the type and degree of equivalence can be presumed to exist in line with the perceived purpose or function of the TT.

Yet, notwithstanding its drawbacks, equivalence remains to be a critical means by which translation is defined, as it serves as “a reminder of the central problems a translator encounters during the translation process” (Panou, 2013, p. 5). Though, because of its vagueness, it is virtually rejected, no substitute idea has yet been provided that is more satisfactory and more applicable. In Ernst R. Wendland’s (2012) words, “although ‘equivalence is not a stable concept’ (xi), no widely acceptable alternative notion has surfaced which is any better” (p. 92).

Likewise, Pym (2010) stresses that equivalence is definitely supposed to exist in the 20th century translation heritage, phrasing aptly the following question: “... should a purpose-based approach then entirely reject the function of equivalence itself?”, in answer to which he declares that equivalence should be retained as a theoretical tool, as “a measure of the specificity and value of translated texts” (p. 39).

Analysis

In this study, two Turkish translations of the short story 'Denunciation' by Ernest Hemingway will be compared with each other and the ST in terms of type and degree of stylistic equivalence. Focus will be on those parts of the texts that specifically allow of a stylistic comparison in the 13-page-long ST.

Translator 1 is T1 and Translator 2 is T2. Translation 1 is TT1 (Target Text 1) and Translation 2 is TT2 (Target Text 2). The underlined elements will be analyzed briefly.

The analysis goes as follows:

1. "Chicote's in the old days in Madrid was a place sort of like The Stork, without the music and the debutantes, or the Waldorf's men's bar if they let girls in (p. 1)."

"Madrid'in eski günlerindeki Chicote'nin Yeri, müzik ve sosyeteye ilk kez takdim edilen genç kızların olmadığı The Stork ya da kızların girebildiği Waldorf'un erkek barı gibi bir yerdi" _ TT1

"Chicote, Madrid'in eski günlerinde müzikten ve sosyeteye yeni tanıtılmış kızlardan yoksun The Stork gibi yahut Waldorf'un – kızların girmesine de izin verilmiş – erkek barı gibi yerlendendi." _ TT2

'Chicote's' means 'Chicote'nin Yeri', as equivalently translated by T1 and non-equivalently as just 'Chicote' by T2.

'debutante' does not have a one-word equivalent in Turkish, so it is rightly translated as '*sosyeteye ilk kez takdim edilen genç kızlar*' by T1 and as '*sosyeteye yeni tanıtılmış kızlar*' by T2. Of course, both translations are much longer than the original, with TT1 having seven words and TT2 four, which inevitably but seriously impairs equivalence.

'*sort of*' is not translated at all by either T1 or T2, which certainly is a loss in equivalence.

2. "Pedro Chicote was the proprietor and he had one of those personalities that make a place (p. 1)."

"Mülk sahibi Pedro Chicote'ydi ve bir mekâm var eden o kişiliklerden biriydi." _ TT1

"Barın sahibi olan Pedro Chicote, bulunduğu yere damgasını vuran kişiliklendendi." _ TT2

TT1, which is '*Mülk sahibi Pedro Chicote'ydi*', is structurally equivalent to 'The proprietor was Pedro Chicote'. TT2, which is '*Barın sahibi olan Pedro Chicote*', corresponds to a Relative Clause structure in English. Thus, both TT1 and TT2 are structurally non-equivalent to the ST.

Here '*make*' means '*to bring into existence*' which is equivalently translated by T1 as '*bir mekâm var eden*'. '*bulduğu yere damgasını vuran*' by T2, which is literally 'leave a mark on where he is', is not a semantic equivalent of the ST, Besides, the phrase '*make a place*' is not an idiom in English unlike '*damgasını vurmak*' in Turkish.

3. "A lot of people went there that I did not like, the same as at the Stork, say, but I was never in Chicote's that it wasn't pleasant (p. 1)."

"Sevmediğim bir sürü insan giderdi oraya, aynı The Stork'taki gibi ama Chicote'nin Yeri'nde olup da keyif almadığım hiç olmadı." _ TT1

"Bunların içinde hiç sevmediğim bir sürü insan da olurdu, tıpkı The Stork'ta olduğu gibi, örneğin, ama Chicote'ye o kadar gittim, bana kötü görüldüğü olmadı hiç." _ TT2

T1's '*Sevmediğim bir sürü insan giderdi oraya*,' seems to be syntactically and semantically an equivalent translation while T2's '*Bunların içinde hiç sevmediğim bir sürü insan da olurdu*' is not.

'*say*' is lost in T1's '*aynı The Stork'taki gibi*', which causes inadequacy in equivalence, whereas it is kept in T2's '*tıpkı The Stork'ta olduğu gibi, örneğin*', which renders equivalence complete.

T1's '*keyif almadığım hiç olmadı.*' which fails to reflect the author's way of expression is equivalent rather to '*...that I didn't enjoy*'. A closer translation could be 'Chicote'nin Yeri'nde bulunduğum hiçbir an yoktu ki keyifli olmasın.' As for T2's '*bana kötü görüldüğü olmadı hiç*', it is simply far from the ST's style.

4. "If you ordered a martini it was made with the best gin that money could buy, and Chicote had a barrel whiskey that came from Scotland that was so much better than the advertised brands that it was pitiful to compare it with ordinary Scotch (p. 2)."

"Martini satın alabileceği en iyi cinle yapılırdı ve Chicote'de İskoçya'dan gelen ve reklamları yapılan markalardan çok daha iyi bir fıçı viskisi olurdu ki bunu sıradan Scotch'larla karşılaştırmak haksızlık olurdu." _ TT1

"İstedğiniz martiniye paranın satın alabileceği en iyi cinle yapılmış gelirdi. Chicote'nin İskoçya'dan getirttiği fıçı viskisi ise reklamı yapılan bayağı İskoç markalarıyla hiçbir şekilde kıyaslanamayacak kadar nefis olurdu." _ TT2

In TT1 '*If you ordered a martini*' is untranslated. So, equivalence is out of the question. In TT2 '*İstedğiniz martiniye*' which is close, though structurally not very, to '*Martini sipariş verdiyseniz*' may be acceptable. But '*gelirdi*' is an addition that has no tangible equivalent in the ST and is an intervention in the author's style.

In TT1 '*Chicote'de İskoçya'dan gelen ve reklamları yapılan markalardan çok daha iyi bir fıçı viskisi olurdu ki*' is quite close to the ST while '*Chicote'nin İskoçya'dan getirttiği fıçı viskisi ise*' in TT2 is built on a Relative Clause that does not exist in the ST. Besides, '*İskoçya'dan getirttiği*', which literally means that Chicote himself arranged the order and shipping – an unverifiable assumption –, is neither structurally nor semantically equivalent, causing an unnecessary shift in meaning.

The ST comprises a Compound Sentence with two full sentences joined by a (,) and a Coordinator (and) while TT2 does not observe this structural equivalence. TT1, in this sense, is structurally equivalent.

'*karşılaştırmak haksızlık olurdu*' in TT1 does not meet '*it was pitiful to compare*', neither does '*hiçbir şekilde kıyaslanamayacak kadar*' in TT2. Instead, '*karşılaştırmak acınası/küçümsenesi olurdu*' would be a close equivalent. It is seen that the author's style undergoes a structural and semantic change in both translations.

Moreover, '*nefis*' in TT2 is not equivalent to '*so much better*'. The author did not prefer to say '*marvelous, or wonderful, etc.*', which he could have done if he had wished to. '*çok daha iyi*' in TT1 is a 'much better' equivalent.

5. "Knowing him, and knowing the place in the old days, it would be perfectly understandable (p. 2)."

"Onu ve mekânın eski günlerini bilen biri olarak söyleyebilirim ki, bu son derece anlaşılabilir bir şey." _ TT1

"Onu ve Chicote'nin eski günlerini bilenler için kesinlikle anlaşılabilirdi bu." _ TT2

The Present Participle structure does not allow of TT2 since it refers to first-person singular. And in this context, the Participle Clause also indicates 'reason'. So, '*bildiğim için*,' is structurally and semantically

the equivalent transfer. *'bilen biri olarak söyleyebilirim ki'* in TT1 involves a Relative Clause which corresponds to *'as a person who knows I can say that'* and is therefore something else.

6. "... I told her to keep the change from a peseta. She said God would bless me. I doubted this ... (p. 3)."

"... kadına verdiğim bir pesetanın üstünün kendisinde kalabileceğini söyledim. Bana Tanrı'nın beni koruyacağını söyledi. Bundan şüpheliydim ..." _ TT1

"'Pesetanın üstü kalsın' dedim. Kadın, 'Allah razı olsun' dedi. Bundan pek emin değildiysem de ..." _ TT2

Both *'I told her to keep the change from a peseta.'* and *'She said God would bless me.'* are Indirect Speech expressions and are the author's stylistic preference. In this regard, TT1 preserves the style whereas TT2, which converts Indirect Speech into Direct Speech, doesn't. Also, *'Tanrı'* is a better choice in this context than *'Allah'* which creates more of a Muslim context than of a Christian. Furthermore, *'Bundan pek emin değildiysem de...'* is now quite incoherent with *'Kadın, "Allah razı olsun" dedi.'* after the conversion, while *'Bundan şüpheliydim ...'* is coherent with *'Bana Tanrı'nın beni koruyacağını söyledi.'*

7. "He was a company commander in the Fifteenth Brigade who had been buried by an airplane bomb which had killed four other men and he had been sent in to be under observation for a while and then sent to a rest home or something of the sort (p. 3)."

"Kendisi, dört adamı öldürmüş bir uçak bombasının gömüldüğü 15. Tugay'da bölük komutanıydı ve bir süreliğine gözlem altında tutulmak üzere yollanmış, sonra da bir tür huzurevine gönderilmişti." _ TT1

"On-beşinci Tugay'da bölük komutanıydı ve başka dört adamın ölmesine yol açan uçak bombardımanı sırasında toprağa gömüldüğü için bir süre gözlem altında tutulmak üzere gönderildikten sonra dinlenme evi falan gibi bir yere gönderilmişti" _ TT2

The 'who' in TT1 modifies 'He', not the Fifteenth Brigade. So, who is buried by an airplane bomb is only the man, not the entire brigade. T2 duly relates the Relative Pronoun to 'He'; however, TT2 loses structural equivalence by saying *'gömüldüğü için'* since there is no use of an equivalent Adverbial Clause of Reason in the ST.

TT2 also translates *'then'* as if it were 'after' in an Adverbial Clause of Time, as if the ST were *'after he had been sent in to be under observation for a while'*. To observe structural equivalence, *'then'* should be translated independently as 'sonra or sonrasında', not as if it belonged to a clause. Therefore, the translation should be 'gönderilmiş, sonra / sonrasında', not *'gönderildikten sonra'*. *'yollanmış, sonra da'* in TT1 is a structurally equivalent rendition in this regard.

'huzurevi' in TT1 brings to mind a place where old and disabled people are housed and taken care of. Though, it is semantically an equivalent of *'rest home'*, pragmatically it does not fit the specific situation as the person in question is a soldier, not a disabled old man. *'dinlenme evi'* in TT2 is probably a better solution since it does not evoke images of old age and disability.

Both *'bir tür'* in TT1 and *'falan gibi bir yer'* in TT2 are semantically equivalent to *'something of the sort'*. T2's choice, however, includes *'yer'*, an extra word that seemingly mars the equivalence, yet it does not because *'something'* denotes a place here.

8. "So just like I say come others. So I am stand there and watch. I watch close. I look up and I point to company what happens. Is come three and three. One first and two behind. Is pass one group of three and I say to company, 'See? Now is pass one formation' (p. 5)."

“Ve aynı dediğim gibi diğerleri de geldi. Ben de orada durdum izliyorum. Yukarı baktım ve bölüğe neler olduğunu gösterdim. Üç ve üç geldi [...] Önce biri, arkadan da ikisi. Bir üçlü geçti ve ben bölüğe dedim ki, ‘Gördünüz mü? Şimdi bir filo geçti.’ _ TT1

“Dediğim gibi başkaları gelir. Orda durup seyreder ben. Yakın seyreder ben. Yukarı bakar ben ve ne oluyor bölüğe gösterir ben. Uçaklar üç üç gelir. Bir önde iki arkada. Üçlü bir grup geçince bölüğe ‘Görür mü siz? Şimdi bir takım geçer’ der ben.” _ TT2

The speaker here is a Greek soldier who cannot speak English grammatically. Hence, his talk should be transferred in such a way - by focusing on the inaccuracies in his non-native speech - that will reflect his peculiar style. T1 appears not to have tried to keep the stylistic equivalence at all. T2, on the other hand, takes this fact into consideration and translates accordingly, thus undertaking quite a challenging, albeit crucial, translational task with such non-native utterances.

9. “I uncovered the big silver piece with the profile of Alfonso XIII as a baby showing (p. 8).”

“Elimi Alfonso XIII’in bebeklik halinin olduğu büyük gümüş paranın üzerinden kaldırdım.” _ TT1

“Elimi iri gümüş paranın üstünden çekince bebek XIII. Alfonso’nun suratı çıktı ortaya.” _ TT2

TT1 seems to fulfil structural equivalence whereas TT2 does not. Rendering the Prepositional Phrase ‘with the profile of Alfonso XIII as a baby showing’ to Turkish like a Relative Clause is fairly natural here. ‘çekince’ in TT2 structurally corresponds to an Adverbial Clause of Time with ‘when’ or ‘as’, but there is no such clause in the ST.

‘elini kaldırmak’ in TT1 and ‘elini çekmek’ in TT2 are functionally equivalent to ‘uncover’ since a scene is portrayed in the story where two characters each toss a coin. However, T2 also uses ‘çıkta ortaya’ to complete the meaning, which is a direct result of the structural alteration that results in a diversion from the author’s style.

‘profile’ indicates a *side view* of a human head or face, but neither T1 nor T2 nevertheless mentions this particularity, which is in fact a loss as regards semantic equivalence.

‘Alfonso XIII’in’ in TT1 does not sound natural in Turkish. Besides, the Turkish “-in’ ending should be “ün’. The naturally equivalent form in Turkish is ‘XIII. Alfonso’nun’ as presented in TT2.

And lastly;

10. “... I felt very badly to have broken him and I felt awfully good to have won the money, ... (p. 8).”

“... bir yandan onu beş parasız bıraktığım için kendimi çok kötü hissettim, bir yandan da o parayı kazandığım için inanılmaz iyi hissettim ...” _ TT1

“Kendimi onu kırmış olduğum için berbat hissediyordum, parayı kazanmış olduğum içinse müthiş iyi hissediyordum; ...” _ TT2

‘broken’ means to completely destroy, defeat, or humiliate someone. In neither TT1 nor TT2 has the meaning been transferred equivalently. ‘beş parasız bırakmak’ which is ‘leave sb flat or leave sb high and dry’, though somewhat close to the ST, does not however entail total destruction, defeat or humiliation. And ‘kırmış’ is totally irrelevant as ‘break sb’ appears to have been confused with ‘break sb’s heart’ whose meaning differs substantially. ‘perişan etmek’ could be a modest suggestion.

T1 used ‘bir yandan ... bir yandan’ for ‘and’ which equals to ‘on one hand ... on the other hand’. This adds extra emphasis which the ST lacks, thus spoiling stylistic equivalence. In TT2, ‘and’ is inserted in

'*çinse*', which is an agreeable way of meaning 've' in Turkish. To satisfy the basic equivalence, however, a modest 've' would be the simplest answer.

Surely, many more examples can be presented here, however, this much analysis should reasonably suffice for the objectives of this paper.

Discussion

Sometimes an equivalent does not exist in the target culture as in the example of the word '*debutante*'. In such cases, preserving the author's style is practically impossible. But those cases are not that frequent, at least in the example of 'Denunciation'. In many of the examples analyzed in this study, it is quite possible to create much more stylistic equivalence and hence enhance the aesthetic quality of the translations.

A simple example from the analysis is the rendering of '*so much better*' as '*nefis*' in TT2. To some or many, it may be a correct transfer. So, the question may arise: What's wrong with it? The problem is that the author is deliberately avoiding such words as '*marvelous, wonderful, etc.*', which are categorized under Extreme Adjectives in English, with a view to achieving a plain literary style. Use of such adjectives in translations will spoil the plainness of the ST.

'*sort of*', '*say*' and '*If you ordered a martini*' in the ST were not translated at all. Then, how can we talk about equivalence?

As '*Pedro Chicote was the proprietor ...*' is transferred as '*Mülk sahibi Pedro Chicote'ydi*', the Subject becomes the Complement and vice versa, resulting in an alteration in emphasis that affects the style.

Misinterpretation of the Participle, inappropriate conversion of Indirect Speech to Direct Speech, misuse of the Relative Clause and Adverbial Clause, etc., are among the most obvious structural deficiencies that also lead to semantic and stylistic defects.

'*huzurevi*', a pragmatically non-equivalent transfer, is also noteworthy in that it represents a typical example of how pragmatic equivalence completes stylistic equivalence.

The non-transfer of the ungrammaticalities of the non-native speaker's remarks in TT1 deprives the reader of the author's authentic style. T2 does a fine job by choosing to familiarize readers in the target culture with the Greek soldier's poor English - not the trouble-free English as presented in TT1 - which is actually the author's point to depict a realistic story. So, when literary style is disregarded in the translation process as in the example of TT1, some truth or aspect - here naturalness - about the ST is unavoidably lost. It is especially true in this specific case where the Greek soldier speaks noticeably long in the story.

Finally, as a result of a semantic mistranslation as in '*... I felt very badly to have broken him ...*', the meaning turns out to be different and inevitably so does the style.

Conclusion

The descriptive stylistic analysis of the TT1 and TT2 in comparison with each other and the ST has revealed that the author's style was not paid a due regard in the translation processes. It is, therefore,

quite possible to argue that artistic style was not of primary concern for neither of the two translators, which consequently led to significant losses in equivalence in their translations. The losses observed in the analysis mostly stemmed from structural, semantic and pragmatic non-equivalences among the TTs and the ST. Referring to Paul Ricoeur's realistic appraisal of nature of translation as "In translation too, work is advanced with some salvaging and some acceptance of loss" (Ricoeur, 2006, p. 3), it can safely be claimed that losses are a natural and inescapable part of a translational process, and in that sense, acceptable; yet, for the sake of attaining a desired degree of equivalence in the TT, the utmost care needs to be taken by those in charge to ensure that they are minimized.

The TT1 and TT2 can be said to be stylistically non-equivalent to the ST to a large extent, based on the specific instances of losses and non-equivalences explored in the analysis. In some examples, TT1 was closer to the ST, in some others TT2, in terms of stylistic equivalence. However, in many cases, both TT1 and TT2 suffered from inadequacies, misinterpretations and mistranslations which resulted in a clear failure to fulfil the requirement – if any – for stylistic equivalence.

As Pym (2014) notes, "Translators' performances are regulated by collective 'norms,' based on informal consensus about what is to be expected from a translator" (p. 62). The results of this critical analysis have shown that stylistic equivalence was not at all a part of the 'informal consensus' between the translators and their publishers. The translation policy seems to have been limited to just conveying the message and content matter of the ST.

Considering how much artistic endeavor an author makes to create an original style of writing to produce a literary work, it is the author's birthright to see his literary style translated into other languages as equivalently as possible. Likewise, it is the reader's absolute right to be aptly familiarized with the true style – the closest equivalent style that is realizable in translation- of an author in a translated literary text.

To conclude, much importance needs to be attached to structural, semantic and pragmatic equivalence all of which are inseparable components that contribute to realization of stylistic equivalence as a whole in a literary translation. Accordingly, pursuit of stylistically equivalent literary translations should be a matter of primary concern to any literary publisher, reader and translator, for, following Ahmet Cemal, a literary work as a ST can only be deemed a literary work as a TT as long as its stylistic aspect _ the very constituent that gives it its literary quality _ is transferred into a target language in a mindful effort to achieve an appreciably high level of equivalence.

References

- Aksoy, B. (2001). Çeviride eşdeğerlik kavramı. [The Notion of equivalence in translation]. *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları Dergisi* 11, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Mütercim-Tercümanlık Bölümü, 1-6.
- Aksoy, N. B. (2002). *Geçmişten günümüze yazın çevirisi*. [Literary translation from past to present]. (1st Ed.). Ankara, Turkey: İmge Kitabevi.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: a coursebook on translation*. (3rd Ed.). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Bulut, A. (2000). Çeviri metnin değerlendirilmesi: metinsel (eş) değerlik anahtarları. [Evaluation of translated text: keys to textual equivalence]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları Dergisi*, 10, 73-87.

- Carr, A. (2018). Write effectively! Use tone, style and pacing for focus and readability. Retrieved from: <https://owlcation.com/humanities/How-to-Begin-Sentences-and-Paragraphs-for-Effect-Focus-and-Readability-Tone-and-Style-Vary-Pace-Beware-Repetition>
- Catford, J.C. (1978). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. (5th Ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hermans, T. (2009). *Translation in systems: Descriptive and system-oriented approaches explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Hermans, T. (2013). What is (not) translation? In Millán, C. & Bartrina, F. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies* (pp. 75-87). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Leech, G & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. (2nd Ed.) UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Leech, G. (2013). *Language in literature style and foregrounding*. London, UK & New York, USA: Routledge.
- Malmkjær, K. (2013). Where are we? (from Holmes's map until now). In Millán, C. & Bartrina, F. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies* (pp. 31-44). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Nord, C. (2013). Functionalism in translation studies. In Millán, C. & Bartrina, F. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies* (pp. 201-212). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Önal, M. (2008). Edebî dil ve üslup. [Literary language and style]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 36, 23-47. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.14222/Turkiyat749>
- Panou, D. (2013). Equivalence in translation theories: A critical evaluation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(1), 1-6. doi:10.4304/tpls.3.1.1-6
- Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring translation theories*. (2nd Ed.). Oxfordshire, UK & New York, USA: Routledge.
- Reiss, K and Vermeer, H.J. (2014). *Towards a general theory of translational action: Skopos Theory explained*. (Tr.) Christiane Nord. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Ricoeur, P. (2004/2006). *On translation*. (Tr.) Eileen Brennan. Oxfordshire, UK & New York, USA: Routledge.
- Rozakis, L. E. (2003). *The complete idiot's guide to grammar & style*. (2nd Ed.). New York, USA: Alpha.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988/1995). *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam, Netherlands & Philadelphia, USA: John Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Amsterdam, Netherlands & Philadelphia, USA: John Benjamins.
- Tanrıkulu, Lokman (2010). Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın "Huzur" romanının Almanca çevirisi ("Seelenfrieden") örneğinde edebi çeviri eleştirisi. [Criticism of literary translation in the example of the German translation of the novel "Tranquility" by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar]. (Doctoral Dissertation). No: 279801. Retrieved from: <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation studies – and beyond*. (2nd Ed.). Amsterdam, Netherlands & Philadelphia, USA: John Benjamins.
- Wendland, E. R. (2012). Exploring translation theories: a review from the perspective of Bible translation. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, 38(2), 89-128.
- Wilss, W. (1982). *The Science of Translation*. Stuttgart, Germany: Gunter Nar.