

## An interpretive approach to translation: Can Yücel's translation of *The Great Gatsby*

Bülent AKAT<sup>1</sup>

**APA:** Akat, B. (2020). An interpretive approach to translation: Can Yücel's translation of *The Great Gatsby*. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (19), 859-875. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.752882.

### Abstract

This study is concerned with an analysis of Can Yücel's translation of F. Scott Fitzgerald's novel *The Great Gatsby* into Turkish -*Muhteşem Gatsby*- in the light of the Interpretive Theory at large and Jean Delisle's translation procedures (*Expansion* and *Economy*) in particular. In his rendering of the novel, the translator adopted a strategy based on conceptualizing the 'sense' behind the source-text message through the process of deverbalization, and then reformulating that message by using a language that sounds quite familiar to the target reader. Instead of establishing equivalences merely at linguistic level, the translator used his linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge to extract the explicit and implicit sense behind the source-text message, and then re-expressing that sense through the discourse of the receptor culture. This is a strategy intended to achieve textual and contextual equivalences rather than finding out correspondences at lexical and phrasal level. Based on these considerations, in this article, exemplary extracts selected from the target text were analyzed with a view to showing that the strategies employed in the rendering of the novel involve features that reflect the basic tenets of the Interpretive Theory. Within this framework, an attempt was made to illustrate that these strategies lend themselves well to the application of Delisle's translation procedures, yielding results that confirm their relevance to the analysis of Can Yücel's translation of the novel.

**Keywords:** The interpretive theory, translation procedures, cognitive approach, discourse, extra-linguistic knowledge

### Çeviriye yorumlayıcı yaklaşım: Can Yücel'in *Muhteşem Gatsby* çevirisi

#### Öz

Bu çalışmada, F. Scott Fitzgerald'ın *The Great Gatsby* adlı romanının Can Yücel tarafından Türkçe'ye çevirisi -*Muhteşem Gatsby* - genelde Yorumlayıcı Kuram, özelde ise Jean Delisle'nin çeviri prosedürleri (*Genişletme* ve *Ekonomi*) ışığında incelenmiştir. Romanın çevirisinde çevirmen, orijinal metinde kullanılan sözcük ve ifadelerden sıyrılarak mesajın 'anlamını' bilişsel olarak kavradıktan sonra kaynak metni hedef kültürün söylemi çerçevesinde yeniden biçimlendirmeye dayalı bir strateji uygulamıştır. Can Yücel sadece dilsel düzeyde eşdeğerleri bulmaya yönelik bir çeviri tarzı benimsemek yerine, sahip olduğu dil içi ve dil dışı bilgi birikimini kaynak metinde verilen mesajın altında yatan 'açık' ve 'kapalı' anlamı ortaya çıkarmak için kullanmış ve daha sonra bu duyguyu hedef dilin söylemiyle yeniden oluşturmuştur. Bu strateji, kaynak metindeki ifadeler karşılık olarak erek dilde bire bir sözcük ve kelime öbekleri bulmaya çalışmak yerine, çeviride metinsel ve bağlamsal anlamda eşdeğerlikler kurmaya dayanır. Bu düşünceler ışığında, makalede, Yorumlayıcı Kuramın temel ilkelerini yansıtan özellikler taşıdığı görülen Can Yücel çevirisinde kullanılan stratejileri ortaya

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Öğr. Gör., Çankaya Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Mütercim-Tercümanlık Bölümü (Ankara, Türkiye), blnt3264@gmail.com, 0000-0003-1244-5448 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 16.03.2020-kabul tarihi: 20.06.2020; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.752882]

koymak amacıyla erek metinden seçilen örnekler incelenmiştir. Bu çerçevede, Delisle'nin çeviri prosedürlerinin erek metne uygulanması suretiyle yapılan analizler, söz konusu prosedürler ile çevirmen tarafından uygulanan stratejilerin örtüştüğünü göstermiştir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Yorumlayıcı kuram, çeviri prosedürleri, bilişsel yaklaşım, söylem, dil-dışı bilgi

## 1. Introduction

Interpreting (oral translation) can be defined as the act of comprehending spoken language and conveying the meaning drawn from utterances in the source language by finding the most appropriate equivalents in the target language. The interpreting process consists of two stages: (1) Comprehension of sense through an analysis of linguistic signs and discourse; (2) Producing the best possible translation in accordance with the notion of *synecdoche* -a figure of speech in which part of an idea represents the whole sense (Jianzhong, 2013: 142). Based on the principles of oral translation (conference interpreting in particular), the interpretive theory - also known as the "theory of sense"- was first introduced in the 1960s by members of the ESIT group ('the Paris School'): Danica Seleskovitch, Marianne Lederer, Jean Delisle, Florence Herbulot, and Maurice Pergnier (Morini, 2013: 112). Unlike the popular theories of the time which focused on achieving equivalence solely at linguistic level, the interpretive theory aimed to adapt the principles of cognitive psychology to the analysis of the translation process, with special emphasis on the importance of grasping and communicating *sense* both in interpreting and translation. Danica Seleskovitch, the leading figure of the Paris School, came up with a theory that aimed at dissociating sense from linguistic meaning (Carr, 2001: 112). Seleskovitch argued that sense is grasped in mind not by decoding the meaning of separate words and then bringing them together, but by comprehending the idea behind oral or written discourse from a holistic perspective (Lederer, 2014: 173). She claimed that perception of a given text takes place at two levels: (1) Linguistic level, which is rather temporary; (2) Level of sense, which involves gaining full insight into reality. Thus, with the interpretive theory, translation came to be viewed as "a dynamic process of comprehension and re-expression of ideas" rather than as "a linear transcoding operation" carried out by focusing on linguistic features alone (as cited in Carr, 2001: 113).

The cornerstone of the interpretive theory is the idea that in the process of translation the 'content' (meaning) transferred from the original text should remain unchanged despite the interference of linguistic elements. According to Seleskovitch and Lederer, the use of literal translation method or any attempt to achieve equivalences purely at linguistic level is problematic simply because clichés, idioms, proverbs, and certain socio-cultural values are unique to the source text, and therefore have no corresponding equivalents in the target language and culture (Theodora, 2017: 70). Stressing the distinction between "language as a system and language in use", Lederer (2010) claims that translators can overcome problems such as "polysemy and ambiguity" only by going beyond linguistic signs and using their extra-linguistic knowledge along with the contextual clues available in the original text (174-5).

Throughout history, several theorists and philosophers put forward substantial views on the importance of comprehending the sense behind words and utterances, thus laying the groundwork for the fundamental principles of the Interpretive Theory. Among these theorists was Jean-Paul Sartre, who, in his well-known essay "What is Literature?"(1948), drew a clear distinction between reading words and grasping the sense:

sense is not contained by the words (of a text) since it is sense itself which allows each word's meaning to be understood; and although the literary goal is reached through language, it cannot be found in language; [...] that is why each of the hundred thousand words of a book can be read one by one without eliciting the sense of the work; sense is not the sum of the words, it is their organic whole.5 (translated) (13-14)

Similarly, Edmond Cary (1962:4), the Russian-born French conference interpreter, paved the way for Seleskovitch and Lederer as one of the first translation theorists to build written translation upon the principles of conference interpreting (Lederer, 2014: 7). Through the experience he gained in both disciplines (written and oral translation), Cary introduced a new approach to interpreting that subordinated “the petrified words” in a text to the vitality and richness of oral discourse (7):

Only the spoken word contains the fullness of human language and it is a mutilation to focus one's interest only on what the printed page can hold [...] The interpreter is faced with someone who lives, who thinks and who speaks. That is what he is called upon to render (7).

Another significant contribution to the Interpretive Theory came from the Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget (1974:258-259), who emphasized the importance of conceptualization in the process of reading, suggesting that unless perception is “accompanied by interpretation”, it never goes beyond a temporary experience that “remains at an elementary level of consciousness”. From this argument, one can infer that, as regards language and discourse, the words or images that are used to communicate messages lead to conscious perception only at basic level, whereas sense is associated with a higher state of consciousness (14-15). As Piaget puts it,

sense is a speaker's meaning beyond language. It precedes what is expressed by the speaker, it follows reception of the discourse by the addressee (p.15) For sense to be produced there must be an association between a non verbal idea and a semiotic sign (it could be a word or a gesture, the nature of what is perceived is unimportant in itself!) [...]. The reception of sense requires a deliberate action on the part of the addressee (15).

In the same vein, Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson (1986), known for their influential work on the relevance theory, came up with the contention that there are two stages involved in comprehending texts: (1) trying to grasp the language used in the text; (2) making inferences about the text by the help of extra-linguistic knowledge, a process influenced by the reader's expectations (closely linked with the notion of relevance) (16).

Still another theory about the importance of grasping sense was proposed by neuro-physiologist Jacques Barbizet, who worked on the pathology of human mind, concluding that understanding sense is an experience that occurs at every moment of our lives. Probing into the issue further, Barbizet and Duizabo (1977) wrote about “the existence of poly-sensorial meta-circuits in the brain which have countless intersections and are activated every time one of them is stimulated.” They argued that words and utterances trigger in the mind of the reader or listener many thoughts, feelings and memories. Thus, when we speak to someone, countless “silent thoughts” become activated as “undercurrents” in response to the word or utterance (17).

Based on this theoretical framework, the present study aims to illustrate that there are strong parallels between the fundamental principles of The Interpretive Theory and Can Yücel's style of translating fiction, as clearly manifested in his rendering of *The Great Gatsby*. On the whole, Can Yücel's translations are receptor-oriented, i.e. they give one the feeling that they were originally written by an author from the receptor culture. This is primarily because his translations are noted by a tendency to allow oneself a wide degree of freedom in re-expressing the sense and feelings conveyed in the original

work. As a matter of fact, Can Yücel's translations are based on the idea of ignoring as much as possible the words, phrases, and structures used in the original text for the purpose of effectively communicating the sense intended by the author. In this regard, his translations are built upon a translation strategy which subordinates linguistic considerations (dealing with lexical, phrasal and syntactic items) to semantic and aesthetic ones (extracting and re-formulating the sense and feelings in the original text). Moreover, in his translations, Can Yücel used the rich heritage and living discourse of the target culture, the domestic idiom, and the language of common people. In this study *Muhteşem Gatsby* was selected for analysis on the grounds that it is a translation in which all these features are clearly manifested, and thus serves as a good example for the basic principles of the Interpretive Theory.

## 2. The interpretive theory: Stages of the translation process

Emphasizing the significance of the mental processes involved in translation, Seleskovitch analyzes the interpreting/translation process in three categories: (1) Understanding, (2) Deverbalization, (3) Re-expression.

### 2.1. Understanding

The first stage of interpreting/translation is understanding, at which linguistic signs of the source text are decrypted in order to gain full insight into the semantic relationships between words and utterances in the text. The conceptual content of the text or speech is grasped by using the contextual clues in the text (Carr, 2001: 113). Linguistic knowledge is supplemented by additional input, i.e. extra-linguistic (non-linguistic) knowledge, also called cognitive inputs (complements) (Albir & Alves, 2009: 55). Lederer (2014) defines cognitive inputs as a whole set of "relevant notional and emotional elements from world knowledge and contextual knowledge which combine with word meanings in speeches and texts to make up sense" (26-27). She claims that cognitive inputs are at once conceptual and emotional by nature, for both are products of the brain (29). Accordingly, translation involves "an association between language meanings and cognitive and emotive elements, an alliance between the linguistic skill of translators, their world knowledge and their affective experience" (39).

Lederer analyzes cognitive inputs in two categories: world knowledge and contextual knowledge. The former refers to "linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge generally stored in the long-term memory (cognitive memory)" while the latter involves "pieces of knowledge acquired at the text's reading, kept in the short-term memory (immediate memory) (Albir & Alves, 2009: 55). World knowledge (cognitive baggage) includes "the body of notional and emotional knowledge acquired by individuals through their life's experiences (empirical knowledge); language (what is learnt through reading, education, conversations, television, etc.); and their own reasoning" (Lederer, 2014: 231). Without this background knowledge, translation turns into "transcoding (linguistic translation)" (231). Contextual knowledge, on the other hand, includes situational knowledge along with any kind of information about the text being translated, such as knowledge of the author, the target audience, subject matter, and the like (Delisle, Lee-Jahnke, Cormier, 1999: 179). Like background knowledge, contextual awareness helps the translator extract from the source text not only the explicit sense (what is actually said or written), but also the implicit sense (what the writer or speaker intends to say) (Carr, 2001: 113).

## 2.2. Deverbalization

Seleskovitch's notion of deverbalization is closely linked with the idea of 'conceptualization', i.e. concentrating on sense rather than on words or phrases. As one moves away from the surface structure of the source text, most of the utterances are forgotten and what remains in memory is only sense. (Lederer, 2010: 175-6). Deverbalization helps the translator avoid the temptation to follow the source language too closely. As Lederer puts it, "The foreign language [is] an obstacle rather than an object to be translated" (as cited in Delisle, 1988: 29).

## 2.3. Re-expression

At this stage, the interpreter/translator tries to find out the best linguistic means to reverbalize in the target language the sense extracted from the original text (Jianzhong, 2013: 143). Lederer (2010) argues that different languages have different synecdoches (explicit components) to communicate the same sense. Hence, in reformulating the explicit and implicit sense derived from the source text, the translator tries to achieve semantic equivalences by using natural forms of expression (appropriate synecdoches in the receptor language) that accurately convey the sense behind the original discourse (176-7).

## 3. Jean Delisle's contribution to the interpretive theory

The Canadian theorist Jean Delisle developed a more elaborate version of the Interpretive Theory, relying on the methods of 'discourse analysis' and 'text linguistics'. He was specially interested in the intellectual processes involved in translation, particularly in the notion of conceptualization, which involves stripping meaning off linguistic signs (Carr, 2001: 113). Delisle defined translation as "the operation by which the relevant signification of linguistic signs is determined through the reference to a meaning as formulated in a message, which then is fully reconstructed in the signs of another language" (as cited in Theodora, 2017: 67). This requires outstanding intellectual skills such as "drawing analogies, interpreting the meaning of a text through analysis and logical reasoning, discerning the underlying structure of a text, and others" (Delisle, 1988: 28). According to Delisle, there are two basic features that inform any kind of translation: (1) the close relationship between "linguistic meanings and cognitive and emotive elements", and (2) the interaction among "the linguistic skill of translators, their world knowledge and their affective experience" (Lederer, 2014: 39).

Delisle introduced a translation model similar to that proposed by Seleskovitch, one that views translation as a "heuristic" process of decision-making based upon "intelligent discourse analysis" (Carr, 2001: 113). Still, his taxonomy differs slightly from Seleskovitch's: (1) Comprehension, (2) Reverbalization, (3) Verification. In his seminal work *Translation: An Interpretive Approach* (1988), Delisle summarizes the process of achieving translation equivalence as follows: "Comprehension is based on decoding linguistic signs and grasping meaning, reverbalization is a matter of reasoning by analogy and re-wording concepts, and verification involves back-interpreting and choosing a solution" (as cited in Sin-Wai, 2015: 36-37). Notably, Delisle excludes 'deverbalization' from the process, regarding it as part of the cognitive operations that occur during the stage of comprehension. Also, he adds to the translation process another operation called 'verification', which aims to ensure an accurate and fluent translation.

### 3.1. Comprehension

Delisle defines 'comprehension' as the process of decoding signifiers (linguistic signs) and understanding the sense behind the source-text message, the author's intended meaning in particular. In this phase, an interpretive analysis of the source text is made with a view to discovering semantic relationships; i.e. finding out the ideas presented in the text by making use of contextual clues (Carr, 2001: 113). Delisle (1988) views translation as "an abstract exercise" in which there are many "cognitive processes" involved, "analysis and synthesis" in particular (6). A concept is mentally dissociated from its written form so that signs drawn from a different linguistic system can be matched with it. (Delisle, 1988: 24) Like Seleskovitch, Delisle (1999) calls this process "deverbalization", which he defines as "the act of deriving the conceptual meaning of a text segment independent of its linguistic signs" (133).

Delisle (1988) holds that the interpretation of a text takes place in the form of discourse analysis, a method he considers more appropriate for describing the act of translating than traditional linguistics (3-4). According to him, translation is "a dynamic cognitive process" whose analysis cannot be made by purely linguistic means (43). Delisle points out that there is a clear distinction between the linguist and translator, the former being concerned with the analysis of language, the latter with the study of discourse (43). Unlike the linguist, who is concerned only with syntax and semantics, the translator also thinks over the origin of the text to be re-expressed, its distinctive features, and the audience for whom it was intended. Delisle insists that translation researchers go beyond the linguistic aspects of the text and include in their analyses the cognitive and situational complements that lie outside the realm of the linguistic signs (10). He further argues that understanding the sense behind an utterance requires an insight beyond understanding the meaning of an isolated sentence. In the field of discourse what matters most is meaning, which must be deduced from linguistic signs and non-linguistic elements. While linguistics involves the study of "sentences in isolation", modern rhetoric is associated with the study of "utterances in context" (43).

### 3.2. Reverbalization (Reformulation)

Delisle (1988) defines translation as an art of re-expression that involves a skillful use of writing techniques along with a good knowledge of the source and target languages (3) He maintains that translation is not only about comparing two languages, but also about the "re-expression of an intended meaning embodied in a text with a specific communicative function" (4). Reverbalization involves reconstructing semantic relationships, re-verbalizing the sense extracted from the source text by using the syntactic and lexical items of the target language. At this stage, it is the ideas presented in the original text that are reverbalized, not the words or phrases used to convey them (Lederer, 2014: 36). The translator tries to establish meaningful equivalences at semantic and stylistic level to communicate the concepts in the source language by finding the most appropriate matches in the target language (35).

Delisle (1988) makes a sharp distinction between *a true translation*, which involves translating a text through *discourse analysis* (contextual interpretation), and *transcoding*, which refers to translating isolated components of language through the analysis of linguistic signs (30). Emphasizing the importance of producing a true translation, Delisle claims that translation (written or oral) is an activity that involves a good deal of exegesis, i.e. explanatory remarks made while interpreting a given text. He argues that while translating the source text, the translator works "indirectly" with the source language and "directly" with the target language (23). So, it is imperative that the translator have a profound knowledge about the resources of the target language, accompanied with the skill for matching the

concepts in the source language with the best possible word or expression in the receptor language. Equivalence in translation is established initially at linguistic level, but then goes beyond it by extending to conceptual level, with due consideration of extra-linguistic factors and the context in which communication takes place (27).

Another argument Delisle (1988) proposes is that the source language, “the foreign idiom” in particular, usually turns out to be an impediment to the translator (29). Often, there is a temptation to follow closely the words and structures of the original text, a tendency mostly arising from the ease with which word-for-word translation can be made. Delisle warns unwary translators against this pitfall: “The foreign signs of the original text interfere with spontaneous re-expression. The translator must learn not to equate the surface structures of one language with those of another” (23). Delisle claims that linguistic signs, which serve to convey thoughts, may cause the translator to become distracted when trying to find out conceptual equivalents, and to become tempted “to assign the wrong content to a given form” (24). This results in “semantic distortion in the target language as the source language leaves its mark on the translated text” (24). Hence, the translator must always keep watchful not to be influenced by lexical, syntactic, or other forms of interference by the source language (24).

### 3.3. Verification

Reserving this term for written translation, Delisle uses it in the sense of a final check carried out to ensure the quality of the translated work, a process designed to determine whether the linguistic signs in the translation accurately communicate the ideas behind the message. As Delisle puts it,

The purpose of verification, the third and final stage of the cognitive process of translation, is to confirm the accuracy of the solution. This is done by checking that the proposed equivalent perfectly renders the full meaning of the original utterance (as cited in Lederer, 2014: 39).

Emphasizing the importance of deverbalization at the stage of verification, Delisle suggests that the final check should be performed “not in relation to the words of the original utterance [. . .] but in relation to the ideas extracted from the message during its first interpretation” (as cited in Palumbo, 2009: 64).

## 4. Delisle’s translation procedures

Delisle’s translation procedures draw on the strategies Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) outlined in their seminal work *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation (French 1958 –English 1995)*, which forms the cornerstone of most research done in the field (50). Vinay and Darbelnet proposed two basic strategies of translation: *Direct translation* and *Oblique translation*. Under the category of *Direct translation*, there are three procedures: *Borrowing*, *Calque (Loan translation)*, and *Literal Translation*, while the category of *Oblique translation* comprises four procedures: *Transposition*, *Modulation*, *Equivalence*, and *Adaptation* (Munday, 2008: 56-58). Apart from these seven procedures, Vinay and Darbelnet introduced four complementary categories - *Reinforcement vs. Condensation* and *Amplification vs. Economy*- out of which Delisle built his own taxonomy: *Expansion* and *Economy* (Delisle, 2013: 214).

### 4.1. Expansion

*Expansion* is a variation of Vinay and Darbelnet’s *Amplification*, a procedure defined as “the technique of remedying a syntactic deficiency, or to highlight the meaning of a word, in both cases by filling a lacuna (gap) in the lexicon or in the structure” (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995: 192). Delisle’s notion of

*Expansion* refers to the use of more words or phrases in the target text than in the source text to convey the same idea (Molina & Albir, 2002: 504). Delisle (2013) uses this generic term in the sense of any kind of addition (lexical, phrasal, syntactic etc.) made to the translation due to “the constraints of form or sense imposed by the target language” (211).

Under the category of *Expansion*, Delisle (2013) defines three major procedures:

a) *Dilution* b) *Explicitation* c) *Periphrasis*

These procedures can be thought to be lined up along a continuum starting from ‘*langue*’ (language as an abstract system of forms and conventions) and extending to ‘*discourse*’ (language as a concrete reality functioning in a socio-cultural context). In other words, *Expansion* can be employed for three reasons: “Due to the constraints inherent in the language (*Dilution*), owing to the concern for clarifying the sense (*Explicitation*), or because of exigencies of stylistic nature (*Periphrasis*)” (214).

#### 4.1.1. Dilution

The simplest form of expansion, *Dilution* occurs when expansion is necessitated by ‘linguistic’ constraints alone. *Dilution* is a translation procedure in which an idea or object in the source text is communicated through more words or phrases in the target language (Delisle, 2013: 211-12). The purpose is to re-phrase an idea or strengthen the sense of a word or expression used in the source text, when its correspondence in the target text cannot be transferred as accurately as in the original due to the differences between the two languages in terms of lexical, syntactic, stylistic and cultural features (Gutiérrez, 2018: 52). To cite a few examples (English to Turkish): *Zoo*: Hayvanat bahçesi; *Pension*: Emekli maaşı; *Mayor*: Belediye başkanı.

#### 4.1.2. Explicitation

*Explicitation* is employed where expansion is necessitated by constraints of ‘*langue*’ and ‘*discourse*’ alike (Delisle 2013: 214). Delisle, Hannelore, & Monique (1999) define *explicitation* as the procedure of inserting extra information and precise details into the target text to offer clarification for any idea in the source text that may otherwise remain unknown to the reader. The need for explicitation - inserting semantic details into the target text - often arises from various constraints within the target language as well as from lexical and syntactic differences between the two languages (139). For this procedure, Delisle cites the following examples (originally English to French; here English to Turkish, based on the French version):

a) **Best before:** .....**tarihinden önce tüketilmesi önerilir.**

b) *Uranium was much sought after as a **strategic mineral** in the years after the war, because it was widely assumed that it was very rare in **recoverable** quantities = Savaşı takip eden yıllarda, uranyum **stratejik öneminden dolayı** ve **kullanılabilecek halde doğada** oldukça az miktarda bulunduğu yönündeki yaygın kanı nedeniyle çok fazla aranan bir maden olmuştu (Delisle, 2013: 212). If the method of *explicitation* is not properly applied or not applied where necessary, this leads to a translation error called *under-translation* (Delisle, 2013: 214), which can be defined as “an error where the translator omits in the target text any compensations, amplifications or explicitations required to obtain an idiomatic translation that conforms to the presumed sense of the source text” (Delisle, 1999: 197).*



### 4.1.3. Periphrasis

This is a procedure employed when expansion is necessitated by constraints of 'discourse' rather than of 'langue'. A method used to "embellish discourse", *periphrasis* is applied in situations where the use of more words and phrases in translation is both necessary and desirable due to stylistic and discursive reasons. To cite Delisle's example: *The sound of her words of complaint, reproach, or grief, evoked in the hearer only a certain physical discomfort.* (A. Huxley) = Şikayet ettiğinde, birilerini azarladığında, veya kederlendiğinde sesinin tonu **onu dinleyen insanlara** sadece fiziksel rahatsızlık veriyordu (Delisle, 2013: 213). If the rule of *periphrasis* is misapplied or not applied at all, this leads to a translation error called *addition*, a term Delisle (2013) uses with reference to the inclusion of stylistic features and unnecessary details that do not exist in the original text (214).

### 4.2. Economy

*Economy* refers to the tendency to use fewer words in the target text than in the source text to express the same meaning (Delisle, 2013: 205). An utterance is considered economical when the same content is transferred to the target language "by a reduced signifier" (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995: 193). *Economy* operates at lexical and syntactic level: what is conveyed through lexical elements in one language may be communicated by syntactic means in another, and vice versa (194). Under the category of *Economy*, Delisle defines three procedures aligned along a spectrum ranging from 'langue' to 'discourse':

a) *Concentration* b) *Implication* c) *Concision*.

In other words, application of *economy* can be dictated by three factors: "Constraints inherent in the language (concentration), the idiomatic logic and character of the target language (implication), or good writing skills (concision)" (Delisle, 2013: 207).

#### 4.2.1. Concentration

The antonym of *dilution*, *concentration* is necessitated by 'linguistic' constraints alone. Closely associated with form and langue, this procedure refers to the communication of an idea or object in the source language through fewer words or phrases in the target language (Delisle et al., 1999). As Delisle (2013) puts it, "concentration involves a reduction of the number of elements used in the target language corresponding to the existence of an equivalence in the source language" (205). In other words, "There is a reduction when, for a given set of signifieds in the source text, fewer signifiers are used in the target language than in the source language" (205). To give several examples: *Steering wheel*: Direksiyon; *Wedding party*: Düğün; *Box office*: Gişe.

#### 4.2.2. Implication

Like *explicitation* (though serving opposite purposes), *implication* is employed in situations where there is a concern for achieving linguistic equivalence as well as a necessity to translate within discourse constraints. *Implication* can be defined as "the process of allowing the target language situation or context to define certain details which were explicit in the source language" (Vinay&Darbelnet, as cited in Klaudy, 2001: 80). Certain parts of the source text considered to be redundant can be left out, as the sense behind the source-text message can easily be understood by the target reader even if these parts are omitted from the translation. If the rule of *implication* is not employed properly or not employed where necessary, this leads to *over-translation* (Delisle, 2013: 214). This term refers to an error in which

“the translator explicates elements of the source text that ought to be implicated in the target text” (Delisle, 1999: 166). When contextual clues are so explicit, any attempt to include explanatory remarks would result in wordiness. For implication, Delisle (2013) gives the following example: *Be sure the iron is unplugged from the electrical outlet before filling with water*: Ütüyü doldurmadan önce fişin çıkarılmış olduğundan emin olun (206).

#### 4.2.3. Concision

This procedure is applied in situations where the application of economy is deemed necessary due to constraints of discourse rather than linguistics (Delisle, 2013: 207). *Concision* can be applied sentence by sentence by eliminating excessive use of repetitions, redundant words or phrases, or expressions that sound awkward, most of which might have been necessitated by the cognitive processes of the source language (Herman, 1993: 17-18). For this procedure, Delisle (2013) cites the following example: *The said land shall be used for agricultural purposes and shall be used for no other purpose or purposes whatever*. = Sözkonusu alan sadece tarım amacıyla kullanılacaktır (207). Misapplying or failing to apply *concision* where necessary leads to the translation error Delisle calls *omission* - the failure to include in the target text an idea or piece of information that is an important part of the source text (214).

#### 5. Analysis of Can Yücel's translation of *The Great Gatsby* in the light of Delisle's translation procedures:

One of the leading poets and translators of Turkish literature, Can Yücel wrote many books of collected poems, among them *Yazma*, *Sevgi Duvarı*, *Bir Siyasinin Şiirleri*, *Ölüm ve Oğlum*, and *Canfeda*. Also, he translated various popular poems from world literature, which were published in his poetry collection titled *Her Boydan* (1959). A striking feature of his poetry translations is that they sound like adaptations, as can be clearly noted in his translation of Shakespeare's "Sonnet 66". Besides, Can Yücel rendered into Turkish various plays written by well-known dramatists such as Shakespeare, Oscar Wilde, Federico Garcia Lorca, and Bertholt Brecht. Among the other works he translated is *The Great Gatsby* (1925), a famous novel written by the American writer F.Scott Fitzgerald. Published in the period after the Second World War (the Jazz Age), the novel takes as its theme the fall of the American Dream. The story builds around Jay Gatsby, an ambitious millionaire in pursuit of his dreams and his ultimate failure to achieve them. The novel has been rendered into Turkish by several other translators, as well.

At this stage of the study, exemplary extracts selected from *Muhteşem Gatsby* will be analyzed on the basis of Delisle's translation procedures with a view to finding out the extent to which these procedures can be employed in the analysis of the target text. Even a casual reading of the Turkish version of the novel reveals that it abounds in lexical, phrasal and syntactic items, which can be seen as typical examples of the six translation procedures defined under Delisle's taxonomy of translation: *Expansion* and *Economy*. Below are several extracts taken from the target text that exemplify the way three forms of *Expansion* - *Dilution*, *Explicitation* and *Periphrasis*- were employed in the rendering of the original work.

**Table1:** Examples of the dilution strategy employed in *Muhteşem Gatsby*

	Source Text	Target Text
1	Father <b>agreed to finance</b> me for a year and after various delays I came east, <b>permanently</b> , I thought, in the spring of twenty-two.(p.5)	Babam bir yıl için <b>masraflarımı görmeye razı oldu</b> . Araya bir takım olaylar girdi; uzatmayalım, yirmi iki yılının baharında, sözümona <b>bir daha dönmemesine</b> , Doğu'ya kapağı attım.(p.9)
2	' <b>Why CANDLES?</b> ' objected Daisy, <b>frowning</b> . (p.14)	" <b>Bu mumlar neden icap etti?</b> " diye çıkıştı Daisy, <b>kaşları çatıldı</b> .(p.15)
3	There was <b>music</b> from my neighbor's house through the summer nights. (p.43)	Yaz geceleri boyunca komşumun evinden gelen <b>çalgi sesleri</b> dinmek bilmedi. (p.37)
4	The day agreed upon <b>was pouring rain</b> .(p.89)	Kararlaştırdığımız gün <b>bardaktan boşanırcasına yağmur yağıyordu</b> . (p.74).
5	I couldn't sleep all night; a fog-horn was groaning incessantly on the Sound, and I <b>tossed</b> half-sick between grotesque reality and savage frightening dreams.(p.157)	Uyuyamadım bütün gece; Boğazda bir sis düdüğü acı acı öttü durdu; ben de acıp gerçekle yirtici, yıldırıcı düşler arasında yarı hasta, <b>yatağın içinde bir o yana bir bu yana döndüm</b> . (p.128)

The extracts presented in table 1 are typical examples of *dilution*, the simplest form of expansion that occurs purely at linguistic level. Notably, the translations written in bold face prove to be longer than their originals due to constraints of linguistic nature rather than discourse requirements. In some of the examples above, dilution seems obligatory, in others optional. The use of **çalgi sesleri** for **music** is an example of optional dilution, for it would have been possible to keep the original word as it is and translate it as **müzik**. Whether optional or obligatory, *dilution* occurs only at linguistic level. It seems that the translator used more words and phrases in the translation not because he wanted to make a message clear to the target reader or he intended to create an artistic or stylistic effect, but because he simply aimed to achieve translation equivalence by choosing the most appropriate linguistic equivalents.

**Table 2:** Examples of the explicitation strategy employed in *Muhteşem Gatsby*

	Source Text	Target Text
1	Most of the confidences <b>were unsought</b> . (p.3)	Bu sırların çoğuna <b>istemeye istemeye kulak misafiri oldum</b> . (p.7)
2	" <b>Conduct</b> may be founded on the hard rock or the wet marshes but after a certain point I don't care what it's founded on." (p.4)	<b>İnsan davranışları</b> belki yalçın kayalar, belki de bataklar üzerine kurulu; ama bir noktadan sonra artık neyin üstüne kurulmuşsa kurulmuş, demeye vardım... (p.7)
3	Gatsby, <b>pale as death</b> , with his hands plunged like weights in his coat pockets, was <b>standing</b> in a puddle of water glaring tragically into my eyes. (p.92)	Gatsby, <b>beti benzi limon sarısı</b> , elleri taş gibi, ceketinin ceplerini çökertmiş, bir gölcüğün ortasında <b>dikilmiş duruyor</b> , acı acı bakıyordu gözlerimin içine.(p.76)
4	He (Gatsby) <b>sat down gloomily</b> .(p.162)	<b>Canı sıkkın, çöktü bir sandalyeye</b> .(p.132)
5	I took him into the drawing-room, where his son <b>lay</b> , and left him there.(p.179)	Oğlunun <b>cansız yattığı</b> oturma odasına götürdüm adamı, bıraktım orda.(p.146)

As stated earlier, *explicitation* is a type of expansion employed because of linguistic constraints as well as discourse requirements. In each of the examples above, the translator is seen to have used more words and phrases to communicate the sense of the original, probably out of the motive to explicate an idea or event that would remain ambiguous if conveyed through fewer words. In order to help the target reader to understand more easily what is being depicted in the source text, the translator used extra words and phrases that sound familiar to the target reader, with due consideration for the discourse of the target culture. For instance, the word “**conduct**” could have been translated as “**Davranışlar**”, yet the translator preferred to employ the explicated version of the original by opting for the phrase “**İnsan davranışları**”, which sounds more natural in Turkish discourse. Similarly, instead of the literal translation of “**pale as death**” as “**ölüm gibi solgun**”, the translator used the expression “**beti benzi limon sarısı**” to communicate what is happening in that scene through an idiom from the discourse of the receptor culture, thus letting the target reader picture the scene more vividly. Likewise, the use of “**cansız yattığı**” as an equivalent for “**lay**” makes more sense than its literal translation as “**yattığı**”, for the latter would fail to give the idea that the narrator is referring to a dead man. Hence, the use of explicitation in this particular context is highly relevant.

**Table 3:** Examples of the periphrasis strategy employed in *Muhteşem Gatsby*

	Source Text	Target Text
1	All my aunts and uncles talked it over as if they were choosing a prep-school for me and finally said, <b>‘Why—yees’ with very grave, hesitant faces.</b> (p.5)	Halalarımınla amcalarım sanki bana okul seçiyorlarmış gibi, düşündüler, taşındılar, sonunda da <b>suratları bi karış; belli bana güvenmedikleri</b> , “Madem istiyorsun, bir dene!” dediler. (p.8)
2	‘Don’t look at me,’ Daisy retorted. <b>‘I’ve been trying to get you to New York all afternoon.’</b> (p.13)	“Kendi kabahatin” dedi Daisy. “ <b>Sabahtan beri New York’a gidelim diye ne diller döktüm sana!</b> ” (p.14)
3	‘I haven’t got a horse,’ said Gatsby. ‘I used to ride in the army but <b>I’ve never bought a horse.</b> ’ (p.110)	“Benim atım yok,” dedi Gatsby. “Askerken binerdim ama, <b>sonradan at almak kısmet olmadı işte.</b> ” (p.91)
4	<b>‘Plenty of gas,’</b> said Tom boisterously. (p.128)	<b>“Bu kadar benzin yeter de artar bile”</b> dedi Tom delidolu. (p.106)
5	He came back from France when Tom and Daisy were still on their wedding trip, and made a <b>miserable but irresistible</b> journey to Louisville on the last of his army pay. (p.162-163)	Fransa’dan döndüğünde, Tom’la Daisy balayı gezisinden daha dönmemişlerdi. Son maasından artakalan parayla Louisville’ye bir gitti; <b>yüreği kana ağlıyordu ama, oraya uğramadan da edemedi.</b> (p.133)

In each of the examples above, the translator is seen to have used the procedure of *periphrasis*, which represents the farthest point of expansion one can get to when rendering the original. As mentioned earlier, *periphrasis* is a form of expansion applied mainly for stylistic and artistic reasons as well as for fulfilling discourse requirements. In this procedure, observance of linguistic constraints is totally out of question. Notably, the translator uses the discourse of the receptor culture, an idiomatic language that exactly fits into the context, for the purpose of bringing the dialogue as close as possible to the target reader. For instance, instead of rendering “**Plenty of gas**” as “**Çok benzin var**”, the translator renders the expression as “**Bu kadar benzin yeter de artar bile**” with due consideration for the discourse of receptor culture. Again, the expression “**I’ve never bought a horse.**” could have been literally rendered as “**hiç at satın almadım**”, whereas the translator preferred to render it as “**sonradan at**

**almak kısmet olmadı işte.**” The extracts above are typical examples of *periphrasis*, which reflect the translator’s interest in using the discourse of receptor culture as well as his familiarity with the domestic idiom. These examples serve to illustrate that *periphrasis* can be employed when the translator acts with the motive to create an artistic and stylistic effect rather than with a concern for merely communicating the meaning of the original text.

Like the examples above which serve to illustrate the way *Expansion* can be applied to the analysis of *Muhteşem Gatsby*, one can find as many examples in the target text to exemplify the three procedures of *Economy: Concentration, Implication* and *Concision*. Below are several examples for each procedure:

**Table 4:** Examples of the concentration strategy employed in *Muhteşem Gatsby*

	Source Text	Target Text
1	“Whenever you feel like criticizing any one,” he told me, “just remember that <b>all the people in this world</b> haven’t had the advantages that you’ve had.” (p.3)	“Ne zaman,” demişti, “birini tenkide davranacak olsan, hatırdan çıkarma, <b>herkes</b> senin imkanlarında gelmemiştir dünyaya!” (p.7)
2	“My family have been <b>prominent, well-to-do</b> people in this middle-western city for three generations.” (p.4)	Ailem, üç kuşaktır, bu Orta Batı şehrinin <b>eşrafındandır.</b> (p.8)
3	<b>Their house was even more elaborate than I expected,</b> a cheerful red and white Georgian Colonial mansion overlooking the bay. (p.9)	<b>Evleri sandığımdan daha özentiliydi;</b> Sömürge George’u denen üslupta, koya bakan, kırmızı-beyazlı, şipşirin bir malikane.(p.11)
4	‘ <b>Civilization’s going to pieces,</b> ’ broke out Tom violently.(p.15)	“ <b>Medeniyet çöküyor,</b> ” diye Tom bir cerzebeyle lafa karıştı.(p.16)
5	<b>It was dark here in front:</b> only the bright door sent ten square feet of light volleying out into the soft black morning.(p.115)	<b>Önümüz karanlıktı.</b> Sade kapı açıldıkça ışık top gibi fırlayıp sabahın tüylü karanlığına gömülüüyordu.(p.95)

The extracts in table 4 illustrate how *concentration* can be employed in rendering the source text. The simplest form of *economy*, this procedure functions only at linguistic level, with little consideration for discourse requirements. From these examples, it is clear that fewer words and phrases were used in the translations than in their originals. In the first example, the expression “**all the people in this world**” could have been translated as “**bu dünyadaki tüm insanlar**”, while, for the sake of brevity, the translator preferred to use just one word - “**herkes**” - which serves to convey the same meaning. Similarly, in the fifth example, the rendering of the expression “**It was dark here in front**” as “**Önümüz karanlıktı**” is another example of the way concentration can be used in translation. In each of the examples above, equivalence is established solely at linguistic level. Here, the translator’s tendency to use shorter expressions in rendering the original text can hardly be seen as a reflection of an effort to create an artistic and stylistic effect, nor can it be regarded as a result of the need to meet discourse requirements.

**Table 5:** Examples of the implicitation strategy employed in *Muhteşem Gatsby*

	Source Text	Target Text
1	<b>His family were enormously wealthy—even in college his freedom with money was a matter for reproach</b> —but now he'd left Chicago and come east in a fashion that rather took your breath away: (p.8)	<b>Ailesi korkunç zengindi; gerçi okulda bile savurganlığı ayıplanırdı</b> ama, Şikago'dan kalkıp Doğu'ya öyle bir depdebeyle yerleşmişti ki şaşar kalırsınız.(p.11)
2	<b>Now he was a sturdy, straw haired man of thirty with a rather hard mouth and a supercilious manner.</b> (p.9)	<b>Otuzunda, boylu boslu, haşin ağızlı, azametli bir adamdı artık.</b> (p.11)
3	At this point Miss Baker said 'Absolutely!' with such suddenness that I started— <b>it was the first word she uttered since I came into the room. Evidently it surprised her as much as it did me</b> , for she yawned and with a series of rapid, deft movements stood up into the room.(p.13)	Tam bu sırada Miss Baker, apansız öyle, “Yaşa!” deyiverdi, irkildim bayağı. <b>Ben odaya girili ağzını ilk açıyordu bu. Kendi de şaşaladı, belli;</b> bir dizi tez, marifetli hareketle odanın ortasında boy gösteriverdi.(p.14)
4	When I came <b>home</b> to West Egg <b>that night</b> I was afraid <b>for a moment</b> that my house was on fire. (p.87)	West Egg'e döndüğümde, ödüm koptu, bizim ev tutuşmuş diye,...(p.72)
5	I didn't want to go to the city. I wasn't worth a decent stroke of work <b>but it was more than that</b> —I didn't want to leave Gatsby.(p.164)	Hiç şehre inesim yoktu, çalışacak halim de yoktu zaten. <b>Ama asıl,</b> Gatsby'i yalnız bırakmak istemiyordum.(p.134)

*Implicitation* is one major way for the translator to set himself free from the interference of the source language. In each of the examples above, the translator used fewer words and phrases than in the original out of a concern for conveying the overall meaning of the source text through a translation that aims at fulfilling linguistic and discourse requirements. Evidently, the translator preferred to make a textual translation, focusing on rendering the sense, not the words. The examples above illustrate that, instead of sticking closely to the source language, the translator gave priority to communicating the sense of the original to the target audience by deliberately leaving some of the words and phrases untranslated. Can Yücel seems to have felt certain that contextual clues will help the reader understand the sense behind the original utterance whether or not the words and phrases in the original text are translated. For instance, in the fourth extract, the words written in bold face - **home / that night / for a moment** - are seen to have been left without equivalents in the translation. Even without these words and phrases, the translation effectively conveys the meaning of the original statement. Again, in the fifth example, the expression “**but it was more than that**” is translated simply as “**Ama asıl,**” which shows that, when *implicitation* is at work, one does not always have to achieve one-to-one correspondence at word or phrase level. What matters most is to communicate the sense in the target language.

**Table 6:** Examples of the concision strategy employed in *Muhteşem Gatsby*

	Source Text	Target Text
1	<b>“In my younger and more vulnerable years my father gave me some advice that I’ve been turning over in my mind ever since.”</b> (p.3)	<b>“Toy çağımda bir öğüt vermişti babam, hala küpedir kulağıma.”</b> (p.7)
2	<b>I am still a little afraid of missing something if I forget that</b> , as my father snobbishly suggested, and I snobbishly repeat, a sense of the fundamental decencies is parceled out unequally at birth.(p.3-4)	<b>Eksik kalmasın, onu da deyivereyim</b> ; babam züppece öne sürmüştü, ben de züppece tekrar edeyim; tembel efendilikler, yaradılıştan hiç de eşit dağıtılmamış Allah vergileridir. (p.7)
3	<b>‘I’ve gotten to be a terrible pessimist about things.</b> (p.16)	<b>Hiç beğenmiyorum bu gidişi.</b> (p.16)
4	Just as Tom and Myrtle—after the first drink Mrs. <b>Wilson and I called each other by our first names</b> —reappeared, company commenced to arrive <b>at the apartment door.</b> (p.33)	Tom’la Myrtle –ilk kadehten sonra <b>Mrs.Wilson ile senli benli olduk</b> –ortaya çıktıktan hemen sonra, misafirler de sökün etti. (p.29)
5	He (Gatsby) had control of himself now and he wanted to see more of Tom. <b>‘Why don’t you—why don’t you stay for supper? I wouldn’t be surprised if some other people dropped in from New York.’</b> (p.110)	Kendini toparlamıştı artık. Tom’u daha yakından tanımak istiyordu. <b>“Hem sahi niye yemeğe kalmıyorsunuz? New York’dan da daha gelen olur herhalde.</b> (p.91)

*Concision*, the farthest point one can reach in *economy*, is a matter of discourse rather than of language as system. The main idea behind this procedure is that the quality of a translation is judged not by whether or not it has an equal number of words and phrases to that of the original, but by whether it is able to communicate the same sense and create the same effect as the original. Moving from this principle, in each of the examples above, the translator used fewer words or phrases to communicate the same meaning. From the examples above, one can infer that the translator seems to have intended to create an aesthetic and natural target text, particularly with artistic and stylistic concerns. For instance, in the second example, **“I am still a little afraid of missing something if I forget that”**, was rendered as **“Eksik kalmasın, onu da deyivereyim”**, which serves to communicate the same meaning with fewer words. Apparently, the translator preferred to use a natural language in conformity with the discourse of the receptor culture rather than trying to establish one-to-one correspondence at linguistic level. Likewise, in the third extract, if the expression **“I’ve gotten to be a terrible pessimist about things”** were to be rendered literally, one possible translation could be **“Her şeye olumsuz bakan korkunç bir kötümser oldum çıktım.”** Yet, Can Yücel translated this statement with fewer words: **“Hiç beğenmiyorum bu gidişi.”** This is a typical example of *concision*, as the translation sounds so simple and bears the stamp of Turkish discourse. Again, the fourth extract serves as another example for *concision*: **“Wilson and I called each other by our first names”** was translated as **Mrs.Wilson ile senli benli olduk**. Following the dictates of discourse rather than of ‘langue’, the translator focused on rendering the sense of the original without in the least bothering to find out matches for each of the words and phrases in the original. Notably in the same extract, the phrase **“at the apartment door”** was deleted in translation, for the context clues available made the rendering of this phrase redundant.

## 6. Conclusion

Can Yücel's translation of *The Great Gatsby* is characterized by certain features that seem to echo the key principles of the Interpretive Theory. Quite in line with the main argument of this theory, the translator employed a strategy based on rendering the sense behind source-text message rather than the linguistic signs that serve to convey them. Furthermore, in his rendering of the novel, the translator adopted a strategy of translation marked by a special concern for using the discourse of Turkish culture as it is used in everyday life, with a special emphasis on communicating the subtle differences that occur in the connotations of words or phrases depending on context. Given the dynamics of discourse, utterances assume different senses in different contexts, for the language used in real life proves to be quite different from the language studied in an abstract sense. Well aware of this fact, the translator focused particularly on communicating the explicit or implicit sense behind the original message at the level of discourse rather than making a translation under linguistic constraints. Based on these considerations, an analysis of Can Yücel's translation of the novel was made in the light of Delisle's translation procedures, yielding results that pointed to a strong correspondence between them. While it is possible to see in the translation quite a few examples of expansion and economy at linguistic level (*dilution* and *concentration*), one can safely assume that it is when using the procedures of *explicitation*, *implication*, *periphrasis* and *concision* that the similarities between the procedures and the translator's style of rendering the novel become more visible. This is mainly because Can Yücel appears to have been deeply committed to exploiting the potentialities of the discourse of the receptor culture, as well as to creating artistic and stylistic effects. In order to do so, he seems to have used every opportunity to go beyond linguistic constraints, allowing himself a wide degree of freedom in reformulating the source-text message to produce a translation that sounded natural in the receptor language.

## References

- Albir, A. H., Alves, F. (2009). Translation as a Cognitive Activity. In J. Munday (ed.). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 54-73). New York&Canada: Routledge.
- Carr, M. S. (2001). *Interpretive Approach*. (ed.). M. Baker. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London & New York: Routledge.
- Delisle, J. (1988). *Translation: An Interpretive Approach*. Canada: University of Ottawa Press.
- Delisle, J. (2013): *La Traduction Raisonnée. Manuel D'initiation à la Traduction Professionnelle de L'anglais Vers le Français*. Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Delisle J., Hannelore, L. J., and Monique, C.C. (1999). *Translation Terminology*. Herausgeber (ed.). John Benjamin Publishing.
- Fitzgerald, F.S. *The Great Gatsby*. PlanetEbook.com.
- Fitzgerald, F.S. (2009). *Muhteşem Gatsby*. C. Yücel. (Trans.). İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.
- Gutiérrez, C.C. (2018). *An Analysis of the Translation Strategies of Evidential Adverbs in a Corpus-Based Study*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.
- Herman, M. (1993). Scientific and Technical Translation. In. Wright, S. E. & Wright, L. D. (eds.). *Technical Translation Style: Clarity, Concision, Correctness*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Jianzhong, G. (2013). The Interpretive Theory and Chinese-English Translation. In Laurence K.P.W. and Chan S. W. (eds.), *The Dancer and the Dance: Essays in Translation Studies* (pp.142-161). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.



- Klaudy, K. (2001). Explicitation. In M. Baker. (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Lederer, M. (2010). Interpretive Approach. In Y. Gambier (ed.). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Lederer, M. (2014). *Translation: The Interpretive Model*. New York: Routledge.
- Molina, L., Hurtado A. A. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta*, 47, (4), 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- Morini, M. (2013). *The Pragmatic Translator: An Integral Theory of Translation*. London, New Delphi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Palumbo, G. (2009). *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. London & New York: Continuum International Publishing.
- Sin-Wai, C. (2015). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology*. New York: Routledge.
- Theodora, O. (2017). Enhancing Literary Translation through the Interpretive Theory of Translation (ITT). *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 22, (8), 67-71.
- Vinay, J. P., Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. (originally published in French, 1958)