

A DESCRIPTIVE-EXPLANATORY APPROACH TO EUPHEMIZATION: THE TRANSLATION OF THE *PAINTED BIRD* INTO TURKISH

NESLIHAN KANSU-YETKINER
İzmir University of Economics
neslihan.yetkiner@izmirekonomi.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0002-8703-2069

ILGIN AKTENER
İzmir University of Economics
ilgin.aktener@izmirekonomi.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-9166-1362

ABSTRACT

Euphemization regarding sexually-loaded texts should not merely be considered as a translator's personal choice, but as an alternative strategy to handle multifaceted dynamics of publishing world, especially efficient in the case of restrictive publishing contexts, which might require evasion to ensure trouble-free publication and to minimize the risk of censorship, prohibition, and confiscation. This study examines the treatment of sexually-loaded scenes by the two Turkish translators of *Painted Bird*, Polish-American writer Jerzy Kosinski's master-work of a shattered post-War Europe, and to explore the strategies used in the target text to mirror and propagate ideological hegemony in Turkish context, focusing on the euphemization processes. The theoretical framework was built upon Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies (Toury 1995: 33; 1998: 11) (henceforth DETS) backed by Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) in which Fairclough's (1992a: 4; 1992b: 213) three-dimensional model consisting of text, discursive practices and social practices creates a supportive plane. DETS employed in this perspective throws light on translators' incorporation of euphemistic strategies as preemptive attempts to minimize social and political risks as the reflections of the internal dynamics of the country.

KEYWORDS: Euphemization, *Painted Bird*, Descriptive Explanatory Translation Studies, Critical Discourse Analysis, sexually-loaded texts, Literary Translation.

UN ENFOCAMENT DESCRIPTIU-EXPLICATIU DE L'EUFEMITZACIÓ: LA TRADUCCIÓ DE *PAINTED BIRD* AL TURC

RESUM

L'eufemització de textos amb càrrega sexual no s'ha de considerar només com una elecció personal del traductor, sinó com una estratègia alternativa per gestionar dinàmiques polièdriques del món editorial, especialment eficaç en el cas de contextos editorials restrictius, que poden requerir l'evasió per garantir una publicació sense problemes i minimitzar el risc de censura, prohibició i confiscació. Aquest estudi examina el tractament d'escenes carregades sexualment per part dels dos traductors turcs de *Painted Bird*, l'obra mestra de l'escriptor polonès-nord-americà Jerzy Kosinski sobre una Europa de la postguerra destrossada i explora les estratègies utilitzades en el text objectiu per reflectir i propagar hegemonia ideològica en el context turc, centrant-se en els processos d'eufemització. El marc teòric es va basar en Estudis de traducció

Data de recepció: 19/vii/2022

Data d'acceptació: 30/ix/2022

Data de publicació: desembre 2022

descriptiva i explicativa (Toury 1995: 33; 1998: 11) (d'ara endavant DETS) recolzats per Critical Discourse Analysis (d'ara endavant CDA), en què el model tridimensional de Fairclough (1992a: 4; 1992b: 213) format per text, pràctiques discursives i pràctiques socials crea un pla de suport. Els DETS emprats per part dels traductors en aquesta perspectiva posen de manifest la incorporació d'estratègies eufemístiques, com a intents preventius de minimitzar els riscos socials i polítics, com a reflex de la dinàmica interna del país.

PARAULES CLAU: eufemització, *Painted Bird*, estudis de traducció explicativa descriptiva, anàlisi crítica del discurs, textos amb càrrega sexual, traducció literària.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Painted Bird (hereinafter *Painted Bird*) which became an important work of holocaust literature, and created highly controversial stardom for its writer Jerzy Kosinski (1933-1991), depicts a young boy's horrific experiences during the Second World War. The book sketches a nameless hero wandering around small war-torn villages in an unspecified European country, and all the forms of sexual and social deviances he comes across. The vivid omnipresence of sexuality and spirituality has troubled Kosinski readers all over the world, with profane violence encompassing rape, incest and bestiality.

Three years after the original text was released in the USA (1965), *Painted Bird* was translated into Turkish by Aydın Emeç, and published with the title of *Boyalı Kuş* [Painted Bird] in Turkey by E Yayınları [E Publishing]. Emeç, a co-founder of E Yayınları, was taken to court in 1971 for publishing obscene content, and was consequently acquitted. The court's conviction, which was attached to the book as peritextual material, highlighted the sexually-loaded nature of the book. In 2018, in honour of the publishing house's 50th year, E Yayınları published a second translation of *Painted Bird* by Zeynep Umuroğlu Çetinel, in whose paratextual material there was no reference to the court case, as part of the publishing house's regular revision activities.

Resonances between the treatment of sexually-loaded passages by translators and extralinguistic factors expose a new, implicit and evasive discourse complied with socio-cultural norms and patronage, by the virtue of the above-mentioned background. We therefore firmly believe that sexuality as the foregrounded aspect of this novel in Turkish context would provide a readily available semantic category to unveil underlying ideological exercise of power in text production and agent-based intentions. Hence, the euphemization processes, which are more prevalent in the old translation and less prevalent in the new one (albeit not completely absent), can be considered a relief mechanism for negotiating cultural and power relations in the wider context, which affects the translator's decision-making process.

Euphemism can be considered as a linguistic strategy, which encompasses substitution of an agreeable expression found to be more polite, less direct and culturally and socially more appropriate in the place of an offensive, blunt and

vulgar one. In line with this, Warren (1992: 135) argues that euphemism provides people with “tactful and/or veiled” ways to talk about “sensitive phenomenon”. This enables both parties in communication (i.e., sender and receiver) to avoid “possible effrontery and offence” (Linfoot-Ham 2005: 228) and “loss of face” (Allan & Burrige 1991: 11) when discussing taboo subjects. These researchers seem to agree that among these taboo subjects is sex, which is the focus of this study.

In the above-mentioned studies, euphemism is generally dealt with as an interpersonal strategy, a potential strategy of politeness, used by interactants for face-saving purposes (Brown & Levinson 1987: 216). When we situate the translator as a mediator within multiple linguistic and cultural framings, this moves the notion of euphemization from the interpersonal to the intercultural platform. Within the context of translation studies, euphemism is a prevalent target-oriented strategy employed by translators to mask or soften unpleasantness of a reality in the source text. In other words, clashes between morals, values and norms of source culture and target culture, and degree of acceptability on taboo topics, force translators to alleviate or ameliorate inappropriateness of source text expressions, and to transform them into socially acceptable forms. As an ideological spin, euphemism functions in the form of social tools for mapping socio-cultural relationships and recontextualization of a text in the hands of a translator. Nevertheless, it is also important to read the use of euphemisms from the perspective of self-censorship, which can be described as “an individual ethical struggle between self and context” (Santaemilia 2008: 221-222), and as a tool “to produce rewritings which are ‘acceptable’ from both social and personal perspectives” (Santaemilia 2008: 221-22). Then again, it is not always clear whether it is translators who personally choose to create acceptable texts or they feel the need to do so in the presence of restrictive censorial institutions. It is indeed institutional censorship’s aim to blur the lines between such external constraints as the rules of censorial institutions and such internal constraints as target norms and ideologies to

induce self-censorship in translators, publishers, booksellers and even readers, all of whom will be disposed to avoid the penalties associated with regulations and mechanism of censorship. (Tymoczko 2009: 38)

Therefore, while we accept euphemism as a critical strategy to avoid impositions by censorial institutions, we cannot argue that it is voluntary and empowering on the part of the translators as it can also be viewed as a form of self-censorship.

In the light of above-discussed considerations, drawing upon Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies (Toury 1995: 33; 1998: 11) (henceforth DETS) backed by Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA), this study explores the treatment of sexually-loaded scenes by the two Turkish translators of *Painted Bird*, and examines the ways in which the target text mirrors and propagates ideological hegemony, by focusing on the euphemization processes. This

perspective allows us to see how translators incorporate euphemistic strategies as preemptive attempts to minimize social and political risks, whilst maximizing stylistic (source text writer), economic (publisher) and public (target reader) interest due to power relations as systemic constraints. In line with above-mentioned considerations, we focus on the following research questions:

1. How do the socio-political and cultural references remap the cross-cultural transfer through discursive constructions?
2. What are the reflections of euphemism on two different target texts?

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Toury's above mentioned framework of DETS, as an extended version of Holmes' (1988 [1972]: 67) Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), attaches an explanatory plane to translation studies, which highlights larger networks/systems and ideological exercise of power in text production. Considering the act of translation as a socially-situated and ideologically-embedded social practice (Toury 1995: 282, Gentzler & Tymoczko 2002: xxviii), DETS considers not only the social and discursive text interpretation and translation in a specific society, but also the ways these processes are manifested through the choice of the translator, influenced by socio-political and cultural dynamics of his/her society. This translation-ideology nexus requires an integration with a critical social theory. In the context of *Painted Bird*, convergence of ideological/cultural factors with the choice of the translators in the representation of obscenity within target text encourages us to look for potential benefits in the intersection between CDA and DTS. In other words, this study pleads for the idea that DETS would provide a sound paradigm, within which CDA, as a critical social theory, would be able to expand and broaden the horizons of the field by elucidating "historical, socio-cultural and socio-political context of target texts as an indispensable part in creating and criticizing translation" (İşbuğa-Erel 2008: 69).

One of the primary premises of CDA is to "recognize the ways in which changes in language use are linked to wider social and cultural processes" (Fairclough 1992a: 1). In line with this consideration, this integrated approach paves the way for critical interpretation of texts constituting a sensitive barometer of socio-cultural and political dynamics in a society (Fairclough 1995: 52).

In this study, DETS methodological framework integrates with Fairclough's above mentioned three dimensional model, within CDA consisting of text, discursive practices and social practices, which can be summarized as follows:

- a) Text (the written or spoken language produced in a discursive event-form and meaning analysis)
- b) Discursive practice (sociocognitive [aspects of text production and interpretation-instance of language use analyzed as text])

- c) Social practice (a socially and historically situated mode of action, i.e. ideological and hegemonic processes signifying experience from a particular perspective).

In a nutshell, Fairclough has described his framework as aiming

[...] to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures relations and process to investigate how much practices, event and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relation of power and struggles over power. (Fairclough 1995: 132)

Drawing upon Toury's argument that "translations are facts of the target culture" (Toury 1995: 29), this integrated enhanced framework sets out to describe the translational situation, the exploration of the discursive practices, and the explanation of the reasons behind some translational decisions within specific social contexts.

The following section will present the theoretical considerations that deal with the construction of an integrated framework. The next section delineates two translations of *Painted Bird* and their presentations in Turkish context. Then, the complex intersection of social, political and historical turbulence with translation practices is explained in the socio-political context. The discussion will further proceed to the explanation of data and method, and qualitative analysis of euphemizations through examples. The paper will conclude by highlighting the possible reasons of the euphemistic strategies employed and their consequences on target text discourse.

3. CONTEXTUALIZATION OF THE TEXT: *PAINTED BIRD* IN TURKISH

The journey of *Painted Bird* into Turkish starts in 1968 with its first Turkish translation by Aydın Emeç who, as mentioned, is the co-founder of E Yayınları. Emeç was the brother of a very prominent journalist, Çetin Emeç, and a member of a long-established and well-recognised journalistic family. Being eager to have a pivotal role in the creation of leftist repertoire, highly popular in the early 1970s, Emeç and Cengiz Tuncer established E Yayınları, a left-wing fiction publishing house in İstanbul, and launched *Boyalı Kuş* as the first imported book published by this infant publishing company.

Emeç's translation was republished in 1970, 1971, 1972, 1974, 1980, 1984, 1991, 2000, 2005, 2006, 2011 and 2014, with local and Kosinski-based peritextual adjustments. The 2006 version was dedicated to the memory of Aydın Emeç on the 20th anniversary of his death. As mentioned in the introduction, a new translation —also entitled *Boyalı Kuş*— by Zeynep Umuroğlu Çetinoğlu was published in 2018 by E Yayınları as part of their renewal policy which includes revisions of translations of their regularly published books (E Yayınları 2018: 8).

Çetinol's translation includes a foreword entitled "E Yayınları ve Boyalı Kuş'un 50. Yılı" [The 50th Year of E Publishing and The Painted Bird] by E Yayınları. In this paratextual material, E Yayınları emphasises its pioneering status as a publishing house, stating that it was the first publishing house in Turkey to advertise on TV, and it continued publishing *Boyalı Kuş* all through its existence and thus, became the first publishing house to continue publishing its first book for half a century. E Yayınları further claims that it was a precursor in following and publishing contemporary books regarded "challenging" and "different", during the 60s and 70s, when the leftist movement and political mobility was at its peak (E Yayınları 2018: 7-8). The assertion that E Yayınları is a pioneering publishing house that tends to publish books that go against the era's dominant ideologies appears to be valid, considering the controversy surrounding its initial translation by Emeç. A court decision which was attached to a post-1972 publication of the novel shows that Emeç was taken to court on the grounds of publishing obscene content, and was consequently acquitted (Karakartal 2016). The acquittal was based on the court's conviction that the book had included scenes of sexual intercourse merely to show the brutal circumstances of war, and that scenes of violations are not such as to provoke sexual desires (Turkish Republic İstanbul Penal Court of First Instance Decision No: 972/12).

The reception of *Boyalı Kuş* can be considered to be far from uniform. The book was introduced into the Turkish market as a popular success, and a controversial and shocking piece, acclaiming that "*Painted Bird* will be one of the most important documents of our age". This statement on the back cover of the second edition of Emeç's translation entails a denial of fictionality, and associates the book with the real world events. It was, thus, foregrounded as a fictionalized autobiography with an astonishing authenticity. However, the back cover of Çetinol's translation features a quote by Jonathan Yardley that reads "Of all the remarkable fiction that emerged from the Second World War, nothing stands higher than Jerzy Kosinski's *The Painted Bird*", insinuating that the novel is fictional rather than autobiographical.¹ In line with this, some European authorities (Richter 1976: 370) also assume *The Painted Bird* to be a surreal, fictional tale.

Despite this difference, an examination of the paratextual material of the second edition of Emeç's and Çetinol's translations shows that in both, the novel is presented as an "important", "impressive" and "magnificent" masterpiece. This means that literary value of the novel tends to be highlighted within Turkish context. Additionally, Kosinski himself is praised as one of "the most important" and "most authentic" authors in the history of literature on the back cover of Çetinol's translation. This acclaim and the presentation of the book in a positive

¹ For the full quote by Jonathan Yardley, see: <https://bookshop.org/books/the-painted-bird-9780802134226/9780802134226>.

light seem to be in stark contrast to the Polish audience's reception of the book. Due to the portrayal of villagers as illiterate and inhumane, the Polish audience showed hostility to the book and it was banned in communist Poland as anti-Polish propaganda (Jarniewicz 2004: 651, Meszaros 1979: 234, Stulov 2015: 34).

The book title is emblematic of a first-person narrator, a nameless young boy, accused of being a Gypsy and a Jewish stray. In a wartime nightmare with a strong bestial depth, which is rife with misery, anarchy and gruesome scenes, this young boy quickly learns the tricks for survival in a world of German soldiers, sadistic peasants, Kalmuks, and torture. These gruesome scenes include those of sexuality, which are not merely limited to consensual sex. The nameless young boy witnesses distressing scenes of rape and bestiality, for example, Rainbow's rape of a young Jewish girl, the Kalmuks' mass rape of the townspeople, and the Makar's family's intercourse with various animals. Through the use of such disturbing scenes, Kosinski aims to paint a realistic picture of the terrors of war, which manifests itself both at collective and individual levels. Furthermore, through the use of scenes of bestiality, which narrate unorthodoxly intimate encounters between humankind and animals, Kosinski showcases the lawless and anarchic world under the conditions of war, in which the lines between the behaviours of people and animals are blurred to the extent that humans act like animals. The fact that the readers witness such horrors and deviance through the eyes of a small, innocent child makes the novel all the more appalling and shocking (Alfonso 2005: 102, Meszaros 1979: 234, Vice 2003: 66, Skau *et al.* 1982: 46). Even at times, the small child voyeuristically watches the sexual encounters of the people with whom he lives, as well as scenes of sexual assaults, violence and torture, although he does not seem to be quite able to make sense of sexuality, as evident in the detailed yet ambiguous ways he narrates these sexual encounters and assaults.

Considering the court case in Turkey, it can be suggested that the novel has sparked a debate about obscenity. Taking this as a starting point, we analyze the two translations of the novel in terms of the depiction of sexuality. Before we embark upon our analyses, we focus on sociopolitical contexts in which our two translations were produced.

4. SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXT OF *THE PAINTED BIRD* IN TURKEY: 1960s-1970s vs. 2010s

Tymoczko (2000: 23) considers translation to be partisan, and closely engaged with the socio-political environment. Considering this, and the fact that the 60s and 70s periods were indeed turbulent in terms of politics, as suggested by E Yayınları, it is important to scrutinize the socio-political context of Turkey at this time. Between the early 60s and early 80s, Turkey had witnessed two coups d'état, and one memorandum, which many regard as a coup d'état. On 27 May 1960, the Turkish army announced that it had seized power from the Demokrat

Parti [Democratic Party], and that a Milli Birlik Komitesi [National Unity Committee] was established to govern Turkey. The takeover was on the basis that the Demokrat Parti's actions were unconstitutional. Eventually, political parties were reactivated, and democratic elections were held in 1961. However, in 1971, the army again intervened in the administration of Turkey through a memorandum. This was a result of the clashes between the leftist and rightist groups in Turkey in the 60s, causing unrest, chaos and deaths. Through the memorandum, the army warned that unless the government took steps to control this situation, the army would take over the government. Upon this, the government resigned, and the new government established reform cabinets, which however, did not succeed in ending the anarchy, and on 26 April 1971, martial rule was declared followed by a martial law on 13 May. Despite all these, political turbulence was never fully prevented by subsequent governments. Consequently, the army seized power once more on 12 September 1980 through another coup d'état (Kabacalı 1990: 164-209, Şahhüseyinoğlu 2005: 76-197, Kayış & Hürkan 2012: 133-245, Zürcher 2004: 221-279).

During times of such political instability, censorship was highly prevalent in Turkey. Although, unlike the Demokrat Parti, Milli Birlik Komitesi initially appeared to be anti-censorship, after some time it began implementing press censorship, which continued throughout the 60s and 70s. In fact, practices of censorship were varied during this time, and they ranged from arrests of journalists and closure of newspapers, to court cases against various publishers, translators and writers —particularly those favouring socialism— and books being pulled off the shelves (Kabacalı 1990: 164-209, Şahhüseyinoğlu 2005: 76-197, Kayış & Hürkan 2012: 133-245, Zürcher 2004: 221-279).

As evident in the case of *Boyalı Kuş*, not all censorship was of a political nature during this time. However, censorship in the form of obscenity court cases was also well established, and not merely limited to this period. One of the very first examples of obscenity court cases against translators and publishers was against Nasuhi Baydar and Semih Lütfü Erciyes, the translator and publisher respectively of Pierre Louys' *Aphrodite: mœurs antiques* (1896) in 1940 (Kayış & Hürkan 2012: 87). The Protection of Minors against Harmful Publications Law, the legal basis of obscenity court cases in Turkey, has been in place since 1927.² This law initially targeted publications that appeared to have harmful effects on minors' morals and intellectual and mental development, but was altered on 6 March 1986. Upon these alterations, publications with harmful effects on minors' morals became synonymous with obscene publications. After these alterations, this law came to be used much more regularly and as a result, many scientific books, literary novels and newspapers were prosecuted on the grounds of obscenity (Kabacalı 1998: 228-231, Kayış & Hürkan 2012: 258-260).

² For the 1117 numbered Protection of Minors against Harmful Publications Law, see: <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.3.1117.pdf>.

The alterations enabled the conservative sect of the Anavatan Partisi [Motherland Party], the political party in power, a greater leeway to ban the publications that it deemed obscene. Since strict censorial practices were imposed on political content post-12 September coup, newspapers and magazines tended to publish tabloid content that included pictures considered erotic, the publication of which the conservative sect of the Anavatan Partisi sought to restrict (Kayış & Hürkan 2012: 258-260). Since the *Boyalı Kuş* court case preceded these changes, it cannot be suggested that the case was a result of them. However, bearing in mind that the court case followed the memorandum and martial law of 1971, the strict censorial environment resulting from the aforementioned developments, coupled with E Yayınları's self-declared tendency to publish books that were challenging for the 60s and 70s period can be taken as the reason behind the court case.

Unlike the period between the two coups d'état, the 2010s, the period during which the second translation of *Boyalı Kuş* was published in Turkey, was much less turbulent in terms of politics. Nevertheless, the socio-political context of Turkey in the 2010s was similarly unaccommodating for freedom of speech with the Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi [Justice and Development Party] regime. To illustrate this, the Reporters without Borders Press Freedom Index can be examined: in 2013, Turkey's place was 154 among 180 countries in terms of press freedom.³ Although this ranking became 149 in 2014, it declined to 157 in 2019. Thus, it would be reasonable to say that the Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi has imposed an authoritarian and conservative conception of politics upon the society since coming to power in 2002. For example, between 2000 and 2008, The Turkish Prime Ministerial Board for the Protection of Minors from Harmful Publications, the legal body that acts as an expert in obscenity court cases in Turkey, in their expert's report, argued that 27 books, some of which were translations, were of an obscene nature (Marakoğlu 2014: 98). Additionally, in 2011 the Turkish translators and publishers of *The Soft Machine* by William S. Burroughs, and *Snuff* by Chuck Palahniuk were taken to court on the grounds of obscenity, which was criticised highly by the international media and freedom of speech organizations (Aktener 2019: 347-348).⁴ The most recent instance of obscenity court cases against translators is the one against Burcu Uğuz for translating *Declaration of the Rights of Girls* by Elisabeth Biami in 2019 (Bia Haber Merkezi 2020). Considering these, it can be argued that although on the surface, socio-political context of Turkey was freer than that of the 1960s and 1970s, with no *coups d'état* or significant political unrest in the picture, censorial practices targeting different issues such as political criticism and sexuality are still prevalent. Nevertheless, a superficial and relative level of freedom seems to have been sufficient for a retranslation —i.e., Çetinol's translation— that is much more

³ See the website of Reporters Without Borders: <https://rsf.org/en/ranking/2019>.

⁴ For a detailed exploration of history of censorship in Turkey, see Aktener (2017: 9-21).

explicit in terms of obscenity in comparison to Emeç's translation. It is this difference in the level of explicitness between the two translations that we aim to explore in this study. The following section introduces the methods used in doing so.

5. METHODS AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

We firmly believe that linguistic shifts in sexually-loaded parts, in which disturbing acts of sexual violence and depravity are depicted, allow us to examine readily available and traceable cultural and ideological data through a comparative analysis, revealing the cultural and political reasons behind the translator's choices. Thus, our method is based on comparative microanalysis of euphemization, as the discursive manifestation on a lexical level within the framework of DETS, used to identify, classify and explain the shifts between the source text (henceforth ST) and two target texts (henceforth TT1 and TT2) in the translation of obscenity. With this aim, the researchers designated 18 sex-related scenes as ad hoc pairs (the systematic, replicable and traceable *modus operandis*), which impinge upon both macro and micro structure design of the translators. This thematic qualitative analysis of euphemistic strategies is based on an extended framework of Warren's (1992: 134) model, in which new devices are added to scrutinize examples that are not covered in her categorization. We, thereby, propose a more comprehensive framework that can capture the instances of euphemization in our data set.

According to Warren (1992: 132), there are four main categories of euphemism, which have further sub-categories. Below, we detail these categories as they are discussed by Linfoot-Ham (2005: 230-231):

Word-formation devices:

- Compounding: euphemisms that are formed through the use of multiple words combined together.
- Derivation: euphemisms that are formed by altering already existing words.
- Blends: As suggested by Linfoot-Ham (2005: 231), euphemistic blends were not previously defined or exemplified.
- Acronyms: euphemisms that are formed through the use of first letters of the dispreferred terms.
- Onomatopoeia: euphemisms that are formed through the use of words that sound like the words to which they refer.

Phonemic modification:

- Back slang: euphemisms that are formed through the use of reversed versions of dispreferred terms.
- Rhyming slang: euphemisms that are formed through the use of words that rhyme with the dispreferred terms.

- Phoneme replacement: euphemisms that are formed by replacing one sound of the dispreferred terms.
- Abbreviation: euphemisms that are formed through the use of short forms of the dispreferred terms.
- Loan words: euphemisms that are equivalences of dispreferred terms in different languages.

Semantic innovation:

- Particularizations: general terms, euphemistic use of which can only be implicitly understood within the context they are used.
- Implications: euphemisms that require interpretation to comprehend the dispreferred term that they stand for.
- Metaphors: metaphors used as euphemisms for dispreferred terms.
- Metonyms: general terms used as euphemisms for specific terms.
- Reversals: euphemistic use of the opposite of the dispreferred terms.
- Understatements: terms that minimize the effect of dispreferred terms, and thus, euphemize them.
- Overstatements: terms that maximize the effect of dispreferred terms, and thus, euphemize them.

In exploring and analyzing the data derived from *Painted Bird*, the focus will be Warren's last category, namely semantic innovation. Because Warren's model does not cover all the euphemization strategies employed by the two Turkish translators, new semantic subcategories are needed to attain an enhanced integrated framework.

Our comparative data analysis between ST, and TT1 and TT2 revealed a total number of 53 euphemistic translation strategies in the translation of 18 sexually-loaded passages in the ST. The uneven distribution reveals that the two translators employed different strategies in TT1 and TT2, reflecting the changing socio-political dynamics and cultural concerns over the course of fifty years. Emeç resorted to euphemization strategies (39) ranging from omission, semantic misrepresentation, implication and idiomatization in the late 1960s, whilst Çetinel rendered the full text by occasionally employing limited euphemization processes (14), namely, idiomatization and semantic misrepresentation. Table 1 displays the distribution of euphemization strategies within 18 sexually-loaded passages identified in two different translated texts.

Identified Strategy	TT1	TT2
Omission	21	1
Semantic Misrepresentation	7	-
Implication	8	10
Idiomatization	3	3
Total	39	14

TABLE 1. Euphemization Strategies in 18 sexually-loaded passages of two Turkish translations of *Painted Bird*

The following section elaborates the above-mentioned euphemistic strategies.

5.1. Omission

Although Warren (1992: 133) does not include omission in her categorization, claiming that it is an uncommon device in euphemizing taboo words, this is the most frequently used euphemization device employed by Emeç. If we consider euphemism as a sort of verbal avoidance, its simplest form is to omit improper expressions. Within the framework of political discourse, Chilton (1987: 12) argues that euphemization is a suppressive and dissimulating attempt to repress the meaning by veiling the full reality. This strategy can also be considered as a purification process, through which offensive parts of source text are cleansed to conform to the accepted, but implicit socio-cultural framework.

Emeç's frequent omissions brought about shortened paragraphs and simplification of the text at the structural, narratological and semantic levels, whereas Çetinol resorted to omissions only once in our dataset. A good example of this case is the following extract from Chapter 9, in which Rainbow, a bulky peasant, rapes a young Jewish girl who has escaped from a Nazi transport train, while the nameless protagonist is watching the ravishment through a hole in the wall.

ST	TT1 (1968) by Emeç	TT2 (2018) by Çetinol
He straddled the prostrate girl and moved his hands gently over her shoulders, breasts, and belly. (108)	Bitkin kurbanın üzerine ata binercesine oturdu. [second part of the sentence is omitted] (111) [He seated himself on the weary victim as if he were mounting a horse.]	Perişan haldeki kızın üstüne ata binercesine abanıp omuzlarını, memelerini ve karnını okşamaya koyuldu. (113) [He leant over the wretched girl as if he were mounting a horse and began caressing her breasts and belly.]

TABLE 2. Example of Omission

As can be seen above, in this instance, Emeç omits the reference to the girl's body parts which Rainbow touches, whereas Çetinol retains these. In this instance, the ST also reveals the small boy's voyeuristic position in the book. Furthermore, his inexperience and confusion in relation to sexuality is clear, in that his narration does not indicate his awareness of the young girl's rape. The boy's inexperience is emphasized even further in Emeç's text, as his narration is much more ambiguous than in the ST, due to the omission strategy.

5.2. Semantic misrepresentation

Semantic misrepresentation, as an additional category to Warren's model, stands for "the production of semantically inaccurate or even false representation of the

original reference, by replacing the relevant (offensive) items with a semantically non-equivalent content (euphemisms)” (Al-Adwan 2015: 17). In this respect, it can be defined as a semantic transformation, which moves the meaning of an expression from the sensitive taboo domain to the innocuous safe domain through the substitution of the unpleasant expression with a semantically nonequivalent euphemistic content.

The following example is taken from Chapter 12, in which the protagonist lives on a farm with Makar and his two grown children. This part of the novel features brutal scenes of incest, bestiality and nymphomania, along with homosexuality.

ST	TT1 (1968)	TT2 (2018)
When Makar came home after a successful sale, both he and his son would get drunk and go to the goats’ quarters. Ewka used to hint maliciously that they were enjoying themselves in there. (151)	Dönüşlerinde satış verimliyse Makar’la oğlu içer sarhoş olur, geceyi keçilerin yanında tamamlarlardı. Ewka hoşça zaman geçirdiklerini söylerdi bana. (148-149) [Upon their return, if their sale was fruitful, Makar and his son would drink and get drunk, and end the night beside the goats. Ewka would say that they were having a good time.]	Kazançlı bir satış yapıp eve döndüğünde, Makar da oğluyla beraber kafayı bulup keçilerin durduğu bölmenin yolunu tutardı. Ewka pis pis sırıtarak evdeki erkeklerin orada gönül eğlendirdiklerini sokuştururdu laf arasında. (152) [When they made a profitable sale and came back home, Makar would get drunk together with his son, and they would make their way to the stalls in which goats were kept. Grinning conspiratorially, Ewka would make the insinuation that the men of the house were having fun there.]

TABLE 3. Example of Semantic Misinterpretation

In this example it appears that Emeç opted for a neutral translation of the sentence “Ewka used to hint maliciously that they were enjoying themselves in there” by converting the verb “hint” into “say” and deleting the adverb “maliciously”, and thus concealing Ewka’s spiteful inferences on bestiality, and many other things between two males. This deprived the Turkish reader from a full understanding of Ewka’s indication about happenings in the goats’ quarters. Her words can easily be understood as a disapproving remark in Turkish text, but not as hints of indiscreet affairs.

In TT2, however, in order to explicitly evoke Ewka’s intention, Çetinoğlu, made some additions both in lexical and semantic levels. For instance, she added a new adverb “pis pis sırıtarak” [grinning conspiratorially] and changed the verb into “laf arasında sokuşturmak” [to make insinuation], which would highlight her malevolence.

5.3. Implication

Euphemization generated by under implication suggests an indirect communication, forcing reader inferencing to retrieve the implied associated meaning in an expression. For Warren, in a communication situation moulded through implication, we can semantically consider euphemism when “the connection between the conventional and novel sets of referents is that of an antecedent to a consequent (if x is valid, then y is (probably) valid too” (Warren 1992: 143). In addition to this restricted view, implicitation as a transfer process of translation, whether at lexical, semantic or syntactic levels, has received scholarly attention. For instance, Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 344) define implicitation as

a stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning. (Vinay & Darbelnet 1995: 344)

Considering this broader framework, we focus on two kinds of implications in this study, a) through reduction, where some source text lexical elements are left out in target text and: b) through generalization by which lexical source text elements are replaced by less specific target language lexical elements (Hjort-Pedersen & Faber 2010: 244).

The following example illustrates the use of euphemistic implication through reduction. In this instance, Makar’s bestial relationship with his favorite rabbit is narrated in an implied manner in ST. Although ST itself only tacitly depicts Makar’s sexual relationship with the rabbit, Emeç’s text renders the insinuation of bestial relationship more implicit, leaving out certain details. In ST, Kosinski hints at the bestial relationship, underlining that the rabbit would bleed under its tail when Makar brought it back from his room. Emeç’s text leaves out “under the tail” and merely tells of the blood loss [kan kaybetmek], completely disregarding the implied connection between the rabbit’s bleeding and events occurring when Makar takes it to his room. On the other hand, Çetinoğlu retains this implied connection by suggesting that “some point under [rabbit’s] tail” [kuyruğunun altında bir yer] would bleed.

ST	TT1 (1968)	TT2 (2018)
<p>One of the females was particularly loved by Makar. She was a white giant with pink eyes and had not had any young. Makar used to take her to the house and keep her there for several days, after which she seemed quite ill. After some of these visits the big white rabbit bled under her tail, refused to eat, and appeared sick. (154)</p>	<p>Çok sevdiği dişilerin arasında bir de gözdesi vardı: pembe gözlü, hiç yavrulamamış, kocaman beyaz bir tavşandı bu. Makar onu sık sık odasına götürür bir kaç gün yanında tutardı. Kafesine geri getirdiğinde pek halsiz olurdu hayvancık. Hiç bir şey yemez, kan kaybederdi boyuna. (152) [Among the females which he loved very much was a favourite: this was a huge, white rabbit with pink eyes which had never reproduced. Makar would take it to his room often and keep it with himself for some days. When he brought it back to its cage, the poor animal would be very weary. It wouldn't eat anything and would continuously lose blood.]</p>	<p>Hele bir tanesi vardı ki, Makar'ın göz bebeğiymiş adeta. Pembecik gözleriyle bembeyaz ve kocaman bir hayvandı, hiç yavrulamamıştı. Makar zaman zaman bunu alıp odasına çıkarır ve günlerce orada tutardı. Geri geldiğinde zavallı pek hasta görünür, kuyruğunun altında bir yer kanar dururdu. Garibanın karnını doyuracak hali bile olmazdı. (156) [There was especially one particular [animal] that was the apple of Makar's eye. With its pink eyes, it was a huge, snow-white animal, it had never reproduced. At times, Makar would take this animal to his room and keep it there for days. When he came back, the poor animal would look very sick and some point below its tail would keep bleeding. The poor thing would be too worn out to eat its fill.]</p>

TABLE 4. Example 1 of Implication

The second example in this category, displaying implication through generalization, is extracted from Chapter 15 and given below. As the most ruthless part of the book, it depicts the horrible attack of the Kalmuk cavalry, which commit sexual assaults and pillaging.

ST	TT1 (1968)	TT2 (2018)
Still another woman was brought out. She screamed and begged, but the Kalmuks stripped her and threw her on the ground. Two men raped her at once, one in the mouth. (186)	Kalmuklar hemen bir başka kurban buldular kendilerine. Zorla soydular kadını; son gücünü, direnmesini yok etmek için de iyice kırbaçladıktan sonra içlerinden ikisi aynı anda üzerine çıktılar; en aşağılatıcı işler yaptılar. (178) [The Kalmuks found another victim for themselves right away. They undressed the woman by force; after they whipped her thoroughly to eliminate her power and resistance, two of them climbed on top of her at the same time; they did the most humiliating things.]	Bu kez ortaya başka bir kadın getirildi. Bu kadının da çıplıklarına, yalvarıp yakarmalarına bakmadan çınlıçplak soyup yere yıktı Kalmuklar. İki asker düşünülebilecek en iğrenç şekilde aynı anda tecavüz etti kadına. (186) [This time another woman was brought into the middle. The Kalmuks stripped the woman to the buff and knocked her down without paying any attention to her screams or pleas. Two soldiers simultaneously raped her in the most disgusting way imaginable.]

TABLE 5. Example 2 of Implication

In this extract, sexual violence committed against peasant women by the Kalmuks is detailed. A coercive sexual assault scene in which two soldiers simultaneously rape a woman is mentioned explicitly as “Two men raped her at once, one in the mouth” in ST. For the same sentence in both TT1 and TT2, verbal escape hatches are created in the form of generalized terms denoting misdeeds such as “en aşağılatıcı işler yaptılar” [they did the most humiliating things] or “düşünülebilecek en iğrenç şekilde aynı anda tecavüz ettiler” [simultaneously raped her in the most disgusting way imaginable]. In this way, profanity and sexual explicitness are sanitized through the substitution of very general words for more explicit terms, leading a higher level of abstraction and interpretation.

5.4. Idiomatization

Idiomatization, another additional category in our framework, which is generally considered to be a semantic process leading to obscuration of meaning, can be defined as a linguistic process of reorganizing certain phrases into fixed expressions, namely idioms, which cause a loss in concrete meaning. According to Akimoto (1995: 588), idiomatization stands for “the process of finding a pattern and assigning a new meaning which cannot be deduced from the constituents”. Semantically, idiomatization provides an inventory of meaning from concrete to abstract. In terms of euphemization, idiomatization means rendering clear-cut source-text expression into target text with its idiomatic substitution. In this way, indirectness and vagueness embedded in idiomatic expression would alleviate unpleasantness or offensiveness of a source-text expression. For instance, while “to rape” could be directly translated into Turkish as “tecavüz etmek”, both translators tend to denote this verb through various other idiomatic expressions

such as “üstünden geçmek” [cross/pass over] or “sahip olmak” [to possess], “üstüne çıkmak” [climb/go on top].

In our analyses, we grouped and analyzed patterns of euphemization strategies that impinge upon the macro structure of the translations, and signal conspicuous shifts of semantic nature. The resonances of repeated euphemistic strategies yield two different discourses, with Emeç’s translation (1968) woven around concealment, and Çetinol’s translation (2018), around semantic blurring. Emeç tends to omit, change and obscure sex-related words, phrases and sentences with dissimulation (Thompson 1990: 60). TT1, thus, has become dissimulated, abridged and purified, aligning with the target culture’s norms and conventions. In contrast, Çetinol, 50 years later, seems to have been more faithful to ST, through rendering it without omission but using semantic blurring, which requires deduction and inferencing. Consequently, the young protagonist’s simple, clear and straightforward, albeit shocking narration on sexual assaults, violence and bestiality has been converted into a relatively evasive text, obscuring and disguising disagreeable scenes. In both cases, the modification of sexually-loaded passages breaks the stylistic texture and softens the sexual discourse of ST, which is generally deemed to be cruel, explicit and shocking. Suppose we put the case in Burridge’s (2012) words. In that case, this binarism lies on a continuum, one end of which is the concealing approach where euphemisms are used as “linguistic fig-leaves” and the other, is the approach of obscuring where euphemisms are utilized as “diaphanous lingerie”. As a result, consistent with the interconnected socio-political context that they inhabit, the two Turkish translators, as revealed in our analyses, employed a great range of euphemistic strategies in 18 sexuality-related excerpts, which led to a more abstract, misdirected or imprecise discourse in TT1 and TT2. Considering that the explicit sexual content serves as a tool to foreground the horrifying circumstances of war, this result also suggests that both TTs somehow diluted one of the crucial intended effects of the novel.

6. CONCLUSION

In the theoretical intermingling, where Critical Discourse Analysis and Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies create a constituting relationship, we designate the euphemization processes as analytical tools to (re)consider discourse built in translated texts as a socially and ideologically constrained process and a potent indicator of socio-political and cultural transition in a society. Within the framework of this integrated enhanced framework, we first view the production and reception of *Boyalı Kuş* in two different Turkish contexts. Then, in the study’s descriptive stage, we explained the discursive processes in sexually-loaded passages in the form of euphemistic components embedded in the texts. Lastly, within the framework of explanatory constituent, we provided

interpretations of the conventions and conditions that regulate and manipulate text production within the given socio-political context.

The study of euphemization with this integrated approach has produced important insights into the exploration of the underlying ideological exercise of power in text production and in the wider socio-political context. As euphemistic strategies are planned to conform to an accepted social format of the target culture rather than confront its norms and values, it is deemed to be an efficient way for the publishing world to cope with the conflicting interests of public, publisher and translator and source text. It simply enhances sustainable publication organization and minimizes the risk of censorship, prohibition and confiscation.

The act of euphemization concomitantly creates a paradox, a self-censorship mechanism to filter out and evade unwanted ideological/cultural elements of a ST. This not only provides a pertinent explanation of socio-political and cultural dynamics surrounding the translation process and of the subjectivity of the translators themselves together with their intimate choices and work ethics but also an invaluable gateway to understand power relations in the society. According to Pym, it is a natural artifact of translation process harboring the concept of risk and reward, namely, a possible means of unifying the two laws: "Translators will tend to avoid risk by standardizing language and/or channeling interference, if and when there are no rewards for them to do otherwise" (Pym 2008: 323). Hence, euphemism inevitably becomes a self-censorship tool for translators, who act as gatekeepers in cross-cultural communication, bypass the political obstacles put up by the local patronage, ensure the trouble-free publication of the book, and thus enable publications to be in congruence with the official discourse.

For Reynolds "In a climate of semi-censorship, translation becomes a form of euphemism. And the trouble with euphemism is that it is always liable to be taken as innuendo" (Reynolds 2007: 188). He underlines semi-censorship as an implicit form conducted through euphemization without threatening the existence of the whole source text. This subtler, less aggressive form, however, does downplay the tone of the novel, in which the horrors of war are depicted through horrifying scenes of sexual assaults and violence, i.e., a key stylistic element of the novel, as "euphemism acts on taboos that the speaker attempts to tone down or disguise" (Crespo Fernández 2005: 79).

As evidenced from the press law and regulations and publication bans, translation has always had an interminable engagement with political and ideological agendas of Turkey. With left and right-wing polarization caused by the youth movements which marked the late 1960s, the political function of translation was foregrounded;

although the Translation Bureau continued to be active until 1966, this time it was not the state but various private publishers whose leftist orientation gave rise to a re-contextualization of the social role of translation. (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2009: 48)

Among these publishers, E Yayınları attained widespread recognition by printing adversary books in which wisdom literature was at work on the reconstruction and representation of reality. The early 1970s was an era when political temperature and social sensitivity were at their highest level. A great deal of euphemization strategies employed in Emeç's target text points to the turbulent socio-political context of the country in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In contrast, following the acquittal of the charge of publishing obscene books in 1972, and being no longer threatened by this issue, E Yayınları published Çetinol's more liberated version in 2018, embracing its inherited pioneering ideology 50 years after the first edition.

In conclusion, this amalgamated approach explicitly reveals that

[...] translation [...] is not simply an act of faithful reproduction, but rather, a deliberate and conscious act of selection, assemblage, structuration, and fabrication —and even in some cases, of falsification, refusal of information, counterfeiting, and the creation of secret codes. (Tymoczko & Gentzler 2002: xxi)

In this framework, as a primary mirror of culturally and politically-motivated mental maps, language functions to propagate ideological hegemony. In light of this assumption, translators, constrained by the relations of domination and exploitation in their society's dominant ideas, will inevitably internalize this diffused ideology and induce consent to its all institutional and private manifestations. Then, as a text producer, a translator has to prepare convincing defenses against potential criticism by manipulating risky expressions concerning the sensibilities or preferences of target reader, publisher and institutional authority (Oktar & Kansu-Yetkiner 2012: 337).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

ST: KOSINSKI, J. (1981), *The painted bird*, Toronto, London, Bantam Books.

TT1: KOSINSKI, J. (1968), *Boyalı kuş*, translated by Aydın Emeç, İstanbul, E Yayınları.

TT2: KOSINSKI, J. (2018), *Boyalı kuş*, translated by Zeynep Umuroğlu Çetinol, İstanbul, E Yayınları.

Secondary sources

ALFONSO, N. L. (2005), "Survival in Kosinski's *The Painted Bird*", *Ac. De Cs. Humanas*, 7, 99-107.

ALLAN, K. & BURRIDGE, K. (1991), *Euphemism and dysphemism: Language used as shield and weapon*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

AKIMOTO, M. (1995), "Grammaticalization and idiomatization", *Lacus Forum*, 21, 583-590.

- AKTENER, I. (2017), *Censorship and literary translation in Turkey: Translating obscenity after 'The Soft Machine' and 'Snuff' court cases*, doctoral thesis, Edinburgh, Heriot-Watt University.
- AKTENER, I. (2019), "Censorship and literary translation: Translating obscenity after The Soft Machine and Snuff court cases", *Neohelicon*, 46(1), 347-367.
- AL-ADWAN, A. S. (2015), "Towards a model of euphemization in Arabic subtitling", *Arab World English Journal*, 4, 6-21.
- BIA HABER MERKEZİ. *Hakkında dava açılan çevirmene destek: Yayıncılığımız sansür kiskacına sokuluyor* [online]. İstanbul: *Bianet*, Bia Haber Merkezi, 23/03/2020 [Access date: 05/04/2022]. Available at: <<https://m.bianet.org/bianet/medya/221838-hakkında-dava-acılan-cevirmene-destek-yayinciligimiz-sansur-kiskacına-sokuluyor>>.
- BURRIDGE, K. (2012), «Euphemism and language change: The sixth and seventh ages», *Lexis*, 7, 65-92.
- BROWN, P. & LEVINSON, S. C. (1987), *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- CHILTON, P. (1987), "Metaphor, euphemism, and the militarization of language", *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, 10(1), 7-19.
- CRESPO FERNÁNDEZ, E. (2005), "Euphemistic strategies in politeness and face concerns", *Pragmalingüística*, 13, 77-86.
- DUDZIAK, P. *Jerzy Kosiniński* [online]. Culture.pl: June 2003 [Access date: 01/04/2022]. Available at: <https://archive.vn/20130416081123/http://www.culture.pl/web/english/resources-film-full-page/-/eo_event_asset_publisher/eAN5/content/jerzy-kosinski>.
- E YAYINLARI (2018), "E Yayınları ve Boyalı Kuş'un 50. yılı", in *Boyalı kuş*, Kosinski, J. (aut.), İstanbul, E Yayınları, pp. 7-8.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1992a), *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1992b), "Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis", *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193-217.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1995), "Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities", *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 133-168.
- HJORT-PEDERSEN, M. & FABER, D. (2010), "Explicitation and implicitation in legal translation – A process study of trainee translators", *Meta*, 55(2), 249-250.
- HOLMES, J. S. (1988 [1972]), "The name and nature of translation studies", in *Translated!: Papers on literary translation and translation studies*, Holmes, J. S. (aut.), Amsterdam, Rodopi, pp. 66-80.
- İŞBUĞA-EREL, F. (2008), "Where translation studies meets critical social theory", in *Thinking translation: Perspectives from within and without*, Hyde Parker, R. & Guadarrama Garcia, K. (eds.), Florida, Brown Walker Press, pp. 69-86.
- JARNIEWICZ, J. (2004), "The terror of normality in Jerzy Kosinski's 'The Painted Bird'", *The Polish Review*, 49(1), 641-652.
- KARAKARTAL, M. *Boyalı Kuş'tan Muhteşem Yüzyıl'a* [online]. *Hürriyet*: 26/01/2016 [Access date: 15/03/2022] Available at: <<https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/melike-karakartal/boyali-kustan-muhtesem-yuzyila-40045388>>.
- KABACALI, A. (1990), *Başlangıçtan günümüze Türkiye'de basın sansürü*, İstanbul, Gazeteciler Cemiyeti Yayını.
- KAYIŞ, N. & HÜRKAN, S. (2012), *Sansürsüz sansür tarihi (1795 - 2011)*, İstanbul, Sinemis Yayınları.

- LINFOOT-HAM, K. (2005), "The linguistics of euphemism: A diachronic study of euphemism", *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4(2), 227-263.
- MARAKOĞLU, O. A. (2014), *Edepsiz kitaplar: Edebiyat eserleri ve müstehcenlik suçu bağlamında bir hukuk eleştirisi*, Ankara, Liberte Yayınları.
- MESZAROS, P. K. (1979), "Hero with a thousand faces, child with no name: Kosinski's 'The Painted Bird'", *College Literature*, 6(3), 232-244.
- OKTAR, L. & KANSU-YETKINER, N. (2012), "Different times, different themes in Lady Chatterley's Lover: A diachronic critical discourse analysis of translator's prefaces", *Neohelicon*, 39(2), 337-364.
- PYM, A. (2008), "On Toury's laws of how translators translate", in *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies*, Pym, A., Shlesinger, M. & Simeoni, D. (eds.), Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 311-341.
- REYNOLDS, M. (2007), "Semi-censorship in Dryden and Browning", in *Modes of censorship and translation: national contexts and diverse*, Billiani, F. (ed.), New York, Routledge, pp. 187-205.
- RICHTER, D. H. (1974), "The Three Denouements of Jerzy Kosinski's 'The Painted Bird'", *Contemporary Literature*, 15(3), 370-385.
- SANTAEMILIA, J. (2008), "The translation of sex-related language: the danger(s) of self-censorship(s)", *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 21(2), 221-252.
- SKAU, M., CARROLL, M. & CASSIDAY, D. (1982), "Jerzy Kosinski's 'The Painted Bird': A modern bestiary", *The Polish Review*, 27(3/4), 45-54.
- STULOV, Y. (2015), "Factuality and fictionality in A. Adamovich's Khatyn Story and Out Of Flames and J. Kosinski's The Painted Bird", *Ostrava Journal of English Philology*, 7(2), 33-46.
- ŞAHHÜSEYİNOĞLU, N. (2005), *Dünden bugüne düşünceye ve basına sansür*, İstanbul, Paragraf.
- TAHIR-GÜRÇAĞLAR, Ş. (2009), "Translation, presumed innocent, translation and ideology in Turkey", *The Translator*, 15(1), 37-64.
- THOMPSON, J. B. (1990), *Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- TOURY, G. (1995), *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- TOURY, G. (1998), "A handful of paragraphs on 'translation' and 'norms'", *Current Issues in Language and Society: Translation and Norms*, 5 (1/2), 9-31.
- TYMOCZKO, M. (2000), "Translation and political engagement: Activism, social change, and the role of translation in geopolitical shifts", *The Translator*, 6(1), 23-47.
- TYMOCZKO, M. (2009), "Censorship and self-censorship in translation: ethics and ideology, resistance and collusion", in *Translation and censorship: patterns of communication and interference*, Ní Chuilleánáin, E., O Cuilleánáin, C. & Parris, D. (eds.), Dublin, Four Courts Press, pp. 24-45.
- TYMOCZKO, M. & GENTZLER, E. (2002), *Translation and power*, Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press.
- WARREN, B. (1992), "What euphemisms tell us about the interpretation of words", *Studia Linguistica*, 46(2), 128-172.
- VICE, S. (2003), *Holocaust fiction*, Abingdon, Routledge.
- VINAY, J. P. & DARBELNET J. (1995), *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- ZÜRCHER, E. J. (2004), *Turkey: A modern history*, London, I. B. Tauris.



Llevat que s'hi indiqui el contrari, els continguts d'aquesta revista están subjectes a la llicència de Creative Commons: Reconeixement 3.0 Espanya.