SCIENTIFIC CULTURE

www.sci-cult.com

SCIENTIFIC CULTURE, Vol. 12, No. 5, (2026), pp. 3314-3325
Open Access. Online & Print

10.5281/zenodo.22761821

TEACHING LITERARY TRANSLATION THROUGH HEMINGWAY: A PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON WORD-FORMATION PATTERNS

Susanna Grigoryan[1] and Sirarpi Karapetyan[2]

[1]PhD in Philology, Associate Professor Yerevan State University. Email: susannagrigoryan@ysu.am
[2]PhD in Philology, Associate Professor Yerevan State University. Email: sirarpikarapetyan@ysu.am

Received:02/04/2026
Accepted: 20/05/2026

Corresponding Author: Susanna Grigoryan (susannagrigoryan@ysu.am)

ABSTRACT

One of the most difficult areas of translator training is literary translation, which requires students to combine critical analysis, stylistic competence, cultural sensitivity, and linguistic comprehension. Since there are sometimes structural and semantic variations between English and the target languages, translating word-formation patterns and related lexical-structural shifts is a major difficulty. Thus, translator education should provide students with the theoretical background and practical techniques that enable them to select an appropriate translation strategy in a given context. The present study examines the pedagogical value of teaching literary translation through Ernest Hemingway's novella The Old Man and the Sea, focusing on the translation of word-formation patterns and related lexical and structural transformations into Armenian. The English source text is compared with two Armenian translations rendered by V. Mikayelyan and N. Jaghinyan. Using a qualitative comparative textual approach, this study analyzes the translation strategies employed by the two translators and considers how authentic examples may be integrated into university translator training. The study is based on textual analysis and does not report an empirical classroom intervention, rather, it proposes pedagogical applications derived from the comparative analysis of authentic translation examples. The findings show that translating word-formation patterns is a complex process that goes beyond formal equivalency. To guarantee semantic accuracy, fluidity, and stylistic impact, translators may use addition, omission, structural modification, paraphrasing, descriptive translation, borrowing, and lexical simplification.

KEYWORDS: Literary Translation; Translation Pedagogy; Translator Training; Word Formation; Compounding; Derivation; Translation Strategies; Higher Education; Ernest Hemingway; The Old Man and The Sea.

Copyright: © 2026. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License. (https://cre-ativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. INTRODUCTION

The educational importance of literary translation lies not just in familiarizing students with translation theory, but in allowing them to cultivate skills in analysis, language, and interpretation within an authentic textual context.

Modern translator education trends in fact point towards learner-centred approaches where students are involved in problem-solving rather than rule application, for according to Kiraly (2015) translator competence is formed through learning in a community, reflection and actively undertaking translation tasks in a realistic context. González Davies (2020) also states that literary texts are perfect to foster in students' critical thinking, translator decisions and professional judgment.

Classroom analysis of literary works therefore encourages students to compare alternative translation solutions, evaluate translators' choices, and understand how linguistic decisions shape the quality and stylistic impact of the translated text. Such activities contribute not only to the development of translation competence but also to students' morphological awareness and critical reasoning, which are very important components of a professional translator training (EMT Expert Group, 2022).

The present paper explores the pedagogical value of Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* as a resource for teaching literary translation at the university level. Particular attention is paid to the translation of compound and derived lexical units in the English original and in two Armenian translations by V. Mikayelyan and N. Jaghinyan.

In doing so, the article seeks to demonstrate that authentic literary texts constitute valuable pedagogical resources for integrating linguistic theory with translation practice and for fostering the development of translator competence in higher education (Kelly, 2005; PACTE Group, 2017).

The present research is based on a qualitative-comparative approach at the intersection of Translation Studies, Morphology, and Translation pedagogy. By analysing authentic examples drawn from Hemingway's novella, alongside two Armenian translations the study demonstrates how comparative textual analysis can enhance students' understanding of lexical and morphological structures while simultaneously encouraging collaborative learning, critical evaluation, and reflective decision-making. In this respect, the article contributes to the growing body of scholarship advocating the use of authentic literary materials as an effective means of bridging theoretical knowledge and professional translation practice (Kiraly, 2015; González Davies, 2020).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Literary Translation As A Component Of Translator Education

Literary translation is crucial to Translation Studies because it requires translators to balance the original text's linguistic, stylistic, cultural, and artistic elements. Additionally, Baker (2018) emphasizes the importance of acceptance and equivalency. In addition to language proficiency, future literary translators must be trained in cultural awareness, critical interpretation, and deliberate decision-making (Kelly, 2005).

Because it requires students to strike a balance between stylistic, cultural, and esthetic considerations and semantic accuracy, literary translation stands out as a particularly difficult area of translator education. Literary translation, as opposed to technical translation, often requires translators to make informed interpretive decisions and rarely allows for exact equivalency. Contemporary methods in translator education focus on learner-centered strategies that integrate theoretical understanding with real-world translation experiences.

For instance, "It may be concluded that the most effective learning occurs in learner-centred communities of learners where meaning-negotiation and self-justification lead to the development of translation competency," (Kiraly 2015, 6).

"A teaching methodology designed to stimulate real translation practice using authentic material and teamwork should be a central element in the training of translator" (González Davies 2020, 102).

These pedagogical approaches allow students to choose among possible options, analyse alternatives, compare results, develop translation skills, and recognise that literary translation cannot aim at a single definitive rendering; rather, each translation represents one choice among several possible solutions. The literature on literary translation and translator training contains relatively few studies on the pedagogical application of word-formation analysis in the English–Armenian context, and even fewer studies comparing multiple published literary translations. The present study fills this gap in the literature by drawing on translation studies, morphological analysis, and translation pedagogy to conduct a comparative analysis of Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea and its two published Armenian translations.

2.2. Word Formation And Translation

Morphological differences between languages form one of the major challenges in literary translation. Beyond its grammatical function, word formation reflects the way in which individual languages conceptualize and organize meaning. Therefore, it often happens that for words equivalent lexemes cannot be found in other languages so a translator must use different compensatory techniques. In the case of English there is abundant use of compounds and derivation to find brief lexis whereas Armenian often (not always) expresses similar meanings through descriptive constructions or syntactic expansion rather than through compact compounds.

So direct formal equivalence is often impossible, even if semantic equivalence can be achieved. Catford (1965) was one of the first to distinguish between linguistic and cultural untranslatability and pointed out the problems of translation when structural and cultural aspects make direct equivalence not possible between source and target languages. However, despite numerous critiques of impossibility of absolute translation his differentiation remains useful. The conceptual background is that often a translator needs to change the linguistic structure to what is more similar with the structure of the target languages. A good example Baker (2018) provides shows that it is quite a number of cases that lexeme non-equivalence might result in cases of culture-specific word concepts, semantic complexity, differential semantic breakdown and difference in the word-formation systems. Baker lists a number of solutions applicable to such issues, for instance, *paraphrase, generalization, cultural substitution, omissions, as well as additions*.

Such ways are very effective when translating into literary field because to preserve stylistic features can be the same task as to keep proposable meaning.

Later work in Translation Studies, including Chesterman (2016), reinforces this view by means of treating morphological choice not only as a linguistic matter but also as part of the translator's strategic decision-making. Translators must constantly assess how morphological choices affect communication, particularly in the absence of comparable structural forms. As a result, translating compound and derived terminology sometimes necessitates striking a balance between stylistic appropriateness in the target language and faithfulness to the original text.

2.3. Teaching Literary Translation Through Authentic Texts

Translation studies scholarship increasingly emphasizes learner-centered methodologies which incorporate authentic tasks instead of classroom exercises limited to language study. According to González Davies (2020), it is through engaging with authentic texts that students learn how to face linguistic, cultural and stylistic issues as professional translators. This way they are prepared both for their analytical role and decision-making autonomous position.

Literary texts provide rich linguistic, grammatical, and stylistic features exposing students to authentic translation challenges.

Thus, they serve as useful training ground where theoretical knowledge and practical translation experience can meet and interact (Kelly, 2005). Comparing published translations can indeed be one highly useful didactic tool. Rather than searching for a single "correct" translation, students compare published versions, evaluate alternative solutions, and reflect on the factors influencing translators' decisions. They become aware that each translation reflects the chosen texts' contexts, intended functions, target text genre and also translators' reading and conceptualization of the source material (Baker, 2018; Chesterman, 2016).

They, thus, begin to see the professional act of literary translation as a complex process of informed decision-making, rather than as the blind mechanical transformation of source-linguistic components into the target language.

Collaboration is equally considered by numerous approaches of present-day translator education. Kiraly's (2015) social constructivist approach to training advocates that professional translator competencies develop via *dialogue, reflection, group problem solving, negotiation of meaning* rather than by a mere memorisation of normative translation guidelines. Furthermore, in the EMT Competence Framework (2022) collaboration and reflective practice are stated among key qualities for a professional translator.

Hence, group discussions, pair work involving critical feedback, and comparative analysis of parallel texts are highly beneficial for students, helping them build their translational skills and professional judgment along with their critical thinking abilities and capacity for professional development.

2.4. Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man And The Sea As A Pedagogical Resource

Particularly good material for translator education can be found in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. Despite its apparent stylistic simplicity, *The Old Man and the Sea* contains

numerous lexical, stylistic, and cultural compounds that present significant challenges for translators. "Hemingway...employed succinct diction, syntactical sparsity and economy, word choice which has come to be known as The Iceberg Theory, under which much meaning resides in what is unstated and is available for the reader to draw inferences from" (Baker, 1969).

These and other stylistic features make it a difficult task for any translator to render its explicit meaning while also conveying the implicit expressivity and accuracy of style of the original. It is a highly appropriate tool for the study of the translation of word-formation patterns, since the novella contains numerous compound words, derived forms, and lexical combinations that provide rich material for examining the translation of word-formation patterns. In the words of Baker (2018) "Non-equivalence arises quite often at the lexical level from the differences in morphologial and semantic structures of languages, for what reason it can be profitable to use literary texts when working on different translation procedures".

The fact that there are two Armenian translations of the text made it a very good choice for comparative analysis, as students can compare how different translators dealt with the same linguistic problems with different translation choices.

Thus, comparative study of the English source text with the translation versions of the Armenian translations (V. Mikayelyan and N. Jaghinyan) proves that literary translation is not just formal linguistic substitution, but is a complex process of interpretation, evaluation and problem-solving, influenced by many linguistic, cultural and stylistic factors (Venuti, 2018). It therefore serves not only as an object of literary analysis, but as a pedagogical instrument in developing translators' competence, morphological awareness, analytical skills among other relevant attributes of a translator in higher education.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The study employed qualitative-comparative research design for the academic domains of Translation Studies, literary translation and translator education. The pedagogical application of literary works in translator training is examined in this research by comparative analysis of Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea and its Armenian translations by V. Mikayelyan and N. Jaghinyan.

Rather than evaluating translation performance from a prescriptive perspective, this study examines published translations as pedagogical resources for translator education. Particular focus is placed on the treatment of compound and derived lexical words, since these units commonly manifest relationships between language systems, making their linguistic, morphological, and stylistic equivalence the challenging task. This analytical viewpoint correlates with descriptive branches of Translation Studies which are aimed at describing translators' decisions not prescribing a particular perfect one (Toury, 2012). The hypothesis of this article is based on the recognition of the literary translation as efficient way for the teachers to enhance students' linguistic awareness, analytical ability and ability of practical translation profession.

Following a constructivist way of pedagogy of Kiraly (2015) and the competencies of European Master of Translation (EMT) Competence Framework (2022) in practice, we focus not on the authentic examples as simple language units but as valuable teaching tools that foster teamwork, self-directed thinking, conscious reflection and independent translator decisions.

3.2. Research Materials

The corpus analysed in this study consists of three primary texts:

- Ernest Hemingway's original English novella *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952)
- the Armenian translation by V. Mikayelyan (2008)
- the Armenian translation by N. Jaghinyan (2016)

The selection of these texts is particularly appropriate because the two Armenian translations represent different translation traditions and methodological approaches. Whereas Mikayelyan's version was produced through Russian as an intermediary language, Jaghinyan's translation was prepared directly from the English original. This distinction creates valuable opportunities for comparative analysis and enables students to observe how different translation pathways may influence lexical, morphological, and stylistic choices. Such comparisons further illustrate that translation strategies are shaped not only by linguistic differences but also by translators' interpretative decisions and the conditions under which translations are produced (Venuti, 2018; Baker, 2018).

The corpus contains numerous examples of compound words, derived lexical units, analytical constructions, and lexical combinations that provide

rich material for investigating translation strategies at both the lexical and morphological levels. These authentic examples constitute the empirical basis of the present study and serve as the principal instructional material for illustrating how comparative literary translation can contribute to the development of translator competence in higher education.

3.3. Analytical Framework

The analysis combines linguistic and pedagogical perspectives. From the linguistic perspective, attention is paid to the translation of:

- compound lexical units;
- derived words;
- analytical constructions;
- synthetic constructions;
- lexical equivalence;
- structural transformations.

From the pedagogical perspective, the study evaluates how these examples may be incorporated into translator training in higher education. The analysis therefore extends beyond the description of translation solutions to consider their educational value in developing students' translation competence.

The discussion is informed by established concepts in Translation Studies, particularly *equivalence, translation strategies, paraphrase, addition, and structural transformation*, while also drawing upon contemporary approaches to translator education that emphasize reflective learning and collaborative classroom practice.

4. RESULTS AND PEDAGOGICAL DISCUSSION

4.1. Introducing Literary Translation In The Classroom

Teaching literary translation should begin with the development of students' conceptual understanding of the nature and objectives of literary translation. Prior to carrying out practical tasks, students need to be reminded that when we talk about translating literature, the translation process consists not only of transferring meanings, but also translating textual features such as impact on readers, narrative structure, authorial voice, and stylistic impression (Venuti, 2018; Baker, 2018). An introduction lecture will help introduce the students to basic concepts, such as the concepts of equivalency, untranslatability (linguistic and cultural), translation strategies, and decision-making on the part of the translator. Even though lectures have been considered efficient in introducing theory concepts to a large group of people (Kiraly, 2015; González Davies, 2020), lectures are likely to become more effective when used together with some active learning activities for student involvement.

Students will need to have some ideas, based on literary translation problems in texts, as to how they could try to resolve problems in literature texts and compare these with the models that are known in the field of translation, which allows them to go from passive receivers to participants and reflective translators – which reflects on a student-centred approach in Translator Education (Kiraly, 2015; González Davies, 2020).

Through multimedia presentations, guided discussion, and illustrative examples, presentation aids and brief discussions, one can effectively illustrate differences of linguistic and culturally tied untranslatability. The classification established by Catford (1965), provides with an appropriate theoretical background to explain, why certain words in the target language have no similar equivalent, because they carry the meanings within a specific language to the foreign one, thereby leading in the translator taking his/her decision for other forms to transfer that (specific) linguistic meaning and (special) functionality. Moreover, students will be exposed to lexical non-equivalence, a concept characterized by the fact that the translator can come across lexical units in the source language which do not have any exact equivalent in target languages; there exist both (structural and/or semantic and/or semantic and cultural) reasons which prohibit exact equivalency (Baker, 2018) which are considered to make the translators free to select the strategy that best preserves the communicative function of the source text. Here, the translator should rather focus on equivalent communicative impact than formal sameness (Chesterman, 2016).

4.2. Brainstorming As A Pre-Translation Activity

Brainstorming is useful for activating students' prior knowledge of Ernest Hemingway, his literary style, and The Old Man and the Sea. As a student-centred activity, it allows learners to demonstrate their existing knowledge while enabling the instructor to identify and address gaps in background knowledge.

Such student-centred activities are widely associated with collaborative knowledge construction and enhanced interaction in translator training (Kiraly, 2015; González Davies, 2020). Discussion may address Hemingway's importance in

twentieth-century American literature, the distinctive features of his style, and the Armenian translations of The Old Man and the Sea. Students' responses can be collected on a board or a digital platform.

As a result of this collaborative discussion, students gradually construct a shared knowledge base, which can be represented as a collaboratively created and continuously developing knowledge map. This map then serves as a solid foundation for subsequent translation activities, further work, and discussion (Kiraly, 2015).

Based on this collective activity, the lecturer can summarize the key points and provide additional scholarly context. This process bridges students' prior knowledge and the theoretical framework while maintaining their active role in learning (Kiraly, 2015). Students should, in particular, become aware of Hemingway's contribution to twentieth-century American literature and of the concision, economy, and implication characteristic of his prose.

They have, for instance, the challenge of knowing what we mean when we talk about the conciseness of language that Ernest Hemingway uses and about economy, implication and reliance on implication rather than explicit explanation.

He greatly influenced writers who came after him.

His iceberg theory implies that one has to use much, but say little. Half a dozen details of the thing we are writing; half a dozen other telling effects which you know. But what, in writing what we all of us write, makes the truth, if anything makes truth, have its effect when we express ourselves.

For if a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the observer, through intelligence, will already know them (qtd. Baker, 1969, p. 77) this statement will also bring another translation problem, namely that of the implications to be translated as well as the simplicity of tone he achieves (Venuti, 2018). Further details should be given on the publication of the novel The Old Man and the Sea which brought Hemingway international recognition worldwide and subsequently was granted the Nobel literary prize.

This would also allow the lecturer to highlight the impact on their literary interest and intercultural awareness (Kelly, 2005; EMT Expert Group, 2022).

4.3. Teaching The Translation Of Word-Formation Patterns

One of the principal objectives of translator education is to develop students' awareness of how different languages organize lexical meaning through their respective word-formation systems. Although English and Armenian employ comparable mechanisms of derivation and compounding, important structural differences frequently require translators to move beyond formal correspondence in order to achieve functional equivalence (Baker, 2018; Catford, 1965). Developing students' sensitivity to such morphological differences contributes directly to the acquisition of translation competence as defined by the EMT Competence Framework (2022).

The comparative analysis of the given novella and its Armenian translations suggests that there are different strategies chosen by translators when translating compound and derived words and word-units. The choice of these translation equivalents can provide an excellent stimulus for discussion in a classroom context since it shows how complicated lexical equivalence is and confirms the fact that translation per se is an activity of linguistically reasoned decision-making (Chesterman, 2016; Toury, 2012). As Baker (2018) points out that "lexical equivalence not necessarily consists in formal correspondence between language items; quite often it hinges upon context, on semantic and cultural factors".

In view of enhancing students' participation, the research recommends using the method of 'jigsaw' where learners study one fragment of translator's work in expert groups and present information on another to students' classmates (Kiraly, 2015).

In the given way cooperative learning enables to study various kinds of translation strategy, provides opportunity to "justify their translations, to argue about meanings, and to build reflective professional competence" (González Davies, 2020).

4.4. Translation Of Compound Words Into Derived Forms

The **first** group analyses cases in which English compound or analytical constructions are rendered as derived lexical units in Armenian. Such examples enable students to examine how differences between the word-formation systems of English and Armenian influence translators' lexical and morphological choices (Baker, 2018; Catford, 1965).

Consider the following example:

... of a Portuguese man-of-war floating close beside the boat (p. 12).... *նավակին հպված-լողացող պորթուգալական ֆիզալիայից (Ն. Ջ., p. 27):... պորտուգալական ֆիզալիայից, որը լողում էր նավակից քիչ հեռու (Վ. Մ., p. 18):*

Here, the translators apply various strategies.

Jaghinyan maintains the compactness of the source language by using a morphologically unified expression in Armenian; Mikayelyan converts the expression into a paratactical descriptive structure in Armenian. This comparison example proves that, while yielding an equal output meaning, translation approaches to language-specific structures such as compounding can and will vary due to the translator's artistic taste and linguistic background.

It follows, as Chesterman (2016) claims, that 'translators very often differ in what they do in the same situation: in solving the same translational problems they may have recourse to different types of translation procedure'(p.103), proving to a great extent that it is a process of choosing different strategies rather than following pre-established linguistics-oriented matches.

It will be interesting to ask learners whether in their opinion the first version corresponds better to the notion of lexical economy. This could be followed by discussing how important lexical economy is for the text as well as to compare conciseness to the clarity of the phrasing, which depends also on stylistic considerations and translators' stylistic choices to take.

4.5. Compound Words Translated As Simple Lexical Items

The second student group investigates cases in which English compound words are translated as simple lexical items in Armenian. Such examples demonstrate how translators may simplify the lexical structure of the source text in order to produce a natural and contextually appropriate target-language equivalent while preserving its communicative meaning (Baker, 2018; Chesterman, 2016).

E.g. *The shack was made of the tough budshields of the royal palm which are called guano...* (p. 4)

Խրճիթը հյուսված էր արքայական արմավենու կոշտ տերևներից, որոնք կոչվում են guano... (Ն. Ջ., p. 12):

Գայմը գրեթե նույնքան երկար էր, որքան խրճիթը, որ շինված էր այդ վայրում guano կոչվող արքայական արմավենու տերևներից: (Կ. Մ., p. 5):

In both Armenian translations, the English compound *budshields* is rendered by the simple lexical item *տերևներից* ("leaves"). Thus, both translators employ lexical simplification, replacing the structurally more complex English compound with a natural simple lexical item in Armenian. Although the Armenian equivalent does not reproduce the morphological structure or the full lexical specificity of *budshields*, it conveys the relevant contextual meaning and contributes to the fluency and naturalness of the target text.

The two translations differ slightly in the treatment of the surrounding descriptive element. Jaghinyan explicitly renders the adjective *tough* as *կոշտ* ("tough"), whereas Mikayelyan omits this descriptive element. This difference, however, does not affect the translation procedure applied to the compound *budshields*, since both translators render it as the same simple lexical item, *տերևներից.*

This example demonstrates that the translation of English compounds does not necessarily involve the reproduction of their morphological structure in the target language. Instead, translators may select a simpler lexical equivalent when it adequately conveys the contextually relevant meaning and sounds more natural in Armenian. Such a strategy reflects the broader tendency in literary translation to prioritise semantic clarity, textual fluency, and target-language conventions over strict structural correspondence (Baker, 2018; Toury, 2012; Chesterman, 2016).

For classroom discussion, students may be encouraged to evaluate the advantages and limitations of each translation strategy. Rather than identifying one solution as inherently superior, they should consider how each choice affects precision, stylistic nuance, and the reader's perception of the literary text. This activity also encourages learners to justify their evaluations and develop reflective translation competence through comparative textual analysis (Kiraly, 2015; González Davies, 2020).

4.6. Translation Of Finite Verb Forms Into Analytical Constructions

The third student group examines instances in which *a finite verb form* in the source text is rendered by means of an analytical construction in the Armenian translation. Such examples illustrate that translators often introduce structural modifications to convey semantic nuances more explicitly in the target language, a phenomenon discussed in relation to translation shifts by Catford (1965) and to translation strategies by Chesterman (2016).

Consider the following passage:

Those who had caught sharks had taken them to the shark factory on the other side of the cove… (p. 2)

Նրանք, ովքեր շնաձկներ էին բռնել, տարել-հանձնել էին դրանք շնաձկան մշակման գործարան ծովածոցի մյուս կողմում... (Ն. Ջ., p. 9):

Այն ձկնորսները, որոնց բռնածը շնաձուկ էր, իրենց որսը հանձնել էին ծովածոցի մյուս կողմը գտնվող շնաձկների մշակման գործարանին (Կ. Մ., p. 2):

Whereas V. Mikayelyan renders the predicate with one lexical verb, Jaghinyan uses the analytical construction *տարել-հանձնել*, indicating clearly the linear progression of the completed action. Jaghinyan's use of an analytical construction is in fact adding further semantic informativity, without the addition creating a change in the propositional content of the text.

Such stylistic choices are, as defined by Toury (2012) not inaccuracies with regard to the SL, but rather interpretations by the translator.

An interesting aspect to consider from a pedagogical point of view, is how students can gain an awareness of grammatical equivalence with, rather than simply without, stylistic analysis, as well as being able to appreciate how a TL translator may make alternative resource selections and still achieve communicative equivalence to the ST, as Baker (2018) and Chesterman (2016) discuss. Such examples are useful for generating classroom discussion of translation choices and developing professional reflective judgement (Kiraly, 2015).

4.7 Descriptive Translation Of Compound Structures

The fourth student group investigates cases in which English compound words are translated through analytical or descriptive constructions, frequently involving the strategy of *addition.*

E.g.,

I wish I was the fish, he thought, *with everything he has against only my will and my intelligence.* (p. 24)

Երանի ես էդ ձուկը լինեի, - մտածում էր նա, - իր եղած-չեղածով հանդերձ՝ մեն-մենակ իմ կամքի ու իմ խելքի դիմաց (Ն. Ջ., p. 47):

Կուզենայի լինել ձուկ և ունենալ այն ամենը, ինչ նա ունի, և ոչ միայն կամք ու խելամտություն (Վ. Մ., p. 35):

The English compound **everything** receives markedly different interpretations in the two Armenian translations. Jaghinyan renders the concept through the analytical expression **եղած-չեղած**, preserving the expressive and idiomatic character of Armenian. Mikayelyan, by contrast, expands the original through a descriptive paraphrase "*ունենալ այն ամենը, ինչ նա ունի*" that explicitly identifies the referential meaning of the lexical item.

This comparison illustrates that literary translation frequently requires translators to balance semantic precision with stylistic expressiveness. Rather than reproducing formal linguistic structures, translators seek solutions that recreate the communicative effect of the original text.

Students may therefore discuss how paraphrase and addition function as legitimate translation strategies, particularly when direct lexical correspondence fails to reproduce the stylistic value of the source text.

4.8. Translation Of Analytical Constructions Into Compound Or Simple Lexical Units

The fifth collaborative group analyses the opposite translation direction, namely, situations in which analytical constructions in the source language are rendered as compound or simple lexical units in Armenian. Such examples demonstrate how translators adapt source-language structures to the lexical and morphological resources of the target language while preserving semantic equivalence and communicative effect (Baker, 2018; Catford, 1965).

Consider the following example:

The blotches ran well down the sides of his face and his hands had the deep-creased scars... (p. 1)

Այդ բծերը սահում-իջնում էին դեմքն ի վար, իսկ ձեռքերին խորածալ սպիներ կային (Ն. Ջ., p. 7):

Այդ բծերը այտերի վրայով իջնում-հասնում էին վզին, ձեռքերի վրա երևում էին խոր սպիներ (Վ. Մ., p. 1):

N. Jaghinyan translates *deep-creased* through the Armenian compound *խորածալ*, thereby preserving the lexical compactness characteristic of the English original. V. Mikayelyan, however, simplifies the expression by using the adjective *խոր*, sacrificing certain semantic nuances while producing a more straightforward rendering. As Chesterman (2016) observes, such translational choices reflect strategic decisions made in response to the linguistic and stylistic requirements of the target text rather than adherence to a single translation procedure.

Such examples demonstrate that lexical simplification may enhance readability but simultaneously reduce the descriptive richness of the source text. Students should therefore evaluate whether the simplified version adequately reproduces Hemingway's imagery or whether the compound construction more successfully preserves the stylistic qualities of the original. This type of comparative analysis encourages learners to recognise that literary translation requires balancing stylistic fidelity with naturalness and communicative effectiveness (Venuti, 2018; Toury, 2012).

4.9. Translation Of Compound Words Into Compound And Derived Structures

The sixth student group focuses on examples where English compounds are translated either by equivalent Armenian compounds or by derived

lexical units. Such examples illustrate how translators make use of the morphological resources of the target language to achieve semantic equivalence while preserving the stylistic effect of the source text (Baker, 2018; Catford, 1965).

E.g.,

... all along the road, in the dark, barefoot men were moving... (p. 9)

... ողջ ճամփին մութի մեջ ***ոտաբոբիկ*** *մարդիկ էին շարժվում... (Ն. Ջ., p. 19)*

... ամբողջ ճանապարհին խավարում պատահում էին իրենց նավակների կայմերը շալակած ***բոբիկ*** *մարդկանց (Վ. Մ., p. 12)*

Here, N. Jaghinyan preserves the compound structure through *ոտաբոբիկ*, whereas Mikayelyan opts for the simpler adjective *բոբիկ***.** This comparison highlights the stylistic implications of lexical choice. While both versions successfully communicate the principal meaning, the compound form conveys greater descriptive vividness and reflects more closely the lexical organization of the source text. As Venuti (2018) observes, literary translation requires translators to balance semantic accuracy with stylistic and aesthetic considerations in order to recreate the expressive qualities of the original.

Students may be invited to discuss whether lexical economy or stylistic expressiveness should take precedence in literary translation and how these priorities influence translator decision-making. Such discussion encourages learners to recognise that different translation solutions may be equally acceptable provided they fulfill the communicative and stylistic functions of the source text (Chesterman, 2016; Toury, 2012). Classroom evaluation of alternative translations also promotes reflective thinking and informed professional judgement (Kiraly, 2015).

4.10. Translation Of Simple Lexical Units Into Analytical And Compound Constructions

The seventh collaborative group examines cases in which a simple lexical unit in the source text is translated either by an analytical construction or by a compound lexical unit in Armenian. Such examples show that the target language occasionally requires greater lexical or structural elaboration in order to reproduce the semantic content and stylistic effect of the original (Baker, 2018; Catford, 1965).

Consider the following example:

...with two men staggering at the end of each plank, to the fish house where they waited for the ice truck *to carry* them to the market in Havana. (p. 3)

... տախտակի ծայրից ճոճվելով բռնած՝ կրում էին ձուկը պահեստ, ուր և սպասում էին սառցարան-վագոնի գալուն, որ եղածը *տանեն-հասցնեն* Հավանայի շուկա (Ն. Ջ., p. 9)

... տախտակի ծայրից երկու-երկու բռնած՝ ձուկը փոխադրում էին պահեստ, որտեղից սառնարան-վագոնով պետք է *տանեին* Հավանայի շուկան **(**Վ. Մ., p. 2)

Although the English verb *carry* is represented by a single lexical item, the Armenian translations demonstrate different degrees of lexical expansion. Jaghinyan renders the action through the analytical construction *տանեն-հասցնեն,* thereby, emphasizing both movement and successful delivery. V. Mikayelyan, in contrast, prefers the simpler predicate *տանեին*, producing a more economical rendering. As Chesterman (2016) notes, translators frequently adopt different strategies to preserve communicative meaning while responding to the structural characteristics of the target language.

This comparison illustrates that analytical constructions may enrich the semantic content of the translation without violating the stylistic simplicity of the source text. Students should therefore recognize that lexical expansion is not necessarily a departure from the original but may represent an effective strategy for reproducing communicative meaning in the target language (Toury, 2012; Baker, 2018).

Another example demonstrates how a simple English lexical unit may be rendered by a compound construction:

"*You bought me a beer,*" *the old man said.* "*You are already a man.*" (p. 2)

— Բայց չէ՞ որ գարեջուր հրամցրիր,— ասաց ծերունին։— Դու արդեն հասած տղամարդ ես (Վ. Մ., p. 3)

— Ինձ համար գարեջուր բերեցիր, դու արդեն տղամարդ ես, — ասաց ծերունին (Ն. Ջ., p. 9)

Here, Mikayelyan employs the expression **հասած տղամարդ**, thereby introducing an additional semantic nuance associated with maturity. Jaghinyan, however, retains the simpler lexical equivalent **տղամարդ**, preserving the concise character of Hemingway's prose. As Venuti (2018) argues, literary translators often balance semantic precision with stylistic economy in order to recreate the expressive effect of the original text.

Such examples encourage students to examine how lexical choice influences characterization and stylistic interpretation in literary translation. Comparative evaluation of alternative solutions also promotes reflective analysis and strengthens students' ability to justify their own translation

decisions in similar contexts (Kiraly, 2015; González Davies, 2020).

4.11. Literal Translation And Borrowing Of Compound Lexical Units

The eighth student group examines compound lexical units that are transferred literally or retained through borrowing in the Armenian translations. In such cases, the lexical structure of the source item is preserved with minimal formal modification, a strategy that is particularly common when the borrowed form is already established and recognizable in the target language. This enables students to observe how borrowing can function as a direct translation solution while preserving semantic economy and cultural reference.

E. g.,

"When I come back, you can tell me about the *baseball."* (p. 4)

— Երբ վերադառնամ, *բեյսբոլի* մասին կպատմես (Վ. Մ., p. 6):

— Երբ ետ գամ, կարող ես պատմել *բեյսբոլի* մասին (Ն. Ջ., p. 13):

In both Armenian translations, the English compound baseball is rendered by the borrowed lexical unit ***բեյսբոլ***. Neither translator replaces the term with a descriptive phrase or a morphologically different Armenian equivalent. The preservation of the borrowed form therefore represents a highly economical solution and maintains the specific cultural reference of the source text. From a pedagogical perspective, students can discuss the circumstances in which borrowing is preferable to paraphrase or substitution, particularly when the target-language readership is already familiar with the foreign lexical item (Baker, 2018; Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995).

The example also demonstrates that formal similarity between source and target items does not necessarily indicate an absence of translational decision-making. Retaining an established borrowing may itself constitute a deliberate strategy aimed at lexical precision, conciseness, and cultural recognizability. Students may therefore evaluate the role of conventional usage in determining whether a borrowed item can function naturally in literary translation.

4.12. Translation Of Phrasal Expressions Into Analytical Constructions

The ninth student group investigates cases in which a complete source-language expression is rendered through an analytical construction in Armenian. Such examples demonstrate that translation may involve restructuring not only individual lexical units but also larger phrases in order to achieve naturalness and stylistic expressiveness in the target language.

Consider the following example:

He was holding his glass and thinking of many years ago (p. 2).

Նա ձեռքին պահած ուներ բաժակը և խորհում էր անցած-գնացած օրերի մասին (Ն. Ջ., p. 9):

Նա նայում էր գարեջրով լի իր բաժակին ու հիշում վաղուց անցած-գնացած օրերը (Վ. Մ., p. 2):

The English temporal expression many years ago is rendered in both Armenian versions through the analytical expression *անցած-գնացած,* with Mikayelyan additionally introducing the adverb *վաղուց.* Rather than reproducing the source phrase word for word, both translators select an idiomatic Armenian construction that conveys temporal remoteness while adding an expressive retrospective quality. The translation thus illustrates how analytical structures can reproduce not only referential meaning but also the emotional and stylistic colouring of a literary passage.

For classroom analysis, students may compare the semantic contribution of *անցած-գնացած* and *վաղուց* and consider whether the additional lexical element in Mikayelyan's version intensifies the sense of temporal distance. Such comparison demonstrates that structural transformation can serve stylistic naturalness and communicative equivalence rather than merely compensate for formal differences between languages (Catford, 1965; Chesterman, 2016).

4.13. Translation Of Derived Lexical Units Into Derived Structures

Finally, the tenth collaborative group examines cases in which derived lexical units in the source text are translated through derived formations in Armenian. This task directs students' attention to derivational correspondence and to the ways in which translators exploit the morphological resources of the target language while adapting lexical meaning to the immediate literary context.

E. g.,

... the old man thought that a gaff and a harpoon were needless temptations (p. 4).

... ծերունին կարծում էր, որ կարթաձողն ու որսատեգը, ամեն դեպքում փորձություն է թողնել մակույկի մեջ (Ն. Ջ., p. 12):

... բայց և այնպես գերադասում էր փորձանքից հեռու պահել կարթաձողը, ասենք և հարպունը (Վ. Մ., p. 5):

The derived adjective *needless* and the noun *temptations* are not reproduced through identical formal structures in Armenian; instead, the translators reorganize the expression by selecting morphologically and semantically appropriate Armenian formations. Jaghinyan uses փորձություն, while Mikayelyan employs փորձանքից within the expression փորձանքից հեռու պահել. Although the two renderings differ structurally and lexically, both communicate the old man's wish to avoid unnecessary risk or temptation associated with leaving the fishing equipment in the boat.

This comparison is pedagogically useful because it demonstrates that derivational correspondence does not require mechanical reproduction of individual morphemes. Students should identify the derivational structure of the relevant source and target units, evaluate the semantic shifts introduced by *փորձություն* and *փորձանք*, and determine how each translator integrates the lexical choice into the syntax of the Armenian sentence. In this way, the exercise reinforces the principle that morphological equivalence in literary translation remains dependent on context, stylistic function, and translator decision-making (Baker, 2018; Chesterman, 2016).

Taken together, the ten collaborative-group tasks demonstrate that Jaghinyan and Mikayelyan employ different solutions for compound, analytical, simple, and derived formations. The differences arise both from structural asymmetries between English and Armenian and from translators' individual choices concerning semantic precision, stylistic naturalness, lexical economy, and expressive effect. Comparing all ten categories therefore provides students with a broader empirical basis for understanding word-formation as a genuine translation problem rather than as a matter of one-to-one formal substitution.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated, through qualitative comparative textual analysis of Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea and two Armenian translations, that no single translation strategy can adequately account for all word-formation patterns. The translators' choices vary according to linguistic context, textual function, semantic precision, lexical economy, and stylistic considerations.

The textual findings show the use of borrowing, paraphrase, addition, lexical simplification, descriptive translation, and structural modification in response to differences between English and Armenian. The comparison also demonstrates that alternative solutions may preserve communicative meaning while differing in morphological structure, semantic specificity, and stylistic effect.

From a pedagogical perspective, these findings provide a basis for the proposed ten collaborative-group activities. The activities are intended to encourage students to compare published translations, justify alternative solutions, and relate morphological analysis to translator decision-making. These educational benefits are proposed on the basis of the textual analysis; they have not yet been demonstrated through empirical classroom testing.

The study is limited to one literary work, one language pair (English-Armenian), and two published Armenian translations. In addition, the proposed pedagogical activities have not been empirically tested with a student cohort, so claims concerning their effects on translation competence should be understood as pedagogical propositions rather than measured learning outcomes.

Future research should extend the analysis to other literary works, genres, language pairs, and translation strategies. It should also test the proposed model through classroom implementation, including pre- and post-assessment of students' translation competence, in order to evaluate more systematically its contribution to translator education.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.G. and S.K.; methodology, S.G. and S.K.; formal analysis, S.G. and S.K.; investigation, S.G. and S.K.; resources, S.G. and S.K.; writing—original draft preparation, S.G. and S.K.; writing—review and editing, S.G. and S.K. Both authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

[1] Abrahamyan, A. (1972). Verlutsakanutyuny hayereni tarber makardaknerum [Analyticity at Different Levels of the Armenian Language]. Patmabanasirakan Handes [Historical-Philological Journal], 3, 44–58.

[2] Baker, C. (1969). *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York: Scribner.

[3] Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

[4] Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press.
[5] Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of Translation* (Revised ed.). John Benjamins.
[6] EMT Expert Group. (2022). *European Master's in Translation Competence Framework 2022–2027*. European Commission.
[7] González Davies, M. (2020). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Education*. Routledge.
[8] Hovsepyan, L. (2009). Barakazmutyan tiper, eghanakner yev mijotsner [Types, Methods and Means of Word Formation]. Jahukyanakan Yntertsumner [Jahukyan Readings], 4, 106–108.
[9] Hovsepyan, L. (2016). Grabari barakazmut'yan verlutsakan tipy [The Analytical Type of Word Formation in Classical Armenian]. Yerevan.
[10] Hemingway, E. (1952). *The Old Man and the Sea*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
[11] Hemingway, E. (2008). *The Old Man and the Sea* (Armenian translation by V. Mikayelyan). Yerevan.
[12] Hemingway, E. (2016). *The Old Man and the Sea* (Armenian translation by N. Jaghinyan). Yerevan.
[13] Kiraly, D. (2015). *Occasioning Translator Competence: Moving Beyond Social Constructivism toward a Postmodern Alternative to Instructionism*. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 10(1), 8–32.
[14] Kelly, D. (2005). *A Handbook for Translator Trainers*. St. Jerome Publishing.
[15] PACTE Group. (2017). *Translation Competence Models and Translator Education*. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*.
[16] Shreve, G. M. (2012). *Cognitive Translatology*. John Benjamins.
[17] Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Revised ed.). John Benjamins.
[18] Venuti, L. (2018). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
[19] Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. John Benjamins.
[20] Zare-Behtash, E., & Firoozkoohi, S. (2019). Literary Translation and Translator Education: Contemporary Perspectives. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 14(2), 211–229.