

“TÜRKÇE SÖYLEYEN” CAN YÜCEL:  
THE “REWRITER” *PAR EXCELLENCE*

ÖZGÜR ÇAVUŞOĞLU

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2007

“TÜRKÇE SÖYLEYEN” CAN YÜCEL:  
THE “REWRITER” *PAR EXCELLENCE*

Thesis submitted to the  
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Translation

by

Özgür Çavuşoğlu

Boğaziçi University

2007

Abstract of the Thesis of Özgür Çavuşoğlu,

“‘Türkçe Söyleyen’ Can Yücel: the ‘Rewriter’ *par excellence*”

This thesis problematizes the poet-translator Can Yücel’s unique translation approach designated as “Türkçe Söyleyen” in the Turkish literary system by analyzing four of his translations in three genres: poetry, drama, and prose fiction. In order to resolve the definitional ambivalence as to whether Yücel’s free translations can be categorized under “translation proper” or under some other label, the study takes up the four key terms used in the discourse on translational output: “imitation,” “adaptation,” “version,” and “rewriting.”

The study demonstrates that André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett’s notion of “rewriting” accounts for Yücel’s specific translation approach in the most thorough way, making him, in fact, the finest practitioner of the designation the “‘rewriter’ *par excellence*.” The four descriptive translation analyses demonstrate that Yücel’s works are “translation proper” and none of the first three terms above can fully define them, because the translator “rewrote” his source texts with his idiosyncratic translation poetics, especially characterized by vocabulary and usages specific to the Turkish language and culture. This poetics of the “Turkish rewriter,” which is sometimes referred to as “Can Babaca” (*Canese*), is based upon a leftist ideology aimed at “colonizing” his source texts.

The textual analyses indicate that while his free strategies help Yücel create “metapoems” in his translations of “Sonnet 66” and “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock,” they hinder literary excellence to a considerable extent in his translations of *The Glass Menagerie* and *The Great Gatsby* because of a drastic shift of register from colloquial to slang. Whereas Yücel’s heavily “appropriating” macro-strategy

foregrounds him as a fine and very “visible” translator of poetry, it indeed “overshadows” the individuality of his two prose translations.

## ÖZET

Bu tez, şair-çevirmen Can Yücel'in Türk yazın sistemi içinde "Türkçe Söyleyen" diye adlandırılan özgün çeviri yaklaşımını, üç edebî türde yaptığı dört çeviriyle inceler. Çalışma, Yücel'in çevirilerinin "dillerarası çeviri" diye mi yoksa bunun dışında başka bir isimle mi kategorize edilmesi gerektiğine dair yaşanan tanımsal kargaşayı çözmek maksadıyla, çeviribilimde kullanılan dört ana terimi konu edinir: "imitasyon," "adaptasyon," "varyant" ve "yeniden yazma."

Bu tez, Yücel'in özgül çeviri yaklaşımını en kapsamlı biçimde açıklayan terimin André Lefevere ile Susan Bassnett'e ait "yeniden yazma" kavramı olduğunu ve Yücel'in de bu kavramın en iyi örneklerini verdiğini ortaya koyar. Çevirmenin dört çevirisi üzerinde yapılan betimleyici inceleme de bizi bu sonuca götürür: Yücel'in çalışmaları "dillerarası çeviri" örnekleridir, yukarıda çeviridışı anlamlar yüklenmiş olan ilk üç terim onun çevirilerini tanımlamakta yetersiz kalır; zira çevirmen, özellikle Türk dili ve kültürüne özgü kullanım ve deyişlerle bezeli, nev'i şahsına münhasır çeviri poetikasıyla kaynak metinlerini "yeniden yazmıştır." "Türkçe Söyleyen" çevirmenin, "Can Babaca" diye anılan bu poetikası, sol bir ideolojiyi temel almış gibi görünür.

Yapılan metin incelemeleri, Yücel'in serbest çeviri stratejilerinin şiir çevirisinde "üst-şiirler" yaratılmasına yol açtığını, ancak bu çalışmada ele alınan oyun ve roman çevirilerinde, sık sık dil düzeyinde halk dilinden argoya kayma nedeniyle Tennessee Williams ve F. Scott Fitzgerald'ın özgül biçemlerinin yeterince yansıtılmadığını ortaya koyar. Yücel'in bu yoğun "kendine mal etme" makro-stratejisi kendisini fazlasıyla "görünür" kılarken, ele aldığı iki yazarı "görünmez" kılar ve farklılıklarını gölgeler.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my thesis advisor Prof. Suat Karantay for his invaluable guidance and meticulous editing. He has generously shared with me his knowledge and experience in literary translation throughout this study, which actually started with his insightful depiction of the poet-translator Can Yücel as “the ‘rewriter’ *par excellence*.”

I would also like to thank Assist. Prof. İsmail Kaplan for encouraging me to take up Yücel’s unique translation approach for my thesis study in the Research Techniques class he taught us. In fact, I really owe a debt of gratitude to all of my distinguished instructors, since this study would not have been possible without their intellectual stimulation and inspiration.

I must also pay tribute to the Turkish Armed Forces for giving me this golden opportunity to further my education.

I am grateful to my beloved wife Özlem for her continuous support and patience, my elder son Yiğit for sharing his room with me, and my little one Ata for offering me some of his valuable play time with Daddy.

Last but not least, since they instilled in me the enthusiasm and perseverance to learn, I dedicate my thesis to the precious memory of my late parents, Türkân Atasoy and Yurdakul Çavuşoğlu, both of whom were candle lights of Turkish education as Atatürk’s dedicated language teachers in their short life spans.

## CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER II: KEY TERMS .....	8
Imitation .....	8
Adaptation .....	12
Version .....	15
Rewriting .....	17
Summary and Conclusions .....	27
CHAPTER III: “TÜRKÇE SÖYLEYEN: CAN YÜCEL” .....	34
Can Yücel and an Overview of His Translated Work .....	34
Critical Assessments of Yücel’s Translations .....	38
“Türkçe Söyleyen” Can Yücel: The “Rewriter” <i>par excellence</i> .....	54
Summary and Conclusions .....	64
CHAPTER IV: “66. SONE” and “MR. PRUFROCK’TAN AŞK ŞARKISI”... ..	70
“66. Sone” .....	70
“Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk Şarkısı” .....	76
Summary and Conclusions .....	85
CHAPTER V: <i>SIRÇA KÜMES</i> .....	90
The Target and the Source Text .....	90
The Plot .....	91
A Critique of the Target Text .....	93
Summary and Conclusions .....	107
CHAPTER VI: <i>MUHTEŞEM GATSBY</i> .....	113
The Target and the Source Text .....	113
The Plot .....	113
A Critique of the Target Text .....	116
Summary and Conclusions .....	131
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION .....	137
APPENDICES .....	149
A. The Cassette Cover of Yücel’s Poetry Translations .....	150
B. Sonnet Translations by Yücel and Talât S. Halman on the Internet .....	151
C. <i>Metis Çeviri</i> ’s Presentation of Three Retranslations from Mallarmé .....	152
D. The Title Page of <i>Fırtına</i> .....	154
E. The Title Page of <i>Hamlet</i> .....	155
F. The Front Cover of <i>Her Boydan</i> in 1957 .....	156
G. A Poetry Translation by Yücel on the Internet .....	157
H. Üstün Akmen’s Programme of 2002-2003 Theatre Season .....	158
I. The Front Cover of <i>Bahar Noktası</i> .....	159
J. The Title Page of <i>Sırça Kümes</i> .....	160
REFERENCES .....	161

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In an interview conducted by Bünyamin Çelebi, the Turkish poet-translator Can Yücel presents his views on poetry translation with the following words:

Şiiri olduğu gibi Türkçe düşünüp Türkçe yazmak taraftarıyım. Bir Rus atasözü var, “Çeviri kadın gibidir, sadığı güzel, güzeli sadık olmaz” diye. Ondan dolayı belki sadakat bakımından hatası olabilir, ama güzelliği, yani Türkçe bir şiir olarak ortaya çıkması daha doğrudur. Yani yarım yamalak bir Türkçeyle, aslına sadık kalıyorum diye çevireceğine, o adam Türkçe yazsaydı bu şiiri, nasıl yazardı diye düşünüp yazmak daha doğru. Bunu ben denedim, çok itirazlar yükseldi. Sonra *Türkçe yazan* demeye mecbur kaldım. (Çelebi 1999: 38, emphasis mine\*)

I am in favor of composing [translated] poetry by thinking in Turkish. There’s a Russian proverb which says: “Translation resembles women; a beautiful translation is not faithful, and a faithful translation is not beautiful.” For this reason, it may not be totally faithful, but the result is a beautiful poem in its own right in Turkish. Instead of translating with a stilted Turkish to conform to the original, it’s better to translate thinking how the poet would have written if he himself wrote in Turkish. I tried doing this, and faced many objections. Thus, I’ve felt compelled to designate myself as *the person writing [the source text] in Turkish*. (translation mine\*)

Yücel here openly states that his translation strategies have received severe criticism and that he had to designate his specific approach as “writing [the source text] in Turkish.” What does this imply? Does one who translates into Turkish normally not write in Turkish? Are Yücel’s translations not translations at all? Should they be designated by a different label? Moreover, Yücel equates or rather is made to equate faithfulness to the source text with sameness. Is a translation an exact copy of its original?

---

\* Unless otherwise stated, all the translations and emphases in this study are mine.

In an interview he gave to Suat Karantay in 1989, Yücel continues to display the ambivalence in his own conception of translation and expresses his exasperation concerning the severe criticism targeted at his translations. In this interview, Yücel argues that his translations are in fact what the Russian translation theorist Roman Jakobson calls “translation proper” (1959: 114), and that they require no other categorization. Karantay’s critical question at this point is whether or not Yücel’s poetry translations resemble his own poems:

Yoksa benim bütün şiirlerime bakın, hiçbiri T.S. Eliot’ın şiirlerine benzemez. Sadece bir tane “Zaman” vardır. Trenden bakıyorum, makıyorum. Onun dışında benim şiirlerimin T.S. Eliot’la hiçbir benzerliği yoktur. Ya da Yeats’le. Bundan dolayı ben tercüme yapıpken, bu sakıncayı ortadan kaldırmak için, Yeats’ten esinlenerek diyorum. Ben çeviriyi de bıraktım artık. *Yeats’ten esinlenerek yazan Can Yücel...* Bu iş bitsin yani. Aman benzedi, benzemedi, bilmem ne etti... *Hâlbuki ben çeviri yapıyorum aslında.* Henri Michaux çeviriyorum şimdi ben. Bayağı dikkat ederek Henri Michaux çeviriyorum ben. Ama hiçbir zaman bu tip itirazlara muhatap olmamak için: Henri Michaux’dan... altına Can Yücel diye atıyorum imzayı. Bu sefer de hırsızlıkla itham edecekler. (1989a: 14)

Look at my own poems: None of them resembles T.S. Eliot’s poetry, except for a single one, “Zaman” (Time), in which the speaker says something like “I’m looking from inside the train.” Other than that, my poems are never like T.S. Eliot’s or Yeats’. For this reason, in order to avoid this problem, I sign my translations as inspired by Yeats. I’ve already stopped using the word “translation”: I just sign as Can Yücel, *writing as inspired by Yeats...* It’s high time that the debate on whether the translation can reflect the original or not came to an end. I’m tired of it... *Actually, what I do is translating.* I do translate Henri Michaux now, in a very careful manner. But to prevent such criticism, I write under it “from Henri Michaux... Can Yücel.” This time, I’m afraid they’ll accuse me of stealing.

Yücel this time uses another definition for his translations: “writing as inspired by [the poet] Yeats”; however he is now quite self-assured. He contends that he is aware of the fact that he is translating. But, what does Yücel mean by “inspired”? Does this word, indeed, connote the term, “imitation,” which is used in translation studies and

which has been defined by several translation scholars and theorists (see Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 73f)?

Can Yücel's ambivalence on what he actually does when he translates a literary work becomes even more pronounced when he refers to his drama translations as "uyarlama," which can be translated into English as "adaptation," another basic term in translation studies (see Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 3-5): "Uyarlama yapıyoruz. Tercüme ediyorum diye bir şey söylemiyorum" / "I make adaptations. I do not claim that I translate" (Karantay 1989a: 16). Yücel is rightfully disconcerted by his critics' reactions; he comes up with another term to describe his translations. Did he really "adapt" dramatic works for the Turkish audience or did he try to translate them into Turkish? Is translation not a form of adaptation in a sense? Yet, in his interview with Çelebi, he explicitly claims that he actually *translated* three plays and two sonnets by Shakespeare (1999: 38): "Shakespeare *çevirisine* gelince. Bugüne kadar üç Shakespeare piyesi, iki de sone *çevirisi yaptım.*" / "As for my Shakespeare *translations*, I've *translated* three of his plays and two sonnets so far."

In his article in the journal *Evrensel*, literary critic Sinan Gündoğar refers to Yücel's drama translations with a totally new phrase: "Ancak bu çeviriler [...] oyunun kurgusunu, kahramanların niteliklerini değiştirmeden oyunları '*yeniden yazma*' tekniğidir. Bu da deyimlerin, mecazların farklı dillerde aynı anlama karşılık gelmemesinden yola çıkarak oluşturduğu bir tekniktir" / "But these translations [...] were made through the technique of '*rewriting*,' without changing the plot of the drama and the characters' traits. He creates this technique because idioms and metaphors differ in different languages" (2000: 1, original emphasis). Although it is difficult to make out what Gündoğar exactly means in his second sentence above, we

can translate into English his designation of Yücel's translations as "rewriting." Literally speaking, does a translator not rewrite an original text in another language when he translates? Does Gündoğar's term correspond to André Lefevere's well-known concept, "rewriting," by which he compares the translator's work to the work of a literary critic, an anthology editor or a literary historian, all of whom "manipulate the original works to some extent" in order to meet the cultural and ideological needs of their time (Lefevere 1992: 8)?

Furthermore, literary scholar Dilek Doltaş describes Yücel's "Mr. Prufrock'tan Aşk Türküsü" as a "variant" of its source text by T. S. Eliot: "Kısaca, Yücel'in şiiri, Eliot'in 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock' şiirinin bir *varyantı* olmuştur." / "In short, Yücel's poem proves to be a *variant* of Eliot's 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock'" (1988: 139). Does Doltaş in fact mean to associate the translator's work with the term "version" which is usually used by some translation studies scholars to refer to a target text that they believe departs too far from its source text? Is every translation not actually a version of its translator, the interpreter?

Thus this thesis aims to resolve the definitional ambivalence that characterizes the critical discourse on Can Yücel's literary translations from English into Turkish by way of analyzing his translator's identity as "Türkçe Söyleyen," which can be translated into English literally as "the one who speaks or retells the source text in Turkish," taking up four of his translated texts in three genres: poetry, drama, and prose fiction. Hence, this thesis should be considered as an "embedded single-case study," since it deals with one issue – the unique designation attached to Can Yücel's translations into Turkish (Yin 1994: 41f).

As this task is clearly and specifically related to translation criticism, I will be especially careful about two points while approaching it. First, I will try to combine

translation theory and practice in my commentary in order to base my research on an objective and firm ground as needs be (see Karantay 1987: 55 and Bengi-Öner 1999b: 111-20). Saliha Paker designates this necessity as the means of approaching the subjective matter of translation with objectivity (1988: 116). Secondly, this research into a practical matter in Turkish translation will be carried out through a descriptive and comparative approach which will include both the target texts and the source texts – this second necessity has been proposed by many scholars, as Carol Maier underlines in “Reviewing and Criticism” (1998: 207). The criticism taken up in this study will be based upon knowledge and understanding more than taste and evaluation just as Raymond van den Broeck suggests in his “Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism” (1985: 60). Besides, I will try to look at the target texts “not from a high and distant position, but right from behind the translator’s shoulder” (İnce 1993: 8) and will avoid turning translation criticism into mere error analysis or “a hunt for errors” (Karantay 1993: 22). However, I will not strive to justify the translator’s every decision, closing my eyes to significant stylistic deviations if there are any, just as Ülker İnce recommends for target-oriented studies like mine (1997: 254).

As for the organization, in order to provide this study with a theoretical basis, Chapter II explicates four crucial translation terms: imitation, adaptation, version, and rewriting. These definitional terms, mentioned during the problematizing of the subject matter above, may help us to delineate what Yücel has actually done in his free translations and to explain the definitional confusion prevailing in the discourse on his translations.

Chapter III, entitled “‘Türkçe Söyleyen: Can Yücel,’” problematizes Yücel’s idiosyncratic designation “Türkçe Söyleyen.” To this end, this chapter first provides

some information about the translator's educational and literary background, as well as his translation output into Turkish, and then it presents a broad literature review on the subject, delineating both the criticism and the acclaim Yücel's particular approach has received from critics and scholars. Finally, it investigates the place of Yücel's special designation both in the Turkish culture and in translation theory.

As for the next three chapters, they descriptively and critically analyze the translator's strategies in four of his target texts within a target-oriented, comparative framework including both their source texts and the existing retranslations. The factors that guided the selection of these particular translations are that (a) they all are the translator's direct translations from English unlike his indirect, mediated translations from German and Spanish literature; (b) their source texts are all canonical works written in three genres by four respected writers and poets of world literature; (c) they all have several critical essays penned about them by scholars and critics; and (d) they all have been translated into Turkish by other translators as well.

Chapter IV, entitled "'66. Sone' and 'Mr. Prufrock'tan Aşk Türküsü'" deals with two verse translations by the translator, which are poems by William Shakespeare and T.S. Eliot, respectively. The chapter first provides us with some factual information about the target texts and their source texts, and then critiques the two translations in terms of their "matricial norms" (Toury 1995: 58f), their discourse, and the appropriating strategies opted for by the translator. The reason why this study focuses on the translator's appropriating strategies in particular is that both the designation "Türkçe Söyleyen" and the discourse on Yücel's translations have obvious overtones of appropriation of the source texts. Also, the relatively short length of the poetic texts is what makes it possible to handle two translations rather than only one in this chapter.

*Sırça Kümes*, the translation of a play written by Tennessee Williams, constitutes the subject matter of Chapter V and *Muhteşem Gatsby*, the translation of a novel by F. Scott Fitzgerald, is taken up in Chapter VI. These chapters analyze the target texts by following almost the same format as in Chapter IV; but they naturally include one additional subsection that summarizes the related plots.

As far as the scope of the analyses is concerned, the translator's four specified works are dealt with in their entirety in order to present a wide perspective and thus to come up with more objective results.

In the Conclusion, what has been dealt with throughout the thesis is summarized, and an effort is made to delineate the possible theoretical and practical implications of the thesis for further research in translation studies.\*

---

\* The views presented in this study are absolutely my own; they by no means reflect the views of the Turkish Armed Forces or any other public institution.

## CHAPTER II

### KEY TERMS

#### Imitation

The *Dictionary of Translation Studies* suggests that the term “imitation” basically refers to “what is otherwise known as free translation.” The term was borrowed from Abraham Cowley by the seventeenth-century British writer, translator and theorist John Dryden (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 73). What did Dryden mean when he used the term as a translation category? A short historical account follows.

In his *Preface to Ovid’s Epistles, Translated by Several Hands*, Dryden (1680/1989) categorizes translation practice as a) metaphrase, b) paraphrase, and c) imitation. The term “metaphrase” stands for word-for-word translation, which was originally coined by the first-century Roman orators Marcus Tullius Cicero and Quintus Horatius Flaccus (Horace). Today we consider this form of translation as a strict form of literal translation because it aims to replace each source-language word with a target-language word “without reference to syntactical factors such as word order” (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 197f). Labeling this translation strategy as “clumsy,” Cicero proposes his metaphorical definition, “not count[ing] [the words] out to the reader like coins, but pay[ing] them by weight” (46 B.C./1976 quoted by Vermeer 1988: 113f). He designates the translator who chooses the former way as “an interpreter” and the latter – who chooses to “keep the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the ‘figures’ of thought, but in language which conforms to [his/her] usage” – as “an orator.” As Hans Vermeer states (p. 112), Cicero delineates the possible functions of the orator’s text, and argues that his [the orator’s] basic aim

should be “to discover how to convince the persons whom he wishes to persuade and how to arouse their emotions” (45 B.C./1982 qtd. by Vermeer 1988: 112).

As for the second term in Dryden’s tripartite classification, paraphrase is “translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense” (1680/1989: 8). As Andrew Chesterman suggests, Dryden favors this second, “middle path [paraphrase], perhaps on [its] metaphrase side” (p. 7). It should be noted that Dryden’s “middle path” seems to resemble or follow very closely Cicero’s concept of free translation since they both stress the keeping of the same ideas, thus of “meaning” in translation. Another prominent translation theorist, Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus, or St. Jerome, as he is called in English, termed this mid-way as “*sensus de sensu*,” meaning “sense-for-sense translation,” by using Cicero and Horace’s theories (Vermeer 1992: 7 and 1988: 121).

However, we should also point out that although we consider Cicero and Horace’s “orator translator” concept as similar to Dryden’s paraphrase, Douglas Robinson refers to the two theorists’ preferred type of translations as “free imitations” in his article “Literal Translation” when he refers to St. Jerome’s sense-for sense translation: “a faithful middle ground between the faithful literalism Cicero and Horace censured and the *free imitations* they defended” (1998b: 125). In his article entitled “Free Translation,” Robinson also uses the terms “imitation” and “freedom” for the orator’s way of translating in the classical Roman tradition, and labels the interpreter’s way as “translation” and “fidelity” (1998a: 88). Robinson’s use of the term “imitation” – with a pejorative meaning that seems to fall outside “translation proper” (Jakobson 1959: 114) – is also present in his tree diagram that categorizes translation under the assumption “if free translation is no translation.” In

this diagram he equates imitation with free “rendering” while he divides “translation” as word-for-word and sense-for-sense.

Dryden, who used the word “imitation” as a term in translation categorization for the first time, also employs it in a negativistic sense:

The third way is that of imitation, where the translator (if now he has not lost the name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the groundwork [make a variation on the basic theme], as he pleases. (1680/1989: 8)

As is clear, under his third category Dryden gives the translator, or rather the imitator, the freedom to ignore the writer’s words, meanings, and the basic theme whenever he thinks it is necessary, and questions whether he or she can still be called a “translator.” He considers imitation as “an endeavor of a later poet to write like one who has written before him, on the same subject; that is, not to translate his words, or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him as a pattern, and to write, as he supposes that the author would have done, had he lived in our age, and in our country” (p. 10). In addition, labeling it “the greatest wrong which can be done to the memory and reputation of the dead,” he clearly declares it as an “extreme” way that “ought to be avoided,” different than translation proper (p. 10f). Explicitly underlining Dryden’s “hesitation” to classify those that follow this third way as “translators,” Işın Bengi-Öner approaches his term more positively and attributes its existence to “a subconscious annoyance” that results from a “normative,” source-oriented notion of translation; Bengi-Öner contends that Dryden’s words on *imitation* “undoubtedly enlarge the perspective of translation theory and comfort literary translators, albeit to some extent” / “Dryden bu sözleriyle kuşkusuz çeviri kuramının

bakış açısını genişletmekte ve yazın çevirmenlerinin yüreğine bir parça olsun su serpmekte” (1999a: 14f).

Unlike Bengi-Öner, in his course book entitled *Poetry Translation*, Donald Davie foregrounds the pejorative meaning in Dryden’s definition of the particular term and argues that “translation [...] denies itself the liberties of *imitation* and of other relations more *tenuous* still” (1975: 9f). This negativistic approach to the term is also seen in André Lefevere (1975: 76), who defines imitation in his seventh poetry translation strategy entitled “interpretation” as the imitator’s act of producing, “to all intents and purposes, a poem of his own, which has only title and point of departure, if those, in common with the source text.” Thus his “imitator writes a different work, using the source text merely as a source of inspiration” (p. 103 and cf. Leighton 1991b: 155). Describing it as making changes “in both structure and texture of the source text,” motivated “by mere whim” (p. 102), Lefevere also considers “imitation” too free to be categorized under translation proper: “The ability to interpret the theme of the source text in the same way as the original author. This is the dividing line between translation proper and version/imitation” (pp. 102f and cf. Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 74). But, how can we expect a translator to understand the “interpretation” in the mind of the writer? How can a translator be sure of this sameness?

This pejorative meaning associated with the term “imitation” can also be seen in the ideas of a modern theorist who defines “literal translation” as “true translation” (1964: vii qtd. by Coates 1999: 103 and see Leighton 1991a: 180): Vladimir Nabokov uses the phrase “graceful imitations” in order to refer to his early translations into Russian from Shakespeare, Keats, Yeats, etc. (see Coates 1999: 94). According to Jenefer Coates, Nabokov “Russianized” his source texts by opting for

what is familiar to the Russian reader, even in character names (p. 93). Another modern theorist, Reuben Brower (1974: 2), also states the derogatory connotation associated with “imitation” by putting it beyond “freer yet responsible translation” – “full imaginative re-making.” Lauren Leighton in fact echoes Brower in 1991 when she claims that this term is characterized by “unrestrained liberty” (1991b: 161).

### Adaptation

We come across another translation category in the discourse on Yücel’s translations: adaptation. According to the *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, it “implies that *considerable changes* have been made in order to make the text more suitable for a specific audience (e.g. for children) or for the particular purpose behind the translation” (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 3). This definition is a possible way of translating according to Hans J. Vermeer’s translation definition: “To translate means to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances” (1987). André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett openly corroborate Vermeer’s theory in their article where they elaborate on the “cultural turn” in translation studies by suggesting that a translation may comprise substantial adaptation: “Translations are therefore not ‘faithful’ on the levels they have traditionally been required to do – to achieve ‘functional equivalence’ a translator may have to *substantially adapt* the source text” (1990: 8). On the other hand, as this dictionary suggests, the term “adaptation” has also at times received *pejorative* comments.

For instance, in her *Translation Studies*, which is considered “the definitive text in the field” (Gentzler 1998: xi), Susan Bassnett states that Ambrose Philips

“felt the need to *adapt* Racine” when he translated his play *Andromache* in the early 1700’s (2002: 124). She claims that Philipps aimed at making the French work suitable to the English taste by way of “substantial alterations to the play, shortening the text in places, adding speeches and, at the ends of Acts IV and V adding whole scenes, including a final scene in which [a character] prepares for a happy ending.” Bassnett adds that unlike the previous translation by John Crowne, Philipps’ adaptation “was such a success that it remained in repertoire right through the eighteenth century” although it was severely criticized for being “deviant.” This pejorative connotation that puts the term “adaptation” outside the terrain of legitimate translation continues in Bassnett’s description of Edward Fitzgerald’s method of translation where “the source-language text was perceived as the rough clay from which the target-language product was moulded.” Bassnett states that “a debate arose around whether they could define [Fitzgerald’s] work as a translation or as something else (adaptation, version, etc.)” (p. 75).

With an attitude similar to Philipps’ and Fitzgerald’s critics, when Donald Davie discusses his views on the relation between a target text by Isaac Watts and its Hebrew original, he claims that “[it] is a relation, not of translation, but of allusion or, at most, adaptation” (1975: 10). As is clear, Davie associates the term with greater liberties than translation proper, which is explicitly and directly mentioned in his short definition: “versions more free than translation” (p. 11) – for instance, he openly designates Robert Lowell’s target text based on an excerpt from a play by Jean Racine as an “adaptation” because it is an abridged version of the source text, with its four lines while the other retranslations consist of nine lines like the original (p. 12). Furthermore, he explicitly defines the place of the terms imitation and adaptation when he claims that Ezra Pound “moved into the ambiguous territory

between original poetry and translation, the territory which we mark insecurely by such vague words as ‘imitation’ and ‘adaptation’” (p. 11). The semantic closeness between these two terms is also observable in Reuben Brower’s comments about Dryden’s translations: “Even in his *Aeneis*, where he aims at responsible paraphrase, [Dryden] moves easily [...] into passages of *imitation* in which he freely *adapts* Virgil to the political, social, and sexual mores of Restoration England” (1974: 2).

As the *Dictionary of Translation Studies* suggests, another criticism against adaptations was voiced by the theorists Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber in their notion of “cultural translation” within the context of Bible translation (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 36). Comparing it with their “legitimate” category, “linguistic translation,” they define “cultural translation” as a “translation in which the content of the message is changed to conform to the receptor culture in some way, and/or in which information is introduced which is not linguistically implicit in the original” (1982: 134 and 199). Thus, the two theorists free the translator to make changes in the target text or to introduce additions to it in order to influence the target audience; however, they do not consider this second way faithful enough because it does not keep intact “the historical events and situations as they occurred,” and equate their term with an already existing one, “adaptation” (p. 134 and see Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 3 and 36). György Radó too categorizes adaptation as being beyond the limits of translation proper by calling it a pseudo-translation, which means that it is not a “real translation at all”; his criterion is the extent to which units of translation, in his own words, the source text and target text “logemes,” correspond (1979 qtd. by Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 4, 97 and 135).

## Version

Another term often used with a negative connotation in discussions on free translations is “version,” which is, at the same time, a “neutral and comprehensive word” for any target text that has some sort of relationship with its source text (Davie 1975: 8 and cf. Brower 1974: 1f).

The *Dictionary of Translation Studies* defines “version” as “a term commonly used to describe a target text which in the view of the commentator departs too far from the original to be termed a translation”; it suggests that people usually opt for this term for a target text if it *adapts* the source text or imposes a definite interpretation of it or foregrounds one of the possible interpretations in it or simply adopts a free strategy rather than a literal one (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 195). The dictionary likens the term to “adaptation,” and associates its free style, which may foreground one aspect of the source text, with unfaithfulness. Although it provides us with this pejorative meaning of the term, the dictionary also draws attention to its use with a positive connotation, as mentioned above, by rightly exemplifying it with John Hollander’s view on the issue.

Drawing attention to the use of the term version which is “absolutely synonymous with ‘translation’” at the same time, Hollander suggests that “we may tend to ask different things of a text when we think of it as a ‘version’ than when we think of it as a ‘translation’” (1959: 220). He uses the two dictionary meanings of “version” in order to explain what he means by the difference of a version from a translation proper: “a special form or variant of something” and “an account resting upon limited authority or embodying a particular point of view.” Hollander claims that people assume that “there is going to be something *queer* about a version of [an

original text]” while, in the case of a translation, it is assumed that “[the target text] is somehow going to try to be [the original text] as well as it can” (p. 221). Hollander tries to explain “something queer” with the adjectives or adjectival phrases describing the word “version”: “shortened,” “leaning strongly towards the views of [the version-writer],” and “garbled,” meaning “very unclear and confusing” (*Longman* 2003: 664).

This negative connotation associated with the term “version” is also underlined by Susan Bassnett. As discussed in the previous subsection, Bassnett also places “version” in the same category as the term “adaptation,” giving it a pejorative meaning. Bassnett’s negative approach to “version” becomes very obvious when she differentiates between “translations, versions, adaptations,” arguing at the same time that this differentiation is actually subjective and difficult to establish (2002: 81).

Likewise, Lefevere employs the term “version” with a pejorative meaning in *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* (1975) by including it in his seventh translation strategy which he terms “interpretation.” Lefevere describes a “version-writer” as someone who basically retains the interpretation of the author or “the substance of the source text” (p. 76) and “therefore, renders the content, while altering the form” (p. 103). Thus, as with his other sub-category “imitation,” Lefevere finds a “version” unreliable, and deems it as distinct from translation proper. Furthermore, he equates his “version” with the term “adaptation” when he describes “version” as “*adapt*[ing] the source text to the taste of both translator and audience” (p. 102). This equivalence in the theorist’s approach may account for why Gülşat Aygen and Yurdanur Salman, the Turkish translators of the particular essay where Lefevere explains his seven strategies, opted for the Turkish word “uyarlama” (actually meaning “adaptation”) for “version” (1990: 35 and 41f). At this point,

Lefevere's definition of "version" should be questioned immediately, because it is not possible to separate "content" from "form" in a literary text according to modern stylistics, which sees these two textual elements as indissoluble (see Brooks and Warren 1979: 298f and Wales 1997: 437). For this reason, it seems difficult to qualify Lefevere's "version" as meaningful.

Yet, as the *Dictionary of Translation Studies* (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 195) states, Lefevere continues to elaborate on his term by arguing that a version "is basically an exercise in rewriting" because it is "not an attempt to make the author's real interpretation of the theme accessible to a new audience," and thus is closer to translation proper than imitation (1975: 103). It is difficult to understand what "real interpretation" means and who makes it; but, at this point, the theorist introduces into our research another term that has been widely discussed in translation studies recently, and which will constitute the next, last subsection of Chapter II: rewriting.

## Rewriting

In the preface to their edited book *Translation, History and Culture*, Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere equate translation with this new concept:

*Translation* is, of course, a *rewriting* of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society. Rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another culture. But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulation processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live. (1990: ix)

Approaching translation from a descriptive perspective rather than a prescriptive one – unlike Cicero, St. Jerome, Dryden, Davie or Nida and Taber – Bassnett and Lefevere openly argue that a translator fulfills a task under the influence of two “motivations/constraints” (Lefevere 1992: 8): a particular ideology, that is, “a certain concept of what the world should be like” and a poetics, that is, “a certain concept of what literature should be like” (Lefevere 1985: 217). Thus the translator manipulates literature, projecting or “refract[ing]” (Lefevere 1982) “images of a writer, a work, a period, a genre, sometimes even a whole literature” (Lefevere 1992: 5) in a certain way, at a definite time in a particular society, thus “constructing cultures” (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998) in the “desired” way (Gentzler 1998: x). In the quotation above, Bassnett and Lefevere also suggest that their term “rewriting” does not cover translations only, and this is made clearer in Lefevere’s words:

Whether they produce translations, literary histories or their compact spin-offs, reference works, anthologies, criticism, or editions, *rewriters adapt*, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant, or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time. (1992: 8)

When he names them “rewriters,” Lefevere includes all those who adapt and “regenerate” (1985: 241) original literary works by such activities like translating, interpreting, criticizing, editing, or anthologizing – namely professionals such as translators, reviewers, critics, scholars, historiographers, teachers, journalists, editors, and publishers (cf. Hermans 1994: 139 and Lefevere 1992: 4-7).

In this respect, unlike the terms “imitation” and “adaptation,” “rewriting” refers to a generic concept covering both any writing about literature and any kind or type of translation without distinguishing between the existent target texts in a

particular society. Therefore, Lefevere's cover term for any target text can easily be claimed to include all the other categories that we have been discussing so far, including "version." Lefevere especially draws attention to this aspect of his approach in his essay "Translation: the Categories": "[...] translation/adaptation? – the *term* rewriting absolves us of the necessity to draw borderlines between various forms of rewriting, such as translation, adaptation, emulation" (1992: 47), where he uses the synonym of imitation as the third type (see *Longman* 2003: 513). We should also point out that in his discourse on "rewriting," Lefevere often equates his concept of translation with "adaptation" as in the quotation above, but gives it the positive meaning Nida does: "A natural translation involves two principle areas of *adaptation*, namely, grammar and lexicon" (1964: 136). As mentioned in the first paragraph of "Adaptation," together with Bassnett again, he suggests that "to achieve 'functional equivalence,' a translator may have to substantially adapt the source text" because today, contrary to the traditional concept of "faithfulness," a faithful translator does what the target audience, or rather the commissioner of the translation wants (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990: 8; cf. Vermeer 1992 12f). Besides, Lefevere defines "refraction," the very first term he used to refer to "rewriting," as "the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work" (1982: 234f). On another instance, Lefevere claims that while "George Büchner himself opposed both the dominant poetics and the dominant ideology" of his time in his *Danton's Tod*, his translator, Karl Gutzkow, needed to "adapt to" the constraints of his own time because "the type of expressions [Büchner] [had] allowed himself to use [could] not be printed [at that time]" (1992: 14f).

As is obvious, Lefevere considers rewritings as "facts of a target culture," just

like Toury's concept of translation (1995: 23-26), and defines this space, or rather this society as the "(super)system" that encompasses, among others, literature as a "heuristic," "contrived," "stochastic" subsystem (1985: 225f and see 1982: 235). What he means by these adjectives is that, being only in the minds of students of literature, this subsystem does "not possess any kind of ontological reality," it "consists both of objects (books, say) and human beings who read, write, rewrite books," and that, being indeterminate, its behavior can be predicted only with a certain likelihood.

How does rewriting – in its narrowest sense, translation – manipulate or shape a literature and its culture? As is already clear, translation, "the *most radical* form of rewriting in a literature" (Lefevere 1985: 241), "*potentially* the most influential" rewriting (Lefevere 1992: 9), "one of the *primary* literary tools [...] to 'manipulate' a given society in order to 'construct' the kind of 'culture' desired" (Gentzler 1998: x), is practiced by the translator, the rewriter, in the service of a particular ideology and poetics in the target super-system. Lefevere emphatically argues that "the translator's ideology (whether s/he willingly embraces it, or whether it is imposed on him/her as a constraint by some form of patronage)" comes before the poetics factor and "dictates" both his/her basic strategy and his/her solutions to the problems related to "the universe of discourse," and to the "language" of the source text (1992: 41). Besides, Lefevere contends that the rewriter may either "fit in the dominant poetics and ideology of his or her time and place" or constitute "an alternative ideology, an alternative poetics" (1985: 225). He often voices this possible "resistan[t]" (Venuti 1995: 20) aspect of rewriting: "[Rewriters] may choose to oppose the system, to try to operate outside its constraints [...] by writing works of literature in ways *that differ from those prescribed or deemed acceptable* at a particular time in a particular

place” (1992: 13). This can be considered as the intra-systemic or intra-cultural notion of resistance that rewriting may be expressing implicitly. And in the special case of translation, the rewriter can create “subversive” target texts because “[translation] offers a cover for the translator [...] in the name of, and relying on the authority of a writer who is considered great enough in another literature so as not to be ignored in [the target] culture” (1985: 238; cf. 1982: 248).

At this point, Lefevere and Bassnett, emphasizing this bicultural characteristic of translation, argue that “although idealistically translation may be perceived as a perfect marriage between two entities for better or worse in mutual harmony,” in reality, translators either shape their target texts according to the paradigms of the source language and culture, or, “*as happens so frequently today,*” they “regard the target culture as greater” and “*colonize* the source text,” especially if it is distant in space and time (1990: 11). The two theorists name this side-taking “*cultural appropriation via translation.*” In this respect, seeing translation as “a means of cultural advocacy” (Tymoczko 2003: 184) or a means of “cross-cultural” resistance (Maier 1995: 21 and Dingwaney 1995: 3), they explicitly maintain that “[it] [can] become one of the means by which a new nation ‘proves’ itself, shows that its language is capable of rendering what is rendered in more prestigious languages” (1990: 8). Furthermore, the following quotation Lefevere takes from Edward Said strengthens this poststructuralist and post-colonial connotation in the concept of rewriting:

the realities of power and authority – as well as the *resistance* offered by men, women and social movements to institutions, authorities and orthodoxies – are the realities that make texts possible, that deliver them to their readers, that solicit the attention of critics (1983: 5 qtd. by Lefevere 1985: 222).

Of course, this idea of taking translation as a cover for its rewriter, who may adopt a resistant attitude in his or her task, leads us to consider Toury's concept of "pseudo-translation" (1995: 45f) as another fine example of rewriting, which Genzler calls "deception" (1998: xv). Bassnett looks at translation from this perspective when she problematizes the sometimes vague boundary between original writing and translation in her "When is a Translation not a Translation?" (1998). She discusses the notion of self-translation, translation in travel writing and pseudo-translation with examples, and concludes that "that the idea of translation can be used so blatantly for ideological manipulation is significant" (p. 39 and cf. Genzler 1998: xv). Bassnett comes to describe translation as "a set of textual practices with which the [re]writer and reader *collude*" (p. 39). In a similar vein, Jenefer Coates too uses the term "rewriting" to refer to Nabokov's self-translations "as a writer of English [rendering] his own early Russian work into English and late English work back into Russian"; Coates, finding "rewriting" closer to original composition like Bassnett does, contends that "Nabokov paraphrased and *rewrote* on the grounds of absolute authority, [...] [taking] the creative liberties that he denied to others" (1999: 92 and 99). Besides, like Lefevere and Bassnett, Coates sees translation as "a cultural appropriation": While she describes Nabokov's early translations in Europe and his self-translations in America as "creative appropriation" (pp. 93 and 99), she labels his late, literal translations from Russian literature into English such as his *Onegin* by Pushkin as "a form of resistance to cultural appropriation" (p. 96).

As for the constraints that influence "[the rewriters'] image of the original" in translation, Lefevere pinpoints four basic factors controlling a literary subsystem, and then makes them five with one natural addition, in a "descending order of importance" according to Theo Hermans (1994: 139): patronage, poetics, universe of

discourse, language, and the source text (1985: 232f and 1992: 100). While any rewriting “takes place under at least one of the constraints mentioned and implies the others,” the fact that translation operates under all of them makes it “probably the most obvious instance of rewriting” (1985: 233f).

According to Lefevere, “patronage” – which refers to the powers extended by persons or institutions such as a king, a political party, the media, publishers, the educational establishment – “operates mostly outside the literary system” and “is usually more interested in the ideology of literature than its poetics” (1992: 15). These power holders “try to regulate the relationship between the literary system and the other systems” by imposing upon the *rewriter* a particular ideology, a “world view,” “which acts as a constraint on the choice and development of both form and subject-matter” (Lefevere 1992: 15 and 1985: 226); the patrons can also influence the literary professionals’ economic lives and their status by, for instance, employing them and accepting them into a certain group, respectively (1992: 16). Patronage is called “undifferentiated” when it is dispensed by a single person, group or institution, as in totalitarian regimes; and it is labeled as “differentiated” when “different patrons represent different, conflicting ideologies,” as in liberal, decentralized societies (1982: 236 and cf. Hermans 1994: 139).

Secondly, the poetics factor is employed by the professionals inside the literary system such as translators, scholars, critics, and reviewers, who use “a code” that helps these “guardians” (Hermans 1994: 139) of the literary system and the readers to communicate with each other (Lefevere 1985: 229). This code consists of two components: (a) “an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, symbols, prototypical characters and situations,” and (b) the function of poetics, “which is closely tied to ideological forces from outside the sphere of the poetics, generated by

ideological forces in the environment of the literary system.” The ideological component of poetics is especially influential in the selection of themes; and this second constraint on translation/rewriting, operates “within the parameters set by the [first constraint]” (p. 226).

As for the third constraint, Lefevere defines his concept of the “universe of discourse” as “the knowledge, the learning, but also the objects and the customs of a certain time, to which writers are free to allude in their work” (1985: 232f), and explains the constraints that shape the translator’s attitude toward the universe of discourse expressed in the source text in relation to that of his or her own society:

This attitude is heavily influenced by the status of the original, the self-image of the culture that text is translated into, the types of texts deemed acceptable in that culture, the levels of diction deemed acceptable in it, the intended audience, and the “cultural scripts” [the accepted pattern of behavior expected of people who fill certain roles in a certain culture] that audience is used to or willing to accept. (1992: 87)

Lefevere, quoting from John Hookham Frere’s definitions of his archetypal translators, calls the translator who tries to be “conservative” in terms of the universe of discourse of the source text a “faithful translator,” while he refers to Frere’s “spirited translator” as the one who adheres to the universe of discourse of the target culture by “substituting in place of [the source-text peculiarities] the peculiarities of his time and nation” (Maine ed. 1909: xvif qtd. by Lefevere 1992: 49f). While his conservative translator “works on the level of the word or the sentence,” and becomes more conservative with more prestigious, “sacrosanct” texts such as the Bible, the Quran, *The Communist Manifesto*, “the ‘spirited’ translator works on the level of the culture as a whole, and of the functioning of the text in that culture,” and often intends to “shock his audience by ‘updating’ the original in such a way that it

tends to lose at least some of its ‘classical’ status” (p. 50f). Thus, the latter’s rewriting “is, in essence, subversive, designed to make the reader question both the prestige of the original and its ‘received’ interpretation in both poetological and ideological terms” (p. 50).

Lefevere’s fourth constraint is “the natural language in which a work of literature is written”; it includes both the formal and pragmatic sides of language, that is, its grammar, and “the way [it] reflects culture” (1982: 236f). Finally, although we mention the source text as the fifth constraint, Lefevere declares it as the first one for the translator because “the original is the locus where ideology, poetics, universe of discourse and language come together, mingle and clash” (1985: 233 and 235).

As the first quotation in this subsection points out, Lefevere adopts a neutral approach to the term rewriting/rewriter: “I am not lamenting an existing state of affairs, I am merely describing it and suggesting that it is eminently worthy of description, since [rewritings] are what keeps a literary system going” (1982: 247). Rewritings can either introduce or repress innovations (Bassnett and Lefevere eds. 1990: ix); “[the rewriters] can make or break a writer” (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990: 10; cf. Lefevere 1992: 38). Drawing attention to the constraints as the *natural* operators of the literary system, Lefevere openly states that he does not want to sound as if he wanted to accuse or condemn the rewriters:

It is not my intention to give the impression that there is a ruthless, unprincipled, and excessively cunning band of translators [...] [that] systematically “betray” whichever work(s) of literature they are dealing with. On the contrary, most rewriters of literature are usually meticulous, hard-working, well-read, and as honest as is humanly possible. They just see what they are doing as obvious, the only way, even if that way has, historically, changed over the centuries. [...] they have no other choice, not as long as they remain within the boundaries of the culture that is theirs by birth or adoption – not therefore, as long as they try to influence the evolution of that culture, which is an extremely logical thing for them to want to do. (1992: 13)

In this excerpt, Lefevere foregrounds the translators as the “visible” (Venuti 1994) actors or “agents of transfer” (Even-Zohar 1997: 172) in the activity or in Genzler’s words, “active participants contributing to particular cultural constructions” (1998: xvii). He emphatically describes the place of the translator, “the place of enunciation” (Tymoczko 2003: 183) as in the target culture, thus, naturally, finds his or her attempts to influence the target literary system like “a culture planner” (Even-Zohar 1994: 19) “logical” and justified.

Last but not least, Lefevere and Bassnett emphatically state that as culture constructors or “image makers” (Lefevere 1994: 7), “rewritings [...] function as originals for most [people]” in the target culture (1998: 9) and especially “certain [translations] can become naturalized to such an extent that they are given the same ‘intracultural’ treatment as texts which have originally been generated within the culture in question” (1990: 9). While the two theorists find this phenomenon very natural for a literary system, they also consider it natural that “professors of literature and its students who approach it in a ‘professional’ way may regret this state of affairs,” especially when they are not satisfied with the images of authors and works constructed in translations because they find the source text still “sacrosanct” (1990: 9f). At this point, exemplifying their influential idea with Proust’s grandmother, who “like[d] to read the translations [of *Odyssey* and *The Thousand and One Nights*] she has grown up with” rather than their new retranslations, the two theorists (p. 13) also suggest that the target audience may or may not like what they see in a rewriting because of this naturalness in the phenomenon of “rewriting,” which is once more described by John Frow (1986: 182) in Lefevere and Bassnett’s quotation as:

the results of a complex articulation of the literary system with other institutions (the school, religion), institutionalized practices (moral or

religious training, commemoration, or else a relatively autonomous aesthetic function) and other discursive formations (religious, scientific, ethical).

### Summary and Conclusions

So far, we have elaborated upon the possible definitions of the terms “imitation,” “adaptation,” “version” and “rewriting” because we often encounter them within the discourse on Yücel’s translations.

To summarize, the term “imitation” was coined as a translation category in 1680 by John Dryden, who mentioned three ways of translating. His first category, “metaphrase” refers to word-for-word translation or literal translation, its more common name today. His second category, “paraphrase,” means sense-for-sense translation, which was coined by St. Jerome, who followed Cicero and Horace’s preferred method of rendering, the orator’s way. As a matter of fact, Dryden’s first category too is based upon these ancient theorists’ view of translation, which they named the interpreter’s way. Thus, Dryden’s first two categories together seem to correspond to what we call “translation proper” in Jakobson’s terms. However, Douglas Robinson believes that Dryden’s second term actually fills the space between Cicero and Horace’s dichotomy and he puts their preferred “orator’s way” outside the legitimate terrain of translation, equating it with Dryden’s third category: “imitation.” Dryden explicitly underlines the negative connotation of his term by questioning whether a translator can still deserve his/her title if he or she takes liberties to *ignore both the author’s words and meanings* whenever he or she likes. In his elaboration of the term, the theorist claims that the imitator, doing “the greatest injustice to be done to the author,” reduces him or her to only “a pattern to imitate.”

Likewise, Davie, Nabokov, Brower, Leighton and Lefevere use the term “imitation” with a negative connotation and find it too free to be considered under translation proper. Dryden’s “pattern” metaphor for the writer becomes “a source of inspiration leading to a different work” in Lefevere’s discourse. Did Yücel ignore both the author’s words and meanings in his translations? Did he consider his writers or source texts only as a pattern to imitate or a source of inspiration to come up with different works? Did he produce poems of his own which have only title and point of departure in common with the source texts in his poetry translations? Was his freedom really unrestrained?

Secondly, the term “adaptation” is used to refer to those target texts in which the translator has done “substantial changes” with respect to the source text by considering the needs of the target audience. Although such a motive in translation is one of the many legitimate ways according to the functionalist translation theory today, “adaptation” is another term that has often been used with a pejorative sense, situating it beyond translation proper. For instance, Susan Bassnett claims that Ambrose Philips *adapted* Racine’s play *Andromache* by making *significant omissions and additions* in order to make it palatable for the English audience, and that despite its successful reception in the target culture, it was labeled as “deviant.” Furthermore, with a metaphor resembling Dryden’s “pattern,” Bassnett criticizes Edward Fitzgerald for reducing his source texts to the rough clay out of which to mould his target texts and reminds us of the controversy over whether to classify them as translations or adaptations. Similarly, Donald Davie defines adaptations as “versions more free than translation” and refers to an abridged target text as an adaptation. Davie also claims a semantic closeness between “adaptation” and “imitation,” just like Reuben Brower, who uses the verb “adapt” to describe the

action in a translation he calls “imitation.” In addition, within the context of Bible translation, Nida and Taber equate their “cultural translation” with “adaptation,” giving the translator the freedom to make the necessary additions and changes in order to increase the influence of the target text on the target reader. Obviously, the theorists find their suggestion wanting in faithfulness or legitimacy, just like György Radó, who labels adaptation as a pseudo-translation. Did Yücel “adapt” his source texts by making *substantial changes* in his translations by way of *many omissions and additions*? Were his target texts in fact pseudo-translations? Did he mold them by reducing his source texts to rough clay? Did he add or omit utterances and scenes in his *Sırça Kümes* or did he abridge it?

As for the third term “version,” in addition to its pejorative connotation similar to that of the terms “imitation” and “adaptation,” it has a neutral, thus negligible meaning, which can be used to refer to any translation. The *Dictionary of Translation Studies* defines the negative meaning of “version” as a target text that *adapts* the source text and *departs too far from the original* to be termed a translation. Justifying the dictionary, Susan Bassnett places “version” in the same category as the term “adaptation,” differentiating them from “translation proper” while emphasizing the subjectivity and difficulty in such a differentiation. John Hollander too finds “version” outside the limits of translation proper, referring to it with the adjectives “queer” and “garbled,” and describes the term as *a special form or variant of the source text* that rests upon limited authority or embodies a particular point of view. In a similar vein, Lefevere considers the term “version” to be different from translation proper and describes it as a translation in which the content of the source text is preserved but the form is substantially changed for the purpose of adapting to the taste of both the translator and the target reader. But, is form and

content in a literary work not an indissoluble entity in modern stylistics? In addition, Lefevere labels “version” as “an exercise in *rewriting*,” in which the version-writer tries to keep the writer’s sense intact, falling closer to a translator than an imitator. Did Yücel’s translations depart too far from the originals, becoming garbled or queer forms or variants? Was the writers’ content his only consideration?

Finally, giving up on this prescriptive approach, which lends the term “rewriting” a negative connotation, Lefevere and Bassnett introduce this new notion into translation studies as a cover term for all translations in general. Aiming to achieve “functional equivalence,” a rewriter tries to adapt his source text because today, contrary to the traditional concept of “faithfulness,” a faithful translator does what the target audience, or rather the commissioner of the translation wants. “Rewriting” refers at the same time to *any writing about* literature such as editions, anthologies, reviews, etc. It is maintained that these works are produced by their rewriters under two basic constraints: ideology and poetics, which simply mean “a certain concept of what the world should be like” and “a certain concept of what literature should be like,” respectively. According to Lefevere, the translator’s ideology, having priority over the poetics factor, may result from either his or her willing embracement of it or its imposition by a patron and acts as a constraint on the choice and development of both form and subject-matter or themes. Furthermore, he contends that the rewriter may either “fit in the dominant poetics and ideology of his or her time and place” or constitute “an alternative ideology, an alternative poetics,” showing an intra-cultural, resistant attitude within the super-system. Thus, the rewriter/translator may produce “subversive” target texts by using translation and important foreign writers as a cover. Furthermore, taking translation as a cross-cultural phenomenon, “a means of cultural appropriation,” Lefevere and Bassnett

argue that, in practice, translators prefer to “regard the target culture as greater” and “colonize” the source text rather than shaping their target texts according to the paradigms of the source language and culture. Thus, becoming “a means of cultural advocacy” or of a cross-cultural resistance, translation can help a nation prove itself capable of rendering works like those more prestigious languages. Of course, this “post-colonial” idea of taking translation as a cover for ideological manipulation leads to the conclusion that “pseudo-translations” and self-translations are fine examples of rewriting, as Bassnett argues in an essay, designating the phenomenon as “a collusion between the rewriter and the reader.” Jenefer Coates also uses the term “rewriting” to refer to Nabokov’s self-translations, and like Lefevere and Bassnett, she considers the phenomenon of translation as a matter of cultural appropriation.

Lefevere transforms his two basic motivations into five constraints that influence the rewriter’s image of the original in translation, the “rewriting” *par excellence*: patronage, poetics, universe of discourse, language, and the source text. “Patronage” refers to such persons or institutions of power outside the literary system as kings, publishers, and political parties, who influence literary people in terms of ideology, economy and status, trying to regulate the relationship between the literary system and the others. Secondly, the poetics factor, exerted by those professionals inside the literary system such as writers, translators, and critics, is “a code between these rewriters and their readers” with two components: an inventory of literary devices and the ideology of poetics. As for the third constraint, “the universe of discourse,” “the knowledge, the learning, but also the objects and the customs of a certain time, to which writers are free to allude in their work,” Lefevere’s definition of a “conservative” translator who adheres to the universe of discourse of the source

culture as a “faithful” translator and the opposite, subversive one as a “spirited” translator is especially noteworthy. While the “faithful” translator is awed by the prestige of the “sacrosanct” source text, the “spirited” translator often intends to “shock” his audience by “updating” it in such a way that the reader begins to question its “received” interpretation and its “classical” or “prestigious” status. And the fourth constraint is the natural language of a work of literature, including both its grammar, and the way it reflects culture.

Lefevere adopts a neutral approach to the term rewriting instead of employing an *a priori* pejorative meaning like those used for imitation, adaptation and version. As Lefevere and Bassnett suggest, rewriting is a “cultural reality” since literature operates this way in a culture in today’s world; so they do not question or lament an existing state of affairs – instead they readily accept and attempt to describe it. In this respect, the two theorists never praise or condemn translators for their target texts; on the contrary, they find these rewriters honest, hard-working and rightful in wanting to influence the literary system of the target culture to which they belong. As culture constructors or image makers, their works function as originals for most people and their translations can sometimes become so naturalized that they are treated as if they were original compositions. However, there is one group of professionals who often disapprove of this natural state of affairs in the literary system: Teachers of literature and their students raise severe criticism against the rewriters’ works when they are not satisfied with their images of the authors or the originals. At this point, the two theorists insightfully suggest that the natural phenomenon of translation becomes a matter of likes and dislikes for the target readership in its natural environment in the target culture.

Did Yücel try to rewrite his source texts? Did he see translation as a means of

cultural advocacy and appropriation? Can we observe Lefevere's two basic constraints in his target texts? Is he a good example of Lefevere's "faithful" translator who does what the target culture expects? Does he fall within the theorist's definition of the subversive "spirited translator"? We shall strive to answer such questions in the remaining chapters. However, when we juxtapose with the last term "rewriting" the first three terms, which have often assumed a similar, pejorative connotation as a result of the prescriptive, source-oriented approach behind them, and which are almost interchangeable, it seems at this preliminary stage that the latter, that is, the descriptive, cross-cultural, thus more realistic approach will be the one that will best help us to define Can Yücel's translations, which have been introduced into the Turkish culture under a special designation: "Türkçe Söyleyen."

## CHAPTER III

### “TÜRKÇE SÖYLEYEN: CAN YÜCEL”

#### Can Yücel and an Overview of His Translated Work

The poet-translator Can Yücel, who was born in Istanbul in 1926 and died in İzmir in 1999, was the son of Hasan Âli Yücel, a renowned Turkish intellectual who served as Minister of Education in Turkey. Yücel studied Latin and Greek at the Classical Philology Department at DTCF (Faculty of Language, History and Geography) in Ankara and continued his studies at Cambridge University.

Yücel worked as a translator at several Turkish embassies and as an announcer in the Turkish Unit of BBC in London. When he returned to Turkey, he first worked as a tourist guide in Bodrum and Marmaris, then began to make his living as a poet and a freelance translator of prose and poetry in Istanbul, where he moved in 1965. Yücel, well-known for his literary translations designated as “Türkçe Söyleyen” rather than the usual “çeviren” (translator) (see Özgüven 1999; Levendoğlu 1999; Yalçın ed. 2001; 927), is widely accepted as the epitome of free translation in Turkey. His translations have been acclaimed for being good literature and severely criticized for going beyond the legitimate limits of translation proper, which is the starting point of this thesis and is to be handled in the following pages.

The “socialist” (Behramoğlu 1987: 1182) poet, who published his first book of poetry *Yazma* in 1950, was engaged intensively in politics after 1965 (Kurdakul 1985: 669; *Gelişim Hachette* 1993: 4532). *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü* (Dictionary of Names in Our Literature) claims that Yücel “moulded his political beliefs into his poetry” (Yavuz and Ercan eds. 2000: 409) and Sinan Gündoğar

openly states that Yücel pursued his interest in politics, which had started during his youth, by retaining his affiliation to the Labor Party (2000: 3). Murat Belge refers to the poet-translator's affiliation to this party with an anecdote and qualifies his friend Can in an article as "a true man" ("sonuna kadar insan"), who loves his people (1999: 22f).

It was during those years in Istanbul, after the military coup of March 12, 1971, that Yücel was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment at the Adana Penitentiary because of two translations: one from Ché Guevara, the Argentinean communist revolutionary, and one from Mao Tsetung, the Marxist founder of the People's Republic of China. Obviously, the leftist poet-translator, who was released after a general amnesty in 1974, chose not to "fit in the dominant poetics and ideology" of the early 70's in Turkey, which was then ruled by a military regime; he opted for "an alternative ideology, an alternative poetics," acting like Lefevre's "rewriter" (1985: 225f and 1992: 13 and 15). It can be claimed that Yücel wanted to produce "subversive" translations by using important foreign writers as a cover for his ideology, evidencing an intra-cultural, "resistan[t]" (Venuti 1995: 20) attitude (see Lefevre 1985: 238 and cf. 1982: 248). Yücel's deliberate choice of these two source texts with opposing ideologies may result from Toury's suggestion that "having normally been regarded as a secondary mode of text-generation," it is no doubt that "deviations occurring in texts which are culturally acknowledged as translations often meet with much greater tolerance" (1995: 41).

Yücel is totally conscious of this important aspect of translation when he refers to his pseudo-translations in the interview he gave to Bünyamin Çelebi:

Bir de çevirinin ilginç bir cilvesi var. Hani ben sadığım falan diyorlar ya, ben bazı şiirlerimi, bazı nedenlerden ötürü, çeviri diye sürdürdüm. Nedeni de, mesela Adnan Menderes merhumun basına çok baskı ettiği sıralarda, iş çok tehlikeye girdiği zaman, şiiri yazıyordum ben, ondan sonra bu Hint şiiri diye basıyordum. (1999: 38)

What's more, translation has an interesting peculiarity. While many profess fidelity to the writer, I presented some of my original poems as if they were translations. I did that when writing openly became a very dangerous business, for instance, during those times when Adnan Menderes oppressed the press so harshly; I would write poems and then publish them in the guise of Indian poetry.

Obviously, following Bassnett and Lefevere's views mentioned in "Rewriting" in Chapter II, Yücel "manipulates literature to function in [Turkish] society in a [particular] way" (1990: ix) by "hiding behind [the] pseudo designation [*Indian poetry*] in fear of censorial measures against himself" (Toury 1995: 42). Thus, he criticizes the government of that period in "Dilem" (My Wish); in "Kapı Kapamaca" (To Close Doors) he uses a slang word he could not otherwise use in his poetry; and he voices the rights of the Turkish people in "Bir İrlanda Türküsü" (An Irish Folk Song) (1993b: 159-61). These pseudo-translations, which Yücel published in his only collection of poetic translations, *Her Boydan: Dünya Şiirinden Örnekler* (From Each and Every Land: Specimens from World Poetry/1993b), should be construed as good examples supporting Bassnett's contention that "the idea of translation can be used so blatantly for ideological manipulation" in the form of collusion between the rewriter and reader (1998: 39); so, together with the Ché and Mao translations, they seem to be the examples *nonpareil* of Edward Said's idea that what makes texts possible are the realities of power and authority, mentioned in "Rewriting" in the previous chapter.

During his lifetime, Yücel produced numerous translations: *Hatırladıklarım*

(*This I Remember*/1953) by Eleanor Roosevelt; *Yeni Türkiye: Bir Garp Devleti (La Turquie Nouvelle, Puissance de l'Occident/The New Turkey: A Western State*/1956) by Georges Duhamel; *Anne Frank'ın Hatıra Defteri (The Diary of Anne Frank*/1958) by Anne Frank; *Gerilla Harbi (On Guerilla Warfare*/1967) by Mao Tsetung; *Küba'da Sosyalizm ve İnsan (Socialism and Man in Cuba*/1967) by E. Ché Guevara; *Lenin Petrograd'da (To the Finland Station*/1967) by Edmund Wilson; *Siyah İktidar (Black Power*/1968) by Stokely Carmichael; *Yeni Başlayanlar İçin Marks (Marx for Beginners*/1977) by Rius (Eduardo del Rio) are his non-literary works.

As for his literary translations in three genres, there are numerous poetry translations from a wide array of world poets such as Shakespeare, Yeats, Ezra Pound, La Fontaine, Baudelaire, Brecht, T. S. Eliot, Kavafis, and Mallarmé in his *Her Boydan* (1957); his drama translations are *Sırça Kümes (The Glass Menagerie*/1964) by Tennessee Williams; *Saloz'un Mavalı (Gesang vom Lusitanischen Popanz/Song of the Lusitanien Bogey*/1972) by Peter Weiss; *Bahar Noktası (A Midsummer Night's Dream*/1981) by William Shakespeare; *Şvayk Hitler'e Karşı (Schweik im Zweiten Veltkrieg/Schweik in the Second World War*/1982) by Bertolt Brecht; *Don Cristobita ile Don Rosita (Los Titeres de Cachipora: Tragicomedia de Don Cristobal y la Sena Rosita/The Tragicomedy of Don Cristobita and Dona Rosita*/1983) by Federico Garcia Lorca; *Batı Yakasının Hikayesi (West Side Story*/1988) by Arthur Laurents; *Kar Kokusu (The Smell of Snow*/1991) by Charles Monroe Schulz; *Fırtına (The Tempest*/1991) and *Hamlet (Hamlet*/1992) by W. Shakespeare. In prose, Yücel translated *Lord Stratford'un Türkiye Hatıraları (Life of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe*/1959) by Stanley Lane-Poole; *Muhteşem Gatsby (The Great Gatsby*/1964) by F. Scott Fitzgerald; *Oliver Twist (Oliver Twist*/1992) by Charles Dickens; *Define Adası (Treasure Island*/1992) by

Robert Louis Stevenson. In addition to these, *Türk Edebiyatçılar Sözlüğü* (Dictionary of Turkish Litterateurs) mentions *Eskicinin Tazesini* (*La Zapatera Prodigiosa/The Shoemaker's Prodigious Wife/1978*) by F. G. Lorca as another drama translation Yücel carried out (Karaalioğlu 1982: 638).

We must also note that some of his translations, for instance those from the Spanish playwright Lorca and the German playwrights Peter Weiss and Bertolt Brecht, are most probably “indirect” (Toury 1995: 58) translations mediated through English while the others, like *Sırça Kümes*, *Muhteşem Gatsby* and *Hamlet*, are direct translations into Turkish from English.

### Critical Assessments of Yücel's Translations

As is widely known in the Turkish literary polysystem and as mentioned both in the introduction and the previous sub-section, Yücel's translations have been harshly criticized on the one hand and have been highly acclaimed on the other; thus, it is of great importance to try to describe how those people responded to the “rewriter” Yücel's translations. What did they actually say to criticize or to honor him?

### Criticism

To begin with, in his article on the *Hamlet* translations into Turkish, although playwright and actor Savaş Aykılıç praises Yücel's “poetic” (“şairane”) language, his efforts and creativity, he claims that this particular translation of *Hamlet* goes beyond translation proper and should be designated as “adaptation” or a “rewrite” rather than a translation (1994: 81); thus, equating the term “rewriting” with “adaptation,”

Aykılıç uses Yücel's designation "Türkçe Söyleyen" as proof of his argument as if the poet-translator had opted for this new label voluntarily. His main reason for placing Yücel's particular translation outside the limits of translation proper is that Yücel's *Hamlet* reflects the translator's specific "universe of discourse" (Lefevere 1985: 233) much more than that of Shakespeare, because the translator "domesticated" (Venuti 1994: 19), or rather appropriated the source text by using many vocabulary items, expressions and idioms specific to the Turkish language and culture, such as "Bir ihtimal daha var o da ölmek mi dersin?" Furthermore, Aykılıç, comparing it with Bülent Bozkurt's *Hamlet* translation, interestingly argues that Yücel's is "a completely subjective translation" / "[...] tamamen öznel bir çeviri bu" (p. 81). But is translation not a subjective phenomenon (cf. Paker 1988: 116)? In another article, Aykılıç calls Yücel's drama translations from Shakespeare a "phenomenon" ("fenomen") classifying them as *unfavorably different* once more (2005: 2).

Similarly, Zehra İpşiroğlu labels *Şvayk Hitlere Karşı* by Brecht as a rewrite rather than a translation (1988: 141). Her reason, again, is that Yücel did not recreate Brecht's universe of discourse because, for instance, he made the character Şvayk speak like a Tophane tramp in Istanbul, and changed Hitler into "Hay itler" and "Başbuğ" sometimes, and added to the text some slang words and references to today's Turkish society. Although İpşiroğlu openly states that this play is a public comedy full of references to the source culture and uses local motifs, aiming to make the audience think about the idea of resistance as they laugh, she does not want to allow the Turkish audience to have a similar experience, an "equivalent effect" (Nida 1964: 129). Yücel explains his aim for this "dynamic," functional equivalence in drama translation with the following words:

Doğrudan doğruya ses verip, ses alma ve sonunda alkış alma zorunda olduğunuz bir noktadasınız. Burada Brecht'in yaptığı parodiler, alıntılar, bilinmeyen seyircisi tarafından nasıl kavranacak ki? [...] O zaman Brecht'in yapmak istediği [...] sınırsal uyanış planını iyi aktarabilmek için bir takım kolpalar kullanman lazım. Bu kolpaları kullandığım zaman, burda hata yapmıyorum ben, Brecht'in istediğini yapıyorum. Almanca yazmıyorum ki ben; Almanca göndermeleri burada hangi seyirciye iletceğim? Brecht'e, Shakespeare'e özgü göndermeleri nasıl bileceğim ben? Goethe'yi göndermeyi nasıl bileceğim ben? Üstelik şu daha önemli birşey: Çıktığı zaman sahneye aktör anlamalı. Aktör anlamazsa oynayamaz. Aktöre anlamadığı bir şeyi nasıl oynatırsınız? Aktörün edebiyat bilgisi yok. Bunu oynamak için bir takım aletler vermek lazım. [...] Bundan dolayıdır ki, Adalet Cimcoz'un yaptığı çeviri, öp de başına koy, iyi güzel, anladık ama, oynamadı. (Karantay 1989a: 15f)

In theatre you are required to make the actors speak and thus elicit applause from the audience. How can the parodies, the quotations from Brecht be understood by an audience that does not know them? [...] So, in order to transfer Brecht's national awakening plan well, I must use some substitutions. When I utilize these substitutions, I don't do anything wrong; on the contrary, I do what Brecht aimed to do. I do not write in German; to which audience here can I communicate the German references? How can I know the allusions Brecht and Shakespeare specifically use in their work? How can I recognize an allusion to Goethe? More importantly, the actor on stage must be able to understand the text; otherwise, he can't act his part. How can you make him play a role that he can't understand? He doesn't know literature. You must give him some tools to enable him to act. That's why Adalet Cimcoz's translation could not be performed on stage although it was considered a pretty good translation.

Here, Yücel behaves like Vermeer's "expert" translator, explaining his strategies (1989: 222). He explicitly states that his aim is to recreate the dramatic source text for his audience and for his actors as well, which is a reasonable motive in translation. Quoting from Bassnett (1989: 35f) in her M.A. thesis entitled "Can Yücel'in Shakespeare Çevirilerinde 'Sadakat'" ("Fidelity" in Can Yücel's Translations from Shakespeare), Neslihan Demirkol refers to this aspect of Yücel's drama translations as the principle of "playability" ("sahnelenebilirlik") (2006: 28 and 51). Besides, taking into consideration the general audience rather than the intellectual elite only can be regarded as another sign of Yücel's ideological stance.

Parallel to Aykılıç and İpşirođlu, Dilek Doltaş (1988: 140-42) criticizes Yücel for not retaining T.S. Eliot’s imagery in his translation of “Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk Türküsü” (1979), using vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture like “kuzum,” “kalk gidelim,” “sabahçı kahveleri,” “türkü,” thus changing the register of the source text into a middle-class everyday discourse, together with plenty of omissions and additions. This poem will be extensively discussed in Chapter IV. Doltaş claims that the poet-translator produced a different universe than that of the source text and changed some of the emotional dimension of the original, and should therefore be called a “variant” (“varyant”) of the original rather than its translation (p. 139). She explicates her term “variant” as “the reproduction of a work that has a more or less different form than that of its original” or “a text that departs considerably from a text that is well-known by the readership” / “Bir metnin, bir yapıtın, aslından az çok ayrılan deđişik biçimlisi” or “bir yazarın herkesçe bilinen bir metnine karşı olan bir başka metin” (p. 135). Her term “variant” reminds us of Hollander’s definition of “version”: “a special form or *variant* of [the source text]” – thus Doltaş finds the particular target text “queer,” in the theorist’s terms (1959: 220f). In fact, in this article whose subtitle is “Esnek Aktarımın Sınırları” (The Limits of a Flexible Transfer), Doltaş criticizes not only Yücel but also the translation scholar Saliha Paker, who analyses the particular target text from a target-oriented perspective by using Anton Popovic’s concept of “shift of expression” and finds it to be a better translation than two other retranslations of the source text (1983). Doltaş, naturally, cannot set the limits of freedom in translation, but she does not hesitate to regard any difference from the source text as a transgression, which itself is questionable in translation criticism (see Broeck 1985: 58; Paker 1983: 131 and 134; Karantay 1987: 53; İnce 1993: 5f and cf. Popovic 1970: 84f). Although she

claims to base her criticism on a source and target text comparison suggested by Broeck (1988: 136), she disregards some crucial factors in his model: Doltaş approaches her task only from the source system and ignores the target system by not taking into consideration the constraints guiding Yücel’s choices. This reduces her criticism to a mere “error analysis” (see Broeck 1985: 56 and 58; İnce 1993: 7f). In an essay in the same journal, Paker responds to Doltaş, quoting from José Lambert and Hendrik van Gorp (1985: 45): “Obviously, whatever the theoretical basis they have got, those ‘normative’ approaches which offer subjective rules about ‘how, especially, a literary translation should be’ are not scientific, and thus are irrelevant” / “Yine çok açık olan bir durum varsa o da, şu ya da bu çeviri görüşüne göre, özellikle bir edebiyat çevirisinin ‘nasıl olması gerektiği’ konusunda öznel kurallar sunan ‘reçetemsî’ yaklaşımların bilimsel olmadığı, dolayısıyla geçersiz sayıldığıdır” (1988: 116).

In her “error analysis,” Doltaş uses the other two translations as her “tertium comparationis” or “hypothetical construct” (Broeck 1985: 57; Paker 1997: 25), and approaches translation excluding the notions of culture and translator (1988: 134). Surprisingly, she labels as an error Yücel’s choices of the suffix “-tan” instead of “-ın,” and “türkü” (folk song) in place of “şarkı” (song) in his title, claiming that his suffix does not convey possessiveness and the word “türkü” does not have a conceptual connection to love (p. 139f). She even criticizes Yücel for not keeping the rhyme scheme of Eliot’s poem intact, as if this was a common practice (pp. 142f).

Suat Karantay argues that Yücel’s *Sırça Kümes*, to be analyzed in Chapter V, ought to be classified as an “untranslated” work, because “despite all the creativity it entails, what we read as the translation is not a Williams play” / “Çevirinin tüm canlılığına, renkliliğine karşın okuduğumuz bir Williams oyunu değil [...]” (1989b:

128). Karantay believes that Yücel does not recreate the unique discourse of the play because of the excessive liberties he takes in his linguistic choices: He does not approve of Yücel's choice for the title, his use of slang words, and the register of the language the characters speak. Like Aykılıç and Doltaş, he disapproves of Yücel's use of vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture like "cicim," "boru değil," "dizlerinin bağı çözülmek," "tü kaka," "peder bey," "varta atlatmak" – calling this strategy "localization" ("yerelleştirme") (p. 127f; cf. 1992: 112f). While Karantay approaches this translation as a text to be read, Yücel explicitly presents it as a performance text (cf. Demirkol 2006: 25). However, unlike the previous critics, Karantay suggests that "Yücel's *Sırça Kümes* can be deemed an example of "acceptable" translation, since it uses many "[optional] shifts" (Toury 1980: 115f and Broeck 1985: 57) / "Verilen bu örnekler [kaydırmalar] çerçevesinde Can Yücel'in *Sırça Kümes*'i kabul edilebilir bir çeviri örneği sayılabilir" (p. 127); however, this target-oriented, objective approach to the target text seems to contrast with the source-orientedness in the critic's classification of the target text as "untranslated," which is criticized by Dilek Dizdar in one of her essays (1992: 132). Işın Bengi-Öner also sees this approach as a reflection of the source-oriented, process-oriented, normative approaches in translation criticism (1999b: 129) and designates the translational level targeted by source-oriented critics as utopian (p. 117).

At this point, having discussed Aykılıç, İpşiroğlu, Doltaş and Karantay's objections, we should recall Lefevere and Bassnett's argument that in the target literary system it is natural that "professors of literature and its students who approach it in a 'professional' way may regret this state of affairs," especially when they are not satisfied with the images of authors and works constructed in translations because they regard the source texts "sacrosanct" (1990: 9f). Thus, the

literary professionals' objections to Yücel's translations should be deemed as the second reason why Yücel's translations ought to be considered as good examples of the notion of "rewriting."

In a manner similar to Karantay's, Nur Deriş (1965) criticizes but does not consider *Muhteşem Gatsby*, the subject-matter of the analysis in Chapter VI, as outside the terrain of translation proper. Deriş deems the particular target text a translation worth analyzing, but criticizes Yücel for not adhering to the style of the writer; however, her argument is not free from Bengi-Öner's notion of *contradiction*: "Although Yücel has very successful translations where he uses his own discourse, you can never find the writer's style in any of his target texts" / "Can Yücel'in bu yolda çok başarılı çevirileri var ama hiç birinde yazarın anlatımını bulamıyor insan" (p. 461). Interestingly, Deriş calls the translation "successful," but finds it wanting in style; she praises Yücel's creative language, like Aykılıç and Karantay, but regards it too lively and ebullient to reflect the language of the source text (pp. 461f). On the other hand, contrary to other objectors (see Gündoğar 2000: 2; Yalçın ed. 2001: 927), the translator Deriş employs the term "rewriting" in the positive sense – "a translator's task should be to rewrite it, not to apply it" / "Oysa çevirmenin amacı çevirdiği yapıtı, yazıldığı dile en yakın biçimde *yeniden yazmak* olmalıdır, *uygulamak* değil" (p. 463). Though the verb "apply" hardly makes sense in this context, she claims to have reached this conclusion because of the many items specific to the target language and culture used in the translation, which she calls "Turkishizing" or "making it typically Turkish" ("Alaturkalaşma"). At this point, Deriş's contention that such a strategy is usually adopted by "those who love their people" as a form of resistance against foreignization of the home culture draws our attention to Yücel's ideological stance once more (p. 460): "Özellikle halkçı olan,

halkçılığı her şeyin üzerinde tutan kimseler bu anlayışı benimsemişlerdir” / “Especially ‘those who love their people and think about the benefit of their people more than anything else’ have adopted this [domesticating] translation approach” (p. 460). Deriş opts for “foreignizing” (Venuti 1995: 20) strategies in translation, like Nâzım Hikmet did (1968), in order to revivify and transform the Turkish language and culture (p. 463).

Contrary to Deriş and Karantay, Talât Sait Halman and Aziz Çalışlar qualify Yücel’s specific approach as being beyond translation proper, and equate it with “adaptation”:

Sonelerin aslına bağlı kalmak amacı güdülmüştür. Ama körü körüne sadakatten kaçınılmıştır. Uyarlama ya da *Türkçede yeniden söyleme* gibi yollara başvurulmamış; öte yandan, Türkçenin hakkını yememek, Soneleri güzel Türkçe şiirler olarak çevirmek üzerinde durulmuştur. (Halman 1989: 37)

I aimed to be faithful to the original sonnets, but avoided a dogmatic faithfulness. I did not adopt such approaches like adapting or *retelling in Turkish*; however, I did avoid doing injustice to Turkish and made an effort to translate the sonnets so as to make my target texts sound like beautiful poems in Turkish in their own right.

Obviously, Halman gives himself more freedom than literalism, but not so much as an adaptation or Yücel’s particular strategy does, aiming for a midway. However, while he emphasizes the significance of using good Turkish, which seems to be the first concern of Yücel’s unique approach, “Türkçe Söyleyen,” it seems that he does not want to understand Yücel. What other things than the peculiarities of the target language and culture can enable a translated poem to become a beautiful poem in the target literary system? Eyuboğlu asks a to-the-point rhetorical question at this point: “Is poetry in a way not the ability to speak the most common thoughts in the most

private, unique way?” / “Şiir bir bakıma en yaygın düşüncelerin en mahrem, en kendince söylenişi değil midir?” (1993: 6). As for Çalışlar, he expresses his opinions on drama translation in an interview conducted by Turgay Nar (1994). Although he is aware of the importance of recreating a dramatic language in the target text to make it function as a play, like Yücel does, he does not want to allow the translator the right to make necessary shifts for the sake of the play (pp. 92f). The contradiction becomes more poignant with this claim which sees translation as a copy of the original: “You need to comprehend the text in the foreign language, but reproduce it in your native language; yet it should still be the same as the original” / “Yabancı dilden alımlayacak, ama öz dilden üreteceksiniz, ama, yapıt, aynı yapıt kalacaktır” (p. 85). In addition, while Çalışlar suggests a “foreignizing” (Venuti 1995: 20) strategy like Deriş, he *opposes* the opposite alternative, “domestication,” just like Halman, claiming that it is “the wrong way.” Self-contradiction and declaration of one’s own way as the “correct” translation in these two approaches remind us again of the old, source-oriented, prescriptive approaches, which regard the translator as a “transparent imitator” of the original text and writer (Çavuşoğlu 2005: 5).

Finally, disapproving of Yücel’s choice of words of foreign origin and slang, of his use of vocabulary of local dialects and of two-word phrases, İsmail Boztaş also claims that Yücel does not recreate the writer’s language, or style or universe of discourse in *Muhteşem Gatsby* (1996: 10-18). Just like Doltaş and Deriş, Boztaş takes the source text at a literary level, considering the writer, the novel’s place in English literature, but deals with the target text only at the linguistic and stylistic levels, refusing to see the translator’s efforts to recreate the source text as a work to be read with ease and enjoyment by the target readers (pp. 9f). He positions the particular text outside the limits of translation proper by arguing that “the translator

does not have the right and authority to render a source text in a different style” / “[...] çeviri yapıt özgün yapıttan çok farklı bir biçimde aktarılmıştır. Bunu yapmaya da hiçbir çevirmenin hakkı ve yetkisi olabileceğini sanmıyoruz” (p. 18). However, Bengi-Öner’s suggestions of “contradiction” and “separateness from the realities of translation” are again central characteristics of this source-oriented criticism by Boztaş (1999b: 116f). While he (pp. 10ff) contends that the source text has a poetic, musical language with occasional sarcasm and satire, embellished by creative images and strong descriptions, and that its lexis loaded with unusual meanings are open to rich associations, he seems to undermine the translator’s creativity. Besides, while he is against Yücel’s “localizing” (“yerelleştirme”) language, Boztaş also criticizes Yücel’s retaining some source-text images because they are *unfamiliar* collocations that are not natural and common in everyday Turkish (p. 11f).

As for his criticism of Yücel’s use of two-word phrases, his reason is that they are almost never used in the source text. However, are Turkish and English not two different languages of different cultures? Why should an unavoidable linguistic difference become a “sin” (Toury 1985: 26) or “violence” (Dingwaney 1995: 3) committed against the source text? Furthermore, although he himself labels these emphatic phrases as “a sign of the richness and power of Turkish to create literary texts,” Boztaş does not consider the possibility that this may account for the translator’s strategies in his target text (1996: 12). Like the other critics, Boztaş does not take into consideration the differences between the author and the translator as “governed by the differing social and literary situations,” which determine the “style” of the target text (Popovic 1970: 79).

## Acclaim

As for the acclaim Yücel's translations have received from the target readership, translator Feyyaz Kayacan Fergar, for instance, calls Yücel's output "wonderful" ("fevkalade") and foregrounds his drama translations *Bahar Noktası* and *Fırtına* from Shakespeare, claiming that they have been successfully staged and have become a turning point in Turkish drama (1993: 23). İbrahim Kardeş, who argues that such designations like "Türkçesi/Türkçeleştiren" (Turkish translation/Turkishized by), and "Türkçe Söyleyen" connote a claim of literary excellence in translation, contends that Yücel's translations can by no means be compared to the work of a translation bureau (2002: 2). The virtual Vikipedi Encyclopedia finds Yücel's Shakespeare translations both extremely successful and yet a little wanting in faithfulness, displaying a clear contradiction specific to the source-oriented approaches, and highlights Yücel's rendition of "to be or not to be" as "bir ihtimal daha var, o da ölmek mi dersin?" (2006: 2). Theatrical director Başar Sabuncu, who staged *Bahar Noktası* (2003) in Istanbul in the early 1980's (Üster 2003), describes this "appropriating" nature of Yücel's translations as "an approach that turns Shakespeare into one of our own" ("Shakespeare'i hemşerimiz yapan") and calls it "extremely attractive" ("tadına doyum olmaz") (2003: 25 and 11) in a similar manner to Karantay, who finds Yücel's translations "outrageous, yet at times delightful" / "çılgın ama yer yer tadına doyum olmaz" (1989b: 125).

In his newspaper article on Yücel's translations, where he especially praises his dramatic works *Bahar Noktası* and *Fırtına* for his skillful use of the target language, translator and literary critic Fatih Özgüven (1999) also refers to the above-mentioned rendition from Shakespeare, and deems it a creative move. Özgüven

claims that since dramatic language, especially that of Shakespeare, should be “down-to-earth” (“avam”), the language of the translation should reflect this in order not to alienate the audience and end up in dead theatre. Here Özgüven sounds like Yücel himself. Quoting from his interview with the translator, Karantay states that Yücel’s aim in using free strategies in drama and poetry translation is “to revive a writer [in Turkey] today because dead things do not inspire people” / “Yücel [...] ölü şeylerin insanı dürtmediğini, amacının bir yazarı ‘günümüzde,’ ‘burada,’ ‘yeniden yaşatmak’ olduğunu, özellikle şiir ve tiyatro çevirilerinde bu nedenle aşırıya gittiğini belirtmiştir” (1987 qtd. by Karantay 1989b: 125). Özgüven claims that the translator’s language in *Bahar Noktası*, filled with idioms peculiar to the Turkish language, and expressions of different social groups, “was far from being an imitation – it flowed like thick, delicious molasses” / “[...] dili bir taklitten çok öteydi, koyu, güzel bir pekmez gibi akıyordu” (1999). Clearly, Özgüven praises Yücel’s natural language in the target text for not being “translationese,” meaning “an artificial form of a receptor language, in violation of normal grammatical and semotactic patterns, caused by an excessive effort toward formal correspondence” (Nida and Taber 1982: 208). Also, Özgüven considers the translator’s objective to recreate the source-text via the opportunities of his native language as very natural.

Similarly, translator Cevat Çapan praises the significant contribution of Yücel’s translation in the success of the *Bahar Noktası* on the Turkish stage (2003: 31). In his article entitled “Özgürlüğüne Kavuşan Shakespeare” (Shakespeare Liberated) Çapan claims that this translation “frees Shakespeare by rescuing him from every negative quality found in scholarly translations” (p. 33). Like Özgüven, Çapan argues that “Yücel grasped what Shakespeare wanted to say in this play and created a dramatic text that voiced his discursive qualities by using all the

possibilities of the Turkish language” / “Can Yücel, Shakespeare’in bu oyunda ne demek istediğini anlayıp onun söyleyiş özelliklerini Türkçenin olanaklarıyla dile getiren bir oyun metni çıkarmış ortaya” (p. 31). Touching upon the appropriation of the source text, Çapan believes that Shakespeare’s characters are recreated in forms familiar to the target culture without losing their original identities, and that the source-text references accessible only to the audience of Shakespeare’s time are “skillfully” (“ustaca”) rendered into suitable equivalents, thus enabling the translator’s choices like “Mehlika Sultan” and “Denizkızı Eftalya” to have a Shakespearean function in the translation. Obviously, Çapan finds a strong functional equivalence between the target text and its source text. In addition, he praises Yücel’s *Her Boydan* for being “the brightest example as a book of translated poetry” / “Can Yücel’in *Her Boydan*’ı başarılı şiir çevirileriyle dolu. Kitap olarak bence en parlak örnek” (*Metis Çeviri* 1990b: 17).

Another translator, Ülker İnce (1999: 14f) also underlines the necessity to provide a drama or poetry translation with a functional equivalence and explicitly gives the translator the expert position he or she deserves in order to fulfill “[the] social role [...] allotted by [the] community” (Toury 1995: 53). In this respect, İnce sees Yücel as the epitome of the concept of “expert translator” (“uzman çevirmen”), and ascribes the controversy over his translations to the lack of this understanding in our literary system (p. 14). İnce states that some of Yücel’s critics wrongly argue about the results of his translation process whereas they should actually discuss his purposes or the understanding behind his translations, just as we suggested in the previous subsection. She argues that “there is no inconsistency between his translations and his translation approach” / “[...] çeviri anlayışıyla çeviri ürünleri arasında hiç tutarsızlık yok” (p. 13). Furthermore, claiming that some of his choices

are “very radical” (p. 15), İnce describes Yücel as the “extreme” example of a “free” translator who is very “visible” since he “familiarize[s]” (Venuti 1994: 18) the writer’s text to such an extent that he in a way “overshadows” him or her: “O ‘serbest’ çeviri yapan, ‘yerlileştiren,’ yazarın ‘önüne’ geçen, fazlaca ‘görünen’ bir çevirmendir” (p. 12). Besides, İnce draws attention to those who dislike his target texts and those who like them (p. 12f); she does “not lament [the] existing state of affairs,” just like Lefevere (1982: 247 and cf. Lefevere and Bassnett 1990: 13). This should be deemed as the third reason to call Yücel Lefevere’s “rewriter.” However, she criticizes those critics like Boztaş who do not give Yücel the right to be himself (p. 13). Criticizing also those who use “rewriting” in the pejorative sense, İnce calls Yücel’s target texts “rewriting” and implies that *they are its best examples*: “He rewrites his source texts because *to translate means to rewrite*” / “[...] yeniden yazıyor çünkü *çeviri yapmak yeniden yazmaktır*” (p. 15).

Another translator and scholar, Saliha Paker (1983), in her article that provoked Doltaş’s criticism in the previous subsection, analyses three retranslations of a poem by T.S. Eliot, using the notion of “shifts of expression” (Popovic 1970). She assesses the target texts, without designating the differences between them and the source texts as errors. Paker (pp. 135-37) concludes that Yücel’s translation is characterized by more structural and local shifts than the other two but that it equally tries to retain the “invariant core” (Bassnett 2002: 33f), that is, the semantic coherence of the original poem. Finding Yücel’s translation more “poetic” (“şiiirli”) than the other two due to its special attention to the recreation of the rhyming scheme and rhythm of the source text, Paker labels it as the only “metapoem” (Holmes 1970: 93f) among the three which can stand as a poem in its own right in the target literary system, achieving a functional equivalence (p. 139). Karantay praises this descriptive

analysis by Paker as “the first step towards an objective translation criticism”: “Paker [...] nesnel eleştirisi doğrultusunda ilk adımı atmış olur” (1987: 53).

Like Özgüven and İnce, theatre director Yücel Erten points to Yücel’s ability as an expert translator to create a theatrical world, “a universe of discourse,” like an expert dramatist (1999: 16 and 18). He too underlines the translator’s special preference for vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture with examples from *Bahar Noktası* and argues that such cultural shifts allow the reader to get the feel of a geography, not of Ancient Athens, but of Istanbul, where Turkish idioms, low-colloquialism and aristocratic register come together and mingle. Although finding the translator’s shifts too free from time to time, like İnce, he cannot help getting impressed by the creativity and literary excellence in them: “Senin ettiğin o yeminleri tartan kantar, kuş cehenneminde kuştüyü tartar!” (p. 18). Erten continues to express his admiration for Yücel’s idiosyncratic approach to translation by referring to two examples from his works as “presents” from Yücel to his writers and readers: “Hay itler!” which was severely criticized by İpşiroğlu in the previous subsection, and “ne deh şey insan denen bu çüş!”

Like Çapan, translator Sabahattin Eyuboğlu praises Yücel’s *Her Boydan*, claiming that it is “one of the most, perhaps the most important event in Turkish poetry in 1957” / “1957 yılında Türk şiirinin en önemli olaylarından biri, belki de en önemlisi Can Yücel’in *Her Boydan* adı altında toplayıp yayımladığı şiir çevirileridir” (1993: 6). He too believes that occasionally Yücel’s renditions are very free and different poets gain a stylistically similar identity in his target texts, but he adds the compliment that “such qualities function like a wind that raises a kite into the air” / “[...] bu aşırılıklar Can Yücel’de uçurtmayı havalandıran rüzgâr oluyor” (p. 6f). Besides, Eyuboğlu stresses that Yücel’s idiosyncratic discourse places him in a

closer position to the writer and describes this characteristic as “a person’s reunion with another person” and “adoption of a world song” / “insanın insanla kaynaşması” and “dünyanın türküsünü benimseme” (p. 7). In a similar vein, Celal Üster states that he did not opt for using Yücel’s idiosyncratic designation between his own name and that of Shakespeare on the cover of *Bahar Noktası* (William Shakespeare - Can Yücel) because he claims that Yücel nearly “rewrote” it by enriching the lust, that is, “lust as sexual desire and lust as that of words” in Shakespeare’s text: “Ne ki, yalnızca bedenlerin şehveti değil, sözlerin şehveti de söz konusudur burada” (2003). If we are to use the notion of proximity between “rewriting” and original composition as a “collu[sion]” between the rewriter and the reader (Bassnett 1998: 39; cf. Gentzler 1998: xv) and if we remember that rewriting is a cultural appropriation or rather “creative appropriation” (Coates 1999: 92 and 99), we can suggest this notion of proximity to original composition prevailing in the discourse on Yücel’s translations as the fourth reason for designating them as fine examples of rewriting.

Finally, Işın Bengi-Öner refers to Yücel as “the poet-translator whose target texts we read with pleasure” / “Çevirilerini zevkle okuduğumuz şair çevirmenimiz Can Yücel” (1999a: 14), and she likens Yücel’s ambivalence about an appropriate designation for his translations to the one in the minds of theorists such as Cicero and Dryden, who felt compelled to leave some translations outside the legitimate limits of translation proper. Using the term “translator” for Yücel rather than “imitator,” “adaptor,” or “version-writer,” Bengi-Öner (p. 14) attributes the existence of such ambivalence to “the lack of an apt literary translation theory to account for literary translators’ performances completely” / “Bu neden, yazın çevirmenlerinin çeviri edimlerini tam olarak açıklayacak bir kurama duydukları gereksinimdir kanımca”.

## “Türkçe Söyleyen” Can Yücel: the “Rewriter” *par excellence*

Now it is time to problematize Yücel’s idiosyncratic translation approach designated as “Türkçe Söyleyen.” To this end, we shall investigate the place of this term first in our culture and then in translation theory.

### The Designation “Türkçe Söyleyen” in the Turkish Culture

To start with, there are many instances where this particular translation designation has been used and foregrounded in the target culture. Özgüven’s article on Yücel’s translational approach is entitled “Türkçe Söyleyen: Can Yücel” (1999). A recent cassette in which Yücel’s poetic translations are recited by Baha Boduroğlu (2006) carries this same idiosyncratic title (appendix A). The Hürriyetim.com website (Ergüder 2000: 3) has sonnet translations from Shakespeare by Yücel and Talât Sait Halman – the website uses the usual designation “Türkçesi” (Turkish translation) for Halman’s translations while it opts for “Türkçe Söyleyen” for Yücel’s translations (appendix B). *Metis Çeviri* (1990a) published Yücel’s poetry translation “Deniz Meltemi” from Stéphane Mallarmé with this specific designation, while two other translations of the same poem by Orhan Veli and Kemalettin Kamu are presented with the usual “çeviren” (translator) (appendix C). The title pages of Yücel’s *Fırtına* (1996) and *Hamlet* (1998) (appendices D and E), the internet advertisement of his *Her Boydan*, by Seçilmiş Hikâyeler Dergisi Yayınları in 1957 (appendix F), and his translation “Alla’sen Söyle Nedir Aşkın Aslı Astarı” published in the online literary archive of *Epigraf* (2005, appendix G) are among the many other examples that bring together Yücel’s name and his self-designation, “Türkçe Söyleyen.”

Although “Türkçe Söyleyen” stands as a unique contribution of Yücel to the translator designation terminology of the post-Republican Turkey, it is not an entirely new term in our literary culture, which dates back to the time of the Köktürk State in Central Asia in the sixth century A. D. (cf. Demircioğlu 2005: 109f). In his doctoral dissertation on translation during the Ottoman period, Cemal Demircioğlu presents two translation definitions, quite similar to Yücel’s idiosyncratic designation, by using the “paratextual” (Genette 1997:1 qtd. by Gürçağlar 2002: 44) information taken from “some verse romance narratives, i.e. *mesnevi*[s]” because “[they] are unavailable in [the] lexicons” (pp. 125-28).

The first is excerpted from the old Turkish translation of the Persian poet Selman Saveci’s *mesnevi*, *Cemşîd ü Hurşîd* by Ahmedî in the fifteenth century: “[*Türkîce*] *eyitmek* (to tell in Turkish),” which is now written in original brackets and emphasis, as in all of the related quotations below (p. 126). Demircioğlu cites what the translator Ahmedî wrote to describe what he did in his work, and translates it into English: “Bu dilce eyidesin (*anı*) *Cemşîd* [...] (So that you may tell the [story of] *Cemşîd* in this Turkish language).” In fact, in the “conclusion of the book,” Ahmedî explains the essence of his translation approach very clearly: “*Getürdüm anı burada be-tazmin* [...] (I took / appropriated it [the source]).” The second definition – close to “Türkçe Söyleyen” – derives from Gülşehri’s translation of *Mantıku’t Tayr* by another Persian poet, Ferideddin Attar, who lived in the fourteenth century: “*Türkî suretinde söylemek* (to tell in Turkish)” (p. 128). Demircioğlu again quotes and translates Gülşehri’s words in old Turkish and does the necessary English translation: “*Anı Türkî suretinde biz dakı/ Söyledük Tâzi gibi Tanrı hakı* (For the sake of God, we told it [the story] in the likeness of Turkish).” Interestingly, Gülşehri was acclaimed, like Yücel, for being creative and showing literary excellence. Quoting

from Saliha Paker (2002: 130), Demircioğlu states that Mehmed Fuad Köprülü praised Gülşehri for “produc[ing] not a casual translation (*gelişigüzel bir terceme*) but a work of his own,” contributing to Turkish poetry, “especially by his inventive use of additional poetic sources” as a poet rather than a translator.

Bülent Aksoy also mentions this very old concept of “Türkçe söylemek” (to tell in Turkish) when he refers to Sabahattin Eyuboğlu’s translation of *Macbeth* in his article elaborating on the competing translation approaches that have existed in our society during the Republican Era (1995: 77). Aksoy designates Yücel’s approach as “the extreme example of the continuation of the Ataç-Eyuboğlu approach,” characterized by the skillful use of the Turkish language, and the conscious effort to make the target text read like an original composition of Turkish rather than as a translation, as opposed to the widely-used term in Turkish, “çeviri kokmak” – literally meaning “smelling of translation.” Lawrence Venuti criticizes the former way for being “fluent,” “transparent” and “invisible” (1994: 19), but praises the latter for “smelling of translation,” for showing its translated, foreign nature, and having power “to revivify and transform” the target language and culture (p. 21).

Another important point about Aksoy’s critique of the “Türkçe Söyleyen” approach is that it is based on a leftist ideology with an aim “to ‘translate’ every idea, concept, term into the language of the people [colloquial language], to seek for the equivalent of every kind of discourse ‘in the people’s language’” / “Her düşüncüyü, kavramı, terimi halk diline ‘çevirmek,’ her söylemin ‘halkçasını’ aramak bu çeviri anlayışının sınırlarını da gösterir” (p. 77). Eyuboğlu expresses this aspect of Yücel’s “Türkçe Söyleyen” so well: “Dünya insanına seslenen şiirleri bizim Ali Veli’lerin diliyle söylüyor” / “He speaks the poems that address the people of the world *in the language of our Ali and Velis*” (1993: 6). The same implication is also found in

Karantay's words which describe this "macro-strategy" (Hönig 1991: 78) as "an extreme case in translation," like Aksoy: "Can Yücel, halk kaynaklarına, halk ağzına, yöresel deyişlere, atasözlerine, argo sözcüklere, sunturlu küfürlere çokça yaslanan zengin bir Türkçe kullanır. Çeviri anlayışı bir uç durum oluşturan Yücel, çılgın ama yer yer tadına doyumaz çeviriler üretmiştir" / "Can Yücel makes use of a rich Turkish based on public resources, people's dialects, local idioms, proverbs, slang expressions, and swear words. Yücel, whose translation approach is an extreme one, has produced outrageous translations that are at times delightful" (1989b: 125).

### The Approach "Türkçe Söyleyen" in Translation Theory

The descriptivist translation theorist Gideon Toury (1995: 32) argues that a translation is what is "presented or regarded as such" by the target culture. Yücel's works were and are still received as translations by Turkish people: In his *Şairler ve Yazarlar Sözlüğü* (Dictionary of Poets and Writers) Şükran Kurdakul describes Yücel as "yayımladığı şiir, yazı, çeviri şiirleriyle tanınan Yücel" / "Yücel is known for his poems, essays, and poetry translations" (1985: 669); the Wikipedia Encyclopedia highlights the translator's drama translations in addition to his poetic ones: "Brecht gibi ünlü yazarların oyunlarından çeviriler yaptı. [...] 'to be or not to be' sözünü bir ihtimal daha var, o da ölmek mi dersin' şeklinde çevirmiş olması hâlâ hatırlardadır" / "He did translations from such famous playwrights as Brecht. [...] His translation of the phrase "to be or not to be" with an idiosyncratic phrase from a Turkish song is still remembered" (2006). Besides, in the first quotation of Chapter I, which ends in "I felt compelled to designate myself as *the person writing [the source text] in Turkish,*" Yücel – the producer of "acceptable" translations – is Toury's

expert translator playing a social role, conscious of “the prerequisite for becoming a translator within a cultural environment,” learning its norms and maneuvering between all its constraints (p. 53).

Similarly, as we briefly mentioned in the subsection “Criticism,” the functionalist translation theorist Hans J. Vermeer enables us to refer to Yücel as a “responsible,” “expert” translator when he suggests that in order to serve the target culture, a translator must be able to say “what is what,” “decide [...] what role a source text plays in his translational action” in accordance with his purpose, and thus “explain why he acts as he does” (1989: 222f). Hence, as Vermeer’s “expert in transcultural communication,” Yücel does more than merely “transcode a text line by line into a target language” (1992: 13f). In addition to the sample quotation in the above-mentioned subsection, where he expresses the basic motives behind his strategies in drama translation, Yücel briefly explains his “skopos” regarding poetry translation with the following words:

Benim çeviri anlayışım aşağı yukarı şu. Kelimenin kitabı yahut alfabetik yahut kelamsal yanını değil, ana şiir olayını çevirmek istiyorum ben, onun olay olarak Türkçeye nakli meselesine dikkat ediyorum. [...] Yoksa bunu at onu getir meselesi olarak görmüyorum çeviri olayını – parçacıkların naklinde bütünselliğin kovalamacası söz konusu olan. (Karantay 1989a: 11)

My translation understanding is more or less as follows: I try to translate the poetic essence of a poem, not its individual words; I’m careful about translating it into Turkish as an entity. [...] I don’t see translation as a matter of omitting words or adding others – what is important for me is to aim for wholeness while translating the pieces.

At this point, we must draw attention to how closely Yücel’s “notion of fidelity” in the above quote resembles George Steiner’s argument that “[f]idelity is not literalism or any technical device for rendering ‘spirit.’ [...] The translator [...] is *faithful* to his

text, makes his response responsible, only when he endeavors to restore the balance of forces, of integral presence, which his appropriative comprehension has disrupted” (1975: 190, original emphasis). Besides, by allowing himself the freedom to translate the form and content of his source text, which is an important consideration in literary translation even for the old theorists such as Alexander Tytler (1791: 209), Yücel uses the freedom suggested by Anton Popovic in his “The Concept of ‘Shift of Expression’ in Translation Analysis,” which quotes from Karel Hausenblas (1968):

“There is a simultaneous relevancy of identity and difference.” It is not the translator’s only business to “identify” himself with the original: that would merely result in a transparent translation. *The translator also has the right to differ organically, to be independent, as long as that independence is pursued for the sake of the original*, a technique applied in order to reproduce it as a living work. (1970: 80)

Saliha Paker calls this understanding of freedom “real faithfulness to the source text” / “kaynak metne gerçek anlamda bağlı kalma yükümlülüğü” (1983: 134). In fact, Katherina Reiss and Hans Vermeer (1984) also allow the expert translator the necessary freedom to produce, rather than reproduce, his or her target text for the target audience by relating his or her “translatum” with the source text through an “intertextual coherence,” defined in terms of the specified skopos. Thus the translator, whether a literalist like Nabokov, Walter Benjamin or a free translator such as Yücel, Ezra Pound, is deemed to have a legitimate strategy (Vermeer 1989: 223 and 228). In this approach, “intertextual coherence” is outweighed by “intratextual coherence,” which is Yücel’s basic concern: The target reader should be able to “interpret [the target text] as being sufficiently coherent with their situation” (Nord 1997: 32).

These modern approaches to translation, which stop seeing a translated text as

a copy of the original and free the translator from the straitjacket of literalness, gain their strength from Eugene Nida's views that "there can be no absolute correspondence between languages [...] there can be no fully exact translations," and "one must not imagine that the process of translation can avoid a certain degree of *interpretation by the translator*" (1964: 126). In addition, Nida allows the translator a more active role, especially with his suggestion of "dynamic equivalence," which intends to "naturalize" or adapt the foreign text according to the needs and expectations of the target readership and culture, making a bilingual, bicultural reader say "That is just the way we would say it" (pp. 136-40). He supports this idea by arguing that in a translation, "the characters, the situations, the reflections must come to us as they were in the author's mind and heart, *not necessarily precisely as he had them on his lips*" (p. 132). This way, taking a big step to free the translator from being judged on the grounds of an impractical idea of translation, Nida seems to justify Yücel's interpretation of his source texts and his taking liberties to make his translations accessible for his readership. Venuti describes this "regime of fluent translating" as the "invisible" act that "produces the illusory effect of transparency," with which "the translated text seems 'natural,' i.e., not translated" (1994: 19). Although he does not opt for this familiarization process in translation, like Venuti, the German theorist Friedrich Schleiermacher can be deemed as another translation theorist who gives the translator the same freedom to act with his second "method": "Either the translator leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer, or *he [or she] leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer toward the reader*" (1992: 42). If we keep traveling back in time, Cicero's notion of familiarizing the source text sounds as if he was referring to Yücel's translations today, not to his own from two Attic orators:

I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the “figures” of thought, *but in language which conforms to our usage*. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language. For *I did not think I ought to count them out to the reader like coins, but to pay them by weight*, as it were.

Quoting Cicero’s words above in H.M.Hubbell’s translation in his *Translation and Empire*, Douglas Robinson interprets Cicero’s strategy as “the Roman *appropriation* of Greece,” an act of making the foreign text their own property (1997: 52). At this point, we must voice Constance B. West’s notion of translation, echoing that of Cicero nearly twenty-two centuries later: “Whoever takes upon himself to translate contracts a debt; to discharge it, he must pay not with the same money, but the same sum” (1932: 344 qtd. by Nida 1964: 126). This emphatic meaning of *appropriation* is also observable in an excerpt from St. Jerome’s famous letter to Pammachius, quoted by Robinson again: “[The translator] did not bind himself to the drowsiness of literal translation, or allow himself to be chained to the literalism of an inadequate culture, but *like some conqueror, he marched the original text, a captive, into his native language*” (p. 55). Likewise, Steiner defines translation as “the hermeneutic motion, the act of elicitation and *appropriative* transfer of meaning” in which “the translator invades, extracts, and brings home [the source texts]” (1975: 186f). In fact, Yücel himself sounds very much like Jerome and Steiner when he qualifies translation as a “frontier” and its aim as “conquest”: “Çeviri bir ‘serhad’ olduğuna göre, (sınırı değil) amacı ‘fetih’dir elbet” / “Since translation is a ‘frontier,’ ‘conquest’ is not its borderline, but its purpose” (antoloji.com 2004: 2). In addition, Willard Quine’s suggestion that “a good way to give a meaning is to say something in the home language that has it” should be deemed as another good reason for Yücel’s appropriating “Türkçe Söyleyen” approach (1959: 95).

Just as Robinson suggests with examples, first, of the “assimilative” translations of French neoclassicism, in which “Homer must enter France a captive, clad in the French fashion, [...] learn French customs” and then of the German Romantics, whose aim of translation “shifted from that of ‘seeing the foreign author as he is’ to conquest” in the late eighteenth century, the translator’s work can be an act of patriotism and thus this metaphorical relation between the translator and empire becomes one of the main foci of post-colonial approaches (1997: 59-61). In this respect, Yücel, the translator of a culture under influence, “using translation [from] an imperial language as a means of cultural advocacy” (Tymoczko 2003: 184), seems to resist the power of the hegemonic English language and culture by his macro-strategy of “appropriation,” which is also a basic strategy in post-colonial literatures (see Ashcroft et al. 1989: 23). Thus, approaching his source texts with the conception of “culture-as-goods” (Even-Zohar 2000: 389), Yücel seems to become a *patriot* who considers them as “cultural” or “informational capital” (Bourdieu 1987: 3) having “symbolic power” (Bourdieu 1992: 164), that is, “accumulated prestige or honor” (p. 14), as a property of another culture or world culture. Thus, Yücel’s appropriating or heavily “domesticating” translation seems to turn into “a form of resistance” against imperialism “in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations” (Venuti 1995: 20) by “stress[ing] [Turkish] translation’s potential for constructing equitable exchange” against the hegemonic English language and culture in his political translation practice (Maier 1995: 23).

Last but not least, Lefevere’s theory of “rewriting,” which he developed together with Susan Bassnett, can also account for Yücel’s translation approach. Just as Ülker İnce and Nur Deriş argue, one does not have to be a translation theorist to see the fact that every translation is in fact a rewriting: The translator is not the writer

of the original; his language is different from that of the original, his text will appeal to a different readership with a different culture than the writer's; so, naturally, he creates his target text by reading, interpreting and rewriting the original, using the possibilities of the target language and culture, and his or her translating competence. Lefevere's two basic factors, ideology and poetics, explicitly operate in the leftist, "post-colonialist" Yücel's translations, in which he creates his unique poetics by including many vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture – called "Can Babaca" (*Canese*) by Üstün Akmen in his theatre programme entitled "2002-2003 Tiyatro Sezonu" (The 2002-2003 Theatre Season) (2006: 2, appendix H and see Demirkol 2006: 53). Yücel becomes Lefevere's subversive "spirited translator," who adheres to the universe of discourse of the target culture by substituting in place of the source-text peculiarities those of his time and nation. Yücel opts for a colloquial language that reflects the target culture very strongly in his works and builds an identical intertextual relationship between his target and source texts, aiming at functional equivalence as Lefevere's "modern," "faithful" translator, doing what the target audience or the commissioner, himself, wants. Consequently, since Yücel's approach operates under all of these constraints, confirming Lefevere's suggestion that "translation is probably the most obvious instance of rewriting" (1985: 234), this macro-strategy becomes the most obvious instance of the notion, and makes Yücel the "rewriter" *par excellence*.

At this point, the four specific aspects of the notion of "rewriting" observable in Yücel's translations, or rather in their reception in the target society, which have been pinpointed since the beginning of this chapter should be summed up. First, rewriting may have a resistant, subversive, and thus "post-colonial" aspect; Yücel's use of his Mao and Ché Guevara translations as a cover for his ideology, which

resulted in his imprisonment, and his use of pseudo-translations to criticize the government or to subvert the literary norms are two fine examples of this aspect of rewriting. Secondly, deeming the source texts sacrosanct, literary people underestimate a translation if they do not like the translator's image of the writer, and this is exactly what has happened in Yücel's career. Thirdly, within the notion of "rewriting," translation becomes a matter of likes and dislikes, which is considered as the natural state of affairs in a culture, and many people have expressed their liking or disliking of Yücel's works. Lastly, as it is an act of constructing cultures, where translation is seen as a cultural appropriation, usually in the form of the "colonization" of the source culture, performed by a "visible" agent, there is an idea of closeness to original writing in "rewriting" and this is very observable, for instance, in Celal Üster's reception and presentation of *Bahar Noktası* (appendix I), which brings together the playwright's and the translator's names without a "translator" designation as if it were an original composition. In the final analysis, all these considerations point to the same conclusion about Yücel once again – that he is the "rewriter" *par excellence*.

### Summary and Conclusions

To start with, Can Yücel was a prolific translator of poetry, drama, prose and non-fiction. He has translated works by canonical writers and poets of world literature such as Shakespeare, T.S. Eliot, Brecht, T. Williams, Charles Dickens – mostly directly from English into Turkish. Yücel's non-literary translations from Ché Guevara and Mao, which caused him to spend three years in prison, and his pseudo-translations, which, under the designation "Indian poetry," criticized the

governments of his time, should be considered as signs of Lefevre's constraint of ideology in his career as a leftist "rewriter," with a resistant, post-colonial stance (cf. Demirkol 2006: 53, 56, 66 and 113). Yücel's free translations uniquely designated as "Türkçe Söyleyen" have been both severely criticized and highly acclaimed by his critics.

Considering the criticism raised against Yücel's translations by Savaş Aykılıç, Zehra İpşiroğlu, Dilek Doltaş, Suat Karantay, Nur Deriş, Talât Sait Halman, Aziz Çalışlar, and İsmail Boztaş, we can come up with two basic objections: Yücel creates a "universe of discourse" in his translations that differs from the one in his source texts; and the "natural language" he uses in his translations is far from reflecting the language of his originals. Thus, we can combine these two criticisms into one basic objection: Critics, six of whom situate his target texts outside the limits of "translation proper" – calling them adaptation, version or rewrite – believe that he does not reproduce the writers' styles in his translations. The main reason behind their argument is Yücel's "Turkishizing" or "localizing" or rather "appropriating" discourse, which includes many vocabulary items peculiar to the Turkish language and culture, and his slang expressions. Did Yücel really not care about recreating his writers' styles? His explanations on his translation strategies refute this possibility; but did he really try and yet fail to recreate this important aspect of literary translation?

This stylistic criticism entails problems: We can detect the typical characteristics of source-oriented, normative, process-oriented translation approaches in the opinions of the said critics: self-contradiction and separateness from translational realities. Although the critics approach the "sacrosanct" source texts at levels of both language and culture, they consider translated texts only at the

linguistic level, which prevents them from “looking at the translations from the translator’s shoulders.” It seems that these critics do not consider the differences between the author and the translator as “governed by the differing social and literary situations” which determine the “style” of the target text. Therefore, from their perspective, Yücel’s translations are weak or faulty in terms of style.

The critical acclaim, emphatically voiced by Fatih Özgüven, Cevat Çapan, Ülker İnce, Saliha Paker, Yücel Erten, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu and Işın Bengi-Öner, converges on three main points: (a) the translator’s skillful, creative use of the Turkish language that leads to literary excellence (which is admitted even by some objectors), (b) his appropriation of the source texts by way of language-specific and culture-specific vocabulary of Turkish, and (c) his aim to create functional equivalence in poetry and drama translation. We must note that the first and the second of the above points are at the same time the two main aspects that are severely criticized; and the third one is not recognized as a legitimate right by any one of the critics although it is implied as necessary by several of them. What the source-oriented critics see as weakness seems to turn into strength for the target-oriented critics who rightfully trust the translator as an expert and try to understand his aims and constraints. Yücel’s supporters, naturally, do not even question whether his translations are translation proper or not; but several of them – Sabuncu, İnce, Erten and Eyuboğlu – explicitly state or imply that his appropriating renditions, which can be considered very free sometimes, turn his writers and poets into Turkish people, giving them a stylistically similar identity that “overshadows” their individuality. This is one of the most significant characteristics of his translations, and entitles him to the designation “rewriter” *par excellence*.

As for the origin of the designation “Türkçe Söyleyen” in the Turkish culture,

thanks to Cemal Demircioğlu's research on translation during the Ottoman period, we learn that two similar designations were used by our ancestors in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries: "*Türkîce eyitmek*" coined by Ahmedî and "*Türkî suretinde söylemek*," by Gülşehri, both meaning "to tell in Turkish" (Türkçe söylemek). At this point, Ahmedî's reference to his translation approach as "I took / *appropriated* it [the source]" and the acclaim Gülşehri received for his literary excellence are particularly important. Bülent Aksoy claims that Yücel's idiosyncratic designation is the "extreme" example of the continuation of Nurullah Ataç and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu's understanding of translation which aimed to bring translation closer to original composition by way of the skillful use of the Turkish language. Once again, we come to realize what Yücel's approach avoids creating: translationese, which is referred to as "*çeviri kokmak*" in Turkish, and we detect the leftist or socialist ideology that seems to form the basis of this particular translation approach: translating almost every idea, concept or term into the language of the *people* and seeking for equivalents in the *people's* language.

From the perspective of translation theory, we can maintain that "*Türkçe Söyleyen*" constitutes a possible, valid macro-strategy that has been suggested by many theorists since ancient times. In light of Toury's descriptive, target-oriented approach, Yücel's translations are translation proper since they are regarded as such in the target culture, and can be classified as "acceptable" translations. Yücel's awareness of the translational norms in Turkey, observable in his interviews, qualifies him as Toury's expert, norm-governed translator who undertakes a social role. Yücel also becomes Vermeer's transcultural communication expert who produces his translations in accordance with his particular "*skopos*," doing more than merely transcode his texts, and is ready to explain his translation decisions when

asked. (Yücel's understanding of fidelity, which is to use freedom for the sake of the original, actually echoes George Steiner and Anton Popovic's ideas on the issue.) Indeed, with its concept of "intertextual coherence," the Skopos Theory provides Yücel with ample freedom and condones his target-oriented decisions with its "intratextual coherence." Furthermore, with his concept of "dynamic equivalence," Nida, the source of inspiration for modern translation theorists with his approach to translation as an interpretive act rather than a copy of the original, would also condone Yücel's understanding of translation. Traveling back in time, Schleiermacher's option that the translator can "leave the reader alone and move the writer toward the reader" is another "method" in line with this particular approach, just like the appropriative understanding by Cicero, who does not want to "count [the words] out to the reader like coins, but to pay them by weight." The view which regards translation as a form of conquest can also be seen in St. Jerome's, Steiner's and Yücel's own discourse on translation, as well as in the translations of the French neoclassicists and the German Romantics of the eighteenth century. Thus, when we qualify the translator's work as an act of patriotism, Yücel, who seems to regard his source texts as "cultural capital" with "symbolic power" belonging to the source cultures, seems to become a "resistant," "post-colonial" translator using translation from hegemonic English into Turkish as a means of cultural advocacy.

Lefevere and Bassnett's notion of "rewriting," whose two basic factors, ideology and poetics, explicitly operate in the leftist Yücel's translations, displaying a unique translation poetics called "Can Babaca" (*Canese*), corroborate the above points. We can witness the influence of all the specific constraints of "rewriting" on Yücel's translations: In addition to his unique poetics, with a stated ideology Yücel adheres to the universe of discourse of the target culture rather than the source one,

and is, thus, Lefevere's subversive "spirited translator" (cf. Demirkol 2006: 22); he uses a colloquial language that reflects the target culture very strongly and makes his source texts play an identical role in each of his translations, aiming at functional equivalence. Thus, with all these characteristics inherent in this particular corpus of translations, Lefevere's statement that "translation is probably the most obvious instance of rewriting" is confirmed and Yücel becomes the "rewriter" *par excellence*. In addition, we can observe four important aspects of "rewriting" in the reception of the poet-translator's translations in the target society: his resistant, subversive, thus, "post-colonial" attitude with his subversive pseudo-translations, and his Mao and Ché Guevara translations that resulted in his imprisonment; his being severely criticized by literary scholars and critics who do not approve of his free renditions of the "sacrosanct" source texts; the fact that his translations have turned into a heated issue of likes and dislikes; the existence of an idea of closeness to original writing in the discourse on his translations, caused by his deeming translation as cultural appropriation or the "colonization" of the source culture. And all these four considerations point to the same conclusion once again – that he is the "rewriter" *par excellence*.

## CHAPTER IV

### “66. SONE” and “MR. PRUFROCK’ TAN AŞK TÜRKÜSÜ”

This chapter will now undertake a descriptive analysis of what “the rewriter *par excellence*” Yücel actually did in two of his poetry translations in terms of, first, Toury’s matricial norms, then in terms of discourse, which is the heart of both the criticism and acclaim he has received, and finally, in terms of the appropriating strategies he follows. The same analytical scheme will also be employed in the remaining two chapters of this study.

#### “66. Sone”

#### The Target and the Source Text

Yücel’s “66. Sone” (1993a), translated from William Shakespeare, reads as follows:

#### 66. Sone

- 1 Vazgeçtim bu dünyadan tek ölüm paklar beni,
- 2 Değmez bu yangın yeri, avuç açmaya değmez.
- 3 Değil mi ki çiğnenmiş inancın en seçkini,
- 4 Değil mi ki yoksullar mutluluktan habersiz,
- 5 Değil mi ki ayaklar altında insan onuru,
- 6 O kızıoğlan kız erdem dağlara kaldırılmış,
- 7 Ezilmiş, horgörölmüş el emeği, göz nuru,
- 8 Ödlekler geçmiş başa, derken mertlik bozulmuş,
- 9 Değil mi ki korkudan dili bağlı sanatın,
- 10 Değil mi ki çılgınlık sahip çıkmış düzene,
- 11 Doğruya doğru derken eğriye çıkmış adın,
- 12 Değil mi ki kötüler kadı olmuş Yemen’e
- 1 Vazgeçtim bu dünyadan, dünyamdan geçtim ama,
- 2 Seni yalnız komak var, o koyuyor adama.

Shakespeare's poem, sonnet no: "66" (1964: 134), which criticizes the "general unfairness of life, societal immorality, and oppressive government" (wikipedia 2006), is as follows:

66

1 Tired with all these for restful death I cry,  
2 As to behold desert a beggar born,  
3 And needy nothing trimmed in jollity,  
4 And purest faith unhappily forsworn,  
5 And gilded honour shamefully misplaced,  
6 And maiden virtue rudely strumpeted,  
7 And right perfection wrongfully disgraced,  
8 And strength by limping sway disabled,  
9 And art made tongue-tied by authority,  
10 And folly, doctor-like, controlling skill,  
11 And simple truth miscalled simplicity,  
12 And captive good attending captain ill:  
1 Tired with all these, from these would I be gone,  
2 Save that, to die, I leave my love alone.

### A Critique of the Target Text

#### Matricial Norms

Matricial norms "govern the very *existence* of target-language material intended as a substitute for the corresponding source-language material (and hence the degree of *fullness* of translation), its location in the text (or the form of actual *distribution*), as well as the textual *segmentation*" (Toury 1995: 58f, original emphasis).

In terms of fullness, i.e. additions and omissions made in the target text, the translator has retained all the fourteen lines of the source text and there is no non-translation. While Yücel's second line looks as if it was an addition, or rather as if

Yücel has omitted Shakespeare's second line and added his own, it is in fact a "negative shift" (Popovic 1987: 34f) or a "sin" (Toury 1985: 26), which is likely to happen in any target text. Although "desert" in line 2 means "a deserving person, a worthwhile person" in this context (Shakespeare's Sonnets 2006), Yücel mistakes it for a metaphor for the current situation of the world: "Değmez bu yangın yeri, avuç açmaya değmez."

As far as the distribution of the source-language material in the target text is concerned, every line of the source text except for the third and fourth are kept in their proper place: The third line of the source text becomes the fourth, and the fourth becomes the third in the translation: "Değil mi ki çignenmiş inancın en seçkini, / Değil mi ki yoksullar mutluluktan habersiz," / "And needy nothing trimmed in jollity, / And purest faith unhappily foresworn." Here we should point out that Yücel's interpretation of the third line of the source text is very free – while the speaker criticizes rich, noble people who are undeservingly happy, Yücel's speaker looks at it from the opposite side, and mentions poor people, who are unhappy in poverty.

Yücel has kept the segmentation of the source-text: He has the three quatrains in the same order, and then indents the last couplet, just as Shakespeare has done in the source text; the translator does not combine any lines or add new lines to the poem. Thus, Yücel complies fully with the matricial norms of the source text.

### Discourse Analysis

First of all, Yücel recreates the two stylistic features of the Shakespearean sonnet form (Buena Vista University 2006): (a) he keeps intact the rhyme scheme of the

source text, *abab, cdcd, efef, gg*; (b) making a skillful “obligatory shift” (Toury 1980: 116), he uses the syllabic meter “7+7” of Turkish poetry in order to recreate the rhythm of the source text, which is written in iambic pentameter (ten syllables in each line). Besides, as another rhythmical quality of the target text, each line, which starts with a capital letter, stands on its own, just as it does in the source text (Geocities.com 2006).

Secondly, Yücel recreates the repetition pattern constructed with the word “and” in the source text by using a target-language element capable of a similar function: “değil mi ki” (lines 3-5, 9, 10 and 12). In addition, he is very careful to recreate Shakespeare’s other repetition in a similar way in the last couplet, which “gives the poem an added punch” (Buena Vista University 2006): “Vazgeçtim bu *dünyadan, dünyamdan* geçtim ama,” / “Tired with all *these*, from *these* would I be gone.”

Thirdly, we can see many *idiomatic expressions* specific to the Turkish language and culture in the target text, some of which are italicized in the following examples: “ölüm *paklar beni*” (line 1), “*çiğnenmiş inancın* en seçkini” (line 3), “*ayaklar altında* insan onuru” (line 5), “*dağlara kaldırılmış*” (line 6), “*el emeği, göz nuru*” (line 7), “*mertlik bozulmuş*” (line 8), “*adı çıkmış*” (line 11), “*kötüler kadı olmuş Yemen’e*” (line 12), “*koyuyor adama*” (line 13), etc. However, this is not a characteristic of Yücel’s translation only – Shakespeare’s sonnet is also characterized by many idiomatic expressions: “a beggar born” (line 2), “needy nothing,” “trimmed in jollity” (line 3), “purest faith [...] forsworn” (line 4), “gilded honour [...] displaced” (line 5), “tongue-tied” (line 9), “doctor-like” (line 10), “captive good attending captain ill” (line 12), etc. In addition, Yücel is careful about not toning down the voice of the speaker or exaggerating it in his choices: “ölüm *paklar beni*” /

“for restful death I cry”; “ayaklar altında insan onuru” / “gilded honour *shamefully* misplaced”; “kızıođlan kız erdem” / “maiden virtue”; “dađlara kaldırılmıř” / “*rudely* strumpeted”; “ezilmiř, horgörölmüř” / “*wrongfully* disgraced”; “mertlik bozulmuř” / “strength disabled”; “korkudan dili bađlı sanatın” / “art made tongue-tied by authority”; “kötüler kadı olmuř Yemen’e” / “captive good attending captain ill,” etc. The purpose of my emphases in some of the source-text phrases is to show the emphatic meanings of those expressions, which Yücel tries to recreate in Turkish. At this point, we must note that while most of Yücel’s choices above are free renditions, the last one “kötüler kadı olmuř Yemen’e” is, perhaps, another very free translation like the example in the previous subsection, “yoksullar mutluluktan habersiz”; however, this rendition too “paraphrase[s]” (Dryden1680/1989: 8) the meaning of the particular line well enough since the speaker severely criticizes the governors of his country. At this point, we must note that although Yücel does not keep intact some of the images of the source text, he follows the legitimate translation strategy of paraphrasing, which is recommended in an essay on translator training (Kussmaul 1995: 31).

As for the “overall effect” (Brooks and Warren 1979: 298) of the target text, in addition to all these stylistic considerations behind his solutions, Yücel is very sensitive to the “turn in mood or thought” in the last line of the sonnet – that the only thing he would regret leaving behind if he died would be his beloved. Yücel recreates this emphatic feeling conveyed at the end of the source text by way of the device of repetition in line 13 and by juxtaposing the two different meanings of the Turkish verb “koymak” in the last line: “Vazgeçtim bu dünyadan, dünyamdan geçtim ama, / Seni yalnız *komak* var, o *koyuyor* adama.” We must also note that with his choice of the two meanings and two forms of this Turkish word, Yücel seems to recreate the

effect of the word-plays Shakespeare creates with “simple” and “simplicity” in line 11, and “captive” and “captain” in line 12.

### Appropriating Strategies

Yücel makes many “optional” shifts (Toury 1980: 116) by using expressions specific to the Turkish language and culture: “ölüm paklar,” “avuç açmak,” “mutluluktan habersiz,” “kız oğlan kız,” “ayaklar altında,” “dağlara kaldırılmış,” “el emeği, göz nuru,” “mertlik bozulmuş,” “adı çıkmış,” “kadı olmuş Yemen’e,” “dünyamdan geçtim,” and “adama koymak.” Furthermore, in his pursuit of appropriation, Yücel especially benefits from vocabulary items peculiar to “spoken” Turkish: “ölüm *paklar*” (line 1) meaning “Death will help me best,” “*derken*” (line 8) meaning “later on,” “*bir şeyden geçmek*” (line 13) meaning “to give up or quit,” “*yalnız komak var*” meaning “to leave alone,” “*koyuyor adama*” meaning “it disturbs or dismays me” (line 14) are all examples taken from spoken Turkish rather than its written form. Yücel could have used more standard forms of written Turkish such as “ölüm kurtarır,” “sonra,” “vazgeçtim,” “yalnız koymak or bırakmak,” and “dokunuyor adama,” respectively. Since in traditional Turkish literature, poetry is a genre to be recited rather than written down, such choices by Yücel help to increase the expressiveness of his translation.

We do not see as many examples of such vocabulary in the two retranslations of the same sonnet; for instance, Yücel’s “dağlara kaldırılmış” and “ölüm paklar beni” become “zorla satmışlar” and “ölüp kurtulsam” respectively in Talât Sait Halman’s retranslation (1989: 173); his “o koyuyor adama,” “ölüm paklar beni,” “kız oğlan kız erdem,” “el emeği, göz nuru” become “bırakmak olmasaydı eğer,”

“ölümü bekliyorum,” “tertemiz genç kız,” “gerçek yetkinlik” respectively in Saadet and Bülent Bozkurt’s translation of the sonnet (2000: 86) – all of which are poetically less effective.

Finally, Yücel’s successful use of the 7+7 syllabic meter of Turkish poetry and his exact recreation of the rhyme scheme of the sonnet should also be considered as a stylistic appropriation of the source text because Yücel could have translated this poem in free verse without following the rhyme scheme of the original poem, just as Saadet and Bülent Bozkurt have done in their translation (see Bengi-Öner 2001: 99).

“Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk Türküsü”

#### The Target and the Source Text

Yücel’s second poetry translation entitled “Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk Türküsü” (1993c) translates the long poem “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” (1936: 11-17) by T. S. Eliot in its entirety. In this part of the thesis only the first twenty-two lines of the poem will be taken up for the sake of a detailed analysis:

#### Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk Türküsü

- 1 Gel gidelim beraberce,
- 2 Akşam gelip göğün üstüne serilince
- 3 Ameliyat masasında baygın bir hasta gibi...
- 4 Gidelim bildiğin ıssız sokak içlerinden,
- 5 O sabahlara dek gürültüsü dinmeyen otellerle
- 6 Sabahçı kahveleri önünden
- 7 Gidelim o sokaklardan işte,
- 8 Bir sinsî niyetle uzadıkça uzayan münakaşalar gibi hani
- 9 Sürükler ya içinden çıkılmaz bir soruya doğru seni...
- 10 Kuzum, sorma! nedir diye?
- 11 Kalk gidelim misafirliğe!..

1 Odada kadınlar bir aşağı bir yukarı...  
2 Michelangelo'dur konuştuqları.

1 Sarı sis sürterken sırtını pencere camlarına,  
2 Sarı duman sürterken burnunu pencere camlarına  
3 Yaladı diliyle kenarını, köşesini akşamın,  
4 Oluklarda oyalandı bir vakit su birikintileriyle,  
5 Sonra yüklenip sırtına bacalardan inen kurumu  
6 Kaydı saçaktan, ansızın başaşağı daldı,  
7 Baktı, bir ılık teşrin gecesini,  
8 Şöyle bir dolandı evin etrafında, uyuya kaldı.

In T. S. Eliot's ironic love poem which is about the conflicting thoughts and feelings of the modern man, the narrator, who is a civilized man nearing old age, thinks of visiting an upper-class lady in her drawing room, like a brave soldier marching to a war zone. He plans to declare his love for her; but as a lonely and desperate man, he lacks self-confidence:

#### The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock

1 Let us go then, you and I,  
2 When the evening is spread out against the sky  
3 Like a patient etherised upon a table;  
4 Let us go, through certain half-deserted streets,  
5 The muttering retreats  
6 Of restless nights in one-night cheap hotels  
7 And sawdust restaurants with oyster-shells:  
8 Streets that follow like a tedious argument  
9 Of insidious intent  
10 To lead you to an overwhelming question...  
11 Oh, do not ask, "What is it?"  
12 Let us go and make our visit.

1 In the room the women come and go  
2 Talking of Michelangelo.

1 The yellow fog that rubs its back upon the window-panes,  
2 The yellow smoke that rubs its muzzle on the window-panes  
3 Licked its tongue into the corners of the evening,  
4 Lingered upon the pools that stand in drains,  
5 Let fall upon its back the soot that falls from chimneys,  
6 Slipped by the terrace, made a sudden leap,

7 And seeing that it was a soft October night,  
8 Curled once about the house, and fell asleep.

### A Critique of the Target Text

#### Matricial Norms

To start with, in terms of fullness of translation, there is no non-translation in the target text except for the six-line epigraph in Italian, taken from Dante's "Inferno" (Lozano ed. 2006). Yücel does not omit or add any phrases or clauses; he combines only one line with another in the first stanza of the target text, thus "rewriting" the 131-line poem in 130 lines.

Yücel tries to express in different words the meanings and images in lines 4-10 of the source text, which create a very long sentence, as can be seen in Saliha Paker's prose translation: "Bir gecelik ucuz otellerde ve talaşlı, istiridyeye kabuklu lokantalarda (geçen) huzursuz gecelerin uğultulu sığınakları (olan) o تنها sokaklardan gidelim" (1983: 136f). Opting for free translation, which is qualified with the adjective "very" by some critics, Yücel translates "The muttering retreats / Of restless nights in one-night cheap hotels" (lines 5 and 6) as "o sabaha dek gürültüsü dinmeyen oteller," making his target text one line shorter; "yerleri talaşlı, istiridyeye kabuklu lokantalar" becomes "sabahçı kahveleri" (line 6) in his translation by way of a "topical shift" translated as "konusal kaydırma" by Karantay and Salman (Popovic 1987: 34), and as "yerel kaydırma" (local shift) by Paker (p. 137). Yücel seemingly opts for a free strategy in this part of his translation due to a poetic concern arising from the syntactical differences between the target and source languages, as Paker claims in her critical essay mentioned in Chapter III. We could

consider Yücel's "Gidelim o sokaklardan işte" (line 7), which looks like an addition at first sight, as an obligatory shift because he might be aiming at repeating the main image "street" of this line as it is repeated in line 8 of the source text (cf. Doltaş 1988: 141). Obviously, here Yücel uses poetic license in order to recreate the work as a poem in its own right in Turkish.

Since there is no significant syntactical problem in the second verse of the poem, Yücel recreates all the images, without a single omission, in the same order as in the source text: A yellow fog rubs its back upon the window-panes, then a yellow smoke does the same, licking the corners of the evening, lingering upon the pools and then it brings down the soot from the chimneys, slipping and jumping downward; finally it feels the warm October night and begins to sleep near the house. Yücel does not make linguistic changes in his translation; his lines follow each other in the same order as they do in the source text – needless to say, as much as the Turkish language allows. This characteristic of the translation can also be observed in the short excerpt in the following paragraph.

As for the segmentation of the target text, Yücel divides the lines in his translation in line with the divisions in the source text, starting and ending the stanzas and couplets in the same places as they are in Eliot's poem, with only one exception: Yücel connects the source-text couplet "I grow old ... I grow old ... / I shall wear the bottoms of my trousers rolled" with the next stanza starting "Shall I part my hair behind? Do I dare to eat a peach? / I shall wear white flannel trousers, and walk upon the beach" (1936: 17), which can be deemed an "individual shift" (Popovic 1987: 34):

İhtiyar oluyorum ... İhtiyar  
Kıvıracağım zahir paçalarımı, potinlerimin konçlarına kadar.  
Saçlarımı arkadan ayırsam mı acaba? Yiyeyim mi dersin bir şeftali?  
Beyaz fanilâ pantolonlar ayağымda, dolaşacağım sahili. (1993c: 65)

Thus, just as he does in “66. Sone,” Yücel closely adheres to the source text in terms of metrical norms.

### Discourse Analysis

When we consider the long and short lines following each other in the target text, it is natural for Yücel to “rewrite” his target text in free verse, which is perhaps one of the most common verse forms in contemporary Turkish literature. The translator seems to prefer this form because the source text is also in free verse: Eliot uses iambic and trochaic meters with a differing number of feet throughout his poem without following a particular pattern. Yücel tries to recreate the rhythm of the poem by paying attention to the length of his lines, that is, to the number of syllables in them. Since he has to achieve this under the constraints of meaning and rhyme, he can only recreate the rhythm of the source text in his translation as much as these constraints of the target language allow him. This rhythmical quality of the target text is observable even when we simply draw a line vertically from the end of the first line of the second stanza down to the end of its last line and compare it with that of the corresponding source-text stanza. The similarity of the two edge lines shows us how the translator tries to recreate this stylistic quality of the source text.

In addition to this simple method of detecting identical lines in corresponding stanzas, a more specific example can be presented, taking the couplet following the first stanza of the translation: “Kuzum, sorma! Nedir diye? / Kalk gidelim misafirliğe!..” While the first line of this couplet has eight syllables, the second one has nine. When we consider the corresponding source-text couplet, “Oh, do not ask, ‘What is it?’ / Let us go and make our visit,” we see that its first line is in iambic

trimeter, consisting of *three* feet, and the second in a longer meter: trochaic tetrameter, having *four* feet. By using the language-specific expression, “kalk gidelim” instead of “gidelim” only, Yücel creates this one-syllable difference in his line, which is very crucial for the rhythm of his translation.

Yücel’s stylistic sensitivity is not limited to rhythm only; he strives to recreate in the target text the rhyming of the source text, which does not follow a particular scheme in the poem. For instance, in the quotation above, “diye” and “misafirliğe” constitute “approximate” rhyming and in the corresponding lines in the source text, “it” and “visit” constitute “perfect rhyme” (see Perrine and Arp 1992: 380). A shift in the type of rhyming should be considered very natural in poetry translation. When we consider the second stanza of the target text, “camlarına - camlarına” (lines 1 and 2) and “daldı - kaldı” (lines 6 and 8) rhyme just as “panes - panes” and “leap - asleep” do in the corresponding source-text lines (1-2 and 6-8). Although Turkish does not allow Yücel to recreate the approximate rhymes of “drains - chimneys” in lines 4 and 5 of this stanza, the refrain of the poem, like the last quotation of the previous subsection, constitutes another fine example of Yücel’s sensitivity to both rhyme and meter:

Odada kadınlar bir aşağı bir yukarı...  
Michelangelo’dur konuştukları.

In the room the women come and go  
Talking of Michelangelo.

Yücel resorts to an optional shift by translating the women’s walk with “bir aşağı bir yukarı” in order to make the lines of the refrain rhyme, as they do in the original. But a similar decision, seemingly aiming at recreating the rhyming in the source text is to be criticized: When Yücel translates “you and I” in line 1 of the first stanza as

“beraberce,” which rhymes with “serilince” in line 2, he seems to misinterpret the poem, because there is indeed no other person that “you” refers to – these two pronouns “are divided parts of Prufrock’s own nature, for he is experiencing internal conflict” (Perrine and Arp 1992: 380). However, this single negative shift does not prevent Yücel from recreating the emotional effect of this psychological journey filled with allusions and narrated in the stream-of-consciousness technique. In the following stanza, the narrator mocks himself through a comparison with Shakespeare’s Hamlet and Yorick, the Fool:

1 Yok! ben Prens Hamlet değilim, ne de o katın ehliyim;  
2 Ben mabeyinden bir beyzade, hizmeti geçen biri  
3 İşlerin seyrine hız vermekte ve bir iki sahneye vesile,  
4 İşe yaradığına memnun gayet,  
5 Ve pirense nasihat etmekte ele yatkın bir maşa nihayet,  
6 Hürmetkâr, dikkatli, ihtiyatlı,  
7 Tumturaklı lâflara meraklı, fakat azıcık kalın kafalı,  
8 Kimi zaman doğrusu gülünç adamakıllı–  
9 Kimi zaman nerdeyse Soyтары. (1993c: 65)

1 No! I am not Prince Hamlet, nor was meant to be;  
2 Am an attendant lord, one that will do  
3 To swell a progress, start a scene or two,  
4 Advise the prince; no doubt, an easy tool,  
5 Deferential, glad to be of use,  
6 Politic, cautious, and meticulous;  
7 Full of high sentence, but a bit obtuse;  
8 At times, indeed, almost ridiculous–  
9 Almost, at times, the Fool. (1936: 16f)

While keeping the allusions in his target text intact, Yücel again uses vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture which are highly expressive: “ehil olmak” (line 1), “mabeyinden bir beyzade” (line 2), “hız vermek,” “vesile olmak” (line 3), “ele yatkın olmak,” “maşa olmak” (line 5), “hürmetkâr olmak” (line 6),

“tumturaklı laflar,” “kalın kafalı” (line 7), “adamakıllı” (line 8), etc. In addition, especially “mabeyinden bir beyzade,” “ele yatkın bir maşa,” “azıcık kalın kafalı,” which correspond to “an attendant lord,” “an easy tool,” and “a bit obtuse” respectively, are choices that can convey the ironic tone in this particular stanza of the poem. Again for the sake of rhyming, Yücel adds the words “gayet” (line 4) and “nihayet” (line 5) to his translation and shifts the meaning of “almost” to “adamakıllı” (quite a lot) in line 8; he also omits the word “politic,” changes the place of “deferential” (line 5), moving its equivalent in Turkish “hürmetkâr” onto line 6 and brings line 5 of the source text to line 4 in his translation. Yücel’s poetic license, once again, aims at making his translation a poem in its own right in Turkish.

#### Appropriating Strategies

First of all, Yücel “appropriates” the title of the source text in an attempt to make it more familiar to the target reader, who usually knows that men are addressed in English as “mister” – pronounced the same way it is written, as if it were a Turkish word. Therefore, he adds the abbreviation of this word to his title and omits the person’s first and middle names. Although Doltaş criticizes Yücel for distancing the Turkish reader from the Prufrock character with his choice of “Mr.” (1988: 139), the translator’s choice seems to produce just the opposite effect on the target reader. Yücel also shifts the Biblical name “Lazarus” (p. 15) into “Lazar” (p. 64), making it sound like a Turkish name. In addition, he opts for a culture-specific word in Turkish to render the word “song” in the title: “Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk *Türkü*sü” / “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock.” The idea of a foreigner singing a “türkü” (Turkish folk song) seems to fit well with the main theme of conflict and feeling of irony dominant

throughout the poem (cf. Paker 1983: 135).

Secondly, just as “türkü” in the title of the translation suggests, Yücel continues to use his strategy of opting for vocabulary special to the Turkish language and culture in “66. Sone”: In the target text, the narrator addresses his other self as “kuzum” (p. 62); “October night” and “a hundred visions” become “teşrin gecesi” and “bin bir karar” respectively; the narrator refers to his receding hair as “Bir hal oldu saçlarının dibine!” and hears a piece of “musiki” (music) from a distance (p. 63); he refers to a lady’s “light brown hair” on her arms as “ayva tüyleri” and the “perfume from a dress” as “entariden yayılan lavanta kokusu.” He qualifies the afternoon’s “peaceful” sleep as “deliksiz” (p. 64); his speaker cannot explain his “merâm,” that is, “what he wants to say” (p. 65). “Sabahçı kahveleri,” “misafirliğe gitmek” (p. 62), “oruç tutmak,” “ahiret” (p. 64), “zahmet,” “türkü söylemek,” and “beyzade” (p. 65) are other examples of Yücel’s particular strategy to make his translation read like an original poem in Turkish.

Thirdly, again similar to “66. Sone,” Yücel makes use of vocabulary and usages peculiar to spoken Turkish, italicized in the examples. He especially writes them the same way they are pronounced by ordinary Turkish people, or rather the man on the street: He opts for “dakka” (minute) in place of the standard “dakika” in the line “Vakitse var aynı *dakka* içinde” (p. 63), which translates “In a minute there is time” (p. 13); he drops the second vowel in the word “ahiret” (the other world): “Ben *ahretten* geldim” (p. 64), rendering “I [...] come from the dead,” (p. 15); similarly, he “rewrites” the word “prens” (prince) in its spoken form when he translates the line “Advise the prince; no doubt, an easy tool” (p. 16): “Ve *pirense* nasihat etmekte ele yatkın bir maşa nihayet,” (p. 65); furthermore, Yücel makes use of a regional dialect spoken in southern Turkey and opts for “yerleştirerekten” and

“tarayaraktan” instead of the standard forms “yerleřtirerek” and “tarayarak”: “Ya hanım bařının altına bir yastık *yerleřtirerekten*” (p. 64), “Dalgaların *tarayaraktan* beyaz saçlarımı, o arkaya savrulu,” (p. 66).

Finally, as seen in the previous subsection on “66. Sone,” Yücel’s sensitivity to rhyming and rhythm to make his target text stand as a poem in its own right in Turkish should be considered as an attempt at stylistic appropriation.

### Summary and Conclusions

In his translation “66. Sone” from Shakespeare – a poem which takes up social problems such as injustice, corruption and oppressive governments – Yücel complies with the matricial norms of the source text by translating the entire text, by keeping intact the distribution of the linguistic material except for one line, and by adhering to the segmentation of the lines.

When we analyze the discourse Yücel creates in his target text, we realize that he recreates the special rhyme scheme of “Sonnet no: 66” completely and skillfully replaces its iambic meter with the syllabic meter of Turkish poetry. Furthermore, he recreates Shakespeare’s discourse which uses repetition as a figure of speech both in the first three quatrains and in the concluding couplet. The idiomatic expressions in the target text are actually a characteristic of the source text and the translator pays due attention to the tone of voice of the poem’s narrator, as in the example “kızıođlan kız erdem dađlara kaldırılmıř” replacing “maiden virtue rudely strumpeted.” With highly free renditions such as “kötüler kadı olmuř Yemen’e” translating “captive good attending captain ill,” Yücel recreates the overall effect, i.e. the style of the source text.

Yücel benefits from the rich vocabulary of Turkish in order to “appropriate” the source text: “mutluluktan habersiz,” “kız oğlan kız,” “ayaklar altında,” “dağlara kaldırılmış,” “el emeği, göz nuru,” “mertlik bozulmuş,” etc. He especially opts for some spoken forms such as “paklamak,” “bir şeyden geçmek,” “yalnız komak” and “adama koymak” – thus strengthening the position of his translation as a poem in the Turkish poetic tradition, which is deeply rooted in orality. In addition, his “rewriting” the poem in the Turkish syllabic meter and keeping its original rhyme scheme should be considered as a stylistic appropriation of the source text.

In his translation of Eliot’s ironic love poem of 131 lines, which recounts the story of a lonely, ordinary man hopelessly in love with an upper-class woman, Yücel conforms to the matricial norms of the source text with two exceptions: He does not translate the epigraph in Italian, and he combines a couplet with the line that follows it. Sensitive to the matter of rhythm, as he was in “66. Sone,” he strives to recreate the free-verse form of the source text by carefully using the same form in Turkish; his rhyme scheme follows that of the original poem as closely as the Turkish language allows. He recreates the emotional effect of this psychological story: For instance, his renditions of “mabeyinden bir beyzade,” “ele yatkın bir maşa,” which correspond to “an attendant lord” and “an easy tool” respectively, convey the ironic tone in that particular line of the poem where the narrator mocks himself. Yücel’s preference for vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture such as “ehil olmak,” “tumturaklı laflar,” “kalın kafalı,” “adamakıllı” adds a lot to the expressiveness of his target text. In order to achieve these ends, Yücel rarely adds words to his text (“gayet” and “nihayet”) or omits (“Alfred” and “politic”), but obviously makes many other optional shifts.

Yücel shifts the narrator’s name into a more familiar one, and makes Mr.

Prufrock sing a “türkü” (a traditional Turkish folk song) in the title, underscoring the pervasive irony in the poem from the very beginning. His preference for vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture again characterizes his target text: “Kuzum” is used as a term of address; “bin bir karar” translates “a hundred visions”; it is “musiki” (music) that is heard from a distance (p. 63); “ayva tüyleri” refers to the “light brown hair” on a woman’s arms. “Sabahçı kahveleri,” “misafirliğe gitmek,” “entari,” “oruç tutmak,” “ahiret,” “beyzade” are some other examples that make his translation read like an original poem in Turkish. Furthermore, again like in his “66. Sone,” Yücel opts for vocabulary items peculiar to spoken Turkish: “dakka,” “ahret,” “pirens,” “yerleştirerekten” or “tarayaraktan” instead of their standard forms. Finally, his sensitivity to rhyme and rhythm to make his target text a poem in its own right in Turkish seems to be another example of the stylistic appropriation of the source text.

Thus, we can conclude that these two translations are by no means imitations, adaptations or versions, but that they are translation proper (cf. Bengi-Öner 2001: 101). In view of our definitions in Chapter II, the translator does not create two poems of his own which have only title and point of departure in common with the source texts (cf. Demirkol 2006: 47-49); he does not make substantial changes by way of many omissions and additions; and unlike a version-writer, his concern is not the poets’ sense only but also the form in which the content is presented. With his macro-strategy that “appropriates” Shakespeare and Eliot’s poems for the target readership, Yücel becomes Lefevere and Bassnett’s “rewriter,” following the more preferred way in this cross-cultural “marriage” which tries to “colonize” the source text. It is easy to detect the influence of the two basic constraints of “rewriting” in them: The leftist Yücel seems to use all the potential of his native language to

advocate the Turkish culture as capable of translating even the “canonized” poems of the hegemonic English language. He displays a translation poetics characterized by many vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture. In fact, with his peculiarly Turkish forms and his selection of these two poems which deal with social issues related to powerless, ordinary people’s lives, he seems to confirm Lefevere’s idea that the translator’s ideology acts as a constraint on his poetics in terms of the selection and development of both form and subject matter.

As for his discourse, Yücel becomes Lefevere’s “spirited translator” striving hard to enable his target texts to stand as “metapoem[s]” (Holmes 1970: 93) in their own right in Turkish culture, which is Davie’s “first and minimal requirement in the translation of a foreign poem” (1975: 13; cf. Anday 1995: 115 and Leighton 1991b: 152); and he proves to be Lefevere’s “faithful” translator who aims for functional equivalence, doing what the target culture or he himself wants as the commissioner.

Furthermore, since Shakespeare’s and Eliot’s different poetic styles permeate his translations, in line with B. Folliard di Stefano’s view (n.d: 254), the objection of Yücel’s critics that he does not reproduce the writer’s or poet’s style in his target texts is refuted. The translator’s supporters prove to be right about the translator’s ability to use the target language and his appropriative macro-strategy that aims for functional equivalence. His heavily appropriating strategies, however, seem to overshadow the individuality of his poets – how can one make the reader believe that “kötüler kadı oldu Yemen’e” are in fact Shakespeare’s words or “Kıvıracağım zahir paçalarımı, potinlerimin konçlarına kadar” are those of T.S. Eliot?

Despite the fact that they make his poets “invisible” to a considerable extent, the liberties that Yücel has taken in the translation processes of these two metapoems really “function like a wind that raises a kite into the air,” proving right both

Eyubođlu’s words on the translator’s poetry translations which we mentioned in Chapter III and Leighton’s view that “the translation of poetry does require freedom” (1991b: 155). Thus, like Pushkin’s translations, Yücel’s recreation of these two metapoems also falls well within Leighton’s definition of “artistic translation,” which “is predicated on the genius of the poet-translator,” as opposed to Nabokov’s “servile” approach (1991a: 182).

Finally, although Yücel actually designated himself as “the person *writing* in Turkish, as stated in the introduction, it is perhaps because of his preference for spoken Turkish that his publishers and editors have preferred to designate Yücel as “Türkçe *Söyleyen*” rather than “Türkçe *Yazan*” (the one writing in Turkish).

## CHAPTER V

### *SIRÇA KÜMES*

#### The Target and the Source Text

*Sırça Kümes*, one of Yücel's drama translations directly from the English, is based on *The Glass Menagerie* written by Tennessee Williams in 1944. The specific translation used in this study is the copy of the work that was available at the library of the Istanbul Municipal Theatres at Harbiye. In this particular copy, which was published by Milli Eğitim Basımevi (The National Education Press) in Istanbul (1964b), the title page is hand-written with spelling mistakes in the translator's and playwright's names and in its English title (appendix J). Furthermore, on the same page, Yücel's name is presented right under the title, without any designation preceding it, whereas the playwright's name is placed over the title, in a similar fashion to that in *Bahar Noktası*, discussed in the subsection "Acclaim" in Chapter III. Besides, the translated text does not include any information about the specific source text Yücel used in his translation.

Tennessee Williams wrote his fourth play *The Glass Menagerie* towards the end of the Second World War, and it became his "first popular success" after its première in Chicago the same year. This seven-scene "memory play" (Williams 1949: ix), which recounts the sad story of a poor family living in Missouri/USA, brought the lyric playwright his first New York Drama Critics Circle Award as the best play of 1945, when it "burst its way onto Broadway" (Cash 2006:2). This classic of the American stage, Williams's "most performed and anthologized play," together with his *A Streetcar Named Desire*, has been "studied and performed in classrooms

and theatres around the world” ever since (Amazon.com 2006); for instance, *Sırça Kümes* has been successfully staged by many state and private theatres in Turkey and I myself had the opportunity to see it at the Konak Stage of the State Theatres in Izmir in 1998.

The source text we shall refer to in this study is *The Glass Menagerie: A play by Tennessee Williams*, which was published by The New Classics in New York in 1949. This “performance” version of the play is accompanied by “The Characters” and “Production Notes,” written by the playwright to provide producers with some information on the characters, setting, music and lighting (pp. vii-xii).

### The Plot

In St. Louis, Missouri, there lives the Wingfield family in a small apartment that is entered through a fire escape. They are a lower-middle-class family of three: the matriarch Amanda, and her two children Tom and Laura, who are coming of age. The father has abandoned them many years ago in search of a free and irresponsible life. He is present only with his picture on the wall.

The homemaker Amanda’s life centers around the D.A.R. (Daughters of the American Revolution) meetings; she is a loving mother who constantly worries about her children and the family’s future. She always dreams of her past life when she was a young Southern belle, and her desires for her family are of an unrealistic nature. She criticizes her son about almost anything he does. Tom, who is a heavy smoker, is both a character in the play and the narrator, connecting the present with the past. As the narrator, he tells the events of the past with five soliloquies on the fire escape. He is the poet bread-winner of the family; he works in a shoe warehouse – a job he

hates. Going to the movies at night is his only escape from his stifling life at home and at work. As for Laura, she is physically and emotionally crippled and lacks self-confidence; she busies herself keeping a collection of tiny glass animals, which her mother calls a “glass menagerie.” She is enrolled in a business school so that she can have a business career.

One day Amanda drops by Laura’s school to ask her teachers about her progress and learns that Laura has dropped out. Giving up her idea to make her a business woman, the mother decides to find a decent husband for her and so begins to earn some extra money to “feather [her] nest and plume the bird” (p. 22) by renewing women’s subscriptions to a magazine on the phone. She often asks Tom to bring a gentleman caller and promises to let him go as soon as his sister is married. Tom invites his best friend from work, Jim O’Connor, to have dinner with them one evening. Excited by this news, Amanda begins her preparations for the caller’s visit.

When the gentleman caller arrives that evening, Laura loses her nerve. Jim was the most popular boy at their high school and she had a crush on him. This unexpected encounter revives her love for Jim. After dinner, the Wingfield apartment is left in total darkness because instead of the light bill, Tom has paid his dues to a union of merchant seamen. However, this gives Amanda a chance to bring together Jim and Laura with a bottle of wine under the romantic candlelight in the parlor. The two youngsters both remember that Jim used to call her “Blue Roses” at school because he misunderstood her illness, “pleurosis,” as blue roses.

While chatting with Laura, Jim gets increasingly flirtatious: He teaches her how to dance, tells her how pretty she is and finally kisses her on the lips. Feeling over the moon, Laura nearly faints with the novelty of her emotions; but this is not true for Jim, who reveals that he cannot see her again because he loves another girl

called Betty. Laura, sad and disillusioned, gives him a souvenir of his visit – the glass animal whose horn they broke while dancing. Unaware of this shocking news, Amanda brings them some refreshments in a jovial manner, and thanks Jim for the gaiety he has brought to her home. When the gentleman caller asks to be excused early, she learns that he is indeed engaged to be married in June, which is a bitter pill for her to swallow. All the expense has proved futile. Amanda accuses Tom of cheating his family. Tom leaves home for good but he can never forget his sister Laura.

### A Critique of the Target Text

#### Matricial Norms

In terms of fullness of translation, Yücel translates all the seven scenes of Williams's play. However, the additional part at the beginning of the source text – that is, “The Characters” and “The Production Notes,” mentioned in the first subsection – is missing. In the interview conducted by Karantay, the translator gives a reasonable explanation of why he did not translate this part: “There was no such part in the text of the script they gave me. I would have gladly translated that part if I had had it. It was not my deliberate choice.” / “Yo, benim elime geçen metinde bunlar yoktu. Elime geçse seve seve tercüme ederdim. Bilerek yapılmış birşey değil” (1989a: 16).

Apart from this non-translation, there are two other units that are not in the translation, and they again seem to be not by a deliberate choice on the part of the translator: Yücel has not translated a short stage direction starting with “It isn't dark enough yet” (p. 64) and also one screen legend. Since Williams himself omitted his

screen legends in the “acting” version of his play (see p. x), these omissions on the part of Yücel can be considered as minor faults. Secondly and more importantly, Yücel has skipped an entire page where Tom and Jim talk about Laura’s shyness. This seeming carelessness can be forgiven to some extent because the target text reads very naturally:

JIM. – Ama neye ellerin böyle soğuk senin, Laura?  
LAURA. – Bilmem. Gramofonu kurdum da ... Ondan belki...  
TOM, *ilgisiz.* – Bak sen! (*Bir sigara yakar, yangın merdivenin sahanlığına çıkar yeniden.*)  
JIM. – Nereye gidiyorsun?  
TOM. – Taraçaya çıkacağım biraz. (p. 63)

JIM. – Your hand’s *cold*, Laura!  
Laura. – Yes, well – I have been playing the victrola ....  
[page 72 skipped]  
TOM. (*Disinterest*) – Yeah? (*Lights cigarette and crosses back to fire-escape door.*)  
JIM. – Where are *you* going?  
TOM. – I’m going out on the terrace. (pp. 71-73, original emphases)

As for the distribution of the linguistic material in the target text, Yücel follows the source text closely: He does not change the place of the playwright’s sentences and his parenthetical information – as is clear in the brief excerpt above.

As far as the segmentation of the target text is concerned, the translator keeps the scene segmentation of the play intact, making them start and finish at the same places as in the source text, and tries to follow the internal segmentation of paragraphs within each scene. The internal segmentation of the target text entails one significant shift: Yücel combines the short, usually one-sentence paragraphs of the source text into full, coherent paragraphs. The following excerpt where Tom tells us about his mother’s gentleman-caller obsession exemplifies this particular strategy in

Yücel's translation:

Sabah akşam bu hayalin, daha doğrusu hayaletin lâfi... Onsuz edemez oldu âdeta... Sözü geçmediği zamanlarda bile, annemin kaygıdan kırışmış alnına, kız kardeşimin o ne yapacağını şaşırılmış, ürkek haline bir göz atmak kâfi... Belli, aramızdaydı o, bir kara bulut gibi çökmüş evimizin üstüne... Annem işi oluruna bırakacaklardan değil... Hemen tertibini aldı, tasarladığı yönde adım adım yürümeğe koyuldu.

O ara kış sonu. Bahar erişti derken... Annem yuvaya çekidüzen vermek, yavru kuşu palazlandırmak için açıktan paraya ihtiyaç olacağını kestirip çoktan harekete geçmişti. Telefonun başına oturmuş, [...]. (p. 19)

An evening at home rarely passed without some allusion to this image, this spectre, this hope....

Even when he wasn't mentioned, his presence hung in Mother's preoccupied look and in my sister's frightened, apologetic manner – hung like a sentence passed upon the Wingfields!

Mother was a woman of action as well as words.

She began to take logical steps in the planned direction.

Late that winter and in the early spring – realizing that extra money would be needed to properly feather the nest and plume the bird – she conducted a vigorous campaign on the telephone, [...]. (p. 22)

Obviously, Yücel combines the first four one-sentence paragraphs of the source text into a full paragraph and then continues his process with the next paragraph, following the playwright's internal segmentation.

### Discourse Analysis

The language of this drama translation can be exemplified by sampling a passage from it. Towards the end of the play Amanda learns that Jim is engaged to be married and wants to leave in time to meet his fiancée at the train station. It is a time of great disillusionment for Amanda, but she is able to hide her feelings; Jim is very comfortable, as usual. The Wingfields now see him off (pp. 98-100):

AMANDA. – Betty mi? Betty de kim?

(*Gökyüzünde, kötüye alâmet, bir çatırdı kopar.*)

JİM. – Şey işte... Konuşup ettiğim genç kız.

(*Tatlı tatlı gülümser. Amanda'nın başına dünyalar yıkılır. Yazı: "Başımıza Dünyalar Yıkıldı."*)

AMANDA, *içini çeker.* – Ciddi bir hikâye mi bu?

JİM. – Evleniyorum. Haziranın on beşinde.

AMANDA. – Ooo! Pek güzel! Tom nişanlı olduğunuzdan bahsetmemişti de...

JİM. – Mağazadakilere mahsus haber vermedim daha. Tefe alırlar sonra insanı, Romeo aşağı, Romeo yukarı... İyisi mi... (*Söbe aynanın yanında durur. Şapkasını giyer, özene bezene oturtur başına, yanını ortasını düzeltir, fiyakasını ayarlar.*) Sayenizde, Mrs. Wingfield, bu akşam öyle eğlendim ki... Tevekkeli Güneyliler için misafirperver demiyorlar.

AMANDA. – Rica ederim...

JİM. – Pek böyle palas pandıras gidiyorum ama, kusura bakmayın! Bety'yi karşılarım diye söz verdim de. Benim Döldülle oraya gidinceye kadar tren de istasyona varır. Siz daha iyi bilirsiniz ya... Bekletmeğe gelmiyor bazı kadınlar, cin ifrit oluyorlar...

AMANDA. – Ah, ah! Bilmez miyim, neler çekersiniz şu kadınların elinden. (*Elini uzatır.*) Güle güle Mr. O'Connor. Size saadetler, kısmet açıklığı, muvaffakiyetler dilerim. Laura da öyle. Değil mi, cicim?

LAURA. – Öyle!

JİM, *elini tutar.* – Allaha ısmarladık, Laura. Verdiğin hâtırayı yanımdan ayırmayacağım hiç. Yalnız sen de söylediklerimi unutmayacaksın, değil mi? (*Sesini yükseltir, şen şatır haykırır.*) Eyvallah Shakespeare! Teşekkür ederim tekrar. Allah rahatlık versin: (*Gülümser, güle oynuya dışarı çıkar. Amanda misafirin arkasından kapıyı kapatır, geriye döner. Yüzündeki o yapmacık gülümseme silinmiştir, ne yapacağını şaşırılmış haldedir. Ana kız birbirlerinin yüzüne bakamaz. Laura gramafonun yanına çöker, kurgusunu kurmağa başlar.*)

AMANDA. – Betty? Betty? Who's – Betty!

(*There is an ominous cracking sound in the sky.*)

JİM. – Oh, just a girl. The girl I go steady with!

(*He smiles charmingly. The sky falls.*) (LEGEND: "THE SKY FALLS.")

AMANDA, (A long-drawn exhalation) – Ohhhh ... Is it a serious romance, Mr. O'Connor?

JİM. – We're going to be married the second Sunday in June.

AMANDA. – Ohhhh – how nice!

Tom didn't mention that you were engaged to be married.

JİM. – The cat's not out of the bag at the warehouse yet.

You know how they are. They call you Romeo and stuff like that. (*He stops at the oval mirror to put on his hat. He carefully shapes the brim and the crown to give a discreetly dashing effect.*)

It's been a wonderful evening, Mrs. Wingfield. I guess this is what they mean by Southern hospitality.

AMANDA. – It really wasn't anything at all.

JİM. – I hope it don't seem like I'm rushing off! But I promised Betty I'd

pick her up at the Wabash depot, an' by the time I get my jalopy down there her train'll be in. Some women are pretty upset if you keep 'em waiting.

AMANDA. – Yes, I know – The tyranny of women! (*Extends her hand.*)

Good-bye, Mr. O'Connor.

I wish you luck – and happiness – and success! All three of them, and so does Laura! – Don't you, Laura?

LAURA. – Yes!

JIM. (*Taking her hand.*) – Good-bye, Laura. I'm certainly going to treasure that souvenir. And don't you forget the good advice I gave you. (*Raises his voice to a cheery shout.*)

So long, Shakespeare!

Thanks again, ladies – Good night! (*He grins and ducks jauntily out.*) (*Still bravely grimacing, AMANDA closes the door on the gentleman caller. Then she turns back to the room with a puzzled expression. She and LAURA don't dare to face each other. LAURA crouches beside the victrola to wind it.*) (pp. 118-20)

First, the language of the target text is characterized by the vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture, as in the translator's other works we analyzed in Chapter IV: “*Konuşup ettiğim genç kız*” / “the girl I go steady with”; “*Tatlı tatlı gülümser*” / “Tom smiles charmingly”; “*Tefe alırlar sonra insanı, Romeo aşağı, Romeo yukarı*” / “You know how they are. They call you Romeo and stuff like that”; “*Tevekkeli Güneyliler için misafirperver demiyorlar*” / “I guess this is what they mean by Southern hospitality”; “*Pek böyle palas pandaras gidiyorum ama, kusura bakmayın*” / “I hope it don't seem like I'm rushing off”; “*Bekletmeğe gelmiyor bazı kadınlar, cin ifrit oluyorlar*” / “Some women are pretty upset if you keep 'em waiting”; Jim says “*eyvallah*” when he says goodbye to Tom and “*Allah rahatlık versin*” to say good night to the family; “the mother and Laura” becomes “ana kız”; Jim's wedding time, “the second Sunday in June” becomes a definite date, “Haziranın on beşi,” which is the usual form in the target culture; and the way Jim goes out of the door is “*güle oynıya,*” which corresponds to “jauntily” in the source text. At this point, we must draw attention to the fact that most of these examples are indeed examples of *spoken* Turkish and this is quite a justifiable strategy as the target

text is a play to be *spoken* by Turkish actors and understood by Turkish audiences.

Secondly, occasional additions and a few omissions are observable in Yücel's translation: While, for instance, Jim's words, "Siz daha iyi bilirsiniz ya..." and "İyisi mi..." do not exist in the source text, Amanda's phrase referring to her good wishes for Jim, "all three of them" is missing in the target text. Yücel seems to follow this strategy in order to create *natural* dialogues in Turkish and thus increase the expressiveness of his translation. In that particular context, it is very natural for a young man to say what he says in the first example to an experienced person in Turkish society; similarly, it is not necessary or usual for a Turkish person to repeat his/her wishes, saying "üçünü birden." In line with this strategy, Amanda's response to "Siz daha iyi bilirsiniz ya" becomes "Ah, ah! Bilmez miyim, neler çekersiniz şu kadınların elinden."

While Yücel's colloquial language which creates natural utterances is an apt choice for this lower-middle class family and their story, the tone of voice of two of the characters is distorted by the translator: Frequently we see Amanda speak a vulgar language, as in the example from the passage above: "Size saadetler, kısmet açıklığı, muvaffakiyetler dilerim. Laura da öyle. Değil mi, *cicim*?" The translator ought to have used a term of address meaning "honey" in this context in order not to repeat the girl's name; however, "cicim" sounds somewhat vulgar; if I were to use my own "tertium comparationis" (Broeck 1985: 57), "tatlım," "hayatım," or "canım" would certainly be better choices. Similarly, the furious mother orders Tom to shut up when he complains that he "makes a slave of himself" for them, with the vulgar expression: "Ağzını koparırım senin!" (p. 22) / "Don't you DARE to –" (p. 25, original capitals). Or in another instance when Amanda speaks highly of the girls of her youth, she says, "*Boru değil*, o zamanın kızları nasıl konuşacağını bilirdi" (p. 7) /

“Girls in those days *knew* how to talk, I can tell you” and, again, she sounds vulgar (p. 9, original emphasis). Perhaps Yücel aims to reflect the writer’s emphasis on the verb “know” in Turkish, but his choice of the crude expression “boru değil” does not become the language of a mother of two who, in the source text, speaks a highly elegant and stylized English. Likewise, Yücel adds a swear word to Amanda’s utterance when she mentions her previous job: “Anlaşılan, o *Allahın belâsı* mağazada çalışırken [...]” (p. 14) / “while I was working at Famous and Barr [...]” (p. 16); he describes Amanda’s walking “airily” (havalı havalı) as “Amanda *kırta kırta* mutfığa gider” (p. 7) or “*kırıtardan* görünür” (p. 9). This aspect of Yücel’s language certainly deserves the criticism raised by Karantay, mentioned in Chapter III. We also observe such an inappropriate tone in Tom’s utterances, shifting the language level to slang throughout the play: Tom “[*is*] *fired* for writing a poem on the lid of a shoe-box,” so he “[*leaves*] Saint Louis” (p. 123): “Bir kundura kutusuna şiir yazarken yakalandım. *Pasaportu tutuşturu verdiler elime. Ben de kirişi kırdım Saint Louis’den*” (p. 102). Yücel also adds some swear words to Tom’s utterances when he addresses his mother: “O *mendebur* mağazanın aşıklısı mı sandın sen beni?” (p. 24) / “You think I’m crazy *about the warehouse?*” (p. 27, original emphases); “Bir hayır sahibi çıkar diye dua ediyorum, sabahları. Bir balta indirir alnımın ortasına, ben de kurtulurum o *cenabet* yere gitmekten!...” (p. 24) / “I’d rather somebody picked up a crowbar and battered out my brains – than go back mornings!” (p. 27). Although Yücel tries to recreate Tom’s hatred for his job, his use of slang words, the inappropriate tone of voice pervading his translation, the frequent shifts of register he resorts to – which he does not admit (see Karantay 1989a: 16) – are stylistic issues to be criticized in Yücel’s discourse.

As for the “overall communicative effect” (Ulrych 1996: 885) of the target

text upon the reader, Yücel's translation enables us to feel Amanda's great disillusionment and her efforts to hide her feelings in the climactic passage above. The metaphor of a falling sky used at the beginning of this passage represents Amanda's psychology: "Amanda'nın başına dünyalar yıkılır," and the legend reads "Başımıza Dünyalar Yıkıldı." The translator opts for this language-specific idiom, that is, "dünyaların başına yıkılması" (literally meaning "the collapse of the whole world over one's head") instead of another idiom because this usage is very emphatic. We do not witness this literary sensitivity in the literal retranslation of the play by Aytuğ İz'at, entitled *Sırça Hayvan Koleksiyonu* (2000), where this part reads: "([Tom] tatlı tatlı gülümser. *Yağmur boşanır.*) Pr. Perdesi Görüntüsü: *Sağnak Yağmur*" (p. 86). Obviously, İz'at's preference for the image of heavy rain ("sağnak yağmur") does not express the mother's disillusionment and sorrow well enough. Furthermore, while Amanda's tendency to hide her feelings is very clear in Yücel's target text, we understand almost the opposite in İz'at's translation because of an error, in which Laura's good wishes for Jim become Amanda's good wishes for Laura: "Güle güle Bay O'Connor. Size şans diliyorum... mutluluk... ve başarılar! *Bunları, elbette Laura için de diliyorum! İstemez misin, Laura?*" (p. 87). Another example showing Yücel's efforts to keep the literariness of his source text is his choices "kuşpalazı" (diphtheria) and "kuşkonmaz" (asparagus) (p. 17) – these words translate "pleurosis," Laura's illness at high school and "Blue Roses," the name which Jim remembers as her illness (p. 20). However, İz'at's choices "satlıcan" (pleurisy) and "patlıcan" (eggplant) (p. 23) are too far removed from producing a similar literary effect; especially the word "patlıcan" certainly does not suit the concept of love.

At the end of Scene V, Yücel's choice "kısmet açıklığı," where "kısmet"

means both “good luck” and “a person to marry,” shows the translator’s sensitivity to literary effect once again. Here, Amanda has just learnt from Tom that a gentleman caller is going to visit them the next day; thus, filled with hope, she calls Laura out to the terrace to make a wish on the moon, and ends up telling her what to wish for: “AMANDA, sesi çatallaşır, gözleri dolu dolu olur. – Saadet! Kısmet açıklığı! (*Keman sesleri keskinleşir, sahne kararır.*) (p. 53) / “Amanda (*Her voice trembling and her eyes suddenly filling with tears*) – Happiness! Good Fortune! (*The violin rises and the stage dims out.*)” (p. 60). In İz’at’s translation, on the other hand, the mother’s wish for her daughter is only “happiness” and “good luck”: “Mutluluk için! Bol şans için!” (p. 50).

### Appropriating Strategies

As in his poetry translations, the first appropriating strategy in this drama translation by Yücel is his preference for vocabulary items and expressions specific to the Turkish language and culture. The following are several among many others: The picture on the wall is Tom’s “peder bey” (father) (p. 2); Amanda sends Laura to a “bakkal” (the grocer’s) to do some shopping (p. 30); “kaş göz,” “boy pos,” and “yerinde olmak” translate “a pretty face,” “a graceful figure” and the verbal phrase “to be possessed of” in “*Kaşı gözü, boyu posu yerinde olmakla bitmezdi ki iş*” (p. 7) / “It wasn’t enough for a girl to be possessed of a pretty face and a graceful figure” (p. 9); Amanda disagrees with Laura about the number of gentlemen callers: “Aklına şaşayım senin!...” (p. 10) / “You must be joking!” (p. 11); she almost wants to die when she learns that Laura, who wears “entari” (a dress) (p. 11), has dropped out of the business school: “*Yer yarılıp içine girecektim nerdeyse*” (p. 12) / “I wanted to

find a hole in the ground and hide myself in it forever!” (p. 14); Amanda reacts angrily to the instructor’s information about Laura’s absence from classes: “*Ne münasebet, efendim! [...] Laura altı haftadır her gün mektebe geliyor*” (pp. 13f) / “No, [...] Laura, my daughter, has been going to school every day for the past six weeks” (p. 16); if a girl does not have a career, she should marry, according to Amanda: “Bak, *bir kısmet çıkarsa*, ona bir diyeceğim yok, tabii” (p.16) / “Of course, some girls *do marry*” (p. 19, original emphasis); when Jim appears as the “young man at door with flowers” (p. 22) the screen image in the target text reads: “Elinde çiçek demeti, bir *delikanlı* kapıyı çalar” (p. 19); “*Cümle âlem* Scarlet O’Hara diyordu da, başka birşey demiyordu” (p. 21) translates “all everybody *talked* was Scarlet O’Hara” (p. 23, original emphasis); when Amanda says she is worried about her daughter only, not herself, she says “*Bir ayağım çukurda zaten. Ben nasıl olsa olurum.*” (p. 38) / “I’m old and don’t matter” (p. 42); as soon as Amanda begins to dream about a wedding, Tom says: “Kendi kendine gelin güvey oluyorsun” (p. 47) / “Aren’t you being a little premature?” (p. 53); the mother asks Laura to open the door: “Laura, kapı çalınıyor, *yavrucuğum*” (p. 61) / “Laura, sweetheart! The door!” (p. 69); the mother “hope[s]” Tom and Jim get home “before it starts to rain” (p. 66): “*İnşallah* yağmura tutulmadan vaktiyle gelirler” (p. 59); Laura and Jim start to talk in private: “Zaten bana da seni bir yerden tanıyormuşum gibi geldi. Kapıyı açar açmaz *gözüm ısırtdı. Dilimin ucuna gelir* gibi oldu adın.” (p. 78f) / “You know, I have an idea I’ve seen you before. I had that idea as soon as you opened the door. It seemed almost like I was about to remember your name” (p. 91); Jim turns out to be “some other girl’s fiancé” for Amanda (p. 122): “*elin nişanlısı*” (p. 101).

Secondly, Yücel makes shifts towards what is more familiar to the Turkish audience: “Yardım Sevenler toplantısı” (p. 12), “Meryem Ana” (p. 16), “Paris

Kunduraları” (p. 21), “kıral,” “İblis” (p. 25), “kırk yıl” (p. 24), “Abrakadabra” (p. 28), “Hitler’in karargâhı” (p. 43), “halk oyunları” (p. 39), “kısmet” (p. 44), “muhallebi” (p. 69), “limonata” (p. 96), “Cennet Bahçesi,” “Vals çalar: Mavi Tuna” (p. 89) correspond to “D.A.R. meeting” (p. 14), “Jesus’ mother” (p. 18), “Continental Shoemakers” (p. 23), “czar,” “El Diablo” (p. 28), “fifty-five years” (p. 27), “Malvolio the Magician” (p. 31), “Berchtesgaden” (p. 47), “dance” (p. 45), “gentleman caller” (p. 48), “angel-food cake” (p. 80), “fruit punch” (p. 116), “Paradise Dance Hall,” “Waltz music: ‘La Golondrina’” (p. 107) respectively. This strategy is also observable in the translation of longer phrases, clauses and sentences: Amanda refers to Tom by saying “Beyimiz de pek celâlli, maşallah...” (p. 6) / “Temperament like a metropolitan star!...” (p. 7); after advising Laura about how to attract young men, Amanda says “O zaman işte, *elini sallasan ellisi,*” / “That’s all you have to do!” (p. 21); the translator describes “slim” ladies in women’s journals, with “delicate cup-like breasts” and “eyes like wood-smoke in autumn,” as “selvi boylu,” “turunç memeli” and “ceylan gözlü” (p. 20); besides, while their bodies are “as powerful as Etruscan sculpture” (p. 23), they resemble a Greek statue in the translation: “Bir Yunan heykeli gibi kusursuz” (p. 20); Tom expresses his exasperation at his mother’s waking him up every morning for work: “Hay, kalkmaz olayım şu yataktan!” (p. 24) / “How *lucky dead* people are!” (p. 27, original emphasis); Amanda speaks like a typical Turkish mother: “*Saçımı süpürge ettim bunca yıldır, bir başıma didindim durdum*” (p. 32) / “I’ve had to put up a solitary battle all these years” (p. 36); “The noise-maker or rattle,” which Tom shakes at the beginning of Scene IV (p. 30), is very familiar to the Turkish audience: “kaynana zırlıtısı” (p. 27); “Başıma gelecekleri *yediğim ekmek gibi biliyorum*” (p. 37) / “Oh, I can see the handwriting on the wall as plain as I see the nose in front of my face!” (p.

41); “Mağazada arkadaşların yok mu senin? Öyle *oturmasını kalkmasını bilir...*” (p. 38) corresponds to “Down at the warehouse, aren’t there some – *nice young men?*” (p. 43); when Tom gives Amanda very short answers by using her own words, she says: “Doğru dürüst konuşacaksan konuş! Üzme beni, *Allahını seversen!*” (p. 45) / “For heaven’s sake, stop putting on and tell me some things, will you?” (p. 50); just before Laura opens the door for Tom and Jim, a piece of music is heard: “Gramafondan kısık, öyle kulak tırmalayıcı bir ses yükselir: *Çanakkale savaşı üstüne eski bir marş*” (p. 63) / “a faraway, scratchy rendition of ‘Dardanella’” (p. 71); at that time the legend on the screen reads: “Aç Kapıyı Bezirgânbaşı” (p. 61) / “The Opening of a Door!” (p. 69); Jim informs them that he is not free to go out with another girl by saying “*Başım bağlanmış bir defa*” (p. 95) / “I’ve – got strings on me” (p. 114); he believes that Laura’s problem with her leg is not such a serious one: “Kadıkızında da olur o kadar kusur” (p. 87) / “Magnified thousands of times by imagination!” (p. 103).

Thirdly, Yücel makes some additions and several omissions in order to create more natural utterances in Turkish and make the context more familiar to the target audience:

Hem çiğne, evlâdım! Çiğnesene doğru dürüst!... Hayvanların midesi ona göre; çiğnemedi de hazmeder onlar yiyeceğini... İnsanlar öyle mi ya!... Lokmanı yutmadan iyice çiğneyeceksin ki bir şeye benzesin... Aheste aheste ye yiyeceğini!... *Atlı mı kovalıyor ya ardından!*... Lokmanı ağzında tut biraz da, yediğinin tadına varasın!... Hem ne güne duruyor tükürük bezlerin!... (p. 6)

And chew – chew! Animals have sections in their stomachs which enable them to digest without mastication, but human beings are supposed to chew their food before they swallow it down. Eat food leisurely, son, and really enjoy it. A well-cooked meal has lots of delicate flavors that have to be held in the mouth for appreciation. *So chew your food* and give your salivary glands a chance to function! (p. 7)

While “Atlı mı kovalıyor ya ardından!...” is added to the target text, “a well-cooked meal” becomes “lokma,” and “so chew your food” is omitted because Yücel wants to avoid repeating the same action (of chewing) in order to increase the expressiveness of his target text. As for some other examples, Laura’s typing instructor says, “*Vallah*, bizde böyle bir talebe yok” (p. 13) / “We don’t have any such student enrolled at the school!” (p. 16); defending his efforts as the breadwinner who hates his job, Tom says: “Yine de kalkıyor, gidiyorum oraya!.. Ayda altmışbeş dolar için hep... Gördüğüm düşleri, kurduğum hayalleri çiğneyip gidiyorum!... *Yaranamıyoruz yine de!* Nefsimi düşünüyormuşum ben, sade kendimi düşünüyormuşum...” (p. 24) / “But I get up. I go! For sixty-five dollars a month I give up all that I dream of doing and being *ever!* And you say self – *self’s* all I ever think of” (p. 27f, original emphases); when the tension between Amanda and Tom grows, Tom says “Ben de çok seviyorum macerayı, *canım*” (p. 35) / “I like a lot of adventure” (p. 39) and Amanda replies: “*Benim bildiğim*, gençler macerayı işinde, gücünde mesleğinde yaratır” / “Most young men find adventure in their careers”; Yücel omits the word “pig” in the following context since it is not natural or usual to compare human beings to pigs in the Muslim target culture: “Onlar gibi değilsin sen herhalde, daha üstün şeylerin peşindesin. Bir fark olacak, değil mi, insanlarla maymunlar arasında?” / “Surely your aims are somewhat higher than theirs! Than monkeys – *pigs* –” (p. 40); Yücel naturalizes the flow of Tom’s words about the youth at the time of World War II with two additions: “Oysa öyle bir macera bolluğuna uğrıyacaktı ki o yıl... *Sen misin macera, değişiklik isteyen... Ne olduklarını şaşıracaktı...* Macera pusuda bekliyordu onları...” (p. 42f) / “Adventure and change were imminent in this year. They were waiting around the corner for all these kids” (p. 47); when Amanda forces Laura to open the door for the gentleman caller, the young girl is too nervous:

“Of! *Yarabbi*, of!...” (p. 62) / “Oh, oh, oh ...” (p. 71); the mother praises her daughter with the statement “*Kızım olduğu için söylemiyorum. Pırlanta gibidir bizim Laura. Hem bu kadar güzel olsun, hem evcimen, nerde bulunur şimdi böylesi?*” (p. 69) / “It’s rare for a girl as sweet an’ pretty as Laura to be domestic! But Laura is, thank heavens, not only pretty, but also domestic” (p. 80); when Amanda says she “was so gay as a girl” (p. 116), Jim replies: “*Maşallah, Mrs. Wingfield hiç değişmemişsiniz. Yine neşeniz yerinde*” (p. 97) / “You haven’t changed, Mrs. Wingfield” (p. 117); Laura says she is afraid to “step on [him]” (p. 107) while dancing and Jim replies: “*Korkma canım! Sırçadan mı sandın beni de?*” (p. 90) / “I’m not made out of glass” (p. 107).

Finally, as is already obvious, Yücel opts for spoken Turkish: For instance, when he finds it necessary, he cuts longer source-text sentences into short phrases, as in the first example of the preceding paragraph, since Turkish people do not usually talk with long, full sentences in their everyday lives: “Sofraya oturduğuma pişman ediyorsun beni... Boğazıma diziliyor... Kapıcı kuş gibi başımda öyle... Dır, dır, dır... Yok hayvan midesiymiş, yok tükruk beziymiş... İştah mı bırakıyorsun insanda!...” (p. 6) translates a three-sentence passage: “I haven’t enjoyed one bite of this dinner because of your constant directions on how to eat it. It’s you that make me rush through meals with your hawk-like attention to every bite I take. Sickening – spoils my appetite – all this discussion of – animals’ secretion – salivary glands – mastication!” (p. 7). Yücel also chooses to write some words as they are used in spoken Turkish: “Suss!” (p. 16) / “Hush!” (p. 18); “ancak” becomes “anca” in “*anca* duyulacak bir sesle” (p. 12), rendering “faintly, almost inaudibly” (p. 14); “pekiyi” becomes “pekiy” in “*Senin evin ha!... Peki ama kim veriyor kirayı?*” (p. 22) / “House, house! Who pays rent on it [...]”; Tom decides to go out in order not to

listen to his mother: “Dedim *a* dinlemeyeceğim” (p. 22); “*Neye* bütün bunlar diyeceksin, değil mi?” (p. 87). Furthermore, the translator benefits from expressions and usages specific to spoken Turkish: In the first quotation in this paragraph, “dır dır dır,” “yok - yok” and “öyle” are usages peculiar to spoken Turkish; Jim asks Laura about her health problem: “*Nen* vardı” (p. 17); “Amanda ‘*öhö*’ diye boğazını temizler” (p. 31) / “She clears her throat” (p. 35); “*Nedir o*, geç vakitlere kadar sokaklarda *dolaşip etmen!* [...] Laura’ya *bakarsan*, tiksiniyormuşun evden,” (p. 36f) / “Staying out late [...] *Laura* says you hate the apartment” (p. 38f); “*Sen tut*, okuldan yok yere ayrıl, tahsilini yarıda bırak!... *Hani* ayağını da sürsen, *yüreğim yanmaz*” (p. 86) / “You dropped out of school, you gave up an education because of a clump, which as far as I know was practically non-existent!” (p. 103); “Ev kızı derler *hani*... *Zaar* Laura da onlardan olacak” (p. 37) / “I guess she’s the type that people call home girls” (p. 41); “Ben başka şey tuttuğunu sanmıştım. Laura’ya bir kismet çıkar *filan diye hani*...” (p. 44) / “I thought perhaps you wished for a gentleman caller” (p. 48); “‘*Yahu* Shakespeare’, dedi ‘senin soyun sopun olacağı aklıma bile gelmezdi’” (p. 55) / “You know, Shakespeare, I never thought of you as having folks!” (p. 62); when Amanda says “Baban içerdi de,” Tom replies using the short, spoken form of the expression we mentioned above: “Başlama yine *allasen!*” (p. 47) / “Don’t get started on that!” (p.53); finally, Amanda pulls out of her trunk a light dress that is “terribly old” (p. 79) and says: “*Taa* ne zamandan kalma” (p. 68).

### Summary and Conclusions

Yücel’s drama translation entitled *Sırça Kümes* (1964b) is based on a play written by Tennessee Williams in 1944. Both this particular translation, which is out of print

today, and its source text have been staged many times for their respective audiences. The play is about an American family living in a triangle of desperation in St. Louis, Missouri. The mother, Amanda, is especially concerned about the future of her daughter Laura, who is crippled and has not completed her education. She is highly critical of her son Tom, the breadwinner of the family, who wants to abandon them like his father did many years ago. A gentleman caller, a friend of Tom's from work, for whom Laura had platonic feeling at school, becomes the only hope for the mother. All her efforts, however, end in great disillusionment and sorrow when they learn that the gentleman caller is indeed engaged to be married soon.

When we critique the target text in terms of matricial norms, except for the introductory part including "The Characters" and "Production Notes" which was not commissioned to the translator, and two other parts which are omitted for some reason or another, the entire source text consisting of seven scenes has been translated by Yücel; the translator follows the distribution of the linguistic material in the source text, never changing the order of the characters' utterances, or the parenthetical information; and he keeps intact the scene and internal segmentation of the source text except that he combines one-sentence paragraphs of the source text into full, coherent paragraphs.

When we critique the target text in terms of language, first of all, it is obviously characterized by the translator's preference for vocabulary and usages specific to the Turkish language and culture: "*Konuşup ettiğim genç kız*" / "the girl I go steady with"; "*Tatlı tatlı gülümser*" / "Tom smiles charmingly"; "*Tefe alırlar sonra insanı, Romeo aşağı, Romeo yukarı*" / "You know how they are. They call you Romeo and stuff like that"; "*Tevekkeli Güneyliler için misafirperver demiyorlar*" / "I guess this is what they mean by Southern hospitality" / "*Pek böyle palas pandaras*

gidiyorum ama, *kusura bakmayın*” / “I hope it don’t seem like I’m rushing off”; “*Bekletmeğe gelmiyor bazı kadınlar, cin ifrit oluyorlar*” / “Some women are pretty upset if you keep ’em waiting”; “eyvallah,” “Allah rahatlık versin,” “ana kız,” “güle oynıya” are some other examples. With this strategy, Yücel seems to make his target text speakable on the part of his actors and understandable for the audience, as he clearly stated in an interview (Karantay 1989a: 15f). Secondly, we come across occasional additions and several omissions in order to create *natural* utterances in Turkish: For instance, Amanda responds to Jim’s suggestion “Siz daha iyi bilirsiniz ya” by saying “Ah, ah! Bilmez miyim, neler çekersiniz şu kadınların elinden.” Thirdly, Yücel manages to recreate the overall communicative effect of the play: A case in point is the great disillusionment at the climax, which is summed up with a highly expressive rendition: “Başımıza dünyalar yıkıldı.” The translator’s efforts at expressiveness become more observable when his target text is compared with Aytuğ İz’at’s retranslation entitled *Sırça Hayvan Koleksiyonu*, where the feeling of desperation and that of love are hardly expressed in the choices “sağnak yağmur” and “patlıcan.” Yücel’s choice of “kısmet açıklığı” rendering “good fortune” at the end of Scene V is another fine instance of his literary sensitivity. However, Yücel frequently uses slang in Amanda and Tom’s utterances, and also changes the tone of the play – consequently, at times, Amanda and Tom sound like vulgar people: Amanda is certainly pretentious but *not* vulgar. Two examples: When she reminisces about her youth in Scene I, she says: “*Boru değil, o zamanın kızları nasıl konuşacağını bilirdi*” / “Girls in those days *knew* how to talk, I can tell you”; when Tom declares that he is tired of his job, he says: “*O mendebur mağazanın aşıklısı mı sandın sen beni?*” / “You think I’m crazy *about* the *warehouse?*” This characteristic of Yücel’s translation should be considered as a factor that really lessens the degree

of his stylistic sensitivity to his source text.

Like his poetry translations in the previous chapter, *Sırça Kümes* is also marked by the translator's appropriating strategies, which can be classified into four groups. His well-known preference for vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture can be exemplified by his rendition "*Kaşı gözü, boyu posu yerinde olmakla bitmezdi ki iş*" / "It wasn't enough for a girl to be possessed of a pretty face and a graceful figure." Secondly, he makes shifts towards what is more familiar for the Turkish audience, as can be seen in his renditions such as "Abrakadabra" and "Aç Kapıyı Bezirgânbaşı" translating "Malvolio the Magician" and "The Opening of a Door!" respectively. Thirdly, he makes additions and omissions in order to create more natural utterances for the target audience: His addition of "Atlı mı kovalıyor ya ardından," used when the mother advises her son to eat slowly, and that of "Kızım olduğu için söylemiyorum. Pırlanta gibidir bizim Laura," used when she praises her daughter, and his omission of "pigs" when referring to the differences between human beings and animals are examples of this strategy. Finally, he opts for usages of spoken Turkish: "*Sen tut, okuldan yok yere ayrıl, tahsilini yarıda bırak!... Hani ayağını da sürsen, yüreğim yanmaz*" renders "You dropped out of school, you gave up an education because of a clump, which as far as I know was practically non-existent!" Yücel also chooses to write some words in the way they are spoken by the man on the street: "anca," "pekiy," "dedim a," "neye," among many others.

Thus, we can conclude that, like his two poetry translations in Chapter IV, this dramatic target text produced by Yücel can by no means be defined as an imitation, an adaptation or a version, since it is translation proper: He does not ignore both the playwright's words and meanings whenever he likes; he does not make

*substantial* changes by way of *many* omissions and additions; and Yücel's translation does not depart too far from the original and, consequently, become a garbled or queer form or variant of the source text since Yücel is stylistically sensitive to it to some extent.

With his macro-strategy that "appropriates" Williams' play for the Turkish audience, once again Yücel becomes Lefevere's "rewriter" who follows the more preferred way in this cross-cultural "marriage" by trying to "colonize" the source text and by promoting the target culture as capable of translating a hegemonic language – thus the two basic constraints of "rewriting" are detectable in this translation. He seems to be motivated, once again, by his leftist ideology and his idiosyncratic translation poetics, designated as "Can Babaca" (*Canese*), which makes him Lefevere's subversive "spirited translator" with a very Turkish universe of discourse. Yücel's unique poetics, making use of many slang expressions in this play, is constrained by his ideology, proving Lefevere's suggestion right once more: It uses all the peculiarly Turkish forms of ordinary people and the play Yücel has chosen to translate is about the problems of ordinary people from a poor family.

In addition, Yücel aims at functional equivalence in this free drama translation once again, since he strives to recreate a work that can stand as a play in its own right, to be performed by the actors of the target culture for the target audience. The translator aims to recreate a performable play with an appropriate dramatic language, discussed in "Acclaim" in Chapter III (cf. Demirkol 2006: 28). Hence, once again, he becomes Lefevere's "faithful rewriter."

Although he seems to be stylistically sensitive to the source text, Yücel, the epitome of free translation, cannot raise his kite as high into the air in *Sırça Kümes* as he did in his poetic translations because of his frequent shifts of register from the

colloquial to slang. The very “visible” translator Yücel cannot help eclipsing his writer’s individuality because of his heavily appropriating strategies and the register shifts. How can one make the reader believe that utterances like “Kaşı gözü, boyu posu yerinde olmakla bitmezdi ki iş” or “Aç Kapıyı Bezirgânbaşı” are in fact Tennessee Williams’s words?

Finally, because his use of spoken Turkish is heavily observable in *Sırça Kümes*, our suggestion – that the verb “söylemek” (to speak) may have been deliberately preferred to the verb “yazmak” (to write) in Yücel’s designation “Türkçe Söyleyen” – becomes more tenable.

## CHAPTER VI

### *MUHTEŞEM GATSBY*

#### The Target and the Source Text

*Muhteşem Gatsby* (1964a) is Can Yücel's prose translation of *The Great Gatsby* – a nine-chapter masterpiece written by F. Scott Fitzgerald in 1925. The specific source text used in this study was published by Penguin Books in 1994.

#### The Plot

The narrator of the novel Nick Carraway is a mid-westerner who is a graduate of Yale. He lives in a small, rented house in West Egg on Long Island, New York and works in the bond business. Next to his house is a big mansion that belongs to a wealthy, self-made man called Jay Gatsby. It is the time of the “Jazz Age” when Americans enjoyed drinking, partying and endless talk in a ritzy, dishonest life (Bellmore-Merrick 2006: 1).

Gatsby, the protagonist of the novel, does illegal business with his mentor Meyer Wolfsheim and gives lavish parties on an open admission basis on the weekends. Gatsby gives these parties in order to find a chance to rekindle his love affair which was interrupted because of the war five years ago. While Gatsby keeps his hope fresh, his old sweetheart, Daisy Buchanan, lives an unhappy life with her husband Tom and their daughter in a mansion right across the bay. There is a green light on their dock, which Gatsby enjoys watching as a sign of his continuing hope.

While his neighbor is a complete stranger to him, Nick knows the Buchanans

very well: Daisy is his second cousin and Tom is his classmate from Yale. One day he goes to their mansion for dinner and Daisy introduces him to a woman golf-player called Jordan Baker. That evening, when Tom is busy with a phone conversation, Jordan whispers into Nick's ear that he has a mistress.

One Sunday afternoon, Tom persuades Nick to go to the city with him and they stop by Mr. Wilson's garage, where Tom arranges for Mrs. Myrtle Wilson to come to their secret apartment in New York City on the next train. There they enjoy themselves with Myrtle's sister Catherine and their neighbors, the McKees; but the chaotic party is over when Tom breaks Myrtle's nose because she argues with him about Daisy. Several weeks later, Nick is invited, this time, to Gatsby's party. Jordan is there as well and they hear people talk about the mysterious host of the party and how he made his money. Finally, Nick meets Gatsby in person. Nick is very much surprised by the fact that Gatsby does not in fact join in the revelry of the party and he sees him speak to Jordan in private.

One morning, Gatsby and Nick drive into the city in Gatsby's gorgeous yellow car and Gatsby tries to impress him, claiming that he comes from a wealthy family, and shows him his war medal and Oxford photographs. That afternoon Nick meets Jordan and learns that Gatsby requests him to stage a meeting between him and Daisy at his house because he aims to impress her with his mansion and wealth. The plan works out well and the old sweethearts start to have an affair after all these years. Meanwhile, Nick and Gatsby have become close friends and so the mysterious neighbor talks to him about his past life.

One weekend, Tom and Daisy attend Gatsby's party, but Daisy especially does not like the wild character of the party. Gatsby stops giving parties, because he has already accomplished his plan. He even replaces his servants with less adept but

more discreet ones. The Buchanans invite Nick, Jordan, and Gatsby to lunch on a very hot day. Gatsby expects Daisy to tell her husband that she is leaving him. Tom is already suspicious of a love affair between them. Daisy suggests going to New York. Tom drives Nick and Jordan in Gatsby's ostentatious yellow car while Daisy wants to go with Gatsby in their coupe. Tom stops by Mr. Wilson's garage again, this time, to buy gas and Myrtle watches them from the window with jealousy because she mistakes Jordan for his wife. Meanwhile, Tom learns from Mr. Wilson that he plans to move to another city because he suspects his wife of being unfaithful to him.

The party rents a suite at the Plaza Hotel, where the storm breaks. Tom accuses his rival of being a good-for-nothing bootlegger. Gatsby claims that Daisy has never loved Tom, but has always loved him. Both men make an appeal to Daisy. Very much confused in the midst of this crossfire, she says she loves them both, but implies that she would choose her husband. On the return journey, Daisy drives Gatsby in his yellow car and the others follow them in the second car. As Daisy goes past Mr. Wilson's garage, Myrtle dashes into the street and tries to stop the yellow car, which she believes Tom is driving. Daisy cannot stop and hits the woman, who is killed instantly. Tom stops at the scene of the accident and tells Mr. Wilson that the yellow car he was driving that morning does not belong to him. Then they too drive on to the Buchanans' place. Nick does not enter the house and finds Gatsby watching the house from behind the bushes in order to make sure that Tom does not hurt Daisy. The next day, still hoping that Daisy will return to him, Gatsby leaves his car in his garage and begins to wait for her phone call, enjoying his time in the swimming pool.

In the meantime, Wilson sets out to revenge his wife's death and goes to the

Buchanans' with a pistol in his hand. From Tom right before he escapes with his wife from their mansion, Wilson learns that the yellow car belongs to Gatsby. Since he now believes that it was Gatsby who drove the yellow car that killed his wife and that he was probably her secret lover, Wilson finds Gatsby's mansion and murders him in his swimming pool without a second thought, and right there he commits suicide.

Nick takes charge of Gatsby's funeral. Nobody except him, Gatsby's father, a man who loved Gatsby's library, a few servants, and a minister attend the ceremony. All of Gatsby's so-called friends at his famous parties have now deserted him. Soon after the funeral, Nick decides to return to the mid-West and says good bye to Jordan.

#### A Critique of the Target Text

##### Matricial Norms

When we consider the target text in terms of fullness of translation, we see that Yücel has translated all the nine chapters of the source text fully. In other words, there is no non-translation in the translator's work. When we consider the target text in terms of the distribution of the linguistic material, the translator has kept the order of the sentences, paragraphs, and chapters in the source text.

As for the segmentation of the target text, Yücel starts and finishes each one of the nine chapters at the same places as the writer does in the source text; within each chapter he keeps the internal segmentation, that is, the segmentation of paragraphs intact – this will be clearly observed in the sample excerpt to be studied in the next subsection.

Thus, as in his poetry and drama translations analyzed in the previous chapters, Yücel once again abides by the matricial norms of the source text.

### Discourse Analysis

In this section, a passage from the target text will be analyzed in terms of its discourse. In the following excerpt from the first chapter of the novel, Nick goes to visit the Buchanans at their mansion in East Egg and Daisy introduces him to the golf-player Jordan Baker. At ten o'clock, Miss Baker excuses herself because she is to play in a tournament the next day. After she leaves, Tom is suspicious that Daisy or Jordan has told Nick about his woman in New York. Nick denies this. On his way back home, he feels sorry for Daisy (p. 28f):

“Sundurmada Nick’e içini dökmüşsündür artık!” diye sözünü kesti Tom.

“Yok, canım.” Bir baktı bana. “Yoo, biz İskandinav ırkından söz ettik, değil mi? Öyle ya! Sahi, lâf döndü dolaştı oraya geldi, derken...”

“Her söylenene sakın inanma, Nick!” diye öğütledi Tom beni.

“Kimsenin bana bir şey söylediği yok ki.” deyip işin içinden sıyrıldım, zâten bir iki dakika sonra savuşmağa davrandım. Kapıya kadar geçirdiler, şen bir ışık karesinin içinde yanyana duruyorlardı. Tam motoru çalıştırıyordum:

“Dur bir dakika, dur!” diye seslendi Daisy. “Bir şey soracaktım sana, unuttum. Batı’da nişanlandığını duyduk da...”

“Ha sahi!” diye doğruladı Tom. “Nişanlanmışsın, öyle duyduk.”

“Düpedüz iftira. Param yok benim bir kere.”

“Ama öyle duyduk biz” diye diretti Daisy, hem de yeniden çiçek gibi, öyle bir açıldı ki, şaşım. Üç ayrı kimseden işittik biz bunu, bir aslı olması lâzım.”

Biliyordum tabiy bu üç kişinin neye kanca taktıklarını ama, nişanlı filân değildim. Zâten buraya gelişimin bir sebebi de, bu işin dedikodusunun nikâh ilânına kadar dayanmış oluşuydu. Sırf dile düştük diye canciğer arkadaşımı silkip atamazdım, ama bu yüzden de apartapar evlendirilmeğe hiç niyetim yoktu.

Benimle böyle ilgilenişleri, eh biraz gönlümü hoş etti, aramızdaki para duvarını acık aşındırdı ama, otomobili sürüp giderken, kafam karışık, içim buruktu. Ben Daisy’nin yerinde olsam, çocuğumu kucağıma kaptığım gibi, fırlar, giderdim o evden. Ama baktım, hiç o taraflı değil.

“Did you give Nick a little heart-to-heart talk on the veranda?” demanded Tom suddenly.

“Did I?” She looked at me. “I can’t seem to remember, but I think we talked about the Nordic race. Yes, I’m sure we did. It sort of crept up on us and first thing you know –”

“Don’t believe everything you hear, Nick,” he advised me.

I said lightly that I heard nothing at all, and a few minutes later I got up to go home. They came to the door with me and stood side by side in a cheerful square of light. As I started my motor Daisy peremptorily called “Wait!”

“I forgot to ask you something and it’s important. We heard you were engaged to a girl out West.”

“That’s right,” corroborated Tom kindly. “We heard that you were engaged.”

“It’s a libel. I’m too poor.”

“But we heard it,” insisted Daisy, surprising me by opening up again in a flower-like way. “We heard it from three people, so it must be true.”

Of course I knew what they were referring to, but I wasn’t even vaguely engaged. The fact that gossip had published the banns was one of the reasons I had come East. You can’t stop going with an old friend on account of rumors, and on the other hand I had no intention of being rumored into marriage.

Their interest rather touched me and made them less remotely rich – nevertheless, I was confused and a little disgusted as I drove away. It seemed to me that the thing for Daisy to do was to rush out of the house, child in arms – but apparently there were no such intentions in her head. (p. 26f)

Once again, Yücel’s translation is highly characterized by its vocabulary and usages specific to the Turkish language and culture: “içini dökmek,” “yok, canım,” “lâfin dönüp dolaşması,” “işin içinden sıyrılmak,” “ha, sahi!” “düpedüz iftira,” “aslı olmak,” “dile düşmek,” “cancığer arkadaşı,” “silkip atmak,” “gönlünü hoş etmek,” “içi buruk olmak,” “kaptığı gibi fırlayıp gitmek,” “o taraflı olmamak,” etc. Another translator of *The Great Gatsby*, Filiz Ofluoğlu (1975: 25f) does not opt for similar usages: for instance, “lâfin dönüp dolaşması,” “aslı olmak,” “ha, sahi!” “dile düşmek,” “cancığer arkadaşı,” “silkip atmak,” and “o taraflı olmamak,” become “birdenbire bir konunun çıkıvermesi,” “doğru olmak,” “doğru,” “söylenti,” “eski bir arkadaş,” “dostluğu kesmek,” and “niyeti olmamak” in her translation, respectively.

Yücel’s preference for emphatic usages makes his renditions highly

expressive, thus literary, as in his previous translations. The following instances will help to illustrate this point: Tom thinks Daisy has talked to Nick about her personal problems: “Sundurmada Nick’e *içini dökmüşsündür artık!*” / “Did you *give Nick a little heart-to-heart talk* on the veranda?”; Daisy says that they did not talk about the Nordic race intentionally: “*Sahi, lâf döndü dolaştı* oraya geldi” / “it sort of crept up on us”; Nick answers Tom, implying that he does not know about his woman in New York: “Kimsenin bana birşey söylediği yok ki” / “I heard nothing at all”; Nick reacts strongly to the news about his engagement: “*Düpedüz iftira*” / “It’s a libel”; Nick says *rumors* should not stop his relationship with his girlfriend: “Sırf *dile düştük* diye *cancığer* arkadaşımı *silkip atamazdım*” / “You can’t *stop going with an old friend* on account of *rumors*”; Tom and Daisy’s interest in Nick makes him happy: “Benimle böyle ilgilenişleri, *eh biraz gönlümü hoş etmişti*” / “Their interest *rather touched me.*” Ofluoğlu’s translation, on the other hand, does not create a similar effect: For instance, her rendition of the second example above is “Birdenbire bir konu çıkıverdi kendiliğinden” (p. 25); her inaccurate rendition of “libel” also hinders her expressiveness: “Şantaj bu” (p. 25); in addition, her “İlgileri dokunmuştu bana” for the last example above is a word-for-word translation that lacks expressiveness because it does not identify what kind of feeling is experienced by the speaker clearly: happiness or, for instance, sadness? After all, the expressive quality of Yücel’s translation is also observable in the rendition of his title, especially when we compare it with Ofluoğlu’s choice, *Büyük Gatsby*. For a self-made, rich man like Gatsby, who will do anything to reunite with his lost love in the midst of the revelries of the Jazz Age in America, the adjective “muhteşem” in his title is indeed highly expressive.

Yücel is generally careful about recreating the tone of the writer in his

choices in our sample excerpt: For instance, Nick says “*lightly* that [he] heard nothing at all”: “Kimsenin bana bir şey söylediği yok ki.” deyip *işin içinden sıyrıldım*”; he claims he “wasn’t even *vaguely engaged*”: “*nişanlı filân* değildim”; the Buchanans’ interest in him “*rather touched*” Nick: “eh *biraz* gönlümü hoş etmişti”; he feels “confused and *a little disgusted*” after he leaves the Buchanans’ mansion: “kafam karışık, *içim buruktu.*” In addition, Yücel is very careful about recreating the rhythm of the source text by not shortening or combining his sentences.

However, as we did in Chapter V, one of Yücel’s choices in the excerpt should be criticized for exaggerating the tone of the writer, causing a shift on the language level from colloquial to slang: He translates the verb “refer to” with the slang expression “kanca atmak”: “Biliyordum tabiy bu üç kişinin neye *kanca taktıklarını* ama” / “Of course I knew what they were *referring to.*” Instead, “bahsetmek” or “söz etmek” would be more appropriate choices in this context. As a matter of fact, this shift of register is observable throughout the entire translation: For instance, Nick says “I came East” in the spring of 1922 (p. 9): “Doğu’ya *kapağı attım*” (p. 12); Nick “*saw* that this was because she felt safer [...]” (p. 64): “[...] *kafama dang etti*” (p. 68); Nick “liked to *walk up* Fifth Avenue and pick out romantic women from the crowd” (p. 63): “Fifth Avenue’da *piyasa ederken*, kalabalık arasından romantik kadınlar seçer, [...]” (p. 66); Gatsby “knew that Daisy was *extraordinary*, but he didn’t realize just how *extraordinary* a ‘nice’ girl could be” (p. 155): “Daisy’nin *cins* bir varlık olduğunu biliyordu ama, bir ‘aile’ kızının daha ne kadar *cins* olabileceğini hesaba katmamıştı” (p. 166). Besides, Yücel refers to “the very old” (p. 183) as “pinponlar” (p. 196); “arkadaşlık etmek” turns into “oynaşmak”: “Ondan sonra da askerlerle *oynaşmıyormuş,*” (p. 87) / “After that she didn’t *play around with* the soldiers any more,” (p. 82); Daisy explains why she

allows Nick to kiss her at the party: “Öyle *kızıştırıyor* ki beni böyle yerler” (p. 119) / “These things *excite* me so” (p. 111); when he was a young officer, Gatsby “*took* what he could get” and Daisy was one of them: “derken sakın bir Ekim gecesi, Daisy’ye de *atladı*, belki de eline bile dokunmağa hakkı olmadığını bildiği için yaptı bunu” (p. 166) / “eventually he *took* Daisy one still October night, took her because he had no real right to touch her hand” (p. 155); Catherine swears after the accident “that her sister was completely happy with her husband, that her sister *had been into no mischief* whatever” (p. 170): “[...] kardeşinin kocasıyla gül gibi geçindiklerine, kardeşinin hiçbir *dalgası* olmadığına yemin etti” (p. 182); Gatsby plans to protect Daisy against Tom after the accident: “Ben burada bekliyeyim de akşamki tatsızlık yüzünden kızın *başına belâ olmasın*. Yatak odasına kitledi kendini, öbürü bir *hayvanlık edecek* olursa, ışığı yakıp söndürecek” (p. 161) / “I’m just going to wait here and see if he tries to *bother* her about that unpleasantness this afternoon. She’s locked herself into her room, and if he *tries any brutality* she’s going to turn the light out and on again” (p. 151); Yücel likens a lover to “a male dog”: “Tom’a rastlayıncaya kadar da bir *erkek köpeğe* bile bakmamıştır” (p. 44) / “Tom’s the first *sweetie* she ever had” (p. 41); Jordan is escorted by “a *persistent* undergraduate” at Gatsby’s party (p. 50): “*atsineği* bir üniversiteli” (p. 53); a young lady at the party addresses another as “nonoşum” (p. 72), translating “honey” (p. 67); “evrensel *köpeksilik*” (p. 91) corresponds to “universal *skepticism*” (p. 86); o azman, o bayağ, o *orospu* güzel” (p. 113) translates “a vast, vulgar, and *meretricious* beauty” (p. 105); Tom does not like where his mistress lives: “Ne *cenabet* yer, değil mi?” (p. 35) / “*Terrible* place, isn’t it,” (p. 32); Tom guesses that “[t]here’s some *bad trouble*” in front of Wilson’s garage (p. 145): “Bir *bokluk* var burda” (p. 155).

## Appropriating Strategies

The first appropriating strategy in this translation is Yücel's preference for vocabulary items and usages specific to the Turkish language and culture, which becomes evident in his very first sentence. All the italics in the quotations below are to emphasize this characteristic of the target text: "*Toy çağım*da bir öğüt vermişti babam, hâlâ *küpedir kulağıma*" (p. 9) / "In *my younger and more vulnerable years* my father gave me some advice that *I've been turning over in my mind* ever since" (p. 7); after boasting about his tolerance, "[Nick] come[s] to the admission that it has a limit" (p. 7): "Hoşgörümle böylece öğündükten sonra, onun da bir sınırı olduğunu söylemek *boynuma borç*" (p. 10); Nick explains why he chose to live in the country: "En *ehveni*, şehirde bir yer bulmaktı *ya*, mevsim yaz, sonra da çayırılık, ağaçlık bir memleketten yeni ayrılmışlık *var serde*; dairedeki arkadaşlardan biri, sayfiyelikte müşterek bir ev tutmağı teklif edince, dayanamadım" (p. 12) / "*The most practical thing* was to find rooms in the city, but it was a warm season, *and I had just left a country of wide lawns and friendly trees*, so when a young man at the office suggested that we take a house together in a commuting town, it sounded like a great idea" (p. 9); Nick is happy with his neighborhood: "*Şurdan şuraya kimildarsam bana da adam demesinler*" (p. 18) / "I'd be a God damned fool to live anywhere else" (p. 16); Jordan says "good night" (p. 25) to Daisy and Tom: "*Hayırlı geceler!*" (p. 27); Nick finds the interior of Wilson's garage "unprosperous and bare" (p. 30): "*İçersi tam takır, kuru bakır*" (p. 33); Wilson complains about a worker: "*Elini biraz ağır tutuyor sizin çocuk galiba?*" (p. 34) / "Works pretty slow, don't he?" (p. 31); Gatsby's Rolls-Royce becomes "an omnibus" on weekends (p. 45): "Hafta sonlarında, Rolls-Royce marka otomobili, *dolmuşluk eder*, [...]" (p. 48); the man in

Gatsby's library is "somewhat drunk" (p. 51): "belli, *çakır-keyif*" (p. 54); this man is so impressed by the books: "*Halis muhlis basma! Numara sandım önce*" (p. 54) / "It's a *bona-fide* piece of printed matter. It *fooled me*" (p. 52); Nick tells Gatsby that he does not "like mysteries" (p. 77): "Böyle *gizli kapalı* şeylerden *hazetmem*" (p. 82); his business partner, Wolfsheim, regards Gatsby as "a man of fine breeding" (p. 78): "*helâl süt emmiş* bir insan" (p. 83); when Tom runs into Nick in a New York restaurant, he is very surprised: "*Hangi rüzgâr attı seni buralara?*" (p. 85) / "How'd you happen to come up this far to eat?" (p. 80); Nick spends a very pleasant evening with Jordan: "Başımda hâlâ o akşamın *kavak yelleri esiyordu*" (p. 96) / "The evening had made me light-headed and happy" (p. 90); Nick believes it is a lucky moment when Gatsby's head hits the mantelpiece clock: "*Allahtan* o anda başının baskısıyla saat *tepetaklak* gelir gibi oldu" (p. 99) / "*Luckily* the clock took this moment to *tilt dangerously* at the pressure of his head" (p. 93); Tom and his friends come to Gatsby's house right after Nick: "Bir iki dakika *geçti geçmedi*, Tom Buchanan birinin ardına takılmış *bir kadeh bir şey içmek için çıktı geldi*" (p. 116) / "I hadn't been there two minutes when somebody brought Tom Buchanan in for a drink" (p. 108); Gatsby "[comes] out *the front door*" (p. 111): "Gatsby [...] *cümle kapısında* göründü" (p. 118); a friend of Tom's says, "We're late. *We've got to go*" (p. 110): "Geç kaldık. *Yolcu yolunda gerek*" (p. 118); Wilson "need[s] money pretty bad" (p. 129): "*elim çok darda*" (p. 138); Wilson cries his heart out after his wife's death: "Ah, Allahım, ah! Ah, Allahım ah," (p. 155) / "Oh, my Ga – od! Oh, my Ga – od!" (p. 145); the young officer Gatsby's love for Daisy is highly passionate: "Daisy'ye bir *alay* erkeğin *abayı yakmış* oluşu da büsbütün *kanını kızıştırıyor*, kızı gözünde daha da yükseltiyordu" (p. 165) / "It *excited* him, too, that *many* men already loved Daisy – it increased her value in his eyes" (p. 154); Nick reminisces about Gatsby,

who is dead now: “‘*Toprağı bol olsun,*’ dedim bir an sonra. ‘Siz en yakın arkadaşınız; biliyorum, *ikindileyin* cenazesine geleceksiniz tabii” (p. 190) / “‘*Now he’s dead,*’ I said after a moment. ‘You were his closest friend; so I know you’ll want to come to his funeral *this afternoon*” (p. 178); Nick decides to “come back *home,*” to the mid-West (p. 184): “[...] *memlekete* dönmeğe karar verdim” (p. 196); Wolfsheim addresses Nick in his letter as “*Azizim* Mr. Carraway” (p. 184) / “Dear Mr. Carraway” (p. 172), and writes that he feels so bad about Gatsby’s murder: “[...] *iler tutar tarafım kalmıyor*” (p. 184) / “I [...] am completely knocked down and out” (p. 172).

In addition, Yücel’s preference for spoken Turkish has a special place in his discourse: For instance, Daisy wants to make a plan and asks: “Ne planlar acaba herkes, *ha?*” (p. 20) / “What do people plan?” (p. 18); Daisy insists that Tom is “hulking” (p. 18): “Hantalsın *ya!*” (p. 20); The dog seller praises his animal: “Şu tüylere bakın *hele!* [...] Soğuk alır diye hiç meraklanmayın *gayri*” (p. 33) / “Look at that dog. [...] That’s a dog that’ll never bother you with catching cold” (p. 33); the drunkard at the library marvels at the books: “*Vallaha* sahici – sayfası *mayfası,* hepsi tamam *ha!*” (p. 54) / “Absolutely real – have pages and everything” (p. 51); he hopes to sober in the library: “[...] kitaplıkta oturursam, *e* biraz ayılıırım, dedim” (p. 55) / “[...] I thought it might sober me up to sit in a library” (p. 52); Nick finds Gatsby “looking a little, not much, younger” in a photograph (p. 73): “*eh,* daha genç, ama çok değil” (p. 77); Wolfsheim inspects the restaurant carefully: “*Hani* benden utanmasa, eğilip bizim masanın altına da bir bakacaktı” (p. 82) / “I think that, except for my presence, he would have taken one short glance beneath our own table” (p. 77); Daisy talks about the guests at the party: “Davetsiz *filân* kalkıp geliyorlar, *bir sürü* insan var burda böyle” (p. 123) / “*Lots of* people come who haven’t been

invited” (p. 115); Nick asks Gatsby about the accident: “[...] nasıl oldu, *yahu*, şu kaza?” (p. 160) / “How the devil did it happen” (p. 150). Nick refers to Gatsby’s big mansion as “allah muhafaza bir şey” (p. 13) / “a colossal affair by any standard” (p. 11); he reacts against Daisy’s calling him a rose: “*Laf tabiy! Nerden benziyeceğim ben güle!*” (p. 23) / “This was untrue. I am not even faintly like a rose” (p. 21); a drunk man praises Gatsby for his library: “*Herif herif değil, Belasco mübarek!*” (p. 54) / “This fella’s a regular Belasco” (p. 52); when he sees Tom and Daisy in Santa Barbara, Nick thinks he’d “never seen a girl so mad about her husband” (p. 83): “[...] *bir aşk, bir aşk*, insan da kocasını anca bu kadar sever, dedim” (p. 88); when Daisy comes into Nick’s living room, Gatsby is lost: “*A, bir de ne bakayım*, odada kimseler yok” (p. 98) / “To my overwhelming surprise the living-room was deserted” (p. 92); Tom is very curious about Gatsby’s identity: “*Kimin nesi bu Gatsby, Allah aşkına?*” (p. 123) / “Who is this Gatsby anyhow?” (p. 114); “Ben ne Tom Buchanan’dım, ne de Gatsby, ne de benim ruhlaşmış yüzü karanlık saçaklarla göz alan afişler boyunca dalgalanan bir sevgilim vardı, *n’apayım*, ben de yanımdaki kızını kucaklayıp çektim kendime” (p. 92) / “Unlike Gatsby and Tom Buchanan, I had no girl whose disembodied face floated along the dark cornices and blinding signs, *and so* I drew up the girl beside me, tightening my arms” (p. 87); Daisy begs her friends to go back home to stop the argument between Tom and Gatsby: “*N’olur*, kalkın gidelim hadi!” (p. 149) / “Oh, please let’s get out” (p. 140); Jordan, in her golf clothes, reminds Nick of her pictures in magazines: “Üzerinde golf giysileri vardı; dergilerdeki renkli resimlerine *amma* benziyor diye düşündüğümü hatırlıyorum” (p. 196) / “She was dressed to play golf, and I remember thinking she looked like a good illustration,” (p. 184); the night after the murder, Nick cannot sleep in his house: “[...] acayip gerçeğe yırtıcı, yıldırıcı düşler arasında yarı hasta, yatağın içinde bir o

yana bir bu yana *döndüm allah döndüm*” (p. 163) / “[...] I tossed half-sick between grotesque reality and savage, frightening dreams” (p. 153); Gatsby “had no comfortable family standing behind him” when he was young (p. 155): “bir kere *ailé filân hak getire*” (p. 166); Nick is obliged to rent the summer cottage without a roommate: “Son dakikada arkadaşı Washington’a *nakletmezler mi*, çaresiz, bir başıma taşındım oraya” (p. 12) / “but at the last minute the firm ordered him to Washington, and I went out to the country alone” (p. 9); Nick is surprised by Gatsby’s special request: “*Sen tut*, beş yıl bekle, bir malikâne satın alıp rastgele pervaneleri yıldız parıltılarıyla ağırla, *sonra da* benden ‘Bir akşamüstü uğrayabilir miyim?’ diye ricada bulunmak için araya adamlar koy” (p. 90) / “He had waited five years and bought a mansion where he dispensed starlight to casual moths – so that he could ‘come over’ some afternoon to a stranger’s garden” (p. 85); Gatsby claims that he “went to Oxford” (p. 135): “Evet, *gitmesine gittim*” (p. 144).

As in his previous translations, Yücel writes some words as they are sometimes spoken by the man on the street: “Baker *bayağ* şaşırmıştı” (p. 23); “*Tabiy* atlardan bir daha söz edilmedi” (p. 24); “[...] söylediklerinin silme içtensizliği *ossaat* çöktü içime” (p. 26); “*Tirende* [...] oturuyorduk,” “Üstünde *sumokin* [...] vardı” (p. 44). Yücel also writes or rather “rewrites” some lexical items in the following way: “apartıman” (p. 66), “epiy” (p. 76), “supor” (p. 77), “birahne” (p. 78), “onlan” (p. 88), “picama” (p. 104), “recisör” (p. 120), “Süperior Gölü” (p. 114), “ayakkaplar” (p. 148), “neylem” (p. 133), “acıık” (p. 134), “telgıraf” (p. 184), “dakka” (p. 185), “ciğara” (p. 192), “purogram” (p. 193), “pardüsü” (p. 118).

Secondly, Yücel makes shifts towards what is more familiar to the Turkish readership: The narrator Nick describes Gatsby’s mansion as “Normandiya’da bir *Belediye Sarayının* tıpatıp taklidi” (p. 13) / “a factual imitation of some *Hotel de*

*Ville* in Normandy” (p. 11); he refers to the location of his house as “Long Island *Boğazi*” (p. 13) / “Long Island Sound” (p. 11); Jordan strongly agrees with Tom about not leaving their town by saying “Yaşla!” (p. 18) / “Absolutely!” (p. 17); Daisy thinks that a girl should be “a *beautiful* little fool” (p. 24): “*akçapakça* bir alık” (p. 25); Nick goes to “the *drugstore* on the corner” to buy cigarettes (p. 35): “[...] köşebaşındaki *cigaracıya* kadar gideyim, dedim” (p. 38); the dog-seller praises his dog’s coat: “Şu tüylere bakın hele! *Tiftik* bayağı!” (p. 36) / “Look at that coat. Some coat” (p. 33); Gatsby buys oranges and lemons from “a *fruiterer* in New York” (p. 45): “[...] New York’ta bir *manavdan* beş koca sandık limon, portakal gelir” (p. 48); Gatsby asks Nick his opinion of him: “benim için ne düşünüyorsun, *Allah aşkına*?” (p. 75) / “what’s your opinion of me, *anyhow*?” (p. 71); while waiting to meet Daisy after five years, Gatsby’s face is “pale as death” (p. 92): “beti benzi *limon sarısı*” (p. 98); Nick describes Daisy: “Beyaz sarayın kulesinde oturmuş, *padişahın* kızı, o altın *sultan*” (p. 135) / “High in a white palace *the king’s* daughter, the golden *girl*” (p. 126). Yücel, whose frequent usage of slang we criticized in the previous subsection, shifts a swear word in the source text into an acceptable phrase because it is by no means proper to speak about a dead person in the target culture in those terms: “Yazık oldu garibe” (p. 194) / “The poor son-of-a-bitch” (p. 182). Likewise, “bayram yerleri” (p. 50), “bir çörek ay” (p. 65), “ahret çanları” (p. 71), “arnavut kaldırımli bir kenar mahalle” (p. 78), “çere-otu gözler” (p. 80), “gerdanlık” (p. 87), “oturak âlemleri” (p. 115), “kahve” (p. 152), “çingene çergisi” (p. 146), “Gatsby’nin konağı” (p. 164) are domestications for “an amusement park” (p. 47), “a wafer of a moon” (p. 62), “church bells” (p. 67), “a cobbled slum” (p. 74), “tiny eyes” (p. 75), “a string of pearls” (p. 82), “gay parties” (p. 107), “coffee joint” (p. 142), “pigsty” (p. 136), “[Gatsby’s] house” (p. 153), respectively.

This strategy can be observed in the translation of clauses and sentences as well: Jordan says that “[Nick] must know Gatsby” (p. 17): “Canım, Gatsby’i tanımayan var mı!” (p. 19); Daisy plans to force Jordan Baker and Nick into an arranged marriage: “*Artık kazayla çamaşır dolabına mı kapatırım sizi birlikte, sandala tıkip denize mi salarım, orası bana ait*” (p. 27) / “You know – lock you up accidentally in linen closets and push you out to sea in a boat, and all that sort of thing –” (p. 25); Daisy mocks herself: “Güngörmüşlerdenim ben, *Allaah, hem de nasıl!*” (p. 26) / “Sophisticated – God, I’m sophisticated!” (p. 24); Wilson is “so dumb that he doesn’t know he’s alive” (p. 32): “Alık işte, *dünyadan haberi yok herifin!*” (p. 35); Tom asks Wilson how his business is faring and elicits the answer: “*Yuvarlanıp gidiyoruz işte!*” (p. 34) / “I can’t complain” (p. 31); people at Gatsby’s party laugh easily: “Kahkahalar gitgide kolaylanır, *sebil gider öyle, işarete bakar herkes gülmek için*” (p. 49) / “Laughter is easier minute by minute, *spilled with prodigality, tipped out at a cheerful word*” (p. 46); right after he meets Daisy after five years, there is “a change in Gatsby that [is] simply confounding” (p. 96): “*Yeniden doğmuş gibi, derler a öyle; kıvancını anlatacak söze, harekete ne hacet, bütün varlığından yeni bir dirlik alevleniyor, küçücük odayı sarıyordu*” (p. 102) / “*He literally glowed; without a word or a gesture of exultation a new well-being radiated from him and filled the little room*” (p. 96); Daisy denies Tom’s insinuation that a visitor at their wedding, named Biloxi, “was a friend of Daisy’s”: “Affetmişsin sen onu” (p. 143) / “He was not,” (p. 134); Gatsby tells how Daisy’s car accident happened: “*Olacak işte; New York’dan çıktığımızda asabı fena halde bozduktu, direksiyona geçersen, kendimi toplarım biraz, dedi. [...] Bir an içinde oluverdi herşey [...]. N’aparsın, Daisy ilkin kadından kaçayım diye öbür arabaya kırdı direksiyonu, [...]*” (p. 160) / “*You see, when we left New York she was very nervous*

and she thought it would steady her to drive. [...] It all happened in a minute [...]. *Well*, first Daisy turned away from the woman toward the other car, [...]" (p. 150); Nick does not want to believe the news about Jordan's engagement, but admits that it could be true: "Gerçi *elini sallasa elli isteklisi çıkardı ya*," (p. 197) / "though *there were several she could have married at a nod of her head*," (p. 184); when Tom asks Nick if he objects to shaking hands with him after Gatsby's murder, Nick answers: "Ha şunu bileydin!" (p. 198) / "Yes. You know what I think of you" (p. 185).

Thirdly, the translator also benefits from the Turkish story-telling tradition, of which special usages and the inverted sentence structure are very characteristic: "Pazar sabahları kıyı boyu köylerinde ahret çanları *çala dursun*, dünya ve güzeli, Gatsby'nin evine döner gelir, cümbüşlü şavkı *vururdu çimenliğe*" (p. 71) / "On Sunday morning *while* church bells rang in the villages alongshore, the world and its mistress returned to Gatsby's house and twinkled hilariously on his lawn" (p. 67). Occasionally, he adds an expression or usage peculiar to Turkish story-telling tradition: "Araya bir takım olaylar girdi; *uzatmayalım*, yirmiiki yılının baharında, sözüm ona bir daha dönmemesine, Doğu'ya kapağı attım" (p. 12) / "after various delays I *came* East, permanently, I thought, in the spring of twenty-two" (p. 9); "Doğu'ya öyle bir debdebeyle yerleşti ki şaşar kalırsınız. *Ne mi? Eake [sic.]* Forest'tan bir sürü polo midillisi getirmişti meselâ" (p. 14) / "[...] and come East in a fashion that rather took your breath away: for instance, he'd brought down a string of polo ponies from Lake Forest" (p. 12); Nick explains how Tom persuaded him to go to New York with him: "Pazar günü, öğleden sonra yapacak ne işim varmış, *falan filân; tutturdu bir kere!*" (p. 33) / "The supercilious assumption was that on Sunday afternoon I had nothing better to do" (p. 30); Nick describes Gatsby's face: "Güneş yanığı teni yüzüne pürüzsüzce gerili; kısacık saçları *desen*, berber makasından yeni

çıkılmış gibiydi” (p. 59) / “His tanned skin was drawn attractively tight on his face and his short hair looked as though it were trimmed every day” (p. 56); a friend of Gatsby’s tells a story about an old friend: “Kapının ağzında döndü bize, *ne dese beğenirsin*: ‘Bitmedi daha kahvem, sakın kaldırmayın garson!’” (p. 81) / “He turned around in the corner and says: ‘Don’t let that waiter take away my coffee!’” (p. 77); Nick narrates what he and Daisy see while waiting for their car on the front steps: “Arada bir de yukarı katta kuşam-odasının istoruna karşı bir gölge vuruyor, *derken* bir başka gölge ve böyle görünmez bir aynanın önünde pudrasını, dudak boyasını tazeleyen gölgeler geçit yapıyordu” (p. 122) / “Sometimes a shadow moved against a dressing-room blind above, gave way to another shadow, an indefinite procession of shadows, who roughed and powdered in an invisible glass” (p. 114).

Fourthly, Yücel makes some additions to familiarize the context, just as he does in *Sırça Kümes*. Nick describes his house: “denizi, komşunun çimeninin birazcığını görüyordu; milyonerlere de yakındık; *az şey mi!* Hepsi bunların ayda seksen dolara!” (p. 14) / “so I had a view of the water, a partial view of my neighbour’s lawn, and the *consoling* proximity of millionaires – all for eighty dollars a month” (p. 11). In this context, the translator seems to give the omitted meaning of “consoling” with his addition “az şey mi!” Mrs. McKee objects to Mr. McKee’s intention of changing the light when photographing Mrs. Wilson: “*Yok, canım,*” diye haykırdı Mrs. McKee. “Ben senin yerinde olsam, bu ışığı olduğu gibi bırakırdım. [...]” (p. 40) / “I wouldn’t think of changing the light,” cried Mrs. McKee (p. 37); Nick is unable to find the whereabouts of Gatsby at a party: “[...] ‘ne bilelim biz’, der gibilerde, öyle bir terslendiler ki, *sorduğuma soracağıma bin pişman,* [...] kokteyl masasına yollandım” (p. 50f) / “[...] stared at me in such an amazed way and denied so vehemently any knowledge of his movements, that I slunk off in the

direction of the cocktail table [...]” (p. 48); Jordan Baker expresses her reason for not recognizing two of her fans at the party: “Bu arada saçlarınızı boyatmışsınız, *ben ne yapayım!*” (p. 51) / “You’ve dyed your hair since then” (p. 49); when Tom says he’ll try to find out Gatsby’s occupation, Daisy answers him: “*Hiç zahmet etme ben sana söyleyeyim*” (p. 124) / “I can tell you right now” (p. 115); when Tom approaches the policeman to learn about the accident, he asks Tom: “*Hayrola, ne istiyorsun?*” (p. 156) / “What you want, fella?” (p. 146); Mr. Wilson’s neighbor, Michaelis, cooks breakfast for Mr. Wilson and another neighbor in the morning after the accident, and they eat it together: “Michaelis üç kişilik kahvaltı hazırladı, yeni gelenle oturup *Allah ne verdiyse yediler*” (p. 177) / “so he cooked breakfast for three, which he and the other man ate together” (p. 166).

### Summary and Conclusions

*Muhteşem Gatsby* (1964) is the translation of *The Great Gatsby* (1925) written by F. Scott Fitzgerald. The novel is about a self-made mid-Westerner’s pursuit of his dream about reuniting with his sweetheart after a break of five years. The story takes place in New York City, the capital of the era known as “the Jazz Age,” characterized by a corrupt lifestyle. Jay Gatsby, who throws wild parties to attract his beloved Daisy to his mansion, is finally able to meet her through his next-door neighbor, Nick, the narrator of the novel. Although Gatsby is able to resume his love affair with Daisy, Daisy does not deny her love for her husband, Tom, who has a mistress. At the end of the novel the mistress’s husband, who is suspicious of his wife’s betrayal, mistakes Gatsby for his wife’s lover who he thinks has killed her in a car accident. The furious husband murders Gatsby and then commits suicide. The

notorious Gatsby is buried not by crowds, but a few people only.

When we analyze the target text in terms of matricial norms, Yücel translates the entire novel consisting of nine chapters, never abridging it in any way; the translator also follows the distribution of the linguistic material in the source text without changing the order of the sentences, paragraphs and characters' utterances; furthermore, he keeps intact both the chapters and internal segmentation of the source text.

When we critique the translation in terms of discourse, first of all, it is clearly characterized by the translator's well-known preference for vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture: "iç dökmek," "lâfin dönüp dolaşması," "ha, sahi!" "düpedüz iftira," "aslı olmak," "dile düşmek," "cancığer arkadaş," "gönlünü hoş etmek," "içi buruk olmak," "o taraflı olmamak" are some examples from the excerpt. With this strategy, once again, Yücel turns his translation into an emphatically expressive one. For instance, his rendition "Sahi, lâf döndü dolaştı oraya geldi," which translates "it sort of crept up on us" has an obviously stronger effect than the retranslator Filiz Ofluoğlu's rendition: "Birdenbire bir konu çıkıverdi kendiliğinden." The comparison of the titles of the two translations, *Muhteşem Gatsby* versus *Büyük Gatsby*, also points to this fact. Besides, Yücel is at times careful about recreating the tone of the novel with his choices: Nick, sorry about Daisy's adulterous husband, feels "confused and *a little disgusted*" after he leaves their mansion: "kafam karışık, içim buruktu." In addition, the translator is sensitive to the reproduction of the rhythm of the source text since he does not combine or divide the writer's sentences.

However, as we pointed out in our analysis of the discourse in *Sırça Kümes*, in *Muhteşem Gatsby* also Yücel often exaggerates the tone of the author with his choices, causing a register shift from colloquial to slang: For instance, Nick says "I

came East” in the spring of 1922 and the translation reads “Doğu’ya *kapağı attım*”; Yücel translates Nick’s *walking up* Fifth Avenue to “pick out romantic women from the crowd” as “Fifth Avenue’da *piyasa etmek*”; he refers to “the extraordinary girl Daisy” as “cins bir varlık”: “Daisy’nin *cins* bir varlık olduğunu biliyordu ama, bir “aile” kızının daha ne kadar *cins* olabileceğini hesaba katmamıştı” / Gatsby “knew that Daisy was *extraordinary*, but he didn’t realize just how *extraordinary* a ‘nice’ girl could be”; Gatsby plans to stop Tom from *bothering* Daisy with *brutality*: “Ben burada bekliyeyim de akşamki tatsızlık yüzünden kızın *başına belâ olmasın*. Yatak odasına kitledi kendini, öbürü *bir hayvanlık edecek* olursa, ışığı yakıp söndürecek” / “I’m just going to wait here and see if he tries to *bother* her about that unpleasantness this afternoon. She’s locked herself into her room, and if he *tries any brutality* she’s going to turn the light out and on again.” The Turkish expressions “pinponlar,” “oynaşmak,” “kızıştırmak,” “erkek köpek,” “atsineği bir üniversiteli,” “orospu güzel,” “cenabet yer,” and “bokluk” which correspond to “the very old,” “play around with somebody,” “to excite someone,” “a sweetie,” “a persistent undergraduate,” “meretricious beauty,” “a terrible place,” and “some bad trouble” in the source text respectively transform the elegant prose of Fitzgerald into crude slang.

Like his poetry translations in Chapter IV and his drama translation in Chapter V, *Muhteşem Gatsby* is dominated by the translator’s appropriating strategies, which can be classified into four groups, resembling very much those in the previous translations. First, he opts for vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture, which can be exemplified by his rendition, “*Toy çağымda bir öğüt vermişti babam, hâlâ küpedir kulağıma*” / “In my younger and more vulnerable years my father gave me some advice that *I’ve been turning over in my mind* ever

since.” Within this strategy, the usages and expressions of spoken Turkish have a special place: A case in point is about a drunkard’s astonishment in Gatsby’s library: “*Vallaha* sahici – sayfası *mayfası*, hepsi tamam *ha!*” / “Absolutely real – have pages and everything.” Yücel writes many words in exactly the same way as they are spoken by the man on the street: “tiren,” “sumokin,” “apartıman,” “supor,” “birahne,” “picama,” “recisör,” “çiğara,” etc. Secondly, Yücel makes shifts towards what is more familiar to the Turkish audience: For instance, Nick describes Daisy as “Beyaz sarayın kulesinde oturmuş, *padişahın* kızı, o altın *sultan*” / “High in a white palace the king’s daughter, the golden girl”; and when Tom asks Nick if he objects to shaking hands with him because of his involvement in Gatsby’s murder, Nick answers: “Ha şunu bileydin!” / “Yes. You know what I think of you.” Thirdly, the translator benefits from the Turkish story-telling tradition, of which special usages and the inverted sentence structure are characteristic features: “Pazar sabahları kıyı boyu köylerinde ahret çanları *çala dursun*, dünya ve güzeli, Gatsby’nin evine döner gelir, cümbüşlü şavkı *vururdu çimenliğe*” / “On Sunday morning *while* church bells rang in the villages alongshore, the world and its mistress returned to Gatsby’s house and twinkled hilariously on his lawn.” In addition, Yücel uses expressions of Turkish story-telling like “uzatmayalım,” “ne dese beğenirsin,” and “derken.” Fourthly, Yücel occasionally adds words or phrases to familiarize the context: Mrs. McKee objects to her husband’s intention of changing the light when photographing Mrs. Wilson: ““*Yok, canım,*” diye haykırdı Mrs. McKee. ‘Ben senin yerinde olsam, bu ışığı olduğu gibi bırakırdım,’” / “‘I wouldn’t think of changing the light,’ cried Mrs. McKee”; Jordan Baker expresses her reason for not recognizing the two girls at the party: “Bu arada saçlarınızı boyatmışsınız, *ben ne yapayım!*” / “You’ve dyed your hair since then.”

Thus, we can conclude that, again like his three other translations in the previous chapters, this particular translation can by no means be referred to as an imitation, an adaptation or a version, since it is translation proper: Although Yücel often ignores the writer's words as a free translator, he never ignores the meanings; the freedom he uses is by no means unrestrained; he does not make *substantial* changes by way of omissions and additions; and unlike a version-writer, his concern is not the writer's sense only, but also the form in which he presents the content.

Once again, with his macro-strategy that "appropriates" Fitzgerald's novel for the Turkish reader, Yücel proves to be Lefevere's "spirited rewriter," who follows the more preferred way in this cross-cultural "marriage" by trying to "colonize" the source text and shows that Turkish is capable of translating a hegemonic language. The two basic constraints of "rewriting" are to be observed in this translation as well: The translator, using the language of the man on the street, seems to be motivated, once again, by his leftist ideology and his idiosyncratic translation poetics, labeled as "Can Babaca" (*Canese*), which creates a very Turkish universe of discourse in his translations. Yücel's unique poetics, full of slang expressions – just like in *Sırça Kümes* – seems to prove Lefevere's suggestion that poetics has an ideological component which is especially influential in the selection of forms and themes: Yücel uses all the resources of Turkish available and the novel he has chosen to translate is about the corruption of the rich, with only a few decent people among the main characters.

With his *Muhteşem Gatsby*, Yücel again becomes Lefevere's "modern" and "faithful" translator, who does what the target readership expects: Aiming at functional equivalence between the source and target texts in this free prose translation, Yücel strives to recreate Fitzgerald's novel as a work that can stand as a

novel in its own right in the target culture. He openly benefits from the highly expressive vocabulary specific to Turkish, and the Turkish story-telling tradition. It is indeed this characteristic of the translation that reinforces the suggestion that the verb “söylemek” (to speak) may have been deliberately preferred to “yazmak” (to write) in Yücel’s designation “*Türkçe Söyleyen.*”

Finally, despite the fact that he does show some stylistic sensitivity to the source text, again due to his frequent shifts of register and heavy appropriation, one needs to agree with the argument that the “visible” translator Yücel overshadows Fitzgerald’s individuality, making him “invisible” to a considerable extent. How can one persuade the reader to believe that “En ehveni, şehirde bir yer bulmaktı ya, mevsim yaz, sonra da çayırılık, ağaçlık bir memleketten yeni ayrılmışlık var serde” are indeed F. Scott Fitzgerald’s words, and that the girl depicted in the following sentence is actually his protagonist’s American beloved: “Beyaz sarayın kulesinde oturmuş, padişahın kızı, o altın sultan”?

## CHAPTER VII

### CONCLUSION

The fact that the poet-translator Can Yücel's literary translations from English have often been labeled with terms other than "translation proper" by his critics constituted the starting point of this study which aims to resolve this definitional ambivalence by analyzing Yücel's own designation "Türkçe Söyleyen" and taking up four of his translated texts in three genres in a target-oriented, descriptive framework of an "embedded single-case study."

To this end, Chapter II explicates four crucial terms in translation studies: "imitation," "adaptation," "version," and "rewriting." All four of them have been used in the discourse on Yücel's translations. The first three have often been used interchangeably and with a somewhat pejorative connotation, situating Yücel's translations outside the legitimate limits of "translation proper" as a result of the prescriptive, source-oriented approach behind them. "Imitation" refers to those target texts in which the translators ignore both the author's discourse and meanings, relegating the authors or their texts to the status of a pattern to imitate or a source of inspiration, enabling them to come up with different works. The term "adaptation" is used when the translator has made substantial changes by way of omissions and additions, reducing his or her source texts to rough clay. In a "version" the translator considers only the sense, and not the form, ignoring the stylistic qualities of the source text and turning the target text into an awkward variant. The fourth term, "rewriting," suggested by Lefevere and Bassnett, is a descriptive, cross-cultural term, regarding translation as "a means of cultural appropriation" and the translator as an "image maker" or a "culture constructor" working under two basic constraints:

ideology and poetics. We have stated that this last term, which foregrounds the modern translator's aim for functional equivalence and underlines his or her "faithfulness" to the target culture or the commissioner, can define Yücel's translations the best.

Chapter III problematizes the designation "Türkçe Söyleyen" by presenting both the criticism and the acclaim Yücel's particular approach has received from critics and scholars, and investigates its place in the Turkish culture and in translation theory. This chapter provides information about the translator's educational and literary background, as well as his translation output into Turkish. In the first subsection, Yücel, who was imprisoned because of his non-literary translations from Ché Guevara and Mao, and wrote poetic pseudo-translations which criticized the Turkish government, comes out as a fine example of Lefevere's "rewriter," who assumes a resistant stance in the target literary system, letting his ideology influence the choice and development of form and subject matter in his poetics.

In the second subsection of Chapter III, Yücel's critics accuse him of not reflecting the style of the texts he translates, putting the blame on his "Turkishizing" or "localizing" diction including many vocabulary items peculiar to the Turkish language and culture, and his slang expressions. Most of his critics position his target texts outside the legitimate terrain of translation proper. However, his critics' source-oriented, normative, process-oriented approaches hinder them from taking into consideration the social and literary factors that have guided the translator's strategies and, thus, from putting themselves in the translator's shoes. On the other hand, Yücel's supporters, who never worried about how to categorize his translations, have praised his discourse as being skillful, creative and conducive to literary excellence.

In the third subsection of Chapter III, we learn that Yücel's idiosyncratic approach designated as "Türkçe Söyleyen" is in fact deeply rooted in the Turkish culture: Ahmedî and Gülşehri had used the designations "*Türkîce eyitmek*" and "*Türkî suretinde söylemek*" in Anatolia in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries respectively. Ahmedî's further explanation of his macro-strategy reveals the essence of this particular approach: "I took/*appropriated* it [the source]." Secondly, we learn that Yücel's idiosyncratic approach is, at the same time, the "extreme" example of the continuation of Ataç and Eyuboğlu's "leftist" or socialist translation understanding which opts for the *people's* language and which aims at bringing translation closer to original composition by way of the skillful use of the Turkish language – avoiding what Nida terms "translationese."

In the second part of the third subsection of Chapter III, it is claimed that the approach "Türkçe Söyleyen" constitutes a possible, valid macro-strategy that has been suggested by many theorists since ancient times – thus, Yücel can easily be deemed as Toury's expert, norm-governed translator who plays a social role, producing "acceptable" translations; he becomes Vermeer's transcultural communication expert who produces his target texts according to his particular, appropriative "skopos," which he can account for whenever he is asked; his understanding of faithfulness, which is to use freedom for the sake of the original, actually echoes Steiner and Popovic's ideas on the issue. Nida's notion of "dynamic equivalence," Venuti's "invisible" and "transparent" regime of "fluent" translating, and Schleiermacher's idea that the translator can "leave the reader alone and move the writer toward the reader" all support Yücel's particular approach. The appropriative understanding beneath Yücel's approach, which sees translation as a "frontier" and its aim as "conquest," is also present in Cicero's, St. Jerome's,

Steiner's and even in Yücel's own discourse on translation, as well as in the understanding of the French neoclassicists and the German Romantics of the eighteenth century. Thus, viewing translation as an act of patriotism and the source texts as the "cultural capital" of foreign societies, we can deem Yücel as a "resistant," a "post-colonial" translator who uses translation from hegemonic English into Turkish as a means of cultural advocacy. In fact, it is Lefevere and Bassnett's notion of "rewriting" that can account for Yücel's translations in the most thorough way. The two basic factors of rewriting, ideology and poetics, explicitly operate in the leftist translator Yücel's works, which display a unique translation poetics called "Can Babaca" (*Canese*), incorporating an abundant use of vocabulary items and usages specific to the Turkish language and culture. We observe all the five specific constraints of "rewriting" in Yücel's translations: In addition to his unique poetics, Yücel is his own patron, with his specified ideology; adhering to the universe of discourse of the target culture rather than that of the source culture, the "spirited translator" uses a colloquial language that reflects the target culture very strongly and makes his source texts play an identical role in his translation processes. Consequently, Yücel confirms Lefevere's suggestion that translation is "rewriting" *par excellence*, and he himself becomes one of the finest examples of the notion. Furthermore, four important aspects of "rewriting" that we can observe in the reception of Yücel's translations in the target society – his resistant, subversive attitude with his translations from Mao and Ché Guevara, and his pseudo-translations; the criticism he received from critics and literary people who do not approve of his image of the "sacrosanct" source text; the fact that his translations have been a source of heated debate; and the idea of closeness to original writing existent in the discourse on his translations due to his deeming translation as a

cultural appropriation of a “visible” translator – all reinforce his identity as the “rewriter” *par excellence*.

As for the next three chapters, they aim to analyze what the translator actually did in four of his direct translations. The criteria used to select this corpus were that they had been discussed in various essays and translated by other translators as well and that they were all canonized works by four poets and writers of world literature. Since the aim of the analysis is the same for each chapter, they follow the same format, providing first some factual information about the target and source texts and then analyzing the particular target texts in terms of Toury’s matricial norms, together with a discourse analysis and a study of the appropriating strategies used. Chapter V and Chapter VI, dealing with a drama and a prose translation respectively, necessitates a short summary of the plot. These three chapters focus on Yücel’s appropriating strategies because the designation “Türkçe Söyleyen” has obvious overtones of appropriation of the source texts.

Chapter IV analyzes two of Yücel’s poetry translations from Shakespeare and T.S Eliot, “66. Sone” and “Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk Türküsü,” which deal with issues relating to ordinary people’s lives. Yücel conforms to the matricial norms of his source texts. Aiming at functional equivalence, he tries to recreate his source texts as poems, or rather as “metapoems” in their own right by paying close attention to their stylistic features such as rhyme scheme, rhythm and tone. His special preference for the highly expressive vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture, which is an appropriating strategy, helps him to recreate the overall effect of the two source texts. Yücel also aims to use the Turkish language as it is spoken by Turkish people. Thus, these two target texts can by no means be defined by the first three terms; they are “translation proper” because Yücel does not create two poems of his own which

have only title and point of departure in common with the source texts. He does not make substantial changes by way of numerous omissions and additions; and his concern is not the poets' sense only, but also the form in which they present their content. Yücel is Lefevre and Bassnett's "rewriter" who tries to "colonize" the source texts: He uses all the potential of his native language to prove Turkish culture capable of translating even the canonized poems of English, opting for what is actually spoken by his *people*, and as Lefevre's "spirited translator," he displays a unique translation poetics, adhering to the universe of discourse of the target culture: "Doğruya doğru derken eğriye çıkmış adın, / Değil mi ki kötüler kadı olmuş Yemen'e."

In Chapter V, *Sırça Kümes* by Tennessee Williams, which is about a poor family in the American South living in a triangle of desperation, is analyzed. Except for two non-translations seemingly due to careless editing, Yücel translates this seven-scene play fully, following the distribution of the linguistic material in the source text, never changing the order of the sentences and paragraphs, nor of the utterances or the parenthetical information, and keeps intact the scene and internal segmentation of the source text: Again, Yücel closely abides by the matricial norms. He only combines one-sentence paragraphs into full, coherent paragraphs. Once again, the target text is characterized by the translator's preference for vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture, which makes it easy for the actors to speak, and the audience to understand: "*Tatlı tatlı gülümser*"; "*Bekletmeğe gelmiyor bazı kadınlar, cin ifrit oluyorlar.*" Yücel makes occasional additions and several omissions, aiming at creating *natural* utterances. However, Yücel's frequent use of slang words in Amanda's and Tom's utterances has been criticized severely as they distort the playwright's tone and shift the register from colloquial to slang: "*Boru*

*değil*, o zamanın kızları nasıl konuşacağını bilirdi” / “Girls in those days *knew* how to talk, I can tell you”; “O *mendebur* mağazanın aşıklısı mı sandın sen beni?” / “You think I’m crazy *about the warehouse?*” Yücel also makes shifts towards what is more familiar to the Turkish audience, as in his rendition of “Malvolio the Magician” as “Abrakadabra.” To create natural utterances for the target audience, he occasionally adds or omits expressions: He adds “Atlı mı kovalıyor ya ardından,” to the words of the mother, who advises her son to eat slowly; he especially opts for usages and expressions of spoken Turkish: “*Sen tut, okuldan yok yere ayrıl, tahsilini yarıda bırak!... Hani ayağını da sürsen, yüreğim yanmaz.*”

Yücel’s target text deserves to be called “translation proper”: Though he at times ignores the playwright’s words as a free translator, he does not distort his meanings; he avoids *substantial* changes, making only a few omissions and additions; his target text can never be regarded as a “queer” variant of the source text. With his macro-strategy that “appropriates” Williams’ play for the benefit of the Turkish audience and actors, once again Yücel becomes Lefevere’s “spirited” rewriter. His leftist ideology and his idiosyncratic translation poetics, “Can Babaca” (*Canese*), create a very Turkish universe of discourse. Aiming at functional equivalence, Yücel recreates the source text as a play in its own right to be performed for the Turkish audience (see Demirkol 2006: 93) and becomes Lefevere’s “faithful rewriter,” who does what the target audience or the commissioner expects.

Chapter VI analyzes Yücel’s translation *Muhteşem Gatsby*, which is the story of a self-made man’s pursuit of his dream to reunite with his sweetheart in the corrupt milieu of the Jazz Age. Yücel abides by the matricial norms, translating the nine-chapter novel fully, following the distribution of the linguistic material in the source text without changing the order of the sentences, paragraphs or the dialogues,

and keeping intact both the chapter and internal segmentation of the source text. The language of the translation is characterized by the translator's well-known preference for vocabulary specific to the Turkish language and culture, which makes it an emphatically expressive one: "iç dökmek," "lâfin dönüp dolaşması," "aslî olmak," "dile düşmek," "*cancığer* arkadaş," "gönlünü hoş etmek," etc. Yücel's rendition "Sahi, lâf döndü dolaştı oraya geldi," which translates "it sort of crept up on us," for instance, has an obviously stronger effect than the rendition in the other translation of *The Great Gatsby* into Turkish by Filiz Ofluoğlu: "Birdenbire bir konu çıkıverdi kendiliğinden." Whereas he reproduces the rhythm of the source text by not combining or dividing the writer's sentences, Yücel is not careful about recreating the tone of the writer often: Just like in *Sırça Kümes*, Yücel frequently employs a register shift from colloquial language to slang: "Nick's *walking up* Fifth Avenue" to watch romantic women becomes "Fifth Avenue'da *piyasa etmek*"; "cins bir varlık" refers to "the *extraordinary* girl Daisy"; "hayvanlık" renders "brutality"; "pinponlar," "erkek köpek," "atsineği bir üniversiteli," "cenabet yer," and "bokluk" correspond to "the very old," "a sweetie," "a persistent undergraduate," "a terrible place," and "some bad trouble" respectively. As for the ways in which Yücel "appropriates" his source text, again he opts for vocabulary items specific to the Turkish language and culture: "*Toy çağım*da bir öğüt vermişti babam, hâlâ *küpedir kulağıma*"; he often employs usages and expressions of *spoken Turkish*: "Vallaha sahici – sayfası *mayfası*, hepsi tamam *ha!*"; the translator even writes many words in exactly the way they are spoken by the man on the street: "tiren," "apartıman," "birahne," "picama," "recisör," "çiğara," etc.; he makes shifts towards what is more familiar to the Turkish reader: "Beyaz sarayın kulesinde oturmuş, *padişahın* kızı, o altın *sultan*"; he benefits from the Turkish story-telling tradition: "Pazar sabahları

kıyı boyu köylerinde ahret çanları *çala dursun*, dünya ve güzeli, Gatsby'nin evine döner gelir, cümbüşlü şavkı *vururdu çimenliğe*"; and in order to familiarize the context, Yücel occasionally adds words or phrases such as "Yok, canım" and "ben ne yapayım!" Hence, Yücel's translation deserves the title "translation proper." Once again, he proves to be Lefevere's "spirited" rewriter with his macro-strategy of "appropriation," his leftist ideology, and his idiosyncratic translation poetics, "*Canese*."

In all of the four translations the influence of the two basic constraints of Lefevere and Bassnett's notion of "rewriting" – "ideology" and "poetics" – are present, making him one of the finest practitioners of this notion (cf. Demirkol 2006: 29). Yücel's ideology is reflected in his special preference for the peculiarly Turkish forms of discourse and in his translation policy that governs the selection of his subject matter. Thus, Yücel confirms Lefevere and Vermeer's respective suggestions: To translate means "to rewrite" and "to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances." We can now suggest another translation for Yücel's idiosyncratic designation "Türkçe Söyleyen" (which we literally translated in the introduction as "the one who speaks or retells the source text in Turkish"): "The Turkish Rewriter."

Yücel's four "actual translations," which are "some ad hoc combination of, or compromise between the two extremes implied by the initial norm" (Toury 1995: 57), seem to prove Leighton's view that "modern translations tend toward the median point of translation types" and "from the median range translators reach in whichever direction is needed to secure literary excellence" (1991a: 179f). While they do not resemble Nabokov's "appropriative translation" of Western literature, which shifted even the proper names in the source text (Coates 1999: 93), Yücel's *appropriating*

four “rewritings,” whose source texts are canonized works with “symbolic power” in the hegemonic English language, can be compared, albeit to some extent only, with “assertive,” “cannibalist” translation, which is “intimately engaged in the renegotiation of Brazilian language, culture and nation both at home and within the power structures of the wider world” (Gentzler and Tymoczko 2002: xv). Yücel seems to do this appropriating “violence” (Dingwaney 1995: 3) or injustice to his source texts and writers, acting as a modern, ideological translator with a “post-colonial” stance. It seems that, being Lefevere’s subversive “spirited translator,” Yücel intends to shock his audience by updating the originals in such a way that they tend to lose at least some of their “classical” or “prestigious” status (cf. Demirkol 2006: 22, 47 and 139ff).

We must also point out that while Yücel’s free translation strategies “function like a wind that raises a kite into the air” in his two poetry translations by reverting to poetic license, making him Leighton’s “artistic” translator, it can be argued that his kite cannot fly that high in his drama and prose translations, where the degree of literary excellence is lessened to a considerable degree due to his frequent shift of register from colloquial to slang.

Hence, Yücel’s critics are right in criticizing him for adding slang to his works; however, they fail to see that the rewriter creates his unique image of his source text rather than its copy through his own interpretation, naturally working under the particular constraints we specified, and aiming for functional equivalence. In fact, his source-oriented critics fail to put themselves in his shoes. On the other hand, his supporters are right in acclaiming his language for being highly expressive with its language-specific and culture-specific vocabulary and usages of Turkish. The “rewriter” *par excellence* really benefits from what philologists call “Seeliche” in

German, meaning “a spiritual essence,” which constitutes the essence of each and every language (see Rifat 2004: 58).

The existence of heated debates on Yücel’s translations point to the fact that while normative, source-oriented approaches to translation are still in effect, a new definition of “faithfulness,” based upon “functional equivalence” has also appeared: Faithfulness to the target culture or the commissioner in the target literary system. Seemingly caused by this survival of source-orientedness, the term “rewriting” is often employed with a pejorative meaning like that of “imitation,” “adaptation,” or “version.”

Yücel’s use of similar appropriating strategies in his translations makes his target texts resemble each other. It seems that confirming Sabuncu, Erten, Eyuboğlu and İnce, Yücel, Vermeer’s “co-author” (1992: 13), “domesticates” or rather “appropriates” his source texts to such an extent and in such a similar fashion that he in a way “overshadows” or “eclipses” (Venuti 1994: 20) their individuality considerably, creating the illusion that he does not care about the different styles in different source texts. This should be considered *natural* since as the most obvious form of “rewriting,” translation itself is an illusion and it should be deemed as a fine example of what Venuti refers to as the “risk” in domestication: “reducing individual author’s styles and national tricks of speech to a plain prose uniformity” (pp. 19f).

Finally, although he actually designated himself as “the translator *writing* in Turkish,” it is tenable to argue that the verb “söylemek” (to speak or to tell) in his designation “Türkçe *Söyleyen*” was deliberately preferred to the verb “yazmak” (to write) by his publishers or editors because Yücel prefers the spoken usages and expressions of the man on the street in his translations.

As for the implications of this thesis for translation studies, it should be

pointed out that what a translator says he did in his translations can be one thing and what he actually does another: Yücel tries to explain his strategies in his interviews, but he hides the fact that he used slang expressions in his *Sırça Kümes*. Secondly, although Yücel's translations are fine examples of Venuti's "domesticating," "transparent," and "invisible" translations, far from having a language that can be called "translationese," the "rewriter" *par excellence* and his translations cannot be deemed "invisible" by any means. Despite the fact that he is not Lefevere's "faithful" translator who adheres to the universe of discourse of the source culture, he becomes the same theorist's "faithful" translator who does what the target culture or the commissioner expects. Thus, looking at an issue from the perspective of a dichotomy such as visibility-invisibility or faithfulness-unfaithfulness is not always fruitful because dichotomies do not, in fact, consist of fixed concepts, but of quite relative notions. Last but not least, it should be underlined that although Venuti's approach and post-colonial approaches, for instance, are to be used under the specific translation conditions of America and of post-colonial countries – which naturally exclude Turkey – they can always be beneficial for describing some other translational phenomena in other parts of the world.

## APPENDICES

A. The Cassette Cover of Yücel's Poetry Translations .....	150
B. Sonnet Translations by Yücel and Talât S. Halman on the Internet .....	151
C. <i>Metis Çeviri</i> 's Presentation of Three Retranslations from Mallarmé .....	152
D. The Title Page of <i>Fırtına</i> .....	154
E. The Title Page of <i>Hamlet</i> .....	155
F. The Front Cover of <i>Her Boydan</i> in 1957 .....	156
G. A Poetry Translation by Yücel on the Internet .....	157
H. Üstün Akmen's Programme of 2002-2003 Theatre Season.....	158
I. The Front Cover of <i>Bahar Noktası</i> .....	159
J. The Title Page of <i>Sırça Kümes</i> .....	160



SHAKESPEARE'DEN BRECHT'E  
TÜRKÇE SÖYLEYEN CAN YÜCEL



TÜRKÇE  
SÖYLEYEN  
CAN YÜCEL

SHAKESPEARE'DEN  
BRECHT'E

DÜNYA  
ŞİİRİNDEN  
SEÇMELER 1



## CAN YÜCEL

1926, İstanbul

Eski Milli Eğitim Bakanlarından Hasan Ali Yücel'in oğludur. A.Ü. Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi'nde Latince-Yunanca, İngiltere'de Cambridge Üniversitesi'nde Klasik Filoloji okudu. Sanat Tarihi dersleri izledi. Şairliği, çevirmenliği ve radyo görevlisi olarak tanındı. Çeşitli elçiliklerde çevirmenlik, Londra'da BBC'nin Türkçe bölümünde spikerlik yaptı. (1953-1958) Türkiye'ye dönünce bir süre turist rehberliği yaptıktan sonra bağımsız çevirmen ve şair olarak yaşamını sürdürdü.

Çeşitli edebiyat, kültür ve siyasi dergilerde şiirleri, edebiyat ve tiyatro çevirileriyle, siyasal konulardaki yazıları yayınlandı, yayınlanıyor.

12 Mart döneminde Che Guevara'nın "Gerilla Harbi" ve "İnsan ve Sosyalizm" kitaplarının çevirisi nedeniyle 15 yıl hapis cezasına çarptırıldı. 1974 affıyla tahliye oldu. 12 Eylül sonrasında SOMUT dergisindeki "HAMİLELER" şiiri edebe aykırı, müstehcen olduğu iddiasıyla para cezasına çarptırıldı. Aynı iddiayla "RENGAHENK" kitabı toplatıldı.

Pekçok çeviri kitabı yanında, yayınlanmış bütün şiir kitapları "BÜTÜN ESERLERİ" başlığıyla Papirüs Yayınları'nca yayınlanıyor.

Vazgeçtim bu dünyadan, tek ölüm paklar beni;  
Değmez bu yangın yeri, avuç açmaya değmez,  
Değil mi ki çignenmiş inancın en seçkini,  
Değil mi ki yoksullar mutluluktan habersiz,  
Değil mi ki ayaklar altında insan onuru,  
O kız oğlan kız erdem dağlara kaldırılmış,  
Ezilmiş, hor görülmüş el emeği, göz nuru,  
Ödekler başa geçmiş, derken mertlik bozulmuş  
Değil mi ki korkudan dili bağlı sanatın,  
Değil mi ki çılgınlık sahip çıkmış düzene,  
66.SONE **Türkçe söyleyen: Can YÜCEL**

Mevsime güzellikler getiren yaz çiçeği  
Yaşar kendi belirli ömrünü, ölür sonra;  
Ama kötü bir illet bozar bozmaz çiçeği  
Şanı maskara olur ne değersiz otlara.  
En tatlı şeyler ekşir kötü işler yaparak;  
Ottan çok daha iğrenç kokar çürüyen zambak.  
94.SONE **Türkçesi: Talat S.HALMAN**

Kötü bilinmektense, iyisi mi kötü ol,  
Zaten lekeliyorlar kötü değilsen bile;  
Meğer ki hepten şuna inansınlar: Her yerde  
Herkes kötüdür, hem de iktidar kötülerde.  
121.SONE **Türkçesi: Talat S.HALMAN**

Acıkan kösnü ruhu yakıp geçer boşuna  
Utañ mezbelesinde; zevk alıncaya kadar  
Yalancıdır, kalleştir, susar kana ve cana,  
Azgın ve korkusuzdur; haindir, sert ve gaddar,  
Ama keyif sürünce birdenbire tiksindir:  
Delice istediği, öksesine girdi mi  
Nefret eder delice  
Ne tuhaf ki dünyada bunları bilenler çok;  
Cehenneme götüren cennetten hiç kaçan yok.  
129.SONE **Türkçesi: Talat S.HALMAN**

Sıcaklardan korkma gayri, ne de kardan tipiden.  
Dürüldü ömür defterin sılaya göçtün mâdem.  
Gül gibi gençler nasipsiz,  
Olacağı bir avuç toz.  
Hırsızlıktan korkma gayri, geride kaldı beyler.  
Unut peyniri ekmeği, geçim derdine boş ver.  
Saltanat ün fayda etmez,  
Sencileyin bir avuç toz.  
CYMBELİNE-IV/2 **Türkçe Söyleyen: Can YÜCEL**

## Karşılaştırmalı Çeviri

Stéphane Mallarmé

### BRISE MARINE

*La chair est triste, hélas! et j'ai lu tous les livres.  
Fuir! lâ-bas fuir! Je sens que des oiseaux sont ivres  
D'être parmi l'écume inconnue et les cieux!  
Rien, ni les vieux jardins reflétés par les yeux  
Ne retiendra ce coeur qui dans la mer se trempe  
O nuits! ni la clarté déserte de ma lampe  
Sur le vide papier que la blancheur défend  
Et ni la jeune femme allaitant son enfant.  
Je partirai! Steamer, balançant ta mâture,  
Lève l'ancre pour une exotique nature!  
Un Ennui, désolé per les cruels espoirs,  
Croit encore á l'adieu suprême des mouchoirs  
Et, peut-être, les mâts, invitant les orages  
Sont-ils de ceux qu'un vent penche sur les naufrages  
Perdus, sans mâts, sans mâts, ni fertiles îlots...  
Mais, ô mon coeur, entends le chant des matelots!*

### DENİZ MELTEMİ

Ten bitirdi hazlarını, tükendi kitap;  
Kaçsam, kaçsam uzaklara... Üstümde mehtap;  
Sanıyorum en güzeli mestoluşların  
Gökle engin arasında uçan kuşların.  
Kim tutacak denizlere bağlı bu gönlü?  
Ne gözlere gülümseyen bahçemin gülü,  
Ne sütbeyaz kâğıtlara aksi lambanın  
Ne dizinde yavrusunu emziren kadın.  
Gideceğim, güzel gemi haydi demir al,  
O ellere yelken aç ki sanılır masal...  
Bir üzüntü, küskün ama umutlarına  
İnanıyor mendillerin elvedâna.  
Belki deli rüzgârlara uyan direkler  
Karayelde bir kazaya baş egecekler  
Ve görünmez olacaklar... Denizler derin  
Gönül, dinle türküsünü gemicilerin...

Çeviren: Kemalettin Kamu

## DENİZ MELTEMİ

Bütün hazları tattım, kitapları okudum,  
Ah, kandırmadı; kaçmak, kurtulmak istiyorum.  
Bir başka köpükle gök arasındaki kuşlar  
Orada şimdi kimbilir ne kadar sarhoşlar!  
Deniz çekiyor, deniz, kim tutabilir beni;  
Gözlerde aksi yanan o eski bahçeler mi?  
Geceler! mahzun ışığı mı yoksa lambamın,  
Beyaz kâğıda vurur, korkar dokunamazsın;  
Ne o, ne de çocuğuna meme veren taze;  
Gideceğim, ey gemi, bilinmedik ellere.  
Demir al sallayarak direklerini. Sızlar  
Yürek ümitle, ama sonra her şeyi anlar.  
Belki de fırtınaları çağıran direkler,  
Şu anda, rüzgârla gelecek ölümü bekler.  
O zaman ne yelken, ne ümit... ama sen yine  
Kalbim, gemicilerin şarkılarını dinle.

*Çeviren: Orhan Veli*

## DENİZ MELTEMİ

Hayır yok tenden artık, hatmedildi kitaplar.  
Ah! Bi kaçsam! bilirim, o mest kuşlara diyar,  
Bir akl'alalmaz köpükle göklerin arasında.  
Bir şey tutamaz gayrı, gözlerin aynasında  
Yanan bahçeler bile, bu deniz kokan gönlü;  
Tutamaz ne geceler, ne duran o hüznü  
Boş kâğıtlar üstüne iğilmiş kandil öyle;  
Tutamaz o çocuğunu emziren taze bile,  
Gidiyoruz! Kalk, gemi! Yalpanı vur şöyle bir,  
Ve sonra al bir günâ âleme doğru demir!  
Ümitten onca çekmiş sıkıntı şimdi, dersin,  
Hayır duasına mı kanmakta mendillerin?  
Belki de bu direkler, fırtınalara davet,  
Nâçar bir gün yığılır güverteye... Ne imdat,  
Ne görünürde ada ve ne kürek ne yelken;  
Ama sen geçme gine gemici türküsünden!

*Türkçe söyleyen: Can Yücel*

---

NOT: Bu şiir çevirileri *Milliyet Sanat Dergisi*'nin 11 Nisan 1986 tarihli sayısından alınmıştır.  
(T.A.)

KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ÇEVİRİ 27

# William Shakespeare



## Firtına

Oyun

Türkçe Söyleyen: Can Yücel



Papirüs Yayınları

*Tiyatro Dizisi*

ISBN 975-7432-60-1

1. Basım, Adam Yayınları, 1992
2. Basım, Papirüs Yayınları, Ekim 1996
3. Basım, Papirüs Yayınları, Ekim 1998

Hamlet

*William Shakespeare*

Türkçe Söyleyen: *Can Yücel*

Yönetmen: *Oktay Şimşek*

Editör: *Feridun Andaç*

Teknik Hazırlık: *Martı Ajans*

Kapak: *Bora Çetinkaya*

Baskı: *MEYA Matbaacılık, İstanbul*

© Papirüs Yayınevi

Selime Hatun Camii Sokak Özlen Apt. No:13/10 Fındıklı, 80040 - İstanbul

Tel: (0212) 252 85 74 - 75 Faks: (0212) 245 40 70

**HAMLET**

William Shakespeare

Türkçe Söyleyen: Can Yücel

Tiyatro

# HERBOYDAN

Dünya Şiirinden Seçmeler

TURKÇE  
Söyleyen

CAN  
YÜCEL



## Alla`sen Söyle Nedir Aşkın Aslı Astarı! / Wystan Hugh Auden

Kimine göre ufak bir çocuktur aşk,  
Kimine göre bir kuş,  
Kimi der, onun üstünde durur dünya,  
Kimi der, kalp kuruş;  
Ama komşuya sordum, nedense yüzüme  
Mânalı mânalı baktı,  
Karısı bir kızdı bir kızdı, sormayın,  
Aşkedecekti tokadı.

Aklına esince çıkarabilir mi dilini,  
Başı döner mi asma salıncakta,  
At yarışlarında mı geçirir hafta tatilini,  
Usta mı düğüm atmakta,  
Millet der peygamber demez mi,  
Para mevzuunda nedir efkârı,  
Borç alır borcunu ödemez mi?  
Alla'sen söyle nedir aşkın aslı astarı!

Şıpıtık terliğe mi benzer yoksa  
Yoksa kandil çöreğine mi,  
Hacıyağına mı benzer dersin kokusu  
Yoksa leylak çiçeğine mi?  
Çalı gibi dikenli mi, batar mı eline,  
Andırır mı yoksa pufla yastıkları,  
Keskin mi kenarı yoksa yatar mı eline?  
Alla'sen söyle nedir aşkın aslı astarı!

Ona rastladığı zaman duyduğu şeyleri  
Kabil değil unutamamış insan,  
Yolunu gözlerim bacak kadardan beri  
Ama o geçmedi bile yanımdan;  
Merdiven dayadım otuz beşine,  
Öğrenemedim gitti bir türlü,  
Nemene mahlûktur bu düşerler peşine  
Bunca insan geceli gündüzlü?

Tarih kitapları dokundurur geçer  
Köşesinde kenarında,  
Hele bir lâfi açılmaya görsün  
Şirket vapurlarında;  
Eksik olmaz gazetelerden, bilhassa  
İntihar haberlerinde,  
Mâniler düzmüşler gördüm üstüne  
Telefon rehberlerinde.

Gelsin ya, nasıl, pat diye gelir mi dersin  
Burnumu karıştırırken tatlı tatlı,  
Ya tutar yatakta bastırırsa sabahleyin?  
Talih bu ya, otobüste nasırıma basmalı!  
Gelişi yoksa havalardan anlaşılır mı,  
Selâmı efendice mi yoksa gider mi aşırı,  
Değiştirir mi dersin bir kalemle hayatımı?  
Alla'sen söyle nedir aşkın aslı astarı!

Aç kurtlar gibi ulur mu dersin  
Bando gibi gümbürder mi yoksa,  
Taklit edebilir misin istesen kemeçede,  
Ne dersin piyanoda çalınsa;  
Çiftetelli gibi coşturur mu herkesi  
Yoksa ağıraksak bir hava mı?  
İstediğin zaman kesilir mi sesi?  
Alla'sen söyle nedir aşkın aslı astarı!

Türkçe Söyleyen Can Yücel

Bir hâl oldum çardakların altında  
Onu araya araya,  
Küçüksu'ya baktım, orada da yok,  
Boşuna çıktım Çamlıca'ya;  
Anlamadım gitti bülbülün şarkısını,  
Bir acayip gülün lisanı da;  
Benim bildiğim o kümeste değildi  
Ne de yatağın altında.

<u>AYSUN ASLAN'A HAFİF GELEN AĞIRLIK: "AĞIR ROMAN"</u>
<u>TİYATRO STÜDYO'SUNDAN ZOR BİR OYUN DAHA: "YAŞAMIN ÜÇ YÜZÜ"</u>
<u>BEN BU OYUNU, NASIL OLMUŞ DA GÖRMEMİŞİM: "SENEYE BUGÜN"</u>
<u>OPERADA ZEYTİNYAĞLI YENİR Mİ, YENMEZ Mİ: "FOLKLORAMA"</u>
<u>İYİ YORUM, İYİ OYUNCULUK VE KOLEKTİVİZM: "2. CADDE' NİN MAHKÛMU"</u>
<u>HADİ ÇAMAN, GENE YEL DEĞİRMENLERİNE SALDIRIYOR: "HİSSE - İ SÂYIA"</u>
<u>HINZIR MI HINZIR BİR MİZANSEN ANLAYIŞI: MERAKÎ</u>
<u>YUMAK OLMUŞ TOPLULUĞUN GÖRÜLESİ OYUNU: "ON İKİNCİ GECE"</u>
<u>MAYASININ SAĞLAMLIĞIYLA AYAKTA KALABİLEN OYUN: "KAYGUSUZ ABDAL"</u>
<u>SENİ İYİ TANIYORUZ VE DE ÇOK SEVİYORUZ: "MUTLU OL NÂZIM"</u>
<u>SİYASAL FANATİZMİN ÇATLATTIĞI DOSTLUK: "BU ADRESTE BULUNAMADI"</u>
<u>"BOEING BOEING"</u>
<u>ELİF VE YELDA'DAN ABUK SABUK ÜRETİCİLERİNE DERS: "HİZMETÇİLER"</u>
<u>CİHANYANDI'NIN, ÖCÜNÜ AGÂH EFENDİ'DEN ALIŞININ KOMİK ÖYKÜSÜ: "KANLI NİGÂR"</u>
<u>TİYATRO İLE İLGİSİ OLMAYAN İLLÜZYON GÖSTERİSİ: "OLAĞAN MUCİZELER"</u>
<u>"BİZİM TİYATRO"DAN EPİZODİK YAPIDA KURGULAMA:"HOŞ GELDİN BEBEK"</u>
<u>ESTETİK BÜTÜNLÜK İÇİNDE, SU GİBİ AKICI BEŞ OYUN: "UNUTMAK"</u>
<u>DİVA YILDIZ KENTER'DEN, BİR YILDIZ KENTER GERÇEĞİ DAHA: "SIRÇA KÜMES"</u>
<u>SEVMEDİM DEĞİL, ANLAMADIM : KIVRANIŞ I. TUTKU II. PSİKOZ 4.48</u>
<u>WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'İN CAN BABACASI: "BAHAR NOKTASI"</u>
<u>ANGELO SAVELLİ'DEN BİR GOLDONİ KLASİĞİ: "GELİN İLE KAYNANA"</u>
<u>KAPTANLAR'IN TURING KARAKTERİNDE YENİ OLGULAR BULDUĞU OYUN: "SONSUZ DÖNGÜ"</u>
<u>HERKESE SORMAK GEREK. SİZCE: "BENERCİ KENDİNİ NİÇİN ÖLDÜRDÜ?"</u>
<u>BİR RUTKAY AZİZ DÜŞÜ: "MEMLEKETİMDEN İNSAN MANZARALARI"</u>
<u>İYİLİK, KÖTÜLÜK, DÜRÜSTLÜK, İHANET KISKANÇLIK VE GÜÇ : "OTHELLO"</u>
<u>İKİ ÇİZGİ ARASINDA YAŞANANLAR: ERMİŞLER YA DA GÜNAHKARLAR</u>



William Shakespeare  
Can Yücel

# Bahar Noktası

Başar Sabuncu'nun önsözü  
ve  
Cevat Çapan'ın incelemesiyle

okuyun  
ars

EROTİK US

SIRCA

TENNESSE WILLIAMS

KÜMES

Confidential

1964

(The Glass Menagerie)

ISTANBUL BE...

...no'su

489

2339

## REFERENCES

- Akmen, Ü. (2006). Üstün Akmen tiyatro eleştirileri. Retrieved February 19, 2006, from [www.tiyatrom.com/u\\_akmen\\_yan.htm](http://www.tiyatrom.com/u_akmen_yan.htm).
- Aksoy, B. (1995). Cumhuriyet döneminde çeviri anlayışları. In M. Rifat (Ed.), *Çeviri ve çeviri kuramı üstüne söylemler* (Translation and discourse on translation theory) (pp. 73-93). Istanbul: Düzlem Yayınları.
- Amazon.com. (2006). *The Glass Menagerie*. Retrieved August 28, 2006, from <http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/product-description/0811214044>.
- Anday, M. C. (1995). Çeviri üstüne. *Tömer Çeviri*, 7, 113-115.
- Antoloji.com. (2004). *Her Boydan: Dünya şiirinden örnekler* (From each and every land: Specimens from world poetry). Retrieved May 28, 2005, from [www.antoloji.com/kitap/kitap.asp?kitap=7370](http://www.antoloji.com/kitap/kitap.asp?kitap=7370).
- Ashcroft, B. & Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (1989). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. London: Routledge.
- Aygen, G. & Salman, Y. (Trans.). (1990). Şiir çevirirken: Yedi strateji ve bir şablon, by A. Lefevere. *Metis Çeviri*, 13, 35-42.
- Aykılıç, S. (1994). *Hamlet çevirileri*. *Tömer Çeviri*, 4, 79-81.
- (2005). Geleneksel tiyatro: 8. sonuç. Retrieved May 5, 2005, from <http://www.tiyatronline.com/ykukds1-8.htm>.
- Bassnett, S. (1989). Labirentin içinde: Tiyatro metinleri çevirisi için yöntemler ve stratejiler. Fatma Günal (Trans.). *Metis Çeviri*, 19, 33-39.
- (1998). When is a translation not a translation? In S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere, *Constructing cultures* (pp. 25-40). Great Britain: Cromwell Press.
- (2002). *Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge (first published in 1980).
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (1998). *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation*. Great Britain: Cromwell Press.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Translation, history and culture*. London & New York: Cassell.
- Behramoğlu, A. (1987). Yücel Can. In *Son yüzyıl büyük Türk şiiri antolojisi* (A comprehensive anthology of Turkish poetry in the last century) (pp. 1181f). Istanbul: Sosyal Yayınlar.
- Belge, M. (1999). Sonuna kadar insandı... *Birikim*, 125-126, 21-23.

- Bellmore-Merrick. (2006). *The Great Gatsby* study guide. Retrieved September 21, 2006, from [www.bellmore-merrick.k12.ny.us/rggatsb.html](http://www.bellmore-merrick.k12.ny.us/rggatsb.html).
- Bengi-Öner, I. (1999a). *Çeviri bir süreçtir... Ya çeviribilim?* (Translation is a process... Is Translation Studies a process too?). Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.
- (1999b). Çeviri eleştirisi bağlamında eleştirel bilincin oluşması ve eleştiri, üst-eleştiri, çeviribilim ilişkileri. In *Çeviri bir süreçtir... Ya çeviribilim?* (Translation is a process... Is Translation Studies a process too?) (pp. 111-135). Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.
- (2001). Eskiler.. yeniler.. şiirler.. çeviriler..eleştiriler.. kuramlar.. Dükkân 1. In *Çeviri kuramlarını düşünürken ...* (While thinking of translation theories) (pp. 93-102). Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32, 1-18.
- (1992). *Language and symbolic power*. London: Polity Press.
- Bozkurt, B. & Bozkurt, S. (Trans.). (2000). *Soneler* (Sonnets), by W. Shakespeare. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Boztaş, İ. (1996). Can Yücel'in *Muhteşem Gatsby* çevirisindeki dil kullanımı ve ikilemeler üzerine. *Tömer Çeviri*, 7, 9-18.
- Broeck, R. van den (1985). Second thoughts on translation criticism. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (pp. 54-62). London: Croom Helm.
- Brooks, C. & Warren, R. P. (1979). Style. In *Modern rhetoric* (pp. 298-303). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Brower, R. (1974). *Mirror on mirror: Translation, imitation, parody*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Buena Vista University. (2006). Sonnets. Retrieved June 20, 2006, from <http://web.bvu.edu/faculty/drake/sonnets.htm>.
- Cash, E. W. (2006). Tennessee Williams. Retrieved February 19, 2006, from [http://www.olemiss.edu/mwp/dir/williams\\_tennessee/index.html](http://www.olemiss.edu/mwp/dir/williams_tennessee/index.html).
- Cicero, M. T. (46 B.C./1976). De optimo generate oratorum. H. M. Hubbell (Trans.). London: The Loeb Classical Library 386.
- (45 B.C./1982). De partitione oratoria. H. Rackham (Trans.). London: The Loeb Classical Library 349.

- Coates, J. (1999). Changing horses: Nabokov and translation. In J. Boase-Beier & M. Holman (Eds.), *The practices of literary translation: Constraints and creativity* (pp. 91-108). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Çapan, C. (2003). Özgürlüğüne kavuşan Shakespeare. In Can Yücel (Trans.), *Bahar Noktası (A Midsummer Night's Dream)* (pp. 31-34). Istanbul: Okuyan Us Yayın.
- Çavuşoğlu, Ö. (2005). The translator in translation theory. Unpublished MA-class term-paper, submitted to Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Çelebi, B. (1999). Can Yücel: "Hayatta ben en çok babamı sevdim." *Istanbul*, 29, 34-40.
- Davie, D. (1975). Unit 12: Poetry in translation. In *Arts: A third level course: Twentieth century poetry*. Great Britain: Open University Press.
- Demircioğlu, C. (2005). From discourse to practice: Rethinking "translation" (*Terceme*) and related practices of text production in the late Ottoman literary tradition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Demirkol, N. (2006). Can Yücel'in Shakespeare çevirilerinde "sadakat." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Deriş, N. (1965). *Muhteşem Gatsby* ve bir çeviri anlayışı üzerine. *Yeni Dergi*, 13, 459-464.
- Dingwaney, A. (1995). Introduction: Translating "third world" cultures. In A. Dingwaney and C. Maier (Eds.), *Between languages and cultures* (pp. 3-15). London: Oxford UP.
- Dizdar, D. (1992). *Metis Çeviri*'de çeviri eleştirisi. *Metis Çeviri*, 20/21, 124-134.
- Doltaş, D. (1988). Yazın çevirisine farklı bir bakış: Esnek aktarımın sınırları. *Metis Çeviri*, 2, 134-143.
- Dryden, J. (1680/1989). Metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation. In A. Chesterman (Ed.), *Readings in translation theory* (pp.7-12). Finland: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- Eliot, T. S. (1936). *Collected poems 1909-1935*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Ergüder, J. (2000, September 13). Bir at için, krallığım: III. Richard sadece iktidarı sevdi. Retrieved February 19, 2006, from [www.arsiv.hurriyetim.com.tr/agora/00/09/13/1.html](http://www.arsiv.hurriyetim.com.tr/agora/00/09/13/1.html).
- Erten, Y. (1999). Can Yücel'in oyunları Türkçe söyleyişi üzerine. *Tiyatro*, 96, 16-18.

- Even-Zohar, I. (1994). Culture planning and the market: Making and maintaining socio-semiotic entities. Retrieved December 20, 2004, from <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/papers.htm>.
- (1997). The making of culture repertoire and the role of transfer. In S. Paker (Ed.), *Translations: (Re)shaping of literature and culture* (pp. 166-174). Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- (2000). Culture repertoire and the wealth of collective entities. In D. de Geest et al. (Eds.), *Under construction: Links for the site of literary theory. Essays in honor of Hendrik van Gorp*. (pp. 389-403). Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Eyuboğlu, S. (1993). Can Yücel'in şiir çevirileri. In C. Yücel (Trans.), *Her Boydan: Dünya şiirinden örnekler* (From each and every land: Specimens from world poetry) (pp. 5-8). Istanbul: Papirüs Yayınları.
- Fergar, F. K. (1993). *The poetry of Can Yücel: Can Yücel'in şiirleri*. Istanbul: Papirüs.
- Fitzgerald, F. S. (1994). *The Great Gatsby*. London & New York: Penguin Books.
- Frow, J. (1986). *Marxism and literary history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Gelişim Hachette*. (1993). Istanbul: Hachette et Cie & Interpres Basın ve Yayıncılık.
- Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gentzler, E. (1998). Foreword. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere, *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation* (pp. ix-xxi). Great Britain: Cromwell Press.
- Gentzler, E. & Tymoczko, M. (2002). Introduction. In E. Gentzler & M. Tymoczko (Eds.), *Translation and power* (pp. xi-xxviii). Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Geocities.com. (2006). "Sonnet 66." Retrieved June 20, 2006, from [www.geocities.com/SoHo/Cafe/2759/sonnet66.html](http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/Cafe/2759/sonnet66.html).
- Gündoğar, S. (2000, August 14). Çelişkileri ironiyle yansıtan şair. Retrieved May 30, 2005, from <http://www.evrensel.net/00/08/14/kultur.html>.
- Gürçağlar, Ş. T. (2002). What texts don't tell: The uses of paratexts in translation research. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *Cross-cultural transgressions: Research models in Translation Studies II* (pp. 44-60). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- Halman, T. S. (Trans.). (1989). *Soneler* (Sonnets), by W. Shakespeare. Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

- Hausenblas, K. (1968). Styl a překlad (Style and translation). *Dialog*, 1, 13-26.
- Hermans, T. (1994). Translation between poetics and ideology. In S. Gillespie (Ed.), *Translation and literature 3* (pp. 138-145). Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Hikmet, N. (1968). Personal letter. In M. Rifat (Ed.), *Çeviri Seçkisi* (A collection of essays on translation) (p. 114). Istanbul: Dünya Yayıncılık.
- Hollander, J. (1959). Versions, interpretations, and performances. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On translation* (pp. 205-231). New York: OUP.
- Holmes, J. (1970). Forms of verse translation and the translation of verse form. In J. Holmes (Ed.), *The nature of translation: Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation* (pp. 91-96). The Hague: Mouton.
- Hönig, H. G. (1991). Holmes' "mapping theory" and the landscape of mental translation processes. In *Translation Studies: The state of the art. Proceedings of the first James S. Holmes symposium on Translation Studies* (pp. 77-89). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- İnce, Ü. (1993). Çeviriyi eleştirmeden önce. In G. Durmuşoğlu et al. (Eds.), *Dilbilim araştırmaları* (Researches in linguistics) (pp. 5-11). Ankara: Hitit Yayınları.
- (1997). Kuram ve uygulama bilgisiyle çeviri eleştirisi. In H. Anamur (Ed.), *Hasan Âli Yücel anma kitabı: Çeviri: Ekinler ve zamanlar kavşağı* (Hasan Âli Yücel memorial book: Translation: The turn of products and times) (pp. 253-260). Istanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- (1999). Can Yücel'in çeviri bilinci ve oyun çevirileri. *Tiyatro*, 95, 12-15.
- İpşiroğlu, Z. (1988). Bertolt Brecht'in oyunlarının Türkiye'de alımlanması. In *Tiyatro'da devrim* (Revolution in theatre) (pp. 129-153). Istanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları.
- İz'at, A. (Trans.). (2000). *Sırça Hayvan Koleksiyonu* (*The Glass Menagerie*), by T. Williams. Istanbul: Mitoş Boyut Tiyatro Yayınları.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.) (2000), *The Translation Studies reader* (pp. 113-118). USA and Canada: Routledge.
- Karaaliolu, S. K. (1982). Yücel, Can. In *Türk edebiyatçılar sözlüğü* (Dictionary of Turkish litterateurs) (pp. 637f). Istanbul: İnkilap ve Aka.
- Karantay, S. (1987). Çeviri eleştirisi: Sorunlar, ilkeler, uygulamalar. *Metis Çeviri, Kitap Dizisi 1*, 49-56.
- (1989a). Can Yücel ile söyleşi. *Metis Çeviri*, 8, 11-18.
- (1989b). Tennessee Williams ve *Sırça Kümes*. *Metis Çeviri*, 9, 124-128.

Karantay, S. (1992). Çevrilmemiş yapıtlara önsözler'e bir önsöz. *Metis Çeviri*, 20/21, 111-114.

(1993). Çeviri eleştirisinin bilimsel konumu üzerine eleştirel görüşler ve bir model önerisi. In *Dilbilim araştırmaları* (Researches in linguistics) (pp. 19-24). Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi.

Kardeş, İ. (2002, May 28). Uluyan köpekler, havlayan kurtlar. *YeniŞafak*. Retrieved May 30, 2005, from [www.yenisafak.com/arsiv/2002/mayis/28/ikardes.html](http://www.yenisafak.com/arsiv/2002/mayis/28/ikardes.html).

Kurdakul, Ş. (1985). *Şairler ve yazarlar sözlüğü* (Dictionary of poets and writers). İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

Kussmaul, P. (1995). What goes on in the translator's mind? In *Training the translator* (pp. 5-37). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lambert, J. & van Gorp, H. (1985). On describing translations. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature* (pp. 42-53). London & Sydney: Croom Helm.

Lefevere, A. (1975). *Translating poetry: Seven strategies and a blueprint*. Assen & Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

(1982). Mother Courage's cucumbers: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature. In L. Venuti (Ed.) (2000), *The Translation Studies reader* (pp. 233-249). USA & Canada: Routledge.

(1985). Why waste our time on rewrites?: The trouble with interpretation and the role of rewriting in an alternative paradigm. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (pp. 215-243). London & Sydney: Croom Helm.

(1992). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. London & New York: Routledge.

(1994). *Translating literature*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Lefevere, A. & Bassnett, S. (1990). Introduction: Proust's grandmother and *The Thousand and One Nights*: The "cultural turn" in Translation Studies. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Translation, history and culture* (pp. 1-13). London & New York: Cassell.

(1998). Introduction: Where are we in translation studies? In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere, *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation* (pp. 1-11). Great Britain: Cromwell Press.

Leighton, L. G. (1991a). Nabokov, *Onegin*, and others. In *Two worlds, one art* (pp. 179-192). Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

- Leighton, L. G. (1991b). The poet-translator. In *Two worlds, one art* (pp. 151-178). Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Levendoglu, A. (1999). Can'ima deęsin. *Tiyatro*, 96, p.19.
- Longman dictionary of contemporary English* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). (2003). Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lozano, A. (Ed.). (2006). "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock." Retrieved June 12, 2006, from [www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/5616/prufrock.html](http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/5616/prufrock.html).
- Maier, C. (1995). Toward a theoretical practice for cross-cultural translation. In A. Dingwaney & C. Maier (Eds.), *Between languages and cultures* (pp. 21-38). London: Oxford UP.
- (1998). Reviewing and criticism. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 205-10). London & New York: Routledge.
- Maine, J. P. (Ed.). (1909). *The plays of Aristophanes* (Volume 2). New York: Dutton.
- Metis eviri* (1990a). Karşılaştırmalı eviri: Kemalettin Kamu, Orhan Veli, Can Yücel. 13, 26-27.
- (1990b). Şiir evirisi üzerine. 13, 11-19.
- Nabokov, V. (1964). Foreword. In A. S. Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin* (vii-xii). London: Routledge.
- Nar, T. (1994). Aziz alışlar'la eviri üstüne. *Tömer eviri*, 2, 85-94.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). Principles of correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.) (2000), *The Translation Studies reader* (pp. 126-140). USA & Canada: Routledge.
- Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The theory and practice of translation*. The Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translation as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- Ofluoęlu, F. (Trans.). (1975). *Büyük Gatsby (The Great Gatsby)*, by F. S. Fitzgerald. Istanbul: Sander Yayınları.
- Özgüven, F. (1999, September 5). Türke söyleyen: Can Yücel. *Radikal*, p. 8.
- Paker, S. (1983). eviride "yanlış/doęru" sorunu ve şiir evirisinin deęerlendirilmesi. *Yazko eviri*, 13, 131-139.
- (1988). eviri eleştirisinin kuramla ilişkisi üzerine bazı düşünceler. *Metis eviri*, 4, 116-121.

- Paker, S. (1997). Çeviride “yanlış”ın sorgulanması (özet yazı). *Tömer Çeviri*, 10, 23-26.
- (2002). Translation as *terceme* and *nazire*: Culture-bound concepts and their implications for a conceptual framework for research on Ottoman translation history. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *Crosscultural transgressions* (pp. 120-143). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- Perrine, L. & Arp, T. R. (1992). *Sound and sense*. San Antonio: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Popovic, A. (1970). The concept of “shift of expression” in translation analysis. In J. S. Holmes (Ed.), *The nature of translation: Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation* (pp. 78-87). Mouton: Slovak Academy of Sciences.
- (1987). *Yazın çevirisi terimleri sözlüğü (Dictionary for the analysis of literary translation)*. S. Karantay & Y. Salman (Trans.). Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Quine, W. (1959). Meaning and translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.) (2000), *The Translation Studies reader* (pp. 94-112). USA & Canada: Routledge.
- Radó, G. (1979). Outline of a systematic translatology. *Babel*, 25:4, 187-196.
- Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H. J. (1984). *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen translationstheorie*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.
- Rifat, M. (2004). Azra Erhat’ın bir yazısı: “Üslup biliminde yeni bir yöntem.” *Varlık*, 1165, 57-60.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Translation and empire*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- (1998a). Free translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *The Routledge encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 87-90). London & New York: Routledge.
- (1998b). Literal translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *The Routledge encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 125-127). London & New York: Routledge.
- Sabuncu, B. (2003). *Bahar Noktası*’nda şenlikli direniş. In C. Yücel (Trans.), *Bahar Noktası (A Midsummer Night’s Dream)* (pp. 9-30). Istanbul: Okuyan Us Yayın.
- Said, E. (1983). *The world, the text, and the critic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1992). On the different methods of translating. In R. Schulte & J. Biguenet (Eds.), *Theories of translation: An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 36-54). Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Shakespeare, W. (1964). "Sonnet 66." In A.L. Rowse (Ed.), *Shakespeare's sonnets* (pp. 134f). New York & Evenston: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Shakespeare's Sonnets. (2006). "Sonnet LXVI." Retrieved May 15, 2006, from <http://www.shakespeares-sonnets.com/66comm.htm>.
- Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997). *The dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Stefano, B. F. di (n.d.). Translation as literary criticism. *Meta*, XXVII, 241-256.
- Steiner, G. (1975). The hermeneutic motion. In L. Venuti (Ed.) (2000), *The Translation Studies reader* (pp. 186-191). USA & Canada: Routledge.
- Toury, G. (1980). *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Ins. For Poetics.
- (1985). A rationale for descriptive Translation Studies. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (pp. 16-41). London & Sydney: Croom Helm.
- (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tymoczko, M. (2003). Ideology and the position of the translator. In M. C. Perez (Ed.), *Apropos of ideology* (pp. 181-201). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- Tytler, A. F. (1791). The proper task of a translator. In D. Robinson (Ed.) (2002), *Western translation theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche* (pp. 208-211). Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA: St. Jerome.
- Ulrych, M. (1996). On integrating stylistics into the translation process. *XIV World Congress of FIT Proceedings*, Vol. 2, 885-891.
- Üster, C. (2003). Editör'ün notu. In C. Yücel (Trans.), *Bahar Noktası (A Midsummer Night's Dream)* (p. 7). Istanbul: Okuyan Us Yayın.
- Venuti, L. (1994). The translator's invisibility: The evidence of reviews. *In other words: Journal of the translator's association*, 4, 16-22.
- (1995). Invisibility. In *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (pp. 1-42). London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H. J. (1987). What does it mean to translate? *Indian journal of applied linguistics*, 13 (2), 25-33.
- (1988). From Cicero to modern times – rhetorics and translation. In J. Holz- Mänttari (Ed.), *Translationstheorie – grundlagen und standorte* (pp. 93-128), Tampere: Tampereen Yliopisto.

Vermeer, H. J. (1989). Skopos and commission in translational action. In L. Venuti (Ed.) (2000). *The Translation Studies reader* (pp. 221-232). USA & Canada: Routledge.

(1992). Translation today: Old and new problems. In M. Snell-Hornby et al. (Eds.), *Translation Studies: An interdisciplinary* (pp. 3-16). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wikipedi (2006). Can Yücel. Retrieved February 19, 2006, from [http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Can\\_Y%C3%BCcel](http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Can_Y%C3%BCcel).

Wales, K. (1997). *A dictionary of stylistics*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman.

West, C. B. (1932). La théorie de la traduction au XVIIIe Siècle. *Revue Litterature Comparée*, 12, 330-355.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (2006). "Sonnet 66." Retrieved June 18, 2006, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sonnet\\_66](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sonnet_66).

Williams, T. (1949). *The Glass Menagerie: A play by Tennessee Williams*. New York: The New Classics.

Yalçın, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Tanzimat'tan bugüne edebiyatçılar ansiklopedisi* (Dictionary of littérateurs since the time of *Tanzimat*) (pp. 925-927). Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Yavuz, H. & Ercan, E. (Eds.). (2000). *Edebiyatımızda isimler sözlüğü: 1000 Türk Edebiyatçısının hayatı ve eseri* (Names in our literature: The lives and work of 1000 Turkish littérateurs). Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Applied social research methods series (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks & London: Sage.

Yücel, C. (1987). Can Yücel'le şiir çevirisi üzerine bir söyleşi. Unpublished interview at Boğaziçi University, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies, 1987/88 academic year seminar series, Istanbul.

Yücel, C. (Trans.). (1964a). *Muhteşem Gatsby (The Great Gatsby)*, by F. S. Fitzgerald. Istanbul: Ağaoğlu Yayınevi.

(1964b). *Sırça Kümes (The Glass Menagerie)*, by T. Williams. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

(1993a). "66. Sone." In *Her Boydan: Dünya şiirinden örnekler* (From each and every land: Specimens from world poetry) (p. 120). Istanbul: Papirüs Yayınları.

(1993b). *Her Boydan: Dünya şiirinden örnekler* (From each and every land: Specimens from world poetry). Istanbul: Papirüs Yayınları.

Yücel, C. (Trans.). (1993c). “Mr. Prufrock’tan Aşk Türküsü” (“The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock”), by T.S. Eliot. In *Her Boydan: Dünya şiirinden örnekler* (From each and every land: Specimens from world poetry) (pp. 62-66). Istanbul: Papirüs Yayınları.

(1996). *Fırtına (The Tempest)*, by W. Shakespeare. Istanbul: Papirüs Yayınları.

(1998). *Hamlet (Hamlet)*, by W. Shakespeare. Istanbul: Papirüs Yayınevi.

(2003). *Bahar Noktası (A Midsummer Night’s Dream)*, by W. Shakespeare. Istanbul: Okuyan Us Yayın.

(2005). “Alla’sen Söyle Nedir Aşkın Aslı Astarı,” by Wystan Hugh Auden. In E. Sururi (Ed.), *Epigraf* online edebiyat arşivi. Retrieved June 15, 2005, from [www.epigraf.fisek.com.tr/index.php?num=979](http://www.epigraf.fisek.com.tr/index.php?num=979).