



Identification of translation procedures for culture specific items in a short story

Mesut Kuleli^{a*} 

^a *Bandırma Onyedi Eylül University, Balıkesir 10200, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Kuleli, M. (2019). Identification of translation procedures for culture specific items in a short story. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 1105-1121.

Submission Date:06/07/2019

Acceptance Date:26/07/2019

Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze cultural items in the short story *Falaka* by Ömer Seyfettin based on Newmark's (2010) revised categorization of culture specific items and find out the translation procedures used to translate those culture specific items based on Newmark's (2010) basic cultural translation procedures. In the analysis of the source text, 31 contexts were found to include culture specific items. Of those culture specific items, ten were categorized as "social life"; nine were categorized as "personal life"; five were categorized as "customs and pursuits"; four were categorized as "private passions"; two were categorized as ecology; one was categorized as "public life". The analysis of the translation of those 31 contexts showed that "target language cultural equivalent" procedure was used in 22 contexts; "transference" was used in four contexts; "componential analysis" was used in three contexts; "descriptive equivalent" was used in two contexts. It was concluded that translation of culture specific items into a new culture is sure to bring some sort of tension created by the gap between those two cultures. However, translation procedures could help translators in making informed decisions in translation of culture specific items during the translation process.

© 2019 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Literary translation; translation procedures; culture specific items; culture; short story

1. Introduction

It is a well-known fact that culture and language are inseparably linked to one another. It is even possible to go to extremes in saying that language cannot be taught or acquired without the integration of culture into that process. While a great many scholars refer to this fact in language acquisition theories and practices, it can also be extended to translation of works of literature. Any literary work, no matter in which culture or language it is produced, is loaded with items that are specific to the culture it was produced in. According to Kramsch (1998: 3) language is "bound up with culture in multiple and complex ways ... Words reflect their authors' attitudes and beliefs, their point of view, that are also those of others... Language expresses cultural reality". As humanity can be said to be the primary creator and product of the primary world around (culture), the 'attitudes' and 'beliefs' of those authors are undoubtedly formed through the culture they were raised in. Moreover, because it is through the language that human beings express their views or opinions, language can be considered to 'express

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90 266 717 0117 – 7542.
E-mail address: mkuleli@bandirma.edu.tr

cultural reality'. As Schudson (1989: 153) states, "culture is constitutive of the person. It is the pre-condition and condition of human-ness". This statement implies the inseparability of authors, and therefore literary works, from the culture they were created in. This proposition is further confirmed by Peterson (1985: 45) arguing that "it has long been recognized that the form and content of cultural works such as literature are profoundly influenced by the milieu in which they are produced". In this proposition, literature is suggested as a product of culture, and the form of the literature, besides its content, is also claimed to be influenced by the social context, whereby the culture surrounding this social context, to a great extent. Therefore, the reading of any literary work is indeed a path to the culture this work was produced in.

A literary work belonging to a culture is likely to be translated into another language for various reasons. These reasons may have to do with the 'centrality' of a specific genre within the 'literary polysystem' of a culture (Even-Zohar, 2005) or the desire to obtain 'economic capital, symbolic capital or cultural capital' (Bourdieu, 1986: 83-84). If translated works are within the centre of literary polysystem of a culture, they tend to affect almost all facets of that culture, as result of which they might maintain their centrality in a specific culture. The desire to earn fame, respect or money could also be the driving forces for publishing houses to bring out translated literary works. Therefore, the act of literary translation can indeed be deemed as a multi-dimensional process. Whatever the reason for translation of literary works is, one thing is certain: translators need to be the mediators between two cultures along with two languages. For this necessity, Kaiser-Cooke (1994) maintains that:

"Translation is a process of conceptual restructuring within the conventions of the target culture. Cultural knowledge in this broad sense is the very essence of translatorial expertise and it is this that translators base their decisions on. What people say and how they say it is culturally determined, on the very fundamental cognitive level, which means that conceptual and semantic restructuring is always necessary". (Kaiser-Cooke, 1994: 138).

This proposition seems to regard the act of translation as a target culture process and considers this act as a decision-making process to transfer what is said in one culture to how it can be said in another culture. This, beyond doubt, depends on the cultural knowledge of the translator as well as linguistics knowledge since almost all words indeed bear more than what they show to the readers or translators. Almost all signs in a language are teemed with culture-specific phenomena; therefore, literary translators are compelled to be proficient users or practitioners of the source culture and the target culture. This transfer of a literary text between two cultures is termed as 'transpacific displacement' by Huang (2002):

"What I call transpacific displacement is a historical process of textual migration of cultural meaning, meanings that include linguistic traits, poetics, philosophical ideas, myths, stories and so on. And such displacement is driven in particular by the writers' desire to appropriate, capture, mimic, parody or revise the Other's signifying practices in an effort to describe the Other." (Huang, 2002: 3).

This view adopts culturally loaded meanings of signs in a language as in a travel from one culture to another. The term 'transpacific' implies a relocation of a sign from one part of the world to a strikingly different part while the term 'displacement' implies that the sign abandons its native land and is being prepared to adapt to conditions in the new place. Huang (2002) elaborates on this proposition suggesting that "translation involves not a transportation of meaning from originality to its equivalent in another language, but a process in which multiple readings of the 'original' are reduced to a version that foregrounds the translator's own agenda." (Huang, 2002: 4). Therefore, the act of translation can, on no condition, be downsized to finding the target language equivalents of words or expressions in a source text, but rather the source text lends itself to various interpretations by different translators, based on the cultural baggage of translators. It is possible to infer from this proposition that the signs in a source text culture are to be translated into a slightly or distinctly different culture with signs that already bear the

cultural values of a target text culture. Nord (2010) confirms this cultural transfer of culturally loaded signs into another culture:

“... a translation is an offer of information made to a target culture-audience about another offer of information directed at a source-culture audience. Within such a framework it does not make sense to speak conveying of ‘the’ meaning of ‘the’ source text in ‘the’ translation. The meaning or function of a text is not inherent in the linguistic signs.” (Nord, 2010: 122)

As can be understood from this proposition, the act of translation necessitates more than a thorough acquisition of the linguistics systems of two different languages, but rather acquisition of cultural norms and items the signs might bear between two languages. Nord (2010: 123) goes further, forming his position around Vermeer’s Skopos theory, positing that “transcultural action has to take account of cultural differences with regard to behavior, evaluation and communicative situations”. Snell-Hornby (2006: 54) states that Vermeer considers the dimension of cultural transfer superior to that of linguistic transfer in translation process. Bachmann-Medick (2009: 2) also emphasizes the cultural dimension of translation, with particular interest to literary translation, stating that “it is no longer possible to ignore how crucial the processes of cultural translation and their analyses have become” and considers translation as “a medium especially liable to reveal cultural differences”. Therefore, it is in translation process that the cultural differences between two languages, and therefore between the source text and the target text cultures, manifest themselves and require the translator to take on the role of ‘mediator’ between two distinct cultures.

1.1. Culture specific items

Seeing the close relationship between culture and translation, it is important to reveal what cultural items might pose challenges or manifest themselves in translation of literary works. The relevant literature bears various categories of cultural items in literary works. However, in this part only the categorization of culture specific items by Aixelá (1996) and Newmark (2010) will be discussed. For Aixelá (1996), “cultures create a variability factor the translator will have to take into account” (p. 53). According to Aixelá’s (1996) proposition, what falls to the translator is to make up for the gap created by the tension between two distinct cultures. Aixelá (1996) further states that “the first problem we face in the study of the cultural aspect of translation is how to devise a suitable tool for our analysis, a notion of ‘culture specific item’ ... in a language, everything is culturally produced, beginning with the language itself” (p. 56-57). Therefore, it is hardly possible to speak of a literary work produced in any cultural community as solely composed of linguistic items, but it is the cultural values and items that already paved the way for those linguistic items, rendering the place of culture to bear a significant role in translation. Aixelá (1996) regards “local institutions, streets, historical figures, place names, personal names, periodicals and works of art” (p. 57) as the constituents of culture specific items, however avoids confining culture specific items to those elements, stating that any concept or expression available in the source text but non-existent in the target language culture could also be considered culture specific items. In this way, Aixelá (1996: 59) divides culture specific items into two categories labelling them as “proper nouns” and “common expressions”.

While the categorization of culture specific items by Aixelá (1996) has been most popular, another equally popular classification can be attributed to Newmark (2010). While Newmark (1988: 94-103) first divided culture specific items into five categories – namely; “a) ecology; b) material culture; c) social culture; d) organizations, customs, ideas; e) gestures and habits”, this categorization was later revised by Newmark (2010: 174-177) and culture specific items were divided into six categories: “a) ecology; b) public life; c) social life; d) personal life; e) customs and pursuits; f) private passions” (Newmark, 2010: 174-177). For Newmark (2010), the cultural items under ecology category are all about the geological and geographical environment; the items under public life category concern

politics, law or governmental patterns in a community; the items under social life are related to terms or phenomena about economy, occupations, social welfare, health or education systems; the items under personal life category are composed of food, clothing and housing patterns; the items under customs and pursuits refer to gestures, postures, body language that are specific to a culture besides hobbies, entertainment and sports, including the idioms related to those pursuits; and finally the items under private passions category could be attributed to religion, music, poetry and relevant various social organizations like churches or poetry clubs (p. 174-177). In this study, in the analysis of the source text in terms of culture specific items, the categorization system by Newmark (2010) was adopted.

It is no wonder that those culture specific items might cause difficulty in translation. For instance, the sign ‘Konya’, which would belong to ecology in Newmark (2010), might arouse some spiritual feelings for Turkish and Muslim community because of the tomb of Mevlânâ Celâleddîn-i Rûmî, a Muslim poet and theologian known for his religious poetry, however, those associations would not be the case for a reader belonging to another religious and national community. As another example, while the term ‘sharia law’, referring to all kinds of musts and practices besides religious law in Islam, in a literary work written in Saudi Arabia in Arabic would be welcome by Arabic readers, it would not signify much to a reader of the translated text belonging to another nation and religious community, and this would be considered a culture specific item belonging to public life in Newmark’s (2010) categorization. The term ‘college’ in a text written in English in the US, which would be considered an element of social life by Newmark (2010), could be read smoothly without any necessity for elaboration on the interpretation of this sign by an American reader as colleges are quite popular in the US and they are part of the education system. However, a Turkish reader of the translated text would either misinterpret this sign or feel compelled to do search on American education system to reach the meaning universe of the text since the term ‘college’ is used for private schools (be it a primary school, a secondary school or high school) in Turkish education system, which is quite different from that of US system. On the other hand, a Chinese literary text, with the protagonist eating ‘sushi’ at a restaurant, would arouse the appetite of a Chinese reader while that food could be regarded terrible for readers of translated text in certain southern countries. As southern countries are not used to eating raw fish in their diet, they would have difficulty understanding why a rich protagonist should consume that food all the time, therefore it falls to the translator to make up for the gap between those two cultures. This phenomenon would fall under personal life in Newmark’s categorization. (2010). To give an example for customs and pursuits, the sign ‘football’ would suffice to pose challenge even between two readers of the same language, one from England and the other from the US. Though both of those cultures speak English as their mother tongue, what’s ‘football’ in England is indeed ‘soccer’ in the US since ‘football’ is what other communities refer to as ‘American football’. While the characters playing football and running to take the ball in hand on field would be read in an excited manner by an American reader, even an English reader, let alone readers from other communities reading the translated text, would have trouble understanding how football players can touch the ball with their hands as it is against the rules in football in their own culture. Finally, the sign ‘Selimiye’, a historic mosque and the masterpiece built by Sinan the Architect in Edirne, Turkey in the latter half of the sixteenth century during the reign of Ottoman Empire, would be considered an example for private passions in Newmark’s categorization (2010). While most Turkish people are familiar with this mosque and the author of a literary text in Turkish could refer to Selimiye without stating it is a mosque, this sign alone, in the translated text, would not make much sense to readers from other nations and those readers might misinterpret that sign as an ordinary place. As can be understood from the definitions and examples of culture specific items, a literary translator might frequently feel compelled to ‘deconstruct’, adopted from Derrida (1976; 1976), the cultural references in the source text prior to the act of translation.

1.2. Translation procedures for culture specific items

While Newmark (2010: 173) states that "... culture, whether it is religious, national, occupational, regional- and its reflection in language – is the main barrier to effective and accurate translation", he does not see the translator as a helpless being irreversibly stuck between two cultures suggesting that "... the magnitude of culture as an obstacle to translation is often widely exaggerated" (Newmark, 2010: 173). A translator could benefit from certain procedures in translation of literary texts loaded with culture specific items.

For translation of culture specific items, Newmark (2010) suggests five basic cultural translation procedures:

"a) transference of a cultural word: [this] is only acceptable as a translation if the word has already been adopted (incorporated, naturalized) into the translating (target) language.

b) target language cultural equivalent: A culture specific item is translated through a target culture equivalent. [this] may be denotative ... or connotative... A cultural equivalent is more inaccurate than most kinds of translation.

c) descriptive equivalent: In this procedure, the meaning of the culture specific item is explained in several words, with its supplementary components.

d) componential analysis: [this] compares a culture specific item in the source language with a target language word which has a similar meaning but is not a one-to-one equivalent. A cultural term is split into its core or generic component which is shared with other relative terms.

e) transonym: [this procedure leads to] the conversion of proper names such as geographical names or personal names" (Newmark: 2010: 176-177).

While the procedures above are termed as "basic" cultural translation procedures, Newmark (2010) also suggested other cultural translation procedures that are "marginal". These marginal translation procedures are "literal translation, synonymy, modulation, paraphrase and cultural footnotes" (Newmark, 2010: 178). However, in this study, only "basic" cultural translation procedures were used in analysis of the procedures in translation of cultural terms in the short story *Falaka* by Ömer Seyfettin since the comparison of contexts with culture specific items in the source text to the target text yielded only "basic" cultural translation procedures.

2. Ömer Seyfettin and *Falaka*

Ömer Seyfettin is a prominent Turkish story-writer born in Gönen, now a district of the city of Balıkesir in Turkey, in 1884 and died in 1920. He was the pioneer of a plain language in literary works (Karaalioğlu, 1974: 301). According to Karaalioğlu (1974: 301), it was through Ömer Seyfettin that Turkish people first encountered short stories reflecting their own lives with the language, style and plots he used in those stories.

"Daily routines, childhood memories, anecdotes, legends, history, folklore, jokes, and observations constitute the topics of Ömer Seyfettin's short stories... In his stories, it is possible to find a severe satirical and fantastic attitude besides a nice and humorous attitude by and large... [He] shies away from sounding poetical, making up long sentences and using metaphors in his short stories... He strives to purify Turkish language of foreign words and phrases. He stands among the forerunners to make Turkish language independent. As opposed to the lexiphancism of Servet-i Fünun Movement, he, together with Ziya Gökalp and Ali Canip Yöntem, stands for the plain public language in his literary works, thereby rendering him the strongest defender of the 'new language' movement [in Turkish Literature]." (Karaalioğlu, 1974: 301-302).

As can be understood from the lines above, Ömer Seyfettin frequently made use of social and cultural phenomena not only for the plot of his stories but also in the language that he used in those stories.

Therefore, the short stories by Ömer Seyfettin can be expected to include and reveal a plethora of culture specific items unique to the Turkish community in a plain language since ‘daily routines, childhood memories, anecdotes, legends, history, folklore and jokes’ that form the basis for his stories cannot be free from culture specific items, on the contrary, it is the culture specific items that form the core of those constituents of Ömer Seyfettin’s stories. Mıhçı and Yörük (1980) also confirm the use of a plain language and cultural phenomena in Ömer Seyfettin’s stories.

“Ömer Seyfettin is of great importance in Turkish Literature with his Maupassant style of narration. The literary works formed through a plain language and a smooth narration went beyond the establishment of classical story techniques in Turkish Literature, extending the topics and plots beyond the limits of Istanbul to history with an observer attitude. In this respect, the ideology he built his literary works on led him to adopt an enthusiastic approach to historical topics and plots.” (Mıhçı and Yörük, 1980: 26-27).

Therefore, besides holding a glory for the plain language that he employed in his short stories, Ömer Seyfettin is also well-known for the plots and topics in his stories. He can be said to have benefited from history in building his stories, and history is, by its nature, a part of a community’s culture, as well. All this refers to the conclusion that Ömer Seyfettin was a master in translating cultural phenomena to short stories in a plain language.

The short story titled *Falaka* is among the various short stories by Ömer Seyfettin that most Turkish readers could be familiar with. This short story deals with the schooling system in the author’s childhood years, which can be thought as the last decade of the nineteenth century. In this fin de siècle plot, the narrator, and also the protagonist of the short story, attends a school based on teaching Quran and religious concepts. The teacher, the hodja in this school in this story, punishes the children in the course with bastinado, an old form of punishment involving caning the soles of a person’s feet, until the district governor visits the school and orders the hodja to remove the bastinado from the class. With the bastinado gone, the children in the school get more and more mischievous, getting on the hodja’s nerves at times, as a result of which the bastinado punishment comes back. The children discover the hodja’s snuffbox one day. Yawning altogether, they cause the hodja to fall asleep in the class and thereafter they take the snuffbox. The inhalation of the snuffbox causes all children to sneeze, as a result of which the hodja wakes up and punishes the children with bastinado. The hodja vows to give the children corporal punishment with bastinado if they ever yawn or sneeze in the class. One day, the narrator of the story comes up with a cunning idea and gives snuffbox to the hodja’s donkey, named after Abdurrahman Çelebi among the children in the school. As the donkey sneezes, the hodja tries to find out what’s happening to the donkey; however, with the shouting of the children reminding him about his promise to give bastinado punishment to whoever yawns or sneezes in the school, the hodja gives bastinado punishment to the donkey. While the hodja is beating his donkey, the district governor sees him and calls him. From that day onwards, the narrator, the main character in this short story, never sees that hodja or the bastinado again.

This short story is also built upon the cultural phenomena ranging from education system of the community to governors, religious concepts or tools. In order to find out the culture specific items and reveal the translation procedures of those culture specific items based on Newmark’s (2010) classification, 2012 edition of the short story *Falaka*, in the book titled *Selected Stories by Ömer Seyfeddin-Seçme Hikayeler* was analyzed in this study. This short story in this edition is a simplified version of the original short story *Falaka*. It is no doubt that all editions of this short story in the current use in the market are simplified versions of the original story. In this 2012 edition, the English translation of the story is given together with the simplified Turkish source text. In the translator’s Preface to the book, it is stated that this English translation of the short story *Falaka* was completed in order to show the cultural elements of Turkish society to other cultures besides help English learners of Turkish origin improve their foreign language reading skills. As the skopos of the translator, as adopted from Vermeer

(2004), was to familiarize the other cultures with Turkish culture, this short story was chosen to analyze the culture specific items and translation procedures in those items.

3. Culture specific items in Ömer Seyfettin's *Falaka* and translation procedures

In this part, the culture specific items in *Falaka* by Ömer Seyfettin are presented based on the order of ecology, public life, social life, personal life, customs and pursuits and private passions as suggested by Newmark (2010). Besides the contexts with culture specific items, the translations of those contexts are also provided with the translation procedures identified based on Newmark (2010).

3.1. Culture specific items on ecology and translation procedures

The contexts with culture specific items on ecology based on Newmark (2010) in the source text and their translations in the target text are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Culture specific items on ecology in *Falaka*

Source Text	Target Text
“Gönen” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“Gönen” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20)
“kestane ağaçları” (Seyfettin, 2012: 31).	“chestnut trees” (Seyfettin, 2012: 32).

As can be seen in Table 1, the sign “Gönen”, a town of city of Balıkesir in Turkey and the birthplace of the author, can be categorized as a culture specific item belonging to ecology in Newmark's (2010) classification. This was translated with the sign “Gönen” in the target text. A cultural item of ecology was directly transferred to the target language. Therefore, this procedure can be considered “transference” according to Newmark's (2010) cultural translation procedures. According to Newmark (1988: 82), translators could use transference procedure as they come across geographical names. Another culture specific item belonging to Newmark's (2010) ecology category is “kestane ağaçları” in the source text. Chestnut is a popular fruit in Turkish culture particularly consumed in winter months in households. It is harvested extensively in Turkey. While “chestnut” could be considered to belong to “personal life” category by Newmark (2010) as food items are categorized under personal life, in this context, chestnut trees are not associated with food but rather with their geographical features. This item was translated with the sign “chestnut trees” in the target text. The translation procedure in this cultural item could be categorized as “target language cultural equivalent” by Newmark's (2010) categorization system of translation procedures. The sign “chestnut trees” is denotatively the equivalent of “kestane ağaçları”.

3.2. Culture specific items on public life and translation procedures

The contexts with culture specific items on public life based on Newmark (2010) in the source text and their translations in the target text are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Culture specific items on public life in *Falaka*

Source Text	Target Text
“Hepimiz kırk çocuktuk. Kızları birkaç ay önce bizden ayırarak başka yere kaldırmışlardı.” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“We all were forty kids. The girls were separated from us and put away somewhere else a few months ago.” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20).

In Table 2, the sentence “Kızları birkaç ay önce bizden ayırarak başka yere kaldırmışlardı” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21) refers to the political and educational system of the era in the past. Because the school the protagonist attended was based on teaching Quran and religious concepts, the boys and girls in that school were in separate classrooms. Newmark (2010) categorized education system under “social life”, however the context of this sentence refers to politics and law rather than education system. Based on the ethics and laws of Islamic education rules, girls and boys have been taught in separate classrooms in Quran courses. Therefore, this context was categorized as “public life” cultural item. Concerning the target text, this public life item was translated as “The girls were separated from us and put away somewhere else a few months ago” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20). This translation is the cultural equivalent of the sentence in the source text. Even though a gender-based separate classroom application would only bring the convent school to the minds of target text readers, this translation is the target language equivalent of the sentence in the source text. Therefore, the translation procedure in this context could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” by Newmark’s (2010) categorization system of translation procedures.

3.3. Culture specific items on social life and translation procedures

The contexts with culture specific items on social life based on Newmark (2010) in the source text and their translations in the target text are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Culture specific items on social life in *Falaka*

Source Text	Target Text
“Falaka” (Seyfettin, 2012: 19).	“Bastinado” (Seyfettin, 2012: 18).
“Mektep” (Seyfettin, 2012: 19).	“School” (Seyfettin, 2012: 18).
“Hoca Efendi” (Seyfettin, 2012: 19).	“Hoca Efendi” (Seyfettin, 2012: 18).
“Müezzinlik” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“a muezzin” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20).
“Hakim Efendi” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“the Judge” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20).
“Kaymakam Bey” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“Head official” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20).
“kalfa” (Seyfettin, 2012: 23).	“the apprentice” (Seyfettin, 2012: 22).
“öğle paydosu” (Seyfettin, 2012: 25).	“noon break” (Seyfettin, 2012: 26).
“çarpım tablosu” (Seyfettin, 2012: 27).	“multiplication table” (Seyfettin, 2012: 28).

“zabit” (Seyfettin, 2012: 31).	“military officers” (Seyfettin, 2012: 30).
-----------------------------------	---

In Table 3, the items “falaka, mektep, öğle paydosu, çarpım tablosu” are related to education system while the items “Hoca Efendi, müezzinlik, Hakim Efendi, Kaymakam Bey, kalfa, zabit” are related to occupations. Newmark (2010) categorizes the items belonging to education and occupations under “social life”. In Ottoman era, falaka, the beating of students’ soles as a punishment, was a part of formal school system for a long time (Hatipoğlu Sümer and Aydın, 1999: 337). In the target text, the sign falaka was translated as bastinado. The sign bastinado is the English equivalent of Turkish falaka. Oxford Online Dictionary defines bastinado as “a form of punishment ... caning the soles of someone’s feet” (Retrieval: 13.06.2019) and adds that the origin of that word dates back to the sixteenth century and the Spanish word bastonada. Therefore, the translation procedure for that cultural item could be defined as “target language cultural equivalent” by Newmark’s (2010) categorization. The item mektep refers to school in old Turkish. Turkish Language Association Online Dictionary defines mektep as an old word referring to “school” (Retrieval: 13.06.2019). It was translated as school in the target text, with the modern and denotative equivalent in English. Therefore, the translation procedure in this item could also be labelled as “target language cultural equivalent” by Newmark’s (2010) categorization. The item öğle paydosu refers to the break time lasting more than thirty minutes, and maybe as long as ninety minutes in schools. In Ottoman school system, there was no standard lesson hour or break time, and the lessons lasted from morning to mid-afternoon, with only breaks at noon (Halis, 2005, cited in Demirtaş, 2007: 174). In the target text, this cultural item was translated as noon break with English equivalents. The procedure in the translation of this cultural item could be regarded as “target language cultural equivalent” by Newmark’s (2010) categorization. The item çarpım tablosu belongs to Math lessons in schools. This item refers to the multiplication rules of one-digit numbers with each other and popularly known in almost all world school systems. It was translated as multiplication table in the target text. This is the “target language cultural equivalent” of the item çarpım tablosu by Newmark’s (2010) categorization of cultural items translation procedures.

Regarding the culture specific items on occupations in Table 3, the item ‘Hoca Efendi’ refers to the teacher of Quran in the course. This teacher is expected to be a religious leader in Islam. The religious leader in mosques is addressed as ‘hoca’ in Turkish. Moreover, the teachers in schools are also addressed as ‘hoca’. This sign is followed by another sign, ‘Efendi’ in the source text. According to the Online Dictionary of Turkish Language Association, prior to the contemporary era, the sign ‘Efendi’ was used as a title for educated people, following the proper name in context (Retrieval: 17.06.2019) as in the example of ‘Muallim Ali Efendi’, in which the job title (Muallim [teacher in old times]) precedes the name of the person (Ali) which is followed by the title ‘Efendi’. This ‘social life’ culture specific item was translated into the target language as ‘Hoca Efendi’. Since the source text culture specific item was directly transferred to the target text, this translation procedure can be categorized as “transference” according to Newmark’s (2010) cultural translation procedures. As another ‘social life’ culture specific item, ‘Müezzinlik’ also refers to an occupation in Turkish which is addressed to the assistant of the religious leader in mosques, sometimes calling people for prayer and sometimes reciting the azan with prayers loudly during the worship process in mosques. This ‘social life’ culture specific item was translated as “a muezzin” in the target text, with a minor change in the structure of the item. This can be considered “transference” according to Newmark’s (2010) translation procedures categorization. In Table 3, the cultural items ‘Hakim Efendi’ and ‘Kaymakam Bey’ are also titles related to occupations in Turkish. Therefore, they are categorized as ‘social life’ according to Newmark’s (2010) categorization of culture specific items. In target text, the sign ‘Hakim Efendi’ was translated as ‘the Judge’ eliminating the title ‘Efendi’ and using the cultural equivalent of the sign ‘Hakim’ as the ‘Judge’. Therefore, this

translation procedure could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” by Newmark’s (2010) categorization because the source text and target text items are denotatively close to one another though there might arise certain differences connotatively. On the other hand, the item ‘Kaymakam Bey’ is translated as ‘Head official’ in the target text, eliminating the title ‘Bey’ and using a more general sign in the target text for a specific sign in the source text. In Turkish, the item ‘Kaymakam’ only refers to the head official of a town, however the item ‘head official’ bears a more generic signification than its Turkish equivalent, referring to not only towns but all top executives in any organization. This could be considered “componential analysis” by Newmark’s (2010) translation procedures categorization since a specific item was split into its generic meaning without a one-to-one signification. The item ‘kalfa’, in old times, referred to the person in charge who took students from home to school or from school to home (Turkish Language Association Online Dictionary, Retrieval: 17.06.2019). Therefore, this sign has an archaic meaning in this short story written by Ömer Seyfettin in Ottoman era rather than a contemporary meaning. In the target text, this item was translated as ‘the apprentice’, one of the possible meanings of the sign in the source text, however not applicable in the context of the source short story. However, it is also important to note that the English equivalent of the item ‘kalfa’ is apprentice in contemporary Turkish, therefore the translation procedure here could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” according to Newmark’s (2010) cultural translation procedures. Finally, the cultural item ‘zabit’ referred to a military officer with the title from a lieutenant to a major commander in Ottoman era. This occupation title is also considered a part of ‘social life’ according to Newmark’s (2010) categorization of culture specific items. In the target text, it was translated as ‘military officers’. This sign in the target text refers to any officer in charge in a military system in English, bearing a more generic meaning than the case in the source text. While the items ‘zabit’ and ‘military officer’ are relatively similar, with certain features sharing similarities, they are still distinct from one another in that the latter one is of a more generic sense; therefore, this could be considered “componential analysis” procedure according to Newmark’s (2010) categorization of translation procedures.

3.4. Culture specific items on personal life and translation procedures

The contexts with culture specific items on personal life based on Newmark (2010) in the source text and their translations in the target text are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Culture specific items on personal life in *Falaka*

Source Text	Target Text
“rahle” (Seyfettin, 2012: 19).	“book rest” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20).
“leblebi, keçiboynuzu, hünnap, iğde” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“chickpeas, carob, jujube, oleaster”(Seyfettin, 2012: 20).
“setre, pantolon” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“trousers and a jacket” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20).
“minder” (Seyfettin, 2012: 23).	“cushion” (Seyfettin, 2012: 22).
“enfiye kutusu” (Seyfettin, 2012: 23).	“snuffbox” (Seyfettin, 2012: 22).
“mest” (Seyfettin, 2012: 27).	“thin soled indoor boots” (Seyfettin, 2012: 28).
“cüppe” (Seyfettin, 2012: 27).	“robe” (Seyfettin, 2012: 28).

“eşeğin yularını ve semerini” (Seyfettin, 2012: 29).	“the donkey’s bridle and the packsaddle” (Seyfettin, 2012: 28).
“kırmızı fes” (Seyfettin, 2012: 31).	“a red fez in head” (Seyfettin, 2012: 30).

As can be seen in Table 4, the items ‘rahle, minder, enfiye kutusu’ are part of household items; the items ‘leblebi, keçiboynuzu, hünnap, iğde’ are part of food items; ‘setre, pantolon, mest, cüppe, yular, semer, kırmızı fes’ are part of clothing items in Turkish culture. Since Newmark (2010) takes clothing, household and food under the category of “personal life”, these items are analyzed under this category in this study.

The item ‘rahle’ is used to refer to a kind of desk or table to read a book on. However, in Turkish culture, this item is associated with more than a book rest as this kind of a desk was used as a book rest to put and read Quran on in the past. Therefore, the sign ‘rahle’ brings to the mind the image of a book rest in Turkish with Quran on it. However, in the target text, it was translated with the sign ‘book rest’. Denotatively, ‘book rest’ could be considered a cultural equivalent of the Turkish sign ‘rahle’, however these two items bear distinct differences connotatively since a reader of the target text might not think of a book rest with Quran due to cultural phenomena. This procedure could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” by Newmark’s (2010) categorization. Another household item, ‘minder’ is also a part of “personal life” according to Newmark’s (2010) categorization of culture specific items. In Turkish, ‘minder’ is a soft item to sit or lean on, and it is mostly placed on the floor in Turkish culture. In the target text, the sign ‘cushion’ was used in translation of this item. ‘Cushion’ in English is the denotative equivalent of Turkish ‘minder’ while they might differ connotatively. Therefore, “target language cultural equivalent” procedure might have been used in translation of ‘minder’ as ‘cushion’ according to Newmark’s (2010) categorization of translation procedures. As the last household item on personal life, the item ‘enfiye kutusu’ was used in the source text. ‘Enfiye’, as a sign, was used in Ottoman era to refer to dried tobacco people breathe through the nose for its pleasant effects. ‘Enfiye kutusu’ is the box in which that tobacco was kept in old times. In the target text, it was translated with its cultural equivalent sign ‘snuffbox’. Denotatively, these two signs refer to the same item and therefore this choice of the translator could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” procedure by Newmark’s (2010) terms.

The food items ‘leblebi, keçiboynuzu, hünnap, iğde’ were translated with the signs ‘chickpeas, carob, jujube, oleaster’ respectively. These food items in the target text are cultural equivalents of the signs in the source text. Therefore, the translation procedure of those food-related personal life culture specific items could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” procedure according to Newmark’s (2010) categorization.

Considering the clothing items in Table 4 on “personal life” culture specific items, the signs ‘setre’ and ‘pantolon’ were the obligatory clothing items in Ottoman era for those working in public sector. As these two items appear in the source text, a Turkish reader of the text might easily associate them with the clothing system in old times. These two items were translated as ‘trousers and a jacket’ in the target text. While the sign ‘trousers’ is the denotative equivalent of Turkish ‘pantolon’, ‘a jacket’ is the denotative equivalent of contemporary design of ‘setre’. While these two equivalents are denotatively close to the signs in the source text, they are not far from certain losses connotatively, therefore “target language cultural equivalent” procedure was used according to Newmark’s (2010) terms. The sign ‘mest’ refers to a soft type of shoes worn indoors or with the real shoes on them outside that do not have to be taken off during ablution in feet washing stage. In Turkish culture, this sign is directly associated with the elderly and ablution process. In the target text, this sign was translated as ‘thin soled indoor

boots', with extra information provided to the reader about the item's appearance and function. As "the meaning of the culture specific item is explained in several words, with its supplementary components" (Newmark, 2010: 176-177), this procedure could be considered "descriptive equivalent" procedure. Another clothing item in Turkish, 'cüppe' is used for various occasions ranging from university graduation ceremonies to religious gatherings. In the context this sign was used, it was worn by the religious leader. In the target text, it was translated with the sign 'robe'. 'Robe' is the denotative equivalent of the sign 'cübbe'. Therefore, "target language cultural equivalent" procedure was used according to Newmark's (2010) terms in the translation of the cultural item 'cübbe'. The clothing items are not confined to human wear as can be seen in Table 4. The cultural items 'yular' and 'semer' that are put on donkeys were also used in the source text. Considered clothing items for animals, these two items were also categorized as "personal life" culture specific items according to Newmark's (2010) classification. In the target text, the signs 'yular' and 'semer' were translated as 'bridle' and 'packsaddle' respectively, which are the cultural equivalents of the source text items. In translation of those animal clothing items, "target language cultural equivalent" procedure was used according to Newmark's (2010) translation procedures. Finally, the cultural sign 'kırmızı fes' was used as "personal life" culture specific item in the source text. It is a kind of headwear that was worn popularly by men in Ottoman era. This item was translated as 'a red fez in head' in the source text. This source text item was somehow described in the target text with the addition of 'in head' to make it clear to the target text reader. Because of the supplementary components used to describe the signification of 'fes', "descriptive equivalent" procedure was used according to Newmark's (2010) categorization.

3.5. Culture specific items on customs and pursuits and translation procedures

The contexts with culture specific items on customs and pursuits based on Newmark (2010) in the source text and their translations in the target text are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Culture specific items on customs and pursuits in *Falaka*

Source Text	Target Text
"tumar etmek" (Seyfettin, 2012: 19).	"grooming" (Seyfettin, 2012: 18).
"sıra dayağı" (Seyfettin, 2012: 23).	"give a beating each" (Seyfettin, 2012: 24).
"Çocuklara baş parmağımı dudaklarıma götürerek: - Susunuz işareti verdim." (Seyfettin, 2012: 25).	"by taking my finger to my lips: -Keep quiet! said I by giving signal." (Seyfettin, 2012: 26).
"Ellerimizi kaldırdık." (Seyfettin, 2012: 29).	"We raised our hands." (Seyfettin, 2012: 28).
"gülmemek için eliyle ağzını tutuyordu." (Seyfettin, 2012: 29).	"was holding his mouth not to laugh." (Seyfettin, 2012: 28).

According to Table 5, there are five customs in Turkish used in the source text. Those customs are labelled as "customs and pursuits" in Newmark's (2010) culture specific items categorization. The custom 'tumar etmek', to clean the hair and skin of animals like horses, was translated as 'grooming'; the custom 'sıra dayağı', a punishment in the form of beating all students one by one, was translated as 'give a beating each'; the custom 'baş parmağımı dudaklarıma götürerek', to give the signal that everybody must keep quiet, was translated as 'by taking my finger to my lips'; the custom 'ellerimizi kaldırdık', a body language used by students to show the teacher that they want to answer the question

or they themselves want to ask a confusing point, was translated as ‘we raised our hands’; and finally the custom ‘gülmemek için eliyle ağzını tutuyordu’, to keep oneself from laughing or making laughing sound by putting a hand or both hands on the mouth firmly, was translated as ‘was holding his mouth not to laugh’. Denotatively, the customs quite popular in Turkish culture were translated through their equivalents in the target language; however, connotatively they might not mean the same to the source culture and target culture. Therefore, Newmark’s (2010) “target language cultural equivalent” procedure was used in translation of all five culture specific items on “customs and pursuits” in the short story.

3.6. Culture specific items on private passions and translation procedures

The contexts with culture specific items on private passions based on Newmark (2010) in the source text and their translations in the target text are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Culture specific items on private passions in *Falaka*

Source Text	Target Text
“Çarşı Camii” (Seyfettin, 2012: 19).	“Bazaar Mosque” (Seyfettin, 2012: 18).
“Elifbe, Amme” (Seyfettin, 2012: 21).	“alphabet” (Seyfettin, 2012: 20).
“Vallahi, billahi!” (Seyfettin, 2012: 25).	“Vallahi billahi” (Seyfettin, 2012: 24).
“cüz” (Seyfettin, 2012: 27).	“fascicle” (Seyfettin, 2012: 26).

As the concepts related to religion or religious organizations are categorized as “private passions” culture specific items by Newmark (2010), those religious organizations or concepts in Table 6 can be safely considered “private passions”. The item ‘Çarşı Camii’ was translated as ‘Bazaar Mosque’, with target culture equivalent of the sign. This translation could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” procedure by Newmark’s (2010) terms. The culture specific items ‘Elifbe, Amme’, parts of the holy book Quran were translated as ‘alphabet’. In Turkish-Islamic culture, the sign ‘Elifbe’ refers to the Arabic alphabet because ‘Elif’ and ‘Be’ are the sounds of first two letters of Arabic alphabet; however, it was translated as ‘alphabet’, with a generic sign eliminating ‘Arabic’ and ‘Amme’. Therefore, this sign ‘alphabet’ in the target text could refer to any alphabet, and could be thought as any alphabet in the world, bringing “componential analysis” procedure to the fore by Newmark’s (2010) terms. The translator seems to have drawn similarities and then rendered the sign through relative terms. Another “private passion” culture specific item is ‘Vallahi, billahi!’. This is an oath exclamation with Arabic origin in Turkish-Islamic culture, showing Allah (the God) as the testifier for this oath. It was translated as ‘Vallahi billahi’ in the target text. The item in the source culture was directly transferred to the target culture. Therefore, this could be considered “transference” procedure by Newmark’s (2010) terms. Finally, the religious item ‘cüz’ refers to two items: each of the thirty parts the holy book Quran is divided into; and the booklet through which people can learn Arabic alphabet and the unique signs in Arabic to learn to read Quran. In the context this item was used in the short story, it refers to the latter as the protagonist of the short story states that he pulled off two sheets from his ‘cüz’. In the target text, this item was translated as ‘fascicle’, the target culture equivalent of the source item in both meanings. This could be considered “target language cultural equivalent” procedure by Newmark’s (2010) terms.

4. Conclusion and discussion

In this study, the short story titled *Falaka* by Ömer Seyfettin was analyzed for culture specific items based on Newmark's (2010) revised categories for culture specific items in literary works. Following the establishment of culture specific items in categories in the source text, their translation in the target text was also analyzed to find out which cultural translation procedures were used in translation of culture specific items from Turkish to English based on Newmark's (2010) basic translation procedures for culture specific items. It is important to note that in the edition used in this study, the source text and the target text were published together. The editor and the translator of the selected stories edition stated in the Preface that the source text was a simplified version of the original story by Ömer Seyfettin. Almost all editions of this short story in the market today are simplified versions. The translator also added that all stories by Ömer Seyfettin were simplified and translated into English on this simplified version. The aim of translations was put forward to familiarize readers from other cultures and nations with Turkish culture as well as help English language learners of Turkish origin facilitate their reading skills and language dynamics like cultural items, vocabulary and grammar. In this study, this simplified version of the short story and its translation were used in data collection.

As a result of culture specific items analysis in the source text, 31 contexts were found to include culture specific items in Turkish. Of those 31 contexts, two (6.45%) were found to include culture specific items on "ecology"; one (3.23%) was found to include culture specific items on "public life"; ten (32.26%) were found to include culture specific items on "social life"; nine (29.03%) were found to include culture specific items on "personal life"; five (16.13%) were found to include culture specific items on "customs and pursuits"; four (12.90%) were found to include culture specific items on "private passions" based on Newmark's (2010) revised version of culture specific items categorization.

The analysis of cultural translation procedures based on Newmark (2010) showed that in translation of the 31 contexts with culture specific items, "transference" procedure was used in four contexts (12.90%); "target language cultural equivalent" procedure was used in 22 contexts (70.97%); "descriptive equivalent" procedure was used in two contexts (6.45%); and "componential analysis" procedure was used in three contexts (9.68%). This shows that the most frequently used cultural translation procedure was "target language culture equivalent" procedure, in which the connotative or denotative meaning of the source text culture specific item is close to the one in the target culture, however they are not exactly the same and something is lost in translation of those culture specific items.

As language and culture are inseparable from one another, it is of crucial importance that translators need to be aware of basic and marginal translation procedures to apply in transferring a cultural item into another culture. In application of those translation procedures, "the form of a translation may change depending on its function but the author's text and the meanings it puts into words cannot and should not be conjured away by whatever skopos translators adopt" (Neubert, 2003: 68). Therefore, the skopos a literary translator adopts indeed affects the translation procedures to use, however the skopos of a translator cannot allow abolishing the meaning of the cultural items in the source text. While the skopos of the translation analyzed in this study is to acquaint foreigners with Turkish cultural items and help English learners of Turkish origin improve their comprehension and reading skills in the target language, the translator did not destroy or omit cultural items, but rather used translation procedures to cope with the difficulties created by the gap between the source culture and target culture. "Cultures have their own particular ways in perceiving and naming the world and it is the translator's task to consider measures to bring these worlds closer together. There are different strategies which are applied by different translators in translation of culture-specific items" (Maasoum and Davtala, 2011: 1777). Translation procedures are regarded as the bridges that enable translators to carry culture specific items from a source culture to a target culture. "Faced with the task of translating cultural references, the

[literary] translator will have a number of tools (procedures) available; to select the appropriate one, (s)he will need to take into account various parameters” (Mailhac, 1996: 133). According to Öztürk Kasar and Can (2017: 288), “it is obvious that to translate literary texts demands linguistic and cultural competence...In addition, to negotiate between two cultures and languages necessitates acquiring cultural competence”. Moreover, Can Rençberler (2019: 125) states that a literary translator seeking to grasp the meaning universe of a literary text prior to the act of translation goes on to take on the role of a mediator between two distinct cultures. Hence, translation procedures are the tools acting like a compass that shows the translator which direction to take in rendering a cultural item. The gap between two cultures should not be viewed as a nightmare that translators cannot get rid of, but rather as a barrier that could be overcome through a thorough application of translation procedures. All in all, translation procedures are the ideal tools for literary translators as translating a literary text is not only about translating its words or grammar structures but also the culture the text was created in. As no two cultures can be exactly the same, the tension created by the gap in translation between two cultures can be resolved through an awareness of translation procedures.

References

- Aixelá, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Alvarez & C. A. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 52-78). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Bachmann-Medick, D. (2009). The translational turn. (K. Sturge, Trans.). *Translation Studies*, 2(1), 2-16.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In I. Szeman & T. Kaposy (Eds.), *Cultural theory: An anthology* (pp. 81-93). Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Can Rençberler, A. (2019). Çeviri göstergebilimi ekseninde özgün metin okuma ve çözümleme modeli ile anlam arayışı. *Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(18), 125-141.
- Demirtaş Z. (2007). Osmanlı’da sıbyan mektepleri ve ilköğretimin örgütlenmesi. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17(1), 173-183.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*. (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Even-Zohar, I. (2005). Polysystem theory (Revised). In I. Even-Zohar (Ed.), *Papers in culture research* (pp. 38-49). Tel Aviv: Porter Chair of Semiotics (Temporary electronic book).
- Hatipoğlu Sümer, Z. & Aydın, G. (1999). Incidence of violence in Turkish schools: A review. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 21(4), 335-347.
- Huang, Y. (2002). *Transpacific displacement: Ethnography, translation, and intertextual travel in twentieth-century American Literature*. London: University of California Press.
- Kaiser-Cooke, M. (1994). Translational expertise- a cross-cultural phenomenon from an interdisciplinary perspective. In M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker & K. Kaindl (Eds.), *Translation studies and interdiscipline* (pp. 135-140). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Karaaliolu, S. K. (1974). *Resimli Türk edebiyatçılar sözlüğü*. İstanbul: İnkılap ve Aka Basımevi.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Maasoum, S. M. H. & Davtalab, H. (2011). An analysis of culture-specific items in the Persian translation of “Dubliners” based on Newmark’s Model. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(12), 1767-1779.
- Mailhac, J. P. (1996). The formulation of translation strategies for cultural references. In C. Hoffmann (Ed.), *Language, culture and communication in contemporary Europe* (pp. 132-151). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Mıhçı, A. İ. & Yörük, Y. (1980). *Yardımcı edebiyat kitabı*. Ankara: Eğitim Yayınları.
- Neubert, A. (2003). Some of Peter Newmark’s translation categories revisited. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *Translation today: Trends and perspectives* (pp. 68-75). Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York, London: Prentice Hall.
- Newmark, P. (2010). Translation and culture. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & M. Thelen (Eds.), *Łódź studies in language* (pp. 171-182). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.
- Nord, C. (2010) Functionalist approaches. In Y. Gambier & L.V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 120-128). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Oxford Online Dictionary. <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/bastinado>. Retrieved: 13.06.2019.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Can, A. (2017). Semiotics of Umberto Eco in a literary translation class: The model reader as the competent translator. *IJLET-International Journal of Languages’ Education and Teaching*, 5(2), 280-289.
- Peterson, R. A. (1985). Six constraints on the production of literary works. *Poetics*, 14(1-2), 45-67.
- Schudson, M. (1989). How culture works. *Theory and Society*, 18(2), 153-180.
- Seyfettin, Ö. (2012). *Selected stories of Ömer Seyfeddin – Seçme hikayeler*. (M. Miyasoğlu, Trans.). İstanbul: Konak Yayınları.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Türk Dil Kurumu Çevrimiçi Sözlük. <http://sozluk.gov.tr/>. Retrieved: 13.06.2019.
- Türk Dil Kurumu Çevrimiçi Sözlük. <http://sozluk.gov.tr/>. Retrieved: 17.06.2019.
- Vermeer, H. J. (2004). Skopos and commission in translational action. (A. Chesterman, Trans.). In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 221-232). London, New York: Routledge.

Bir öyküdeki kültüre özgü terimlerin çevirisinde kullanılan çeviri yöntemlerinin saptanması

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Ömer Seyfettin'in *Falaka* başlıklı öyküsündeki kültürel terimleri Newmark'ın (2010) gözden geçirilmiş kültürel terimler sınıflandırmasına dayanarak çözümlmek ve Newmark'ın (2010) temel kültürel çeviri yöntemleri ışığında bu kültürel terimlerin çevirisinde kullanılan çeviri yöntemlerini bulmaktır. Kaynak metnin çözümlenmesi sonucunda, 31 söylemde kültüre özgü terimler saptanmıştır. Bu 31 söylemin onunda "sosyal yaşam", dokuzunda "kişisel yaşam", beşinde "gelenekler ve uğraşlar", dördünde "özel tutkular", ikisinde "çevrebilim", birinde "toplumsal yaşam" sınıflarına ait kültürel terimler bulunmuştur. Kültüre özgü terimler içeren 31 söylemin çevirilerinin çözümlenmesi sonucunda, 22 söylemde "hedef dil kültürel eşdeğerliği", dört söylemde "aktarma", üç söylemde "anlam çözümlenmesi", iki söylemde "betimsel eşdeğerlik" çeviri yöntemleri saptanmıştır. Bu bulgulara göre, bir kültüre özgü olan terimlerin başka bir kültüre çevirisinde, bu iki kültür arasındaki farklılığın yarattığı bir gerilim doğabilir. Ancak, yazın çevirmenleri bu kültürel farklılıklar karşısında çaresiz hissetmemelidir. Çeviri yöntemleri, yazın çevirmenlerine çeviri edimi esnasında mantıklı tercihlerde bulunmada ve zorlukları aşmada yardımcı olabilirler.

Anahtar sözcükler: Yazın çevirisi; çeviri yöntemleri; kültüre özgü terimler; kültür; öykü

AUTHOR BIODATA

Mesut Kuleli holds PhD in Interlingual and Intercultural Translation Studies. He currently works in the Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures at Bandırma Onyedü Eylül University. His main focus of research is on Semiotics of Translation and literary translation.