

## An Analysis of Culture-Specific Items in the Turkish Translation of Shakespeare's *As You Like It* by Halide Edip Adıvar and Vahit Turhan

Shakespeare'in *Nasıl Hoşunuza Giderse* Oyununun Halide Edip Adıvar ve Vahit Turhan'ın Türkçe Çevirisinde Kültüre Özgü Unsurların İncelenmesi

Ercan Gürova<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Dr., Ankara University, The School of Foreign Languages, Ankara, Türkiye

Corresponding author/  
Sorumlu yazar : Ercan Gürova  
E-mail / E-posta : ercangurova@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the translation of culture-specific items in Shakespeare's comedy *As You Like It* by Halide Edip Adıvar and Vahit Turhan. To this end, Javier Franco Aixela's two major translation strategies (conservation and substitution) and sub-categories (repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic [non-cultural] translation, extratextual gloss, intratextual gloss, autonomous creation [source-culture origin], synonymy, limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, deletion, autonomous creation [target-culture origin]) are employed for the classification and analysis of the randomly selected items from the play. The findings of this analysis are later discussed with the help of Venuti's approaches to foreignization and domestication. Furthermore, the translation of culture-specific terms, the debates regarding the translator's visibility, and their effects on the translation output are addressed. This study suggests that although both major strategies have been adopted during the translation process to a certain degree, the frequency of the domesticating strategies has outnumbered the frequency of the foreignizing strategy. This finding indicates that as macro-strategies of domestication are predominantly employed in the translation of *As You Like It*, the translators become invisible, which has created a false image of authorship. By employing the domesticating strategies predominantly, the foreignness of the text has been disrupted. Although employing domesticating strategies renders easy readability, this type of translation fails to fully appreciate the cultural differences between the source and target text.

**Keywords:** *As You Like It*, culture-specific items, Shakespeare, translation strategies, Venuti

### ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı Halide Edip Adıvar ve Vahit Turhan tarafından tercümesi yapılan Shakespeare'in *Nasıl Hoşunuza Giderse* komedisindeki kültüre özgü unsurların çevirisini incelemektir. Bu amaçla, Aixela'nın iki ana çeviri stratejisi (koruma ve ikâme) ve alt kategorileri (tekrar, imla uyarılama, dilsel [kültürel olmayan] çeviri, metin dışı açıklama, metin içi açıklama, özerk yaratım [kaynak kültür kökenli], eş anlamlılık, sınırlı evrenselleştirme, mutlak evrenselleştirme, doğallaştırma, silme, özerk yaratım [hedef kültür kökenli]) oyundan rastgele seçilen öğelerin analizi ve sınıflandırılması için kullanılır. Bu analizin bulguları daha sonra Venuti'nin yabancılaştırma ve yerelleştirme yaklaşımlarının yardımıyla tartışılmaktadır. Ayrıca, kültüre özgü terimlerin çevirisi, çevirmenin görünürlüğü tartışmaları ve bunların çeviri çıktısına etkileri ele alınmaktadır. Bu çalışma, çeviri sürecinde her iki ana stratejinin de belirli bir dereceye kadar benimsenmiş olmasına rağmen yerelleştirme stratejilerinin sıklığının yabancılaştırma stratejisinin sıklığından daha fazla olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu bulgu *Nasıl Hoşunuza Giderse*'nin çevirisinde ağırlıklı olarak yerileştirme makro stratejileri kullanıldığından çevirmenlerin görünmez hale geldiğini ve bunun da yanıltıcı bir yazarlık imajına neden olduğunu gösteriyor. Çeviride ağırlıklı olarak yerileştirme stratejileri kullanıldığından metnin yabancılığı bozulmuştur. Yerileştirme stratejilerinin kullanımı kolay okunabilirlik sağlasa da bu çeviri türü kaynak ve hedef metin arasındaki kültürel farklılıkları yansıtmakta başarısız olur.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** çeviri stratejileri, kültüre özgü unsurlar, *Nasıl Hoşunuza Giderse*, Shakespeare, Venuti

Submitted / Başvuru : 27.06.2023  
Revision Requested /  
Revizyon Talebi : 25.10.2023  
Last Revision Received /  
Son Revizyon : 07.11.2023  
Accepted / Kabul : 08.11.2023  
Published Online /  
Online Yayın : 15.12.2023



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

## 1. Introduction

The translation process does not occur simply as a linguistic exchange between any two languages. As language and culture are intertwined entities and cannot be isolated from each other, the translation process should also reflect this reciprocal relation not only on a lexical but also on a semantic level. Therefore, this two-way configuration has caused debates on how culture affects translation. Some scholars put an emphasis on the translator's role "as a mediator between cultures" (Katan, 2013, p.84) which signals a cultural turn in translation studies. Similarly, Bassnett argues that any attempt to isolate the text from its culture by the translator is bound to suffer consequences as language is not a mere transformer of certain words (1980, p.14). Even though there is a great consensus on the inseparability of language and culture in translation studies, which methods/approaches to adopt in the translation of culture-specific items still pose challenges.

This study aims to analyze the methods applied in the translation of culture-specific items in William Shakespeare's *As You Like It* in an attempt to decipher whether a foreignizing or domesticating translation is generated and to what extent the foreignness of the English culture is reproduced in the Turkish translation. To this end, Aixela's strategies will be employed in order to investigate the translations of culture-specific items in *As You Like It*. The findings of this investigation will be utilized to uncover whether a predominantly foreignizing or domesticating target text is produced in the Turkish translation. In the analysis of culture-specific items, Venuti's translation approaches (foreignization and domestication) as macro-strategies and Aixela's eleven translation strategies as micro-strategies (repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, intratextual gloss, extratextual gloss, absolute universalization, naturalization, synonymy, limited universalization, deletion, autonomous creation), which are also classified under two categories as conservation and substitution, will be used in this study.

Shakespeare's play *As You Like It* will be investigated to determine the culture-specific items in the source text. Next, the identified culture-specific items will be classified along with Aixela's translation strategies. In the analysis part of the study, a random selection from the translated culture-specific items will be illustrated and discussed. The findings of this analysis will later be discussed with the help of Lawrence Venuti's approaches to foreignization and domestication. The scope of this study is limited to the culture-specific items in Shakespeare's *As You Like It* and its translation into Turkish by Halide Edip Adivar and Vahit Turhan.

### 1.1. Translation of Culture-Specific Items

In translation, it is not only languages that come into contact, but also the cultures that interact with each other. As languages and cultures do not exist in a vacuum, this cross-cultural communication form requires the necessity to convey cultural meaning in translation. Prominent scholars in the field have suggested different terms and definitions for cultural transformation in the translation process. Peter Newmark, for instance, has used the term "cultural words" (1988, p.9) and argued that these words pose a special challenge for translation as there is no consensus for them between the source and target cultures. Nord, on the other hand, suggests the term "cultureme" to indicate both the verbal and non-verbal behavioral patterns, and in order to better understand these patterns one should pay attention to the cultural acquisition process (1988, p.32). Jean Pierre Mailhac proposes the term "cultural reference" which illustrates any reference to a cultural entity that causes a translation problem because of its distance from the target culture (1996, p.173). Another scholar, Ritva Leppihalme, employs the term "culture-bound elements" and suggests that they create a communication barrier between the source and target language audience (1997, p.8).

Aixela, whose model will be used in this study, employs the term "culture-specific items" and believes that they are dynamic but dependent entities that are formed as an outcome of a conflict during the translation process between two languages (1996, p.57). In other words, for Aixela, the emergence of culture-specific items is only possible within a given context and translators should take cultural variabilities such as values, habits, customs, etc. into consideration while making translation decisions. Since the dynamic nature of culture-specific items is underlined and it offers a more context-based approach, Aixela's model will be employed in this study.

Aixela suggests two major translation strategy categories based on the level of cultural manipulation: conservation and substitution. These categories are also divided into sub-categories according to their level of manipulation: repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic (non-cultural) translation, extratextual gloss, intratextual gloss, autonomous creation (source-culture origin), synonymy, limited universalization, absolute universalization, naturalization, deletion, autonomous creation (target-culture origin) (1996, p.52-57). The following table also summarizes all major and sub-categories according to Aixela's model.

A brief explanation of the major and sub-categories will be useful before the analysis part. In the conservation category, the source-language-based item is retained and the foreignized effect of the translated item can be experienced

**Table 1.**

<b>Translation Strategies</b>	
Conservation	Repetition
	Orthographic adaptation
	Linguistic (non-cultural) translation
	Extratextual gloss
	Intratextual gloss
	Autonomous creation (adding an element of source-culture origin)
Substitution	Synonymy
	Limited universalization
	Absolute universalization
	Naturalization
	Deletion
	Autonomous creation (adding an element of target-culture origin)

by the readership. On the other hand, in the substitution category, the source-language-based item is transformed and domesticated by the target language or it is deleted altogether in the target text. In the first sub-category of conservation, repetition provides the original reference with no or limited change in the target language. It is mostly used in the translation of toponyms and proper names. Even though this strategy shows respect toward the source text, it may cause an alienating effect on the target audience. Orthographic adaptation, the second sub-category of conservation, conveys the original reference with some adjustments such as making phonetic and phonological changes in the target language. This strategy is mostly used in the procedures such as transcription and transliteration of the source text and it conveys the foreign nature of the item into the target text. A third sub-category of conservation is called linguistic (non-cultural) translation where the translator conveys the culture-specific items with an indicatory close reference to the source text. While this strategy enables the target reader to grasp the text easily, it retains the foreign effect of the source language. This strategy is mostly preferred in the translation of currencies, measurements, or idiomatic expressions. Extratextual gloss, the fourth sub-category of conservation, offers extra information to elaborate on the meaning of culture-specific items. This is employed in the form of footnotes, endnotes, glossaries, etc. This strategy provides the necessary background information for the target reader to better understand the source-culture reference and the alienating effect of the source text is retained. The fifth sub-category of conservation, intratextual gloss, is very similar to extratextual gloss, only with the difference that it provides extra information within the text so as not to distract the reader’s attention. This additional information embedded in the text increases the accessibility of the source culture for the target reader. In the final sub-category of conservation, autonomous creation, the translator comes up with a cultural reference that is not provided in the source text. This strategy has the capacity to generate either a domesticating or foreignizing effect on the original cultural reference. Daily expressions, and religious phrases constitute a major part of this strategy. In synonymy, the first sub-category of substitution, as the name suggests, a synonymy or similar words are provided for the culture-specific word. The aim is to avoid unnecessary repetition in the text. In limited universalization, the second sub-category of substitution, the culture-specific item which is too ambiguous/unclear for the target audience to understand is replaced with another source culture reference which is more clear and closer to the target culture. By doing this, the translator diminishes the extent of alienation of the source culture in the target language. Absolute universalization, another sub-category of substitution, differs from limited universalization in the form that it replaces the culture-specific item with a neutral reference because there is no available familiar equivalence in the target language. In naturalization, the fourth sub-category of substitution, the culture-specific item is transformed into the target culture in such a way that it gives the impression that the item is originated in the target culture. In other words, the reader is misguided as to believe that the source language item belongs to the target culture. By doing this, the foreign associations of the source language item are eliminated. In deletion as the fifth sub-category of substitution, as its name suggests, the culture-specific item is omitted on the grounds that it is either stylistically unfit or inappropriate for political or ideological reasons. Another reason can be the vagueness or obscurity of the item for the target reader. In autonomous creation, as the final sub-category of substitution, the translator creates a cultural reference which does not correspond to the source text. As mentioned before, this strategy allows for either a domesticating or foreignizing effect according to the origin of the cultural reference (Aixela, 1996, p.52-57).

## 1.2. The Effects of the Foreignization and the Domestication Strategies on Translation

In his influential works such as *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995) and *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference* (1998), Lawrence Venuti foregrounds the translation of culture-specific items and the role of foreignization and domestication in the translator's (in) visibility. Venuti argues that giving priority to fluency and transparency in translation creates invisibility on the part of the translator, causing damage in conveying the foreignness of the text to the target reader (1995, p.33-34). Instead, he suggests alternative solutions in which linguistic and cultural differences are retained as a result of an ethical stance to respect and appreciate cultural differences. In his model, Venuti makes a distinction in translation choices by providing a binary structure: domestication and foreignization. He favors foreignization over domestication by arguing that the latter serves the norms of the target language and imposes what to translate according to the target culture (1998, 2). For Venuti, foreignization paves the way for confronting the target culture and challenges the dominant culture patterns (1998, p.241). In this regard, Venuti considers foreignization to be an antidote to domestication, the dominant strategy in Anglo-American translation.

When the reasons why Venuti is supportive of foreignization are examined closely, it becomes clear that his motives are mostly political and ideological. He argues that a domesticating translation strategy will serve the needs of domineering Anglo-American culture and neglect the linguistic, cultural, and social factors which have a profound impact on the author (1998, p.7). Therefore, the translated text which has lost its authenticity will be no more than a fake or a false copy of the original. Another adverse consequence of this process is problematic authorship. The domesticating strategy will eventually cause a false image of authorship with its so-called representation in the target language (1998, p. 46).

Venuti finds the domesticating strategy which creates a fluent and transparent reading problematic as this type of translation promotes the hegemony of the dominant culture. On the other hand, the foreignizing strategy shows resistance to this dominion by simply displaying the foreign features of the source text and/or disrupting the dominant discourses in the target culture (1998, p.80). In other words, a proper translation for Venuti should not eliminate the oddity of the foreign text but instead, resist the norms which domineer the target text. In short, the foreign identity and cultural otherness of the source text should be preserved as much as possible.

## 1.3. The (In)Visibility of the Translator

Karen R. Emmerich defines the concept of "visibility/invisibility" by presenting three categories in her article entitled "Visibility (and invisibility)" (2013, p.200-206). The first category expresses the invisibility of the translator as a co-author of a text, which is forced by the domineering practices in marketing, reviews, and criticism of the translated text. The second category refers to the act of translation, which is under the heavy influence of "fluency" and "transparency" norms of the Anglo-American culture. The third category illustrates the invisibility of translation as a cultural interaction between the translations made to and from the English language (1998, 2-3). Venuti's locating the concept of (in)visibility is in parallel with Emmerich's definitions as it refers to the translator's situation and activity during the translation process.

Venuti favors the visibility of the translator for several reasons. One reason is the "self-annihilation" of the translator in which translators refrain from using their own interpretation and rewriting skills (1998, p.1). This is done for the sake of easy readability and to fabricate a sense of transparency. Another reason why Venuti rejects the invisibility attitude is the idea of creating a false image of authorial presence in translation. The efforts to conceal the foreignizing influence of the source text eventually lead to a faulty reproduction of the original text. Hence, this attitude will foster the asymmetrical relations between the Anglo-American culture and the other cultures (1998, p.7). For these reasons, Venuti suggests a foreignizing translation strategy which allows for keeping the foreignness of the source text.

## 1.4. About the Author and the Translators

*As You Like It* is one of William Shakespeare's comedies written in 1599 and published in 1623. It portrays a complicated love story with various illusions and disguises for the sake of love. Although the play starts in Duke Frederick's court, the rest takes place in the forest of Arden where one can see "the traits of English culture and historical details" (Vural Özbey, 2022, p. 2). In this regard, the setting and the communities (both the court and the pastoral), the details of ordinary life, and the various characters of the English society provide a fertile ground for culture-specific items in the text.

Halide Edip Adıvar (1884-1964), one of the leading Turkish writers, activists, and academicians, is also known for her translation of English fiction such as Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Shakespeare's *As You Like It*. It should also be noted that "the translation office" was founded in 1940 with Hasan Ali Yücel's great contributions, who was the minister of

education, and Adivar was one of the members of this office (Gürçağlar, 2005, p.69). Between the years 1941 and 1949, Adivar started an initiative to translate some of the prominent works of Shakespeare with Vahit Turhan and Mina Urgan. In this regard, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, *As You Like It*, *The Tragedy of Coriolanus*, and *The Tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra* were translated into Turkish. In all of these translations, paratexts (introduction, preface and endnotes) are added to the main text for the purpose of introducing or promoting Shakespeare's world to the reader. For example, the introduction part of the translation of *As You Like It* is devoted to Shakespeare's biography, his language, the sources he used, detailed mythological allusions and references, a separate part for the essential characteristics of the play, and analysis of the characters. In short, a total of 45 pages is reserved as paratexts, which shows that these translations were conducted with an educative purpose which was in line with the principles of the newly founded Turkish Republic (Araboğlu, 2019, p.992). This study will investigate the culture-specific items in *Nasıl Hoşunuza Giderse*, a translation of the 1943 edition. In this Turkish translation, Halide Edip Adivar is joined by Vahit Turhan, a professor of English Literature.

## 2. Categorization of Culture-Specific Items and Their Analysis

In order to better investigate the extracts taken from the translated text, a combination of various taxonomies suggested by different scholars will be used in the analysis part. These are anthroponyms and honorifics; toponyms and architecture; art and education; religious life and myths; idioms, saying, expressions.

In this part of the study, how the culture-specific items in Shakespeare's *As You Like It* are conveyed in Turkish will be illustrated and discussed based on Aixela's model at a micro-strategic level. Furthermore, the domestication and foreignization model by Venuti will be added to Aixela's model to investigate the translation at a macro-strategic level. As mentioned earlier, Aixela offers two broad groups: conservation and substitution. The strategies listed under conservation will also be treated as foreignizing and in a similar vein, the strategies listed under substitution will be treated as domestication. Finally, a random selection of extracts from the play will be examined based on Aixela's and Venuti's model. The findings of this study will be interpreted in detail at the end.

### 2.1. Anthroponyms and Honorifics

Under this title, the proper names of people will be investigated in the play. In the target text, all the proper names of characters and places are retained as they are without any change, and brief explanations are provided about the characters at the beginning of the book. The following table below presents a random selection of them, which are examples of the "repetition" sub-category and "conservation" major category by Aixela. They should also be treated as an example of "foreignization" in accordance with Venuti's model.

Table 2.

Names
Frederick, Jacques, Le Beau, Orlando, Adam, Dennis, Touchstone, William, Rosalind (1943, p.27-151)

In addition to proper names, honorifics are frequently used in the text and they are mostly translated by the orthographic adaptation strategy, which contains small adjustments to the original item. In this regard, they are treated under the major category of "conservation" and "foreignization". The following table below displays some examples.

Table 3.

Honorifics	
ST	TT
Duke	Dük
Lady	Leydi
Monsieur (1993, p.97-228)	Mösyö (1943, p.27-151)

The title "duke" refers to a sovereign male ruler of a duchy or a nobleman of the highest hereditary rank and it is translated as "dük" in Turkish with a slight alteration. The word "lady" refers to a type of woman who has a superior social status or position and its Turkish equivalent "leydi" simply means "hanım, hanımefendi" and conveys a similar meaning. The title "monsieur" is a word of French origin which means a Frenchman of high rank. Its Turkish equivalent "mösyö" refers to "mister" (bey, beyefendi). As there are only limited or small adjustments to the original items, this method creates a foreignizing effect and underlines the alien nature of the source text.

## 2.2. Toponyms and Architecture

Under this title, the translation of the names of the places such as towns, cities, mountains, hills, lakes, seas, buildings, etc. will be investigated. In Adivar and Turhan's translation of places, various methods are adopted as the following table below shows:

Table 4.

Toponyms and Architecture	
ST	TT
Arden	Arden
The Court	Saray
The Jove's Tree	Jüpiter Ağacı
The Bay of Portugal (1993, p.97-228)	Portekiz Körfezi (1943, p.27-151)

The forest of Arden, the major setting of the play, is transferred as "Arden" as an example of the "repetition" sub-category. Another important setting of the play is "the court" and it is transferred into Turkish as "saray" as an example of a literal translation. Another cultural item regarding toponyms is "the Jove's tree" and it is translated as "Jüpiter ağacı", which is an example of orthographic adaptation. Last but not least, "the bay of Portugal" is transferred into Turkish as "Portekiz Körfezi" and it is another example of orthographic translation. When all the culture-specific items under this title are considered, it can be suggested that the translators adopted a conservation strategy and the use of sub-categories such as repetition and orthographic translation has a foreignizing effect on the translated text. The word "saray" being an exception, the other cultural-specific items "Arden, Jüpiter ağacı, Portekiz Körfezi" will emphasize the unfamiliar origin of the source text and contribute to the foreignizing effect.

## 2.3. Art and Education

Under this title, cultural items with reference to music, dance, and literature will be investigated. *As You Like It* consists of a great number of songs and opportunities to dance for performers on stage. Adivar and Turhan adopt various translation strategies as elaborated in the tables below.

Table 5.

Art and Education I	
ST	TT
Who doth ambition shun, And loves to live i'th' sun, Seeking the food he eats And pleased with what he gets, Come hither, come hither, come hither. Here shall see No enemy But winter and rough weather. ... If it do come to pass That any man turn ass, Leaving his wealth and ease A stubborn will to please, Ducdame, ducdame, ducdame. Here shall he see Gross fools as he, An if he will come to me. (1993, p.140-141)	İhtirasa yüz vermeyen Ömrü gün, güneşte geçen, Emeğiyle ekmek yiyen Bulduğuna şükreyleyen, Buraya gelsin, buraya: Kış kar, soğuk vardır ama Düşman yüzü görmez asla ... Bilinmez, insan bu ya! Eşek olsa, anırsa; Kapılıp bir duyguya Rahatını kaçırsa. Bana gelse bu adam Tikadam da tikadam, Burda bulur divaneler, Kendi gibi neler neler. (1943, p.41-42)

In this song, “to live in the sun” is translated as “ömrü gün, güneşte geçen” and it is clear from “gün, güneş” expression that there is an addition of an element of target culture origin. In this sense, this is an example of autonomous creation under the major category of substitution. In a similar vein, “seeking the food he eats” is translated as “emeğiyle ekmek yiyen”, which illustrates the sub-category of limited universalization. The word “seek” (“aramak” in Turkish) is replaced with “emek” (effort/toil) probably to both domesticate the word as it is more common and has an emotional undertone and to make alliteration with the following word “ekmek” (bread).

In the second part of the song, words and expressions such as “if it do come to pass”, “wealth”, “a stubborn will” in the source text are omitted in the target text as part of the deletion sub-category. Instead expressions such as “Bilinmez, insan bu ya!”, “anırsa”, and “kapılıp bir duyguya” are produced as part of the autonomous creation sub-category. Furthermore, “ducdame”, a nonsensical refrain in the song, is translated as “tikadam” and it can be described as an example of orthographic adaptation. In addition, “gross fools” (which means “büyük aptallar” in Turkish) is translated as “divaneler” (mad, crazy people) in the target text, which is an indicator of the naturalization sub-category. In short, mostly substitution major category is preferred by the translators in the song above, which also means that these choices have created a domesticating effect on the target text.

Table 6.

Art and Education II	
ST	TT
From the east to western Ind	Şarkından garbına Hindin
No jewel is like Rosalind.	Eşi yoktur Rosalindin.
Her worth being mounted on the wind	Şu Rosalind'in değeri
Through all the world bears Rosalind.	Rüzgâra vurmuş eğeri.
All the pictures fairest lined	Resimlerin en güzeli
Are but black to Rosalind.	Hasedinden olur deli.
Let no face be kept in mind.	Kiblesi olsun her rindin,
But the fair of Rosalind. (1993, p.159)	Güzel yüzü Rosalind'in. (1943, p.56)

The word “jewel” in the source text is translated as “eş” (from the phrase “eşi benzeri olmamak”, which means unique”), whereas the word “mücevher” (literal translation of jewel) is not adopted. This usage exemplifies the sub-category of naturalization. Another point is that the line “through all the world bears Rosalind” is completely omitted in the target text, which is an example of deletion. Also, the expression “hasedinden olur deli” (becomes mad because of jealousy) has no equivalent in the source text and it is another example of autonomous creation by the translators. Finally, the line “let no face be kept in mind” is translated as “kiblesi olsun her rindin”, which is used figuratively and means “being the important center of”. Although there is a similar meaning in both expressions, absolute universalization as the sub-category is used in the target text. To conclude, this song is translated by resorting to a substitution strategy, and therefore the domesticating effect on the target text is inevitable.

Table 7.

Art and Education III	
ST	TT
It was a lover and his lass,	Aşkla sevgilisi atıp dünya yasını
With a hey, and a ho, and a hey-nonny-no,	İkisi bir ağızdan bir hey hey tutturarak
That o'er the green cornfield did pass	Geçtiler bugün yeşil bir buğday tarlasını
In spring time, the only pretty ring-time,	İlkbaharda, senenin tek evlenme çağında
When birds do sing, hey ding-a-ding ding,	Başlar başlamaz kuşlar şakrak civıtlılara
Sweet lovers love the spring.	Elbette bayırlılar aşıklar bu bahara.
... (1993, p.215)	... (1943, p.107)

The line “with a hey, and a ho, and a hey-nonny-no” in the source text is translated as “ikisi bir ağızdan bir hey hey tutturarak” by omitting the part of “a ho, and a hey-nonny-no”, which is another non-sensical refrain in the play. It is replaced with “hey hey” (which is a loud cry in Turkish as well) and it is an example of limited universalization in this

regard. In the following lines, another non-sensical refrain “hey ding-a-ding ding” is also omitted, and “şakrak cıvıltı” (chirping of birds) is created to replace the omitted part. To put it another way, deletion, limited universalization, and autonomous creation are adopted as part of the substitution strategy. As encountered in the previous song translation in the play, the use of substitution strategy has caused domesticating effects on the target text.

#### 2.4. Idioms, Sayings, and Expression

Table 8.

Idioms, Saying and Expression I	
ST	TT
Marry	Meryem hakkı için
Let me go, I say	Çek elini diyorum
God be with my old master	Allah benim eski efendime rahmet etsin
Good morrow	Sabahlar hayır olsun
God keep your worship	Efendimizi Allaha emanet ederim
I hope I shall see an end of him	İnşallah defterinin dürüldüğünü göreceğim
Sweet my coz	Benim şeker kardeşim
Prithee	Kuzum
Man may grow wiser every day	Bir yaşına daha girdim
For in it I have nothing	Çünkü dünyada dikili taşım yok
Fare you well	Allaha ısmarladık
Pray heaven	İnşallah
Your heart's desires be with you	Allah gönlüne göre versin
Hercules be thy speed	Herkül yardımcın olsun
Not one to throw at a dog (1993, p.97-123)	Köpeğe bile atacak sözüm yok (1943, p.3-26)

The table above displays the idioms, sayings, and expressions taken from the first act of the play. For “Marry”, the translators use the expression “Meryem hakkı için”, which is an example of autonomous creation. Similarly, “let me go, I say” is translated by adding an element from the target culture and illustrates autonomous creation. The next example, “God be with my old master” and its translation is another autonomous creation. “Good morrow” is transferred into Turkish as “sabahlar hayır olsun” and it is an example of limited universalization as there is source culture reference but it is also closer to the target culture. In a similar vein, “God keep your worship” is translated as “Efendimizi Allah’a emanet ederim”, which contains references to both source and target culture and it is an example of limited universalization. The next culture-specific item is an example of absolute universalization. “I hope I shall see an end of him” is replaced with a cultural equivalent which gives a similar meaning with different words. The next item “sweet my coz” is translated as “benim şeker kardeşim” (literally “my sweet sister”) and the “coz” (short for cousin) is omitted and replaced with “sister” in the target text. Another item “Prithee”, which is an archaic way of saying “please” is replaced with “kuzum”, which is also used to attract attention or to beg something from someone and it is an example of limited universalization. Another example of absolute universalization can be found in the translation of “Man may grow wiser every day”. The core meaning of this saying is provided with a different saying in Turkish which expresses the surprise when someone finds out about a new situation. The next three items are also examples of absolute universalization. “For in it I have nothing”, “Fare you well”, and “Pray heaven” are replaced with their neutral equivalents in the target language. The next item on the list is “Your heart’s desires be with you”, which is an example of limited universalization since the translators adopt an equivalent that is closer to the target culture along with the source culture effect. Another example of limited universalization can be seen in the next item’s translation, “Hercules be thy speed” as “Herkül yardımcın olsun”. The original sentence is conveyed in Turkish with a restricted change. The last item on the list is “Not one to throw at a dog”, which is translated into Turkish literally as “Köpeğe bile atacak sözüm yok” and it is an example of the linguistic (non-cultural) sub-category of conservation. Of all items considered, among the fifteen selected culture-specific items under the title of idioms, saying, and expressions, only one of them belongs to the major category of conservation. For the rest of the items, the translators have adopted the substitution strategy, which creates a domesticating effect on the target text.



Table 9.

Idioms, Sayings and Expressions II	
ST	TT
I think you have no money in your purse	Zannedersem kesende on para yok
Holla, you clown!	Hey, bizim köylü!
Good even to you, friend	Akşamlar hayrolsun dostum
As dry as the remainder biscuit	Nevale artığı peksimet parçası gibi kup kuru
Be blessed for your good comfort!	Allah sizden razı olsun!
God make incision in thee, thou art raw	Allah kafanı hacamat etmiş, çatlak kalmışsın
Wherever sorrow is, relief would be	Derd olan yerde deva da olur
I will be more jealous of thee than a Barbary cock-pigeon over his hen	Seni, hint horozunun tavuğunu kıskandığından fazla kıskanacağım
My affection hath an unknown bottom, like the Bay of the Portugal	Sevdamın dibi Portekiz körfezininki gibi meçhuldür
I am but a guiltless messenger	Elçiye zeval yoktur
Why, she defies me, like a Turk to Christian	Hristiyana meydan okuyan bir müslüman gibi bana meydan okuyor
Such Ethiop words	Kara zenci kelimeler
I have a pretty wit (1993, p.97-228)	Akıldan nasibim var (1943, p. 27-151)

The idioms, sayings, and expressions in the table above are taken from the acts between two and five in the play. The first item, “I think you have no money in your purse” is an example of limited universalization as it is close to the source text with little change. The second item is a type of addressing someone and it is a great example of absolute universalization. The word “clown” in the source text is replaced with “köylü” (villager) in the target text. The next item “Good even to you, friend” is another example of limited universalization. The next cultural expression, “as dry as the remainder biscuit” illustrates the sub-category of absolute universalization as the word “biscuit” is replaced with “peksimet” in the target language. The translation of the next item, “Be blessed for your good comfort” shows the use of the naturalization strategy because the translated expression involves a large extent of manipulation and it gives the impression that the item is part of the target culture. In the next item, “God make incision in thee, thou art raw”, the word “hacamat” (cupping) is used, and “thou art raw” is replaced with “çatlak kalmışsın” (you have become crazy), both of which are illustrations of naturalization. The translation of the next item, “Wherever sorrow is, relief would be” is another example of limited universalization as its literal meaning is close to the source text. In the next item, “the Barbary cock-pigeon”, a kind of pigeon with a northern African origin, is replaced with “hint horozu” (Indian cock), and in this regard, it is an example of limited universalization. The next culture-specific item demonstrates an example of a linguistic (non-cultural) translation strategy as there is a close reference to the source text. For instance, “like the Bay of the Portugal” is translated literally as “Portekiz körfezininki gibi”. The next item “I am but a guiltless messenger” is replaced with a Turkish proverb containing a similar meaning, and it is another example of limited universalization. The last three items are also illustrative of the limited universalization strategy. In the first one, the word “Turk” is replaced with “müslüman” (Muslim) since in the 16th century, the image of Turk was almost always associated with Islam. In the second example, “Ethiop” is replaced with “kara zenci” (black person) since the word was associated with “black African” in Shakespeare’s time. Finally, “I have a pretty wit” is translated with a close reference to the source text as “akıldan nasibim var” (I have my share of wit). When all the culture-specific items and their translations are considered under table 9, it becomes evident that the translators mostly use a substitution strategy which involves a domesticating effect on the target text. The only conservation strategy used in this chart is linguistic translation, which preserves the foreign effect of the source text.

## 2.5. Religious Life and Myths

The first culture-specific item “As the destinies decrees” is translated as “kaderin hükmüyle” (with the decree of destiny) and a footnote is provided to explain the mythological reference of three fates, namely Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos. Therefore, this can be regarded as an example of extratextual gloss. The next item “holiday” is replaced with “bayram günleri” (festival days) and it is a representation of absolute universalization as the original cultural reference

Table 10.

Religious Life and Myths	
ST	TT
As the destinies decrees	Kaderin hükmüyle
Holiday	Bayram günleri
Juno's swans	Juno'nun kuğuları
O, Jupiter!	Ey Jüpiter!
O, Phebe, Phebe, Phebe!	Ah, Phebe, Phebe, Phebe!
Judas	Yahuda
Cupid (1993, p.97-228)	Cupid (1943, p.3-151)

changes completely. "Juno's swans" is another mythological reference and its translation is an example of linguistic translation. Furthermore, a footnote is added to explain the myth. The next item, "O, Jupiter" is translated as "Ey Jüpiter" and it is an example of orthographic adaptation as there is a slight change in the target text. An example of repetition strategy can be found in the translation of "O, Phebe, Phebe, Phebe". Another example of orthographic adaptation is the translation of "Judas" as "Yahuda". Finally, the word "Cupid" is retained as it is in the source text and it is an example of a repetition strategy. To summarize, when it comes to the translation of myths, conservation strategies such as repetition, orthographic adaptation, linguistic translation, and extratextual gloss are frequently adopted. This also means that in the translation of myths, the foreignizing effect of the source text is preserved.

### 3. Conclusion and Discussion

Randomly selected culture-specific items from *As You Like It* have been investigated under five different titles in the previous section. This part of the study will present an overall evaluation and a discussion of the results based on the micro and macro strategies used in the translations.

A total of 64 culture-specific items have been obtained from *As You Like It*. The obtained items have been investigated based on Aixela's micro strategies and Venuti's foreignization and domestication categories. The following table below shows the number of strategies used in the selected items of the play and which category they belong to.

Table 11.

Strategies and Number of Instances		
Macro-strategies	Micro-strategies	Number of instances
Foreignization	Repetition	12
	Orthographic adaptation	8
	Linguistic translation	2
	Extratextual gloss	1
	Intratextual gloss	-
	Autonomous creation	-
	<b>Total number of instances</b>	<b>24</b>
Domestication	Synonymy	-
	Limited Universalization	15
	Absolute Universalization	9
	Naturalization	5
	Deletion	4
	Autonomous creation	7
	<b>Total number of instances</b>	<b>40</b>

In light of the results above, it can be suggested that although both strategies have been adopted during the translation process to a certain degree, the frequency of the domesticating strategies has outnumbered the frequency of the foreignizing strategy. The most common micro-strategy under the title of foreignization is repetition with 12 occurrences

while the least common ones are intratextual gloss and autonomous creation. On the other hand, the most common micro-strategy under the title of domestication is limited universalization with 15 occurrences while the least one is synonymy.

As far as the foreignization macro-strategy is concerned, the repetition sub-category seems more dominant than the others. The reason for its frequency lies in the fact that there are a great number of proper names in the play and their originality is preferred to be preserved. The second most frequently used micro-strategy in this part is orthographic adaptation and its frequency is connected to the fact that loan words of English/Western origin in Turkish make this kind of translation more convenient.

Based on the micro-strategies under the title of domestication, limited and absolute universalization appear to be the most dominant strategies used in the translation process. The reason behind this choice lies in the fact that the translators tend to hinder the alienating effect of the source text for the sake of appealing to the target audience. Considering the 45-page-long paratexts at the beginning of Adivar and Turhan's version to facilitate the readability of a Shakespearean play, the educative purpose of the translation becomes evident. When both macro-categories are taken into account, it can be suggested that the use of domesticating strategies has outnumbered the use of foreignizing strategies. This finding indicates that as macro-strategies of domestication are predominantly employed in the translation of *As You Like It*, the translators become invisible, which has created a faulty image of authorship. By employing the domesticating strategies predominantly, the foreignness of the text has been disrupted. In other words, the authenticity of the source text and its foreign features have been mostly eliminated in light of Venuti's arguments presented at the beginning. Although employing domesticating strategies renders easy readability, this type of translation fails to fully appreciate the cultural differences between the source and target text. Furthermore, the translators' invisibility throughout the translation process has caused a faulty reproduction of the original text. In order for translators to become more visible, respect, and appreciate cultural differences, foreignizing strategies can be encouraged in relation to contexts where they will be able to display their interpretative skills.

---

**Hakem Değerlendirmesi:** Dış bağımsız.

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Yazar çıkar çatışması beyan etmemiştir.

**Finansal Destek:** Yazar finansal destek beyan etmemiştir.

**Peer Review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** Author declared no conflict of interest.

**Financial Disclosure:** Author declared no financial support.

---

#### ORCID IDs of the authors / Yazarların ORCID ID'leri

Ercan Gürova 0000-0001-5446-9013

#### REFERENCES / KAYNAKLAR

- Aixela, Javier Franco. (1996). 'Culture-Specific Items In Translation.' In R. Ivarez & M. C. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*, 52-57. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Araboğlu, Aslı. (2019). 'Halide Edip'in "Hamlet": İngiliz Edebiyatı Semineri Mesaisinden Shakespeare Külliyyati.' *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*. 18 (3): 990-1003.
- Bassnett, Susan. (1980). *Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Emmerich, Karen R. (2013). 'Visibility (and Invisibility).' In (Eds. Gambier, Y. and Van Doorslaer, L.) *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Volume 4. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gürçağlar, Tahir. (2018). *Kapılar: Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar*. İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık.
- Katan, David. (2013). 'Translation as Intercultural Communication.' In (Eds. Gambier, Y. and Van Doorslaer, L.) *Handbook of Translation Studies Volume 4*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Leppihalme, Ritva. (1997). *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mailhac, Jean Pierre. (1996). 'Evaluating Criteria for the Translation of Cultural References.' In Geoffrey Harris (Ed.) *On Translating French Literature and Film*, 173-188. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Newmark, Peter. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nord, Christiane. (1997). *Translation as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Shakespeare, William. (1993). *As You Like It*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shakespeare, William. (1943). *Nasıl Hoşunuza Giderse*. Trans. Adivar, Halide Edip & Vahit Turhan. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.

Venuti, Lawrence. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London & New York: Routledge.

Vural Özbey, Kübra. (2022). 'The Representation of Communitas in the Forest of Arden: Shakespeare's *As You Like It*.' *IDEAS: Journal of English Literary Studies*, (1), 1-14.

### **How cite this article / Atıf biçimi**

Gürova, E. (2023). An analysis of culture-specific items in the Turkish translation of Shakespeare's *As You Like It* by Halide Edip Adivar and Vahit Turhan. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Dergisi - Istanbul University Journal of Translation Studies*, 19, 164–175. <https://doi.org/10.26650/iujts.2023.1320638>