

# Quality Assessment for The Translations of Museum Texts: A Case Study of The Archaeology and Ethnography Museum of Edirne

DR. ÖĞR. ÜYESİ HARİKA KARAVİN YÜCE\*

## Abstract

Museums have significant roles in promoting and presenting cultural heritage and cultural values in various ways. An intrinsic part of intercultural communication in museums, bilingual museum texts (e.g. labels, brochures, explanatory texts, etc.) have become an important field to be investigated within the framework of Translation Studies. In order to increase the functionality of museum translations, this study aims to provide a quality assessment of English translations of texts in the Archeology and Ethnography Museum of Edirne. Even though English translations of different text types such as labels, brochures, and explanatory texts are available in the museum, this study specifically focuses on the translation of explanatory texts presenting the ethnographic identity and archeological findings of the city. For this purpose, twenty-three texts displayed on information boards have been selected, and their translations have been analyzed according to the translation quality assessment model of *Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MMQ)*. As a result of a detailed qualitative and quantitative analysis of the selected texts, the type, distribution, and frequency of translation errors encountered in the selected corpus have been described according to eight dimensions of the metrics. Based on this text-based and linguistically-oriented methodology, the functionality of the translated museum texts has been evaluated. It has been concluded that this metrics can be used as a methodological tool to analyze the functionality of museum translations.

**Keywords:** museum translation, museum texts, functionality, translation quality assessment, Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM).

## EDİRNE ARKEOLOJİ VE ETNOGRAFYA MÜZESİ ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME: MÜZE METİNLERİ ÇEVİRİLERİNİN KALİTE DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

### Öz

Müzeler, kültürel mirasın ve kültürel değerlerin çeşitli şekillerde tanıtılması ve sunulmasında önemli rollere sahiptir. Müzelerdeki kültürlerarası iletişimin ayrılmaz bir parçası olan iki dilli müze metinleri (örneğin etiketler, broşürler, açıklayıcı metinler vb.) Çeviribilim çerçevesinde incelenmesi gereken önemli bir alan haline gelmiştir. Bu çalışma, müze metinleri çevirilerinin işlevselliğini artırmak amacıyla, Edirne Arkeoloji ve Etnografya Müzesi'ndeki

\* Trakya University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Translation and Interpretation, harika.karavin@trakya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-5113-4808.

metinlerin İngilizce çevirileri için kalite değerlendirmesi yapmayı amaçlamaktadır. Müzede etiket, broşür ve açıklama metinleri gibi farklı metin türlerinin İngilizce çevirileri mevcut olsa da bu çalışma özellikle kentin etnografik kimliğini ve arkeolojik bulgularını tanıtan açıklama metinlerinin çevirisine odaklanmaktadır. Bu amaçla, bilgi panolarında sergilenen yirmi üç metin seçilmiş ve bu metinlerin çevirileri *MMQ (Multidimensional Quality Metrics)* çeviri kalite değerlendirme modeline göre incelenmiştir. Seçilen metinler üzerinde yapılan detaylı nitel ve nicel incelemeler sonucunda, seçilen bütüncedeki çeviri hatalarının türü, dağılımı ve sıklığı, metriğin sekiz boyutuna göre tanımlanmıştır. Metin temelli ve dilbilimsel odaklı bu metodolojiye dayanarak, çeviri müze metinlerinin işlevselliği değerlendirilmiştir. Bu metriğin müze çevirilerinin işlevselliğinin incelenmesinde yöntemsel bir araç olarak kullanılabileceği sonucuna varılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** müze çevirisi, müze metinleri, işlevsellik, çeviri kalite değerlendirmesi, MQM.

## INTRODUCTION

**M**useums have long been considered valuable spaces for consolidating cultural identity and cultural heritage of specific cultures. According to the most general definition provided by the International Council of Museums (ICOM), a museum is “a not-for-profit, permanent institution in the service of society that researches, collects, conserves, interprets and exhibits tangible, and intangible heritage, [...], offering varied experiences for education, enjoyment, reflection and knowledge sharing”<sup>†</sup>. As is clear, they are meant to fulfill important social roles in promoting mutual understanding between different cultures, “constructing spaces or slots of meaning inside which other cultures can be made intelligible to the museum visitor”, and they generally provide verbal information that answers the visitor’s questions (Sturge, 2007, p. 129). Within the scope of their social functions, museums create meanings, produce and transfer knowledge, and help the visitors to gain awareness of themselves and the society (Janes, 2007, p. 135).

Museums are also considered an important cultural institution that boosts the economy. In other words, museums are expected to generate income and contribute to local or national economic development (Rentschler, 2004, p. 140). In this context, the role and function of museums have undergone some changes, giving much more importance to the production of written texts (guides, brochures, labels, etc.) to present narratives for the object they represent. They start to produce hybrid genres and multimodal texts, whose translation can be seen “as a transfer of meaning either at the level of text-genre production or at the level of museums’ social and cultural function in society” (Ravelli, 2007, p. 152). For these reasons, translation has become an intrinsic part of the communication process in museums. Especially with the increase of traveling around the world, museums of different types have been visited by a large number of people, causing some challenges for cross-cultural communication in museums. As museums communicate by

<sup>†</sup> See <https://icom.museum/en/resources/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/>

creating texts of different types, translation of museum texts has become a crucial tool to fulfill this cross-cultural function.

The increasing interaction between museum studies and translation activities has led to the development of the notion of “museum translation”. As the studies have shown, the notion of “museum translation” is a broad term that encompasses various definitions. It generally refers to the interlingual translation of texts (e.g. labels, brochures, wall texts, etc.) in museum exhibitions. On the other hand, “museum translation” is defined “as a process of selecting, relocating, exhibiting, and interpreting museumized objects that represent source cultures” (Sturge, 2007, p. 153). Another comprehensive definition is provided by Louise J. Ravelli, who claims that museum translation involves the translation of “the language produced by the institution [museum], in written or spoken form, for the consumption of visitors, which contributes to interpretative practices within the institution” (Ravelli, 2007, p. 1). Though translation has important functions in the representation of meaning in museums, the study of museum translations is still limited in content and quantity. In other words, the studies on museum translation are still an under-researched area although most of the museums around the world provide bilingual representations of different cultures.

## 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

When the current studies on museum translation are examined, it is seen that they are mainly divided into two categories. While the studies belonging to the first category focus on “museums as texts” from the perspective of “cultural translation”, those in the second category analyze the translation of texts exhibited in museums. Approaching museums as text-like is a tendency that has gained significance in museum studies over the past few decades (Hooper-Greenhill, 2000; Pecci, 2009). In such studies, the museum representation of cultures is described in terms of meaning-making about cultures with a particular ideological perspective through the presence or absence of particular objects, which is “written” and “read” by specific interpretive communities (Hooper-Greenhill, 2000, p. 3). Against this background, in her book titled *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography and the Museum*, Kate Sturge treats ethnographic museums as “cultural translation” by virtue of their role in representing other cultures through the medium of objects and museum texts as a genre of ethnographic representation. The story of these objects in the museum is retold in the language of the display in different times and contexts (2007, p. 131-132). In this representation, museums are expected to represent the realities of the cultures in a fixed and intelligible form for the benefit of the general reader (Sturge, 2014, p. 431). Her arguments add “an important dimension to our understanding of translation as a practice of representing other people’s words, lives and beliefs” (Sturge, 2007, p. 3). Similarly, in her book titled *Museum Texts: Communication Frameworks*, Louise Ravelli considers museums “as a kind of ‘text’: a space which makes meanings and which can be ‘read’”. In her discussions, “museums as texts” can mean how the whole institution makes meaning (e.g. through the design of the building or policies), or can refer to how one display can trigger specific forms of interaction (2006, p. 119-121). In another study, based on the idea of museums as translations of memory, Robert Neather explores how the

memories of particular communities can be translated in the design and conceptualization of museums. In this study, he questions the way in which the memories of specific communities can be translated in the design and conceptualizations of displays (2002, p. 157). All of these above-mentioned studies have important implications for the study of museums and museum texts, which will require to consider the role played by power and ideology in museum communication.

There are also some studies focusing on the translation of “texts in museums” from the perspective of linguistic and functional approaches, most of which problematize the quality of museum translations. Complaints about the quality of translation in museums have led the researchers to direct their attention toward quality assessments of the translation of museum texts. As one of the pioneers in this area, Chengzhi Jiang develops “a systemic functional model for the quality assessment” for the translation of museum texts, in which he connects the physical level of the museum (e.g. building, pathways) and Halliday’s functional grammar (1994), and claims that “the judgment of the translation quality requires empirical analyses based upon both interlingual and intertextual comparison” (2010, p. 124). This model provides an applicable analytical methodology for the detailed and systemic description of language patterns and functions. In another study titled “Quality in Translation: Planning and Assessing Museum Texts”, Silvia Pireddu (2022) discusses aspects of translation quality (TS) in museum communication, and offers a quality checklist that adopts a holistic approach to the texts in museums, which can provide some significant points to be monitored in the quality analyses of museum texts. In a corpus-based analysis, Leiva Rojo (2018) analyzes texts from 77 museums in terms of their phraseological units, and explains the significance of phraseological quality for the overall quality of translations of museum texts. In other words, he claims that translation quality analysis of the museum texts needs to focus on the analysis of phraseology, which involves the analysis of phrases on various levels such as grammar, orthography, punctuation, style, and register. These translation quality-oriented studies are significant in terms of providing a theoretical framework and methodological tools to analyze the translation of museum texts.

Even though the mentioned studies are quite limited in content and quantity throughout the world, it is good to see that the number of similar studies is increasing in Türkiye. For instance, as one of the first attempts in this field, the book titled *Turizm Metinlerinin Çevirisi: İstanbul Örneği* (Yazıcı (Ed.), 2018), which covers the studies carried out by some of the lecturers, research assistants and students from İstanbul University, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies, provides a detailed analysis of the translation of introductory texts in some of the famous touristic destinations (Hagia Sofia Museum, İstanbul Archeological Museums, etc.) around İstanbul University. With these studies, it is aimed to increase the functionality of the translations in these touristic areas, focusing on issues such as the functionality of translated texts, their acceptability in the target culture, the significance of terminology transfer, and the quality of the target texts. In this context, the quality of the translated texts is evaluated according to Juliane House’s “Translation Quality Assessment Model” (1997) and some suggestions are provided in order to improve the quality of the target texts in this specific area. A recent study titled *Turizm Metinleri Çevirisi: Türkiye Örneği* (Yazıcı & Güner (Ed.), 2023) also includes an interesting study in

which translations in the Complex of Sultan Bayezid II Health Museum are examined with an artificial software called *text analyzer* in order to analyze the effect of terminological density on the “readability” of translations (Korkmaz, 2023, p. 57). The density of the terminology in these texts is measured with the formula put forth by Olena Skibitska (2015) in her study titled “The Language of Tourism: Translating Tourist Texts”.

As is seen, the area of museum translation is getting more interest from the researchers both in Turkey and around the world. Especially in recent years, the application of translation quality assessment models to the analysis of translation of museum texts has increased. The motives behind this increased concern for quality may result mostly from the significant functions of museums aiming to serve for the society and ensure visitor satisfaction. For these purposes, in order for the museums to fulfill their functions, the quality of translated texts is of great importance. Although several important studies examining the quality of translation of museum texts have been published in recent years, corpora-based studies on this area are still limited. For this reason, more empirical studies that focus on the quality of museum translations are needed.

## 2. AIM AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Being aware of the research gaps in this specific area of museum translation, this study aims to provide a quality assessment for the translations of museum texts by means of a translation quality assessment model. For this purpose, this study presents a case study of the quality assessment of English translations of texts in the Archeology and Ethnography Museum of Edirne. Even though there are English translations of different text types such as labels, brochures, and explanatory texts in the museum, this study specifically focuses on the translation of explanatory texts. On the other hand, though the “quality assessment” normally needs to involve non-verbal semiotic systems and other different aspects in museum studies, the present research only addresses the issue of translation quality of “texts in museums”, focusing mostly on bilingual writing and bilingual representations. To this end, twenty-three texts displayed on information boards are selected and their translations are examined according to the translation quality assessment model of *Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MMQ)* (Lommel, Burchardt, Uszkoreit, 2015). Using this metrics in the analysis, it is aimed to show not only the types, but also the distribution and frequency of translation errors in the selected corpus. In other words, this study also aims to question the efficiency and usability of this model in identifying translation errors, and hence in quality evaluation of museum translations.

*The Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM)* was developed in the European Union and funded by QT Launchpad project for developing translation quality assessment metrics. MQM “provides a framework for describing and defining quality metrics which is used to assess the quality of translated texts and to identify specific issues in those texts” (Lommel, Burchardt, Uszkoreit, 2015). MQM is generally used for the translation quality assessment of all kinds of texts. MQM draws upon more than one hundred issue types, which are grouped into eight major dimensions: accuracy, fluency, terminology, locale convention, style, verity, design, and internationalization. *Accuracy* includes mistranslation, omissions, and additions; *fluency* covers

such issues as grammar, typography, spelling, cohesion, and coherence of texts; *design* is related to the overall presentation and formatting of the texts; *internationalization* includes areas related to the preparation of the source content for subsequent translation or localization. *Terminology* covers issues related to the true usage of specific terms in specialized areas. *Locale convention* is related to the formal compliance of the content with the local conventions, such as the use of proper number formats. *Style* covers areas related to register and specific style guides<sup>‡</sup>.

As *MQM* adopts a “functionalist” approach, it is considered an appropriate tool to test whether or to what extent the target text meets its communicative purpose, the requirements and expectations of the commissioner, and/or target audience (ibid.). Considering the variety of issue types regarding translation errors and its functional approach, this metrics was selected in order to assess the quality of the translations in the Archeology and Ethnography Museum of Edirne. This metric can also be used to construct a customized translation quality assessment metrics by selecting relevant issue types, depending on the text-type, the purpose of translation, and the translation quality assessment (Melby, Fields, Hously, 2014, p. 289). On the other hand, since translation quality assessments need to provide objective evaluations, this metrics may help to develop more objective approaches by providing over a hundred issue types, enabling to focus on the practice of translation quality evaluation in the professional sphere where translation quality is ever topical and contentious (O’Brien, 2012, p. 55).

In line with the above-mentioned goals and methodology of the study, the present study adopts Ravelli’s perspective for the analysis of meaning-making mechanisms in museum communication. With the aim of explaining the meaning-making mechanisms in museums, Ravelli uses interconnecting frameworks derived from Michael Halliday’s social-semiotic approach to language (2006, p. 150-151). She claims that “texts in museums” gain meaning through a combination of various semiotic systems, including language and exhibitionary context. In other words, language and other semiotic systems work together to make meanings within museum contexts. For this reason, it is important to understand how various semiotic systems (language, layout, etc.) work together to create “one” text (ibid.). According to Ravelli, this effect is created through intersemiosis, which is defined as the coordination of semiosis across different sign systems (2000, p. 508). Based on this perspective, Ravelli explains that meaning-making mechanism in museum context is realized on two levels: “first-order meanings” and “second-order meanings” (2006, p. 152). The first-order meanings are made through the systems of language and “design” elements such as pathways, framing, lighting, and special layout. The first-order meanings of language are explained in three subcategories: organizational meanings, interactional meanings, and representative meanings. Organizational meanings are realized through a selection of (grammatical) themes, generic structure, and details of language complexity. Interactional meanings are realized through speech function, type of voice, mood, and modality. Representational meanings are realized through the selection and interrelation of process type, participant role and circumstances (Ravelli, 2006, p. 152). As is clear, Ravelli’s frameworks enable us to focus on various factors in order to understand the meaning-making mechanisms in museum

---

<sup>‡</sup> <https://web.archive.org/web/20211216145215/https://www.qt21.eu/mqm-definition/issues-list-2015-12-30.html>

discourse, which also has an impact upon translation and translation analyses of museum texts. For this reason, adopting this theoretical framework and using a functional translation quality assessment model, this study aims to provide a methodological guide to improve the functionality of translation of museum texts.

### 3. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

With the aim of evaluating the quality of translations in the Archeology and Ethnography Museum of Edirne, all translations presented on information boards in the museum were collected and analyzed on different levels. The selected corpus consisted of explanatory texts that gave information on the ethnographic identity and archeological findings of the city. The findings of the analysis were presented in the tables with their frequencies so that translators and researchers could make inferences regarding the most frequent error categories observed in the translation of museum texts, which would increase the functionality of translations in museums. For the display of the errors, the study used the error categories of the *MQM* and provided some representative examples for the most frequent error types.

#### 3.1. Analysis of Translation Errors According to MQM

Based on the theoretical framework explained in Section 2 of the study, the following part aims to provide both a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the selected corpus. The findings of both the qualitative and quantitative analysis are given in tables below. While quantitative analysis presents data on the frequency of translation errors, the qualitative analysis gives information regarding the type of translation errors. In order to simplify the presentation of translation errors in the selected corpus, they are divided into three categories derived from the major dimensions of the *MQM*.

**Table 1:** Frequency of translation errors in the category of accuracy

Error types	Frequency (Instance)
Mistranslation (Ambiguous translation)	4
Mistranslation (Lexical choice)	1
Mistranslation (Semantic shift)	1
Omission	4
Addition	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

In line with *MQM*, accuracy issues refer to ambiguous translations, mistranslated words or phrases, semantic shifts, omissions and additions in content. In this study, as is seen in Table 1, translation errors observed in the category of accuracy result from mistranslation, omission and addition error types. Among 11 translation errors observed in the selected corpus, the most frequent ones belong to the mistranslation error type resulting from ambiguous translations, some of which are exemplified below.

**Example (1):**

ST: Farklı hazırlama ve pişirme metodu ile özel bir tadı, köpüğü, kokusu, pişirilişi, ikramıyla kendine has kimlik ve gelenek yaratan Türk kahvesi ise telvesi ile ikram edilen tek kahve türüdür. [Turkish coffee, which creates a unique identity and tradition with its special taste, foam, odour, cooking and serving with different preparation and cooking methods, is the only type of coffee served with its grounds.]

TT: With a special taste different preparation and cooking methods, its foam, aroma, and brewing, Turkish coffee is the only coffee that is served with a unique identity and tradition.

In this example, some information is provided regarding the unique characteristics of Turkish coffee, mentioning that it is the only coffee that is served with its coffee grounds. When the translation is examined, it is possible to observe mistranslation on two different levels. In the first part of the sentence, the expression “with a special taste different preparation and cooking methods” creates a semantic ambiguity resulting from a lack of punctuation (comma) after the word “taste”. On the other hand, while the source text relates the uniqueness of Turkish coffee to the coffee grounds with which it is served, the translation directs the emphasis towards another aspect and defines it as “the only coffee that is served with a unique identity and tradition”. Considering these two factors, it is possible to conclude that the English version involves translation errors in the category of accuracy.

#### Example 2:

ST: Hat yazısının ilk biçimi olan “kufi” yazısının yerini 9. yüzyıldan sonra aklam-ı sitte (altı çeşit yazı) almaya başladı. [The first form of calligraphy, "kufic", was replaced by aklam-ı sitte (six types of scripts) after the 9th century.]

TT: The first format of the calligraphy art, “kufic” letters were replaced by aklam-ı sitte (six types of article) after the 9<sup>th</sup> century.

Example 2 gives information about specific script styles of calligraphy used in Islamic cultures. In the ST, it is stated that the “kufic” script is replaced by another style of script that is called “aklam-ı-sitte”. Even though the source text presents the scripts with the following word “yazı”, the target text renders them as “kufic letters” and “aklam-ı sitte” (six types of article). The usage of the word “article” in the parenthetical explanation in the target text causes ambiguity in the translation, and gives harm to the informative function of the source text.

Apart from translation errors resulting from mistranslations, it is also possible to encounter translation errors resulting from omissions in the selected corpus. The omissions can lead to the under-representation of cultural knowledge and items in the case of museum translations.

#### Example (3):

ST: Saray mutfağında ve evlerde de çok miktarda tüketilen kahve önce çiğ kahve çekirdekleri tavalarda kavrulduktan sonra dibeklerde dövülerek cezvelerde pişirilmek suretiyle içiliyor ve en itibarlı dostlara büyük bir özenle ikram ediliyordu. [Coffee, which was consumed in large quantities in the palace kitchen and at home, was drunk by first roasting raw coffee beans in pans, then crushing them in mortars and cooking them in coffee pots, and was served with great care to the most prestigious friends.]

TT: First the raw coffee beans are roasted in a pan, then they are pounded and eventually cooked in traditional coffee pots, it was drunk together and was being served with great

care for the most respected friends.

It is seen that the underlined information in the source text is omitted in the translation, which leads to translation error in the category of accuracy. This error gives harm to the transfer of cultural information regarding the drinking habits of Turkish coffee.

**Example (4):**

ST: Doğu Roma döneminde Trakya'ya inen akınlara karşı onarılan kalenin burçlarından iki tanesinin üzerinde dönem kitabesi yer almaktadır. [Two of the bastions of the castle, which were repaired during the Eastern Roman period against the raids descending to Thrace, have period inscriptions on them.]

TT: During the reign of East Rome castle's were repaired against the influx to Thrace, and there are period inscriptions on the two of them.

This example is taken from an information board which gives detailed information regarding historical transformations that the city of Edirne has undergone since ancient times. As is mentioned on the board, the Edirne Castle was used during Roman, East Roman and Ottoman periods. This example mentions the inscriptions written on two bulwarks of the castle. However, this information becomes ambiguous in translation, resulting mainly from the omitted word (bastion or bulwark) in the target text.

**Example 5:**

ST: Edirne yöresindeki "Bison cf. Priscus" bulgusu bu iri türün ülkemizdeki ilk gerçek kayıdır. [The finding of "Bison cf. Priscus" in the Edirne region is the first real record of this species.]

TT: "Bison cf. Priscus" finding in Edirne region is the first record of these large speices.

As is seen in this example, the texts in the archaeology museums provide paleontological data on species that lived during paleontological periods. This example mentions a finding of Edirne region and claims that it is the first real record of a huge specimen. However, it is seen that the word "gerçek" (real) is omitted in the translation, which causes mistranslation by de-emphasizing the significance of the record. On the other hand, this example also involves a translation error resulting from the misspelled word "speices".

**Table 2:** Frequency of translation errors in the category of fluency

Error types	Frequency (Instance)
Grammar	23
Ambiguity	6
Spelling	10
Typography	24
Inconsistency	2
Capitalization	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>

The selected corpus also provides rich data on probable translation errors in the category of fluency. This category shows a surprisingly high number of translation errors compared to the category of accuracy. Among 73 translation errors identified in the category of fluency, the most

frequent ones belong to the translation errors caused by typography, which is followed by translation errors resulting from grammar mistakes. Apart from these problems, the selected corpus includes spelling, capitalization, ambiguity, and inconsistency error types, which need to be taken into account in the translation of museum texts. Even though the severity of these errors is not as significant as those of the category of accuracy with regard to re-creating the communicative effect of the source text, these errors have an impact on understanding and hence overall quality of the translated texts. The following examples show some of the frequent translation errors encountered in the category of fluency.

**Table 3:** Grammar Errors

Source Text	Target Text	Suggested Translation and Kind of Error
(1) Meyve sabunculuğu 19. yüzyıl Edirnesinde çok önemli bir meslek haline <u>gelmiştir</u> .	Soap making <u>has become</u> a very important profession in Edirne in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century.	Soap making <u>became</u> a very important profession in Edirne in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century. (Tense Shift)
(2) At cenaze taşındıktan sonra kurban edilerek, tümünün eteğine <u>bırakılmıştır</u> .	After the body of the deceased <u>was brought</u> by the grave the horse <u>has been</u> sacrificed and left by the foot of the tumulus.	After the body of the deceased <u>was brought</u> by the grave the horse <u>was</u> sacrificed and left by the foot of the tumulus. (Tense Agreement)
(3) Kültürel tabakalar [...] göstermektedir.	The cultural layers <u>shows</u> [...]	The cultural layers <u>show</u> [...] (Subject-Verb Agreement)
(4) Mastodonun ilk kaydı [...]	First record a mastodon [...]	First record <u>of</u> a mastodon [...] (Lack of preposition)

These examples show possible translation errors that can result due to grammar errors. As is seen, the reason for grammar errors in translation can occur because of various reasons, including tense shift and agreement, subject-verb agreement and lack of preposition. These kinds of errors result from breaching the target language system and affect the acceptability of the translations.

**Table 4:** Ambiguity errors

Source Text	Target Text	Suggested Translation
(1) Bugünkü Kaleiçi'nin etrafı surlarla çevrilerek [...]	Within today's Kaleiçi are by surrounding with walls [...]	Today's Kaleiçi is surrounded by walls [...]
(2) Avrasya'da ve Afrika'da geç miyosenden günümüze kadar sürekli bir yayılım sunan bir mastodon olan [...]	a mastodon which shows a continuous expands and Eurasia and Africa [...]	A mastodon with a continuous distribution in Eurasia and Africa from the late Miocene to the present day [...]

In these examples, ambiguity errors are observed, which result from breaching the target language system. For instance, while the source text in the first example simply mentions that the

walls of Kaleiçi are surrounded with walls, it is not clear what is surrounded in the target text. On the other hand, the second example defines a specific species that has lived in a specific region, the names of the countries in the target text are represented as independent elements from the defined subject, which creates ambiguity on semantic the level and negatively affects the readability of the target text.

Apart from grammar and ambiguity errors, a significant number of errors result from spelling and capitalization problems in the translations, some of which are exemplified in the following table.

**Table 5:** Typographical errors

Source Text	Target Text	Suggested Translation and Kind of Error
"tasarım"	"desing"	"design" (Spelling)
"onların"	"thair"	"their" (Spelling)
"Tunca nehri"	"Tubca river"	"Tunca river" (Spelling)
"tür"	"speices"	"species" (Spelling)
Edirnekari gündelik eşyalara uygulanır.	Edirnekari was applied on Daily objects.	Edirnekari was applied on daily objects. (Capitalization)
Çeşitli taşlar bulunur.	There are various Stones.	There are various stones. (Capitalization)

Finally, a high number of typographical errors have been identified in the analysis. In the context of MQM, these errors refer to the peculiarities including the incorrect usage of punctuation or lack of punctuation, which may also cause ambiguity on the semantic level in the target text.

**Table 6:** Punctuation errors

Source Text	Target Text	Suggested Translation and Kind of Error
(1) Bölgenin tarihsel geçmişine katkıda bulunan pek çok kazı açığa çıkarıldı.	Many remains were unearthed which greatly contributed to the region's historical past	Many remains were unearthed which greatly contributed to the region's historical past. (Lack of full-stop)
Daha sonra ölü, başı açıkta kalacak şekilde büyükçe bir kefene sarılarak [...]	Afterwards the deceased was shrouded with a large winding sheet leaving the head out.	Afterwards, the deceased was shrouded with a large winding sheet, leaving the head out. (Lack of comma)
Lak denilen bir tür vernikle parlatılır.	Polish it with loc a kind of polisher.	Polish it with loc, a kind of polisher. (Lack of comma)

As is shown in the examples, the translated museum texts may involve various error types that have an effect on the representation of content in terms of fluency. The error types in this

category can also be evaluated as “minor” based on the weighing system of the *MQM* model, according to which, minor issues include problems that do not seriously impact usability and understandability of the content (Lommel et al. 2015). Even though they are mostly considered “minor” problems in the quality assessment of translations, they may be more critical for the translations in museums where visual representations play a significant role in displaying cultural elements of different cultures through exhibitions. For this reason, it is also necessary to evaluate the translations in museums in terms of the category of design in the *MQM* model, which will have an impact on the functionality and overall quality of museum translations. This category involves errors that are related to the physical presentation of the text, including local formatting, and mark-up of the whole text. The types and frequency of errors in the category of design in the selected corpus are presented in Table 3 below.

**Table 7:** Frequency of translation errors in the category of design

Error types	Frequency (Instance)
Missing text	4
Local formatting: wrong font size	3
Mark-up: missing orthographic space	6
Mark-up: extra orthographic space	7
Overall design: margins	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>

The category of design comprises translation errors resulting from missing text, local formatting, mark-up, and overall design problems. Among 22 translation errors identified in this category, the most frequent ones belong to the error type of extra orthographic space, followed by the error type of missing orthographic space. These kinds of errors will create difficulty in the readability of translations and hence affect their functionality in a negative way. In other words, since visual representation of the content is a significant component of museum exhibitions for promoting cultural assets, they need to be taken into account in museum translations.

Apart from the error types explained in three categories above, the *MQM* metrics also enable the researchers to assess the quality of terminology translation in museum texts. As is known, these texts include not only culture specific terms, but also those terms belonging to various specialized areas such as archeology, ethnography, history, and art. For this reason, it is also significant to carry out terminology-oriented analysis of museum translations with the aim of improving functionality and understandability of the content. However, this study will not touch upon translation errors in the category of terminology.

## CONCLUSION

Departing from real-life problems observed in the field of museum translation, this study aimed to make a contribution to increasing the functionality of translated museum texts by providing a quality assessment of English translations of texts in the Archeology and Ethnography Museum of Edirne. Based on Ravelli’s frameworks to understand and analyze meaning-making mechanisms in museum discourse and benefiting from the metrics of the quality assessment

model of *Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM)*, this study wanted to describe not only the variety, but also the distribution and frequency of translation problems that could be encountered in museum translations. For this purpose, twenty-three explanatory texts presented on information boards were selected and examined with the aim of identifying translation problems. As a result of a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative analysis of the selected corpus in terms of different dimensions of the metrics, inferential conclusions regarding the quality of translations were drawn in order to provide a practical guideline for translators and researchers to increase the functionality of museum translations.

When the selected corpus was examined, it was seen that the translations involved errors in the categories of accuracy, fluency, design, and terminology. Due to the limit of scope and time, terminology-based errors were not included in this study. For the various error types enlisted under the category of accuracy, fluency and design, 106 incorrect instances of translation errors were identified. The type and frequency of these errors were also presented in the tables. Among 106 instances of translation errors in total, the most frequent errors were found in the category of fluency, which amounts to about 68.9% of all the errors identified in the corpus. It is followed by the errors in the category of design (about 20.8%) and accuracy (10.3%). The category of fluency included errors in the types of grammar, ambiguity, spelling, typography, inconsistency, and capitalization. Among 74 incorrect instances of translation errors identified, the most frequent errors were caused by the problems in typography, which amounts to 32.8% of all the errors identified in the same category. The category of design included errors in the types of missing text, mark-up, local-formatting, and overall design. Among 22 incorrect instances of translation errors identified, the most frequent errors were caused by the problem of using extra orthographic space in the texts, which is equal to 31.8% of all the errors identified in the same category. Finally, the category of accuracy included errors in the types of mistranslation, omission and addition. Among 11 incorrect instances of translation errors identified, the most frequent errors belonged to the error type of mistranslation, which amounts to 54.5% of all the errors identified in the same category. Even though some errors were also found in the category of terminology, they were not included in this study.

Based on the findings of the analysis, it is possible to conclude that the functionality of the translation of museum texts constitutes a very significant element of museum communication, which is also carried out by texts that have a social and anthropological impact. In this context, this study shows that the translation quality assessment model of *Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM)* can be used as a useful tool to improve the quality of museum translations as it provides a common vocabulary to describe and evaluate common errors to be observed in the translated texts. To put it differently, this study also underlines the importance of integrating such translation quality assessment metrics to the process of museum exhibition planning with the aim of increasing the communicative force of museums. On the other hand, this study aims to contribute to improving the quality assessment competences of lecturers at the departments of translation studies as well as professional translators and researchers working in the area of museum translation with the methodological guide it provides. This study can be extended with another

study that will focus on the functionality of the translation of terms in the Archeology and Ethnography Museum of Edirne.

## REFERENCES

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2000). *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. London: Routledge.
- House, J. (1997). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Janes, R. J. (2007). "Museums, Social Responsibility and the Future We Desire", In Simon J. Kneel, S. M. and Sheila W. (Ed.), *Museum Revolutions: How Museums Change and Rechanged*. London: Routledge.
- Korkmaz, İ. (2023). "Turizm Metinleri Çevirisinde Terim Yoğunluğunun Okunabilirlik Düzeyine Etkisi" [The Effect of Terminology Density in Touristic Text Translations on the Readability Level.], In Yazıcı, M. & Güner E. S. (Ed.) *Turizm Metinleri Çevirisi: Türkiye Örneği* [Tourism Translation in Theory: The Case of Türkiye]. Ankara: Grafiker.
- Leiva Rojo, J. (2018). "Phraseology as an Indicator for Translation Quality Assessment of Museum Texts: A Corpus-based Analysis". *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 5(1), 1442116, p. 1-16, <<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2018.1442116>>.
- Lommel, A., Uszkoreit H., Burchardt, A. (2014). "Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM): A Framework for Declaring and Describing Translation Quality Metrics". *Tradumatica* 12, p. 455-463.
- Lommel, A. et al. (2015). "Multidimensional Quality Metrics Issue Types". Retrieved from <<http://www.qt21.eu/mqm-definition/issues-list-2015-12-30.html>>, (20 December, 2023).
- Melby, A., Fields, P., Housley, P. (2014). "Assessment of Post-editing via Structured Translation Specifications", In O'Brien, S., Balling, L. W., Carl, M., Simard, M., & Specia, L. (Ed.), *Post-Editing of Machine Translation: Processes and Applications*, p. 274-298. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Neather, R. (2022). "Translation, Memory, and the Museum Visitor", In Deane-Cox, S. & Spiessens, A. (Ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Memory*, p. 155-169. London: Routledge.
- O'Brien, S. (2012). "Towards a Dynamic Quality Evaluation Model for Translation". *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 17(1), p. 55-77.
- Pireddu, S. (2022). "Quality in Translation: Planning and Assessing Museum Texts". *Status Quaestionis*, (23), <<https://doi.org/10.13133/2239-1983/18223>>.
- Ravelli, L. (2007). *Museum Texts: Communication Frameworks*. London: Routledge.
- Rentschler, R. (2004). "Museum Marketing: Understanding Different Types of Audiences", In Kerrigan, F., Fraser, P., & Ozbilgin, M. (Ed.), *Arts Marketing*, p. 139-158. Amsterdam & Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Skibitska, O. (2015). "The Language of Tourism: Translating Tourist Texts". *Translation Journal (Online)*, Retrieved from: <<https://translationjournal.net/October-2015/the-language-of-tourism-translating-terms-in-tourist-texts.html>>, (20 December, 2023).

- Sturge, K. (2007). *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography, and the Museum*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Sturge, K. (2014). "The Other on Display: Translation in the Ethnographic Museum", In Hermans, T. (Ed.), *Translating Others* (Vol.2). London: Routledge, p. 431-440.
- Yazıcı, M. (Ed.) (2018). *Turizm Metinlerinin Çevirisi: İstanbul Örneği* [Translation of Tourism Texts: The Case of İstanbul]. İstanbul: The Faculty of Letters Publishing.
- Yazıcı M., Güner E.S. (Ed.) (2023). *Kuramsal Olarak Turizm Çevirisi: Türkiye Örneği* [Tourism Translation in Theory: The Case of Türkiye]. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.

OKTAY YİVLİ

**Kırk Yama**

AŞK, EDEBİYAT ve ÖTEKİ ŞEYLER




Günce Yayınları

(İnanışlar ve Gelenekler Bağlamında)

**TÜRK ve SLAV  
KÜLTÜRLERİNDE  
RENK SEMBOLİZMİ**

DR. HAKAN SARAÇ




Günce Yayınları

Dr. Zuhalemirosmanoğlu

**Fenomenolojik Bir 'Çeviri İş'i':  
Bachelard-Düşünceleri**


Günce Yayınları

Mahmut Babacan

Üniversiteler İçin

**Türk Dili  
Kompozisyon  
Bilgileri**


Günce Yayınları

**8.**

BASKIM