

ÇEVİRİ YÖNTEMLERİ

Abdülkadir ÇAKIR*

ÖZET

Bu makale çok uzun süredir tartışılan gelen bir çeviri sorununu yani çeviri yöntemlerini, onların değişik metinlere uygulanışını ve büyük çapta çevirinin kalitesini belirleyen uygun çeviri yönteminin seçimini etkileyen etmenleri ele almaktadır. Kuşku yok ki kaynak metin yazarının amacı, kaynak metin ve kendi okuyucusu hakkında bilgiyle donanmış bir çevirmen işini daha iyi yapabilecek bir konumdadır. Çevirmen kaynak metnin içeriğini, üslubunu, dilbilimsel ve kültürel özelliklerini ayrıntılı bir biçimde inceleyerek onların amaç dildeki karşılıklarını bulmaya çalışmalıdır. Kaynak metin yazarının okuyucusu üzerinde yarattığı etkiyi bir çevirmenin kendi okuyucusu üzerinde yaratabilmesi belirtilen etmenleri göz önünde bulundurmasıyla mümkün olabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karşılık, sade insanlar, okuyucu, öncelik, kelime kelime çeviri, eş etki.

ABSTRACT

This article deals with a long discussed issue, translation methods, their application to different types of texts and the factors that affect the choice of the appropriate translation method which is of extremely importance as it determines the quality of translation to a large extent. A translator who is furnished with the necessary information about the writer's intention, the source text and the readership will be in a better position to do his job properly. A translator should start to do his task analyzing the source text he is going to translate considering all linguistic and cultural aspects along with the content, style and their equivalents in the target language. The effect created on the readers of the original text by the writer can be created on the reader of the translation by the translator if he takes the above mentioned factors into account.

Keywords: Literal, equivalent, versus, laymen, readership, effect, priority

1. Introduction

Source language and target language, the foreign culture and native culture, the writer and the translator with the readership are the main factors to determine the appropriate translation method. Some writers overestimate one of these factors while some underestimate it. A translator needs to analyze the source text to choose the right method. Thus, he has to study the intention of the text, the readership of the target text and his own objective. Taking all of these factors into account, the translator must determine the one he will put the emphasis on and decide the method on the ground of his priorities. Different methods can be applied for the same text in terms of the primacy he will put on. For example, when translating a text written for children, a different method will be applied from the one for the intellectuals or laymen.

Literal versus free translation has been discussed for ages. The translators who have been more faithful to the content, the message and the spirit than the form have favoured literal translation while others have favoured free and natural translation. This conflict lasted up to the 19th century depending on the

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi

inclination being in favour of the author or the reader. At the beginning of the 19th century the view of intranslatability became popular with the influence of the behaviorists who maintained that language was entirely a product of culture. However, since the rise of the modern linguistics, the primacy has changed on the reader. The equivalent effect or equivalent response principle which Nida and Taber (1982) call dynamic equivalence, has gained dominance over formal elements. Yet, that doesn't mean that the conflict between literal versus free translation is over.

We have got many different classifications of translation types. As we have already mentioned above, one of the oldest type is 'literal' versus 'free' and the other is 'literary' versus 'non-literary'. Literalists argue that form and content are inseparable but the advocates of free translation claim that the same message can be expressed in a completely different form. The partisans of these two views do not deny the qualities reflected by linguistic elements of the source text which require a particular strategy of approach. However, they apply opposing methods in practice. We often see discussions of literal versus free in connection with literary versus non-literary discussion. Nevertheless, there is a crucial difference between these two classifications. The former denotes the strategy but the latter denotes what is being translated. Another division is the one that depends on the function of the text. According to this division, texts are intended to be 'informative', 'expressive' or 'operative'. The translation of these texts differ from each other as they carry out different functions. Another division made by House (1981) depending on the function considers the relation of the target text both to the translator and to the translation receiver. It is called 'overt' versus 'covert' translation. In overt translation the reader knows that the text is a translation and recognizes that it is bound to the source text. On the other hand, in covert translation, the reader may not realize what he is reading is a translation as it is not bound to a specific culture. In other words, overt translation is culture bound and sounds like a translation while covert translation is culture – free and sounds very natural. Another division is 'reader-oriented' versus 'text-oriented' translation. The former aims at satisfying the readers' expectations and the latter aims at making the readers accommodate their taste to the translation. The two poles in this division are source autonomy versus audience needs which compose the two opposing propositions in many classifications. The last, but not the least classification made by Newmark (1982) is 'Semantic' and 'Communicative' translations.

2. Translation Methods

The translator's relation to his material and to his audience marks the nature of the method. In other words, translation methods are named according to the degree of faithfulness of the translator to the material he translates or to the degree of his freedom in changing the form and style of it while carrying out his job. For instance, literal or word-for-word translation methods denote the translator's faithfulness to the content while free, communicative and idiomatic translation methods signal the writer's freedom in changing the form. In this

paper, we shall take up the most common translation methods such as, literal translation, structural translation and particularly semantic and communicative translations

2.1. Literal Translation

Literal translation can be exploited as a pretranslation activity to find out the problematic points and to get rid of ambiguity and obscurity. This is a kind of word-for-word translation. This can be applied when the content and form of the source text overlap with those of the target text. As it is not always possible to make a successful translation at word level, other translation methods which seek equality at text level should be used.

2.2. Structural Translation

Structural translation is carried out with reference to surface forms of the source language and those of the target language. As a result, it establishes structural equivalence. This method should be used when form is more important than content. For instance, some jingles, political slogans and advertisements can be translated structurally as the sound effect and rhythm are more important than the content in such texts.

2.3. Communicative Translation

Communicative translation is carried out with reference to rhetorical deep structure and it aims at establishing communicative equivalence. If we follow the path through pragmatic representations, we demonstrate communicative acts. The equivalent effect principle is of great importance in the application of this method as the focus is always on the reader. Communicative translation assumes that translation should read like the original. The translator must take his customers' demands into consideration. In other words, he translates to inform, to give advice or to meet whatever the reader's demand is. Therefore, he can improve or rearrange the source text to apply the equivalent effect principle. That is to say, communicative translation is basically functional. The aim is to reexpress the original message effectively and elegantly.

Though very few linguists think communication has no place in translation, many agree that translation is a means of communication. Yet, to accept the assumption that translating is nothing but communicating is seeing only one side of the coin. Every translator knows for sure that meaning is complicated, many levelled and an outcome of complex relations. The potential risk the translator must notice is that more communication may mean more generalization and simplification and as a result the loss of meaning.

One is most aware of meaning when he is thinking but as soon as he speaks or writes what he thinks of, he starts losing some of the meaning. Namely, one cannot express the images in his mind as perfectly as he envisages them. The loss of meaning will be more at the stage of translating the communication into another language. Even the common words such as 'breakfast' 'table', 'window', 'food' etc. may have different connotations in different languages and

even in different regions of a country where the same language is spoken. For instance, the word 'breakfast' denotes 'soup' for some people who live in the rural area but it denotes 'tea, butter, cheese, jam, etc.' for the people who live in the urban areas in Turkey. People's different experiences of objects, abstracts and relations are reflected through the language they use.

A translator seems to be free in leaning on the writer's or reader's shoulder. However, considering the elements he has to examine in order to choose the appropriate method for the particular text and for the particular readership, we infer that his freedom is not so vast. For the culture bound informative texts he has to lean on the writer's shoulder and for the expressive texts he has to focus his attention on the reader. Since all languages differ in form and each language has its own genius to convey the content of a message, it is inevitable to change the form of the original message. Nevertheless, it must be changed in such a way that it achieves an effect on the target text readers as close as possible to the effect created on the source text readers. Therefore, Nida's (1982) dynamic equivalence aims at creating the closest natural equivalent of the original message in the target language in terms of meaning and style.

Usually the translation of a text with rich metaphors and polysemy will be simpler and more clear than the original and it will serve as one of the interpretations of the original. Figurative language, only becomes meaningful if it is created in the metaphors of the target language and its culture. If it is not possible to reproduce it in the target language and its culture, it will be suitable to reduce it to sense. As the communicative method uses more idiomatic and more general terms, the output will often be smoother and simpler. That is why the translations of some literary works are easier to understand than the originals. In other words, the translator tries to write more naturally and fluently than the original in communicative translation. Thus, the translator may underestimate while trying to remove obscurities.

In this method, syntax is remodelled and more common expressions and collocations are used. It is actually a subjective procedure as it intends to achieve a certain effect on its reader's mind.

2.4. Semantic Translation

Semantic translation is carried out with reference to grammatical deep structure and it aims at establishing semantic equivalence. If a translator follows the path through semantic representations, he can demonstrate how sentences in the source language and target language relate to a common deep structure.

On the contrary of communicative method, this method is author-centered. In this method, the translator tries to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the author within the bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the target language. Semantic method emphasizes the content of the message rather than the effect. As it does not want to miss any semantic nuance, it tends to be more detailed and more complex and as a result of these more awkward in some cases. Most advocates of this method consider form and content equally important. For instance, Newmark (1982:47) remarks "the words are sacred

..... not because they are more important than the content but because form and content are one.”

All important statements, legal documents, contracts, scientific and technical articles and informative texts must be translated semantically to convey the essence and flavour of the original text. In such texts, the effects of the translator on the target reader is not as important as conveying the information. All types of texts except the original ones where the specific language of the writer is as important as the content can be translated semantically. The texts whose forms are more important than the contents cannot be translated semantically. For example, some literary works including a lot of metaphors and connotations, poems, political slogans and jingles cannot be translated semantically. The translator has difficulty in conveying the connotative and metaphoric aspects of the text through this method. Yet, semantic translation is more objective in conveying the message as it gives priority to truth rather than to the stylistic arrangements. That is why semantic translation is more successfully applied to the translation of the texts where the primacy is on the thought.

Semantic and communicative translations may coincide where texts convey a general message and where the matter is as important as the manner. For example, in the translation of culture-free texts these two methods may overlap.

A translation can be more or less semantic or more or less communicative. Even a particular section or sentence of a text can be treated semantically or communicatively. Such a translation will satisfy both the reader of the translation and the author of the source text equally.

Now, we shall try to illustrate the use of communicative and semantic translation methods applying them to some English and Turkish utterances and sentences. We exclude literal and structural translation methods as they are confined to a certain range of texts.

1. He is his father's Son.

Semantic Translation: O babasının oğludur.

Communicative Translation: Hık demiş babasının burnundan düşmüş, or O tıpkı babasına çekmiş.

2. My mother is younger than I am.

Semantic Translation: Annem benden daha genç.

Communicative Translation: Annem benden daha enerjik or Annem hayata benden daha çokbağlı.

3. I am me.

Semantic Translation: Ben benim.

Communicative Translation: Beni kimseyle karşılaştırma or Ben herkes değilim or Ben herkesten farklıyım.

4. Time is money.

Semantic Translation: Vakit nakittir

Communicative Translation: Vakit nakittir.

Both Semantic and communicative translations overlap.

5. Business is business

Semantic translation: İş iştir.

Communicative Translation: İşin iyisi kötüsü olmaz or İşinin kıymetini bil or İnsan yaptığı işi iyi yapmalıdır.

6. Button your lips.

Semantic Translation: Dudaklarına kilit vur.

Communicative Translation: Çeneni kapat.

7. I shall go on a trip to recharge my batteries.

Semantic Translation: Aküyü şarj etmek için geziye çıkacağım.

Communicative Translation: Dinlenmek için geziye çıkacağım.

8. I cried because I hadn't any shoes until I saw a man who hadn't any feet.

Semantic Translation: Ayakları olmayan bir adamı görene dek, ayakkabım yok diye ağladım.

Communicative Translation: Benden daha önemli sorunları olan birini görene dek halime üzüldüm or Benden çok daha kötü durumda birini görünce, kendi dertlerimi unuttum or (halime şükrettim)

9. If you cannot beat them, join them.

Semantic Translation: Eğer onları yenemiyorsan, onlara katıl.

Communicative translation: Bükemediğin eli öp.

10. - You might even be appointed managing director.

- Pigs might fly.

Semantic Translation :

- Müdür bile atanabilirsin.

- Domuzlar da uçabilir.

Communicative Translation:

- Müdür bile olabilirsin.

- Balık kavağa çıkarsa (bende müdür olurum)

11. Türk sanat müziğinin dev soluklarından M. Nurettini de kaybettik.

Semantic Translation: We also lost M. Nurettin, who was one of the most distinguished figures of the classical Turkish music.

Communicative Translation: Unfortunately, one of the most distinguished figures of the classical Turkish music, M. Nurettin passed away.

12. Nerelere kayboldun yine? (said to a thinking man)

Semantic Translation: What are you thinking about?

Communicative Translation: What is your trouble? Or What is the matter with you?

13. Alem ne bilsin bizim halimizi. Aç olanın halinden tok ne anlar!

Semantic Translation: How can other people know the circumstances we are in? Those who are not hungry cannot know the problems of the hungry ones.

Communicative Translation: How can the others know our troubles? You cannot expect the people with full stomachs to understand the problems of the hungry ones.

14. Mahzenden adeta erimiş bir öğle aydınlığına çıktığım zaman, şakaklarımda bir zonklama vardı.

Semantic Translation: There was a pulsing in my temples when I got out of the cellar into the strong light in the afternoon.

Communicative Translation: When I left the cellar, and plunged into the blinding afternoon light, my temples were pulsing awfully.

15. Geliyorum efendim, on tane ayağım yokya.

Semantic Translation: I am coming, Mr. I have not got ten feet.

Communicative Translation: Just a moment, Mr. I have got only two feet.

16. Şimdi onlarla birlikte olmak için neler neler vermezdim.

Semantic Translation: I would be really happy to be with them now!

I would to everything to be with them now

I would sacrifice everything to be with them now.

Communicative Translation: If only I were with them now?

17. İnsan dünyaya bir kere gelir.

Semantic Translation: One comes to the earth only once.

Communicative Translation: You live only once. Or 'Enjoy yourself when you have the chance'

18. Vallahide hayır, billahi de hayır.

Semantic Translation: I swear that it isn't true.

Communicative Translation: I swear in God's and Christ's name, I haven't done it.

19. Maliyet fiyatı diyordu gözleri başka birşey görmüyordu.

Semantic Translation: He was only talking of the cost and saw nothing except it.

Communicative Translation: He only thought of the cost of it or The only thing that interested him was the cost.

20. 'Böylece yaz geçti. Güz geçti. Kış geçti. İlkbahar gelipte mayıs güneşi bir genç kızinkine benzeyen ılık nefesini tabiata hohlayınca, bademler birden beyaza büründü.

Semantic Translation: So the summer passed. The fall passed. The winter passed. The almond trees turned white suddenly when the spring came and the may sun exhaled its warm breath like that of a young girl into the nature.

Communicative Translation: The summer ended in this way. The fall and winter are gone. The almond trees wore their white dresses suddenly with the arrival of the spring when the warm breath of the may sun like that of a young girl was exhaled into the nature.

3. Conclusion

As we can see in the above examples, to translate some utterances or sentences literally sounds silly. The translator has to think of the equivalent expressions to convey the meaning and reflect the style of the source text. Of course, to achieve this requires analyzing the text linguistically and semantically. When the form and content of the source text overlap with those of the target text, either of the mentioned methods can be applied. All informative texts,

such as, statements, scientific and technical articles, declarations, contracts, legal documents and agreements must be translated semantically because the aim is conveying the information of the source text accurately. In those types of texts, the content has priority over the form.

It is needless to say that the translator's linguistic knowledge, world view, his personal gift of using the pertaining languages and alertness are major factors in his success. However, the use of proper words and expressions at proper times cannot be underestimated. In fact, there are conventional patterns in each language to express our ideas, emotions and relations. The realization of equivalent effect principle may be possible thanks to the translator's knowledge of convention.

There is almost a consensus that 'how to say' something is as important as 'what to say.' This view also advocates the long discussed maxim 'content and form are equally important. Nevertheless, the translator can emphasize the former or the latter considering the mentioned factors that determine the quality of translation within the limits of the freedom he has in selecting and applying the appropriate method or methods. Choosing the proper method for a text to translate is important but it is not the only criterion of the quality of the translation by itself. No matter which method is applied, the measure is the accuracy of the translation and the translator's ability to reproduce the heart of the source text. In fact, it is not always possible to say which method is better to adopt for a particular text because texts are usually of hybrid nature. In such cases, different methods can be applied within the same text.

References

- Catford, J.C. 1978. **A Linguistic Theory Of Translation**. Oxford: Oxford U.L
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason.1990. **Discourse and Translation**. London: Longman
- Mason Ian. 1987. "A Text Linguistic Approach to Translation Assessment"
Translation in Modern Language Degree. Ed. Hugh Keith and Ian Mason. London: CILT
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. 1982. **The Theory and Practice of Translation**. Leiden: Brill
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. **A Textbook of Translation**. New York: Prentice Hall.
- _____, **Approaches to Translation**. Oxford: Pergoman.