



## **Turkish Studies**

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 12/22, p. 511-532

DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.12372>

ISSN: 1308-2140, ANKARA-TURKEY

---

### *Article Info/Makale Bilgisi*

✍ **Referees/Hakemler:** Prof. Dr. Sündüz ÖZTÜRK KASAR –  
Doç. Dr. Beki HALEVA

---

*This article was checked by iThenticate.*

### **ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVITY IN LITERARY TRANSLATION FROM SEMIOTICS OF TRANSLATION POINT OF VIEW: ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTIVITY IN THE PLAY “CORIOLANUS” AND TRANSLATION EVALUATION\***

*Mesut KULELİ\*\**

#### **ABSTRACT**

The aim of this study is to analyze the play *Coriolanus* by Shakespeare from semiotics point of view and evaluate its Turkish translations from semiotics of translation perspective. To this end, the play *Coriolanus* originally published in 1623 and re-published by Penguin Books in 1955 was chosen as data collection tool. “Theory of Instances” by Jean-Claude Coquet (2007) was adopted in the semiological analysis of the original play and striking examples were found regarding “non-subjects” as coined by Coquet (2007). In the categorization of “non-subjects”, the typology system revised by Öztürk Kasar (2009a) based on Coquet and Öztürk Kasar (2003) was used. In reporting the non-subjects in the play, the “components of instance” as termed by Coquet (in Öztürk Kasar, 2012) was also used. Two Turkish translations of the play, one by Halide Edib Adıvar and Vahit Turhan (1945) and the other one by Bülent Bozkurt (1994) were chosen for translation evaluation. “Designificative Tendencies Systematic” developed by Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar, Tuna, 2015) was used in data collection procedure for translation evaluation. As a result of translation evaluation, it was found that while subjectivity was preserved in some contexts in the translated texts, translators were exposed to certain designificative tendencies in the translation of certain contexts with non-subject discourse, It was concluded that semiotics and translation complement each other, with semiotics contributing to translation act thereby minimizing the chances of designificative tendencies.

---

\* Part of this study was presented as an oral presentation in World Congress of Translation Studies at Paris West Nanterre University organized on 10-14 April 2017.

\*\* Okt. Dr. Duzce University, El-mek: mesutkuleli@duzce.edu.tr

---

### STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to analyze the contributions of semiological analysis to translation act. Semiotics of translation has been gaining popularity not only in our country but also across the world. The scholars thought to have paved the way to semiotics of translation range from Ferdinand de Saussure (2001<sup>[1916]</sup>), one of the founders of semiotics as a branch of science, phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty (1962; 2005; 2006), and the prominent linguist Emile Benveniste (1995<sup>[1966]</sup>) who are claimed by Öztürk Kasar (2012) to have influenced Jean-Claude Coquet in formulating his semiotics theory. According to Öztürk Kasar (2012), Coquet developed his semiotics theory influenced by Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological considerations and Benveniste's terms such as "subject" and "discourse".

Gorlée (1994) suggested an interaction between translation act and semiotics, and Öztürk Kasar (2001) conceptualized this interaction both in French and Turkish, using the term "semiotics of translation" for this interaction. Magdalena Nowotna (2005) and Astrid Guillaume (2009; 2015) can be considered among the scholars having conducted studies on semiotics of translation. Besides those scholars concerned with semiotics of translation, the journal titled *Punctum* published a volume devoted to semiotics of translation in 2015, which also shows that semiotics of translation is gaining ground all over the world. While a number of scholars from different parts of the world conducted studies on this interaction between translation act and semiotics, it was Öztürk Kasar (2009a; 2009b; 2016a; 2016b; 2017) who first dwelt upon this interaction in Turkey, also inspiring Tuna (2016a; 2016b, 2017a; 2017b) to conduct studies in this field.

In this study, the play titled *Coriolanus* written by Shakespeare and first published in 1623 and then re-published in 1955 by Penguin Books Publishing House was selected as data collection, and semiological analysis was conducted on this original play based on Coquet's (1984; 1997; 2007) "Theory of Instances". Two Turkish translations of the play, one by Halide Edib-Adivar and Vahit Turhan (1945), and the other one by Bülent Bozkurt (1994), were chosen to find the contribution of semiological analysis to translation act. In analyzing subjectivity in terms of semiological analysis, "Theory of Instances" by Coquet (1997; 2007) was used. The terms "fundamental component, judgmental component, immanent component and transcendental component" suggested by Coquet (1997; 2007) as part of "components of instance" and applied to translation analysis by Öztürk Kasar (2012: 430) were used in finding which component influenced the instances in contexts with subjectivity in the original play *Coriolanus*. In defining the subjectivity of instances in the play, the terms "subject, quasi-subject and non-subject" coined by Coquet (2007: 37) as part of "Theory of Instances" and later applied to translation analysis by Öztürk Kasar (2009a) were used. Öztürk Kasar (2009a; 2017) divided Coquet's term "non-subject" into eight categories:

1. Absence or insufficiency of consciousness by nature
2. Lack of consciousness from a pathological condition

---

#### Turkish Studies

3. State of unconsciousness under the effect of certain therapeutic substances
4. State of unconsciousness under the effect of certain chemical substances
5. States causing a physical imbalance
  - 5.1. Due to an immanent component of an impulsive nature
  - 5.2. Due to an immanent component of passional nature
    - 5.2.1. Euphoric state
    - 5.2.2. Dysphoric state
    - 5.2.3. Aphoric state
  - 5.3. Due to a transcendental instance of cosmic nature
6. State of submission to a transcendental instance
  - 6.1. Submission to an internalized symbolic nature
  - 6.2. Submission to an oppression that terrorizes or tortures
  - 6.3. Submission to a body acting on the consciousness of the subject
7. Programmed status
8. Identity reduced to a function”

Öztürk Kasar (2009a: 3-6; 2017: 190-195)

In translation evaluation, “Systematic of Designificative Tendencies in Translation” developed by Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015) was used. Öztürk Kasar (2009b) initially came up with eight designificative tendencies, however one more designificative tendency was added to this list in 2015 and it got its final form:

1. Over-interpretation of the meaning
2. Darkening of the meaning
3. Under-interpretation of the meaning
4. Sliding of the meaning
5. Alteration of the meaning
6. Opposition of the meaning
7. Perversion of the meaning
8. Destruction of the meaning
9. Wiping-out of the meaning

Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015: 463) (Translated into English by Didem Tuna).

According to Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015), of those nine designificative tendencies, over-interpretation of the meaning, darkening of the meaning and under-interpretation of the meaning still remain within the meaning boundaries of the sign; sliding of the meaning,

alteration of the meaning and opposition of the meaning are within the limits of the meaning boundaries of the sign; perversion of the meaning, destruction of the meaning and wiping-out of the meaning fall into somewhere out of the meaning boundaries of the sign.

As a result of the subjectivity analysis based on Coquet's (2007) semiotics theory, 11 contexts were found to include non-subject instances. Of those 11 contexts, in 10 (90.9%) of them, the non-subjects were found to be under the influence of immanent component of passional nature. The passion that led the instance to turn into a non-subject in all of those 10 contexts was anger. Therefore, Shakespeare can be said to have designed the plot of this play around the theme of passion. Only one (9.1%) of the non-subjects was found to be under the influence of transcendental component. According to Öztürk Kasar (2017: 190-195), when the immanent component and transcendental component are at play in a context, the instance is stripped of the judgmental component and turns into a non-subject. Based on Öztürk Kasar's (2009a; 2017) categorization of non-subjects, nine (81.82%) contexts were found to include non-subject instances due to dysphoric state stemming from immanent component of passional nature, causing a physical imbalance. In one of those 11 contexts, the non-subject (9.09%) was in a state of submission to a transcendental instance in the form of oppression that terrorizes or tortures. In one (9.09%) context, the non-subject was found to be an identity reduced to a function. Translation evaluation was conducted on contexts with subjectivity, and it was found that in seven of the 11 contexts, there were designificative tendencies while translators were able to preserve meaning in the other four contexts. When the original text was compared to two Turkish translations of the text based on Öztürk Kasar's (in Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015) systematic of designificative tendencies, it was found that both translators, deliberately or indeliberately, resorted to designificative tendencies in one context, but only one translator resorted to designificative tendencies in the other six contexts, which yielded eight designificative tendencies in total. Of those eight designificative tendencies, two were categorized as alteration of the meaning; another two were categorized as wiping-out of the meaning; one was categorized as over-interpretation of the meaning; one was categorized as sliding of the meaning; one was categorized as perversion of the meaning; and one was categorized as destruction of meaning.

To conclude, semiological analysis of a text prior to translation act can help translators avoid, or at least minimize designificative tendencies. Öztürk Kasar (2009b: 164-166) suggests that semiotics of translation can help readers and translators greatly in grasping the meaning universe of the original text in discourse level; moreover, it can help translators and editors in inter-discourse level by allowing them to draw a comparison between the original text and the translated text; finally semiotics of translation can help scholars and researchers in translation studies in meta-discourse level. In this study, the original text and the translated texts of the play *Coriolanus* were analyzed from literary perspective, rather than a performance perspective. Karantay (1995) states that a play can be translated for literary value besides performance potential. Therefore, only literary value of the original text and the translated texts was taken into consideration in this study.

---

#### Turkish Studies

**Keywords:** Subjectivity, Translation, Semiotics of Translation, Theory of Instances, Designificative Tendencies

## **ÇEVİRİ GÖSTERGEBİLİMİ BAKIŞ AÇISIYLA YAZIN ÇEVİRİSİNDE ÖZNELİK YETİSİ İNCELEMESİ: “CORIOLANUS” OYUNUNDAKİ ÖZNELİK YETİSİNİN İNCELENMESİ VE ÇEVİRİ DEĞERLENDİRMESİ**

### **ÖZET**

Bu çalışmanın amacı Shakespeare’in *Coriolanus* oyununu çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla incelemek ve Türkçe çevirilerini değerlendirmektir. Bu amaca yönelik olarak, ilk defa 1623’te basılan ve Penguin Books tarafından 1955 yılında tekrar basılan *Coriolanus* oyunu veri toplama aracı olarak seçilmiştir. Oyunun göstergebilimsel çözümlemesinde Jean-Claude Coquet’nin (2007) Söyleyenler Kuramı temel alınmış ve Coquet’nin (2007) yükümsüz özne olarak isimlendirdiği söyleyen türüne ait örnekler bulunmuştur. Yükümsüz öznelerin sınıflandırılmasında, Coquet ve Öztürk Kasar’ın (2003) yükümsüz özneler tipolojisinin yanı sıra Öztürk Kasar’ın (2009a) çeviri değerlendirmesine uyguladığı sınıflandırma kullanılmıştır. Oyundaki yükümsüz öznelerin bulunduğu söylemlerde, Coquet’nin kavramlaştırdığı (Öztürk Kasar, 2012 içinde) söyleyenin bileşenleri kuramı kullanılmıştır. Bu oyunun Halide Edib Adıvar ve Vahit Turhan tarafından 1945 yılında yapılan ve Bülent Bozkurt tarafından 1994 yapılan iki Türkçe çevirisi çeviri değerlendirmesi amacıyla seçilmiştir. Öztürk Kasar tarafından geliştirilen (Öztürk Kasar ve Tuna, 2015 içinde) Çeviride Anlam Bozucu Eğilimler Dizgeselliği, çeviri değerlendirmesinde veri toplama yöntemi olarak kullanılmıştır. Çeviri değerlendirmesi sonucunda, çeviri eserlerde öznellik yetisi bazı söylemlerde korunuyorken, bazı söylemlerde çevirmenlerin anlam bozucu eğilimlere maruz kaldığı bulunmuştur. Göstergebilimin çeviri edimine yaptığı katkılarla anlam bozucu eğilimleri en aza indirmesi bakımından göstergebilim ve çeviri ediminin birbirini tamamlar nitelikte olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Öznellik yetisi, Çeviri, Çeviri göstergebilimi, Söyleyenler Kuramı, Anlam bozucu eğilimler

### **1. Introduction**

This part of the study is divided into two parts. The first part deals with how semiotics emerged and developed through time; however, rather than presenting all semiotics scholars in the world, only the theories of Ferdinand de Saussure, as the founder of semiotics, the terms and concepts of the eminent phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty and the linguist Emile Benveniste, who are supposed to have influenced Jean-Claude Coquet in achieving his semiotics theory were presented. The first part of this section ends with the theory, terms and concepts of Jean Claude Coquet. Therefore, the first part of this section summarizes the course of semiotics history that finally led to Coquet’s semiotics theory. In the second part of this section, a recently proposed analysis model,

namely “semiotics of translation” is presented. This second part deals with the scholars engaged in “semiotics of translation” since the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### 1.1. Semiotics from Saussure to Coquet

As a branch of science, semiotics was first proposed by Ferdinand de Saussure in his book *Cours de Linguistique Générale* (General Linguistic Courses) compiled by his students at Geneva University following his death and published in 1916. Saussure (2001) not only proposed the establishment of semiotics as a branch of science, but he also suggested that semiotics and linguistics will be separate branches of science. Saussure (2001) stated that “a new branch of science, dealing with the functions of signs in the social life, could be designed, and it will be called *semiotics*” (p.46). Saussure (2001) further stated that linguistics will be only a part of this umbrella term, *semiotics*, whose laws and paradigms could be applied in various branches of science. Saussure (2001) went further than proposing semiotics as a new branch of science, coining and defining the terms *sign*, *signifier*, and *signified*, the basic premises of semiotics. For Saussure (2001), “*sign* is the interaction between a *signifier* and a *signified*” (p.107).

Maurice Merleau-Ponty was one of the scholars that greatly influenced Jean-Claude Coquet in formulating his semiotics theory. Öztürk Kasar (2012) stated that Coquet was profoundly influenced by Merleau-Ponty and Benveniste. In this section, Merleau-Ponty will be discussed only in terms of his concepts and terms that Coquet adopted from him rather than all aspects of his philosophical and phenomenological considerations. Primožic (2013) stated that Merleau-Ponty was closely influenced by eminent German phenomenologists of the time besides Husserl and Heidegger in formulating his theory, further suggesting that Merleau-Ponty was also influenced by Descartes’ dualism but based his theory as a critical response to Descartes. Rozemond (2009) stated that for Descartes, a human being is composed of mind, and body is a phenomenon separate from the human being, suggesting the separateness of mind and body. This shows that Descartes attached primary role to the mind. However, Merleau-Ponty (2005) opposed to Decartes by attaching the body the primary role in perception of phenomena and objects outside the human self. As opposed to Descartes, Merleau-Ponty (2006) suggested that body and mind cannot be considered two distinct entities, but rather a uniform entity complementing one another. Merleau-Ponty (2006) attributes this uniformity to the fact that in perception, there is always a threat that might interfere with rationality of thought and that perception can be shaped by the cultural world around us. This shows that one’s perception could be under the influence of the external elements and that perception may not be able to obtain invariable entities at all times. Therefore, Merleau-Ponty can be regarded as a phenomenologist since he attached the utmost importance to “body” in perception. Merleau-Ponty (2006) attributes the pre-condition for humans to be *subject* to the perception of objects and phenomena around, and “it is the body that makes this perception possible” (p. 58). Merleau-Ponty (1962) adds that “all activities of the mind are possible only through the five senses in our body” (p. 213). Merleau-Ponty greatly influenced the linguist Emile Benveniste with his views and terms, the most important one being his approach to the relationship between the *subject* and *object*. In his overview of Merleau-Ponty’s views, Primožic (2013) summarizes that for Merleau-Ponty, “a *subject* can turn into an *object* in a context involving interaction between two parties and this *object* can turn into a *subject* in the course of the same context” (p. 85). Regarding this subject-object interaction, Merleau-Ponty (in Primožic 2013) adds that “even the creator of a context (subject) might not be aware of the content of the discourse perceived by the listener (object)” (p. 85). In this way, states Merleau-Ponty (in Primožic, 2013), “language can be analyzed from a phenomenological point of view and the effect of body and mind on language can be studied with reference to the premises of phenomenology” (p. 85). This proposition can be interpreted to refer to *body* as the prime factor in

ensuring perception, which seems to bring Merleau-Ponty closer to Husserl's phenomenological considerations.

Öztürk Kasar (2012) states that Coquet was greatly influenced by the eminent linguist Emile Benveniste. Benveniste (1995<sup>[1966]</sup>) developed Saussure's term *parole* coining the terms "discourse" and "enunciation" (p. 138). For Saussure (2001), "*parole* is the functional use of language by speakers" (p. 41), but Benveniste (1995) referred to this as *discourse*, "leading to a paradigm shift in linguistics" according to Öztürk Kasar (2012) (p. 428). Benveniste (1995) states that a discourse inseparably depends on the presence of "*I : you*" (p. 128). Benveniste (1995) refers to "*I*" as the speaker and the producer of a discourse, defining "*you*" as the listener. Benveniste (1995) suggested that "*I*" inevitably requires the presence of "*you*" in order that a subject could manifest itself as a subject in a discourse. However, Benveniste (1995) adds that this subject is invariably exposed to alterations in a discourse, with the listener turning into the speaker after perceiving the discourse and producing another discourse and the former speaker turning into a listener in the new situation, as already suggested by Merleau-Ponty (in Primožic, 2013). According to Benveniste (1995), it is only through and within language that one manifests itself as the subject, moreover, "whether in psychology or in phenomenology, this subjectivity essentially lies in language" (p. 129). Öztürk Kasar (2012) states that those terms by Benveniste, namely "*subject* and *discourse* seem to have affected Coquet in establishing his semiotics theory" (p. 427).

Öztürk Kasar (in Coquet and Öztürk Kasar 2003) stated that "even though Jean-Claude Coquet and Algirdas Julien Greimas studied in the same school of semiotics for long years, Coquet put forward a semiotics theory distinctly different from that of his colleague, Greimas" (p. 137). This semiotics theory by Coquet (1984) is generally referred to as "Theory of Instances". In his theory, Coquet (1997; 2007) defined instance with four different components. Öztürk Kasar (2012) states that Coquet identified four different components of instance, namely "*fundamental component* (body), *judgmental component* (mind), *immanent component* (impulses and passions), and lastly *transcendental component* (cosmic events and symbolic phenomena)" (p. 429). Öztürk Kasar (2012) suggests that "an instance can be under the pretext of various different components at the time of discourse" (p. 429). It may be possible to conclude from those components that if the instance is under the influence of fundamental component and judgmental component at the time of the discourse, then this instance is totally aware and produces the discourse consciously, which is referred to as "*subject*" state under the typology of non-subjects by Coquet in Coquet and Öztürk Kasar (2003). However, if the instance is under the influence of fundamental component and immanent or transcendental components, then this instance is referred to as "*non-subject*" state under the typology of non-subjects by Coquet in Coquet and Öztürk Kasar (2003, p. 143-145). According to Öztürk Kasar (2012), "*non-subject* is the one that is not aware of his/her discourse at the time of discourse production" (p. 431). There is a last instance type in the typology of non-subjects by Coquet in Coquet and Öztürk Kasar (2003), which is called "*quasi-subject* state that is half aware of the situation around at the time of discourse production" (p. 144). A good example for this can be a person who wakes up due to a ringing telephone at the mid-night according to Coquet and Öztürk Kasar (2003). Öztürk Kasar (2009a) further divided "non-subject" into various types. Öztürk Kasar (2009a;) states that there are eight different types of a non-subject and they are:

- “ \* absence or insufficiency of consciousness by nature
- \* lack of consciousness from a pathological condition
- \* state of unconsciousness under the effect of certain therapeutic substances
- \* state of unconsciousness under the effect of certain chemical substances

---

#### **Turkish Studies**

- \* states causing a physical imbalance
- \* state of submission to a transcendental instance
- \* programmed status
- \* identity reduced to a function” (p. 3-6).

According to Öztürk Kasar (2012), “Coquet adopted the terms *subject*, *subjectivity*, and *discourse* from Benveniste” (p. 429). Therefore, it is hardly surprising that Coquet focused on “subject” in his semiotics theory considering that he built his theory on phenomenological considerations by Merleau-Ponty. Öztürk Kasar (2012) clearly shows how Coquet was influenced by phenomenology in his semiotics theory with the title of the study “Jean-Claude Coquet ile Bir Dil Görüngübilimine Doğru” (Towards a Phenomenological Study of Language by Jean-Claude Coquet).

## 1.2. Semiotics of Translation

Even though semiotics and translation studies emerged as two different disciplines, in recent years these two disciplines have begun to be integrated in translation act. One of the pioneering studies suggesting a close relationship between semiotics and translation studies goes back to the year 2001 when Öztürk Kasar presented a paper entitled *La semiotique subjectale et la traduction*. Öztürk Kasar (2001) dealt with translation act based on the terms of semiotics. Öztürk Kasar (2009b), in her paper entitled *Pour une semiotique de la traduction* (Towards Semiotics of Translation), suggested that “semiotics of translation could help in three different levels, the first one being on the level of discourse, the second one being on the level of inter-discourse and the third one being on the level of meta-discourse” (p. 164-166). Öztürk Kasar (2009b) further adds that “both semiotics and translation studies deal with the meaning universe in narration” (p. 165). Öztürk Kasar (2009b) suggests that “a translator could grasp the meaning universe and signs in a literary text in a more secure way if that translator adopts an analysis model for the source text, and the most appropriate model could be a semiological analysis” (p. 166). Öztürk Kasar (2016a) states that there are frequent traps in a literary text that could only be solved through a semiological analysis of the source text by the translator. Öztürk Kasar (2016a) maintains that a semiological analysis of the source text prior to the translation act could be a guide to translators and an integrated use of semiotics and translation could help translation act greatly. Öztürk Kasar (2016b) clearly shows the contribution of semiotics to translation, suggesting that a translator builds the translation upon the results obtained from semiological analysis.

Gorlee (1994) states that translation act and semiological analysis complement each other, suggesting that translation requires the analysis of signs, which is already the main concern of semiotics. Magdalena Nowotna is another scholar into semiotics of translation. Nowotna (2005) presents meticulous analysis of literary texts based on semiological analysis drawing on such eminent semiotics scholars as Greimas, Coquet, Benveniste, Merleau-Ponty and Paul Ricœur. Nowotna is closely interested in *subject* problem in literary texts and published over 50 papers on the contribution of semiological analysis to interpretation of literary texts. Another scholar studying on semiotics of translation is Astrid Guillaume. Guillaume (2015) suggests that “theories may evolve in the course of time, turning into completely new theories or being integrated into other theories in different disciplines” (p. 13), which proves Öztürk Kasar’s (2001) proposition that semiotics and translation studies could be integrated, leading to semiotics of translation. Guillaume (2009) states that “translation of a literary text into another language requires deconstruction of the words and aesthetical structure of the text” (p. 195-196), which shows the contribution of semiological analysis to a literary text. Kourdis and Kukkonen (2015,) state that “translation studies is in its very nature an

interdisciplinary endeavor and scholars in semiotics can also contribute to translation studies, which can be attributed to the groundbreaking study of Jakobson in 1959” (p. 5). Aguiar, Ata and Queiroz (2015) also suggest that “translation studies would greatly benefit from the contribution of semiotics” (p. 18). Petrilli (2015) also refers to the relationship between two distinct disciplines, semiotics and translation studies. Petrilli (2015) further adds that translation act is more of an interpretation and semiological analysis could be a basis for any translation theory. Tuna (2016a) conducted a semiological analysis on the short story *Sunday In The Park* based on the semiological analysis model proposed by Öztürk Kasar (2009b) and put forward certain solutions to translation of that short story based on semiotics of translation. Tuna (2016b) also analyzed a Turkish poem on Coquet’s “Theory of Instances” and evaluated its translation based on semiotics of translation, suggesting that semiological analysis could greatly help translation act. Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2015) also put forward that a literary text is full of signs that need to be sorted out and a translator ought to know how to analyze a literary text on semiological steps, otherwise that translator would miss an essential guide for grasping the meaning universe of the literary text.

As can be seen, semiotics of translation has been on the increase in popularity among translation and semiotics scholars recently. With conferences and journals on the relationship between semiotics and translation studies, this model is expected to be more popular not only among scholars but also with translators in the future. As Öztürk Kasar (2009b) states, semiotics of translation could help not only translators but also scholars.

## **2. Method**

In this section, data collection tools, data collection procedure and data analysis procedure used in this study are presented.

### **2.1. Data Collection Tools**

As data collection tools, the original play *Coriolanus* by Shakespeare, supposed to have been completed in 1608 and first published in 1623 and then re-published by Penguin Books in 1955 was used to collect data for semiotics analysis of the play. For translation evaluation, two Turkish translations of the play by Shakespeare (1955) translated by Halide Edib-Adivar and Vahit Turhan (1945) and by Bülent Bozkurt (1994) were chosen to collect data from a semiotics of translation point of view.

### **2.2. Data Collection Procedure**

In data collection, the original play was analyzed based on Coquet’s (1997) “components of the instance” theory and its application to translation act by Öztürk Kasar (2012), and Coquet’s (in Coquet and Öztürk Kasar 2003) “typology of non-subjects” theory. 11 striking contexts with non-subject utterances were chosen in this study. In reporting the non-subjects, the illustrated version of typology of non-subjects by Öztürk Kasar (2009a) was used. In translation evaluation, two Turkish translations of the play were compared to the original play only in terms of the contexts determined as non-subject enunciations in the semiotics analysis. The evaluation of the translations was based on Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic of designificative tendencies in translation.

### **2.3. Data analysis**

In data analysis, a qualitative approach was adopted. The data collected from the original play as a result of the semiological analysis were analyzed only in English. The components influential on the instance at the time of discourse production were determined. The type of non-subject based on Coquet’s expanded and illustrated version of Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology of

non-subjects was determined building upon the components of the instance. In translation evaluation, designificative tendencies in the translations based on Öztürk Kasar's (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic were put into categories of designificative tendencies. Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) defines nine designificative tendencies in translation. Those tendencies are :

- “ • over-interpretation of meaning, in which the translator explicitly reveals an implicit sign in the original text;
- darkening of the meaning, in which the translator comes up with a vague discourse of a very clear sign in the original text;
- under-interpretation of the meaning, in which the translator cannot convey the whole meaning of the discourse in the original text, resulting in insufficient meaning
- sliding of the meaning, in which the translator uses one of the potential meanings of a word but which is not plausible in the context it was used in the original text;
- alteration of the meaning, in which the translator comes up with a mistaken discourse though it is somehow related to the discourse in the original text;
- opposition of the meaning, in which the translator comes up with an opposite meaning of the sign in the original text;
- perversion of the meaning, in which the translator comes up with a discourse that has nothing to do with the one in the original text;
- destruction of meaning, in which the translator comes up with a totally meaningless discourse but maintains some traces from the discourse in the original text;
- wiping-out of meaning in which the translator doesn't translate some part of the discourse or a complete discourse in the original text.” (p. 463) <sup>2</sup>

### 3. Findings

In this part of the study, the contexts with non-subjects are provided with the component influential on the instance at the time of enunciation. Along with instances, translation evaluation of the contexts is also given.

#### Analysis 1:

“ MARTIUS  
 All the contagion of the South, light on you,  
 You shames of Rome: you herd of biles and plagues  
 Plaster you o'er, that you may be abhorr'd  
 Farther than seen, and one infect another  
 Against the wind a mile: you souls of geese,

<sup>2</sup> Translated into English by Didem Tuna.

That bear the shapes of men, how have you run  
From slaves, that apes would beat; Pluto and hell,”  
(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 39-40)

In this context, from the signs “*All the contagion of tge South, light on you, / shames of Rome*” Martius can be considered to be under the influence of immanent component, with his judgmental component lost. Therefore, the instance seems to be a non-subject here, and it can be classified as the non-subject due to an immanent component of passionate nature according to Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) categorization of non-subjects. Below are the two Turkish translations of the context:

“Marcius  
Sizi, Roma’nın vebaya tutulası yüzkaraları! Sizi sürüler! Hepinizin  
vücudu-görünmeden iğrendirecek kadar-çiban döksün! Bir mil  
mesafe uzaktan birbirinize veba aşlayın. Sizi insan kılıklı  
kaz yürekli! Maymunların dayak atabileceği köle makulesinden  
nasıl kaçtınız? Pluto ve cehennem hakkı için...”  
(Edib-Adivar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 23)

“Martius  
Güneyin tüm hastalıkları tepenize yağsın!  
Roma’nın ayıbını hepimiz! Sürüden farkımız yok;  
Sizi... Çıban ceragat sarsın her yanımızı;  
Görmeden iğrensin herkes sizden; bir mil öteden  
Rüzgarla bulaşsın hastalığınız birbirinize!  
İnsan kılığına girmiş kaz ruhlu herifler sizi!  
Şebekler bile hakkında+n gelirdi kaçtığınız o kölelerin!  
Plato’nun cehennemine kadar yolunuz var!”  
(Bozkurt, B., 1994, Trans. p.40)

In Edib-Adivar and Turhan’s (1945) translation, the part of the context, “*All the contagion of the south light on you*”, was not translated and it was not included in the translated text, therefore it was wiped out. According to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic, this tendency can be categorized as “wiping-out of meaning”.

Analysis 2:  
“CORIOLANUS  
What must I say, 'I Pray Sir?  
Plague upon't, I cannot bring  
My tongue to such a pace. Look Sir, my wounds,  
I got them in my Country's service, when  
Some certain of your brethren roar'd, and ran  
From th' noise of our own drums.'  
MENENIUS  
Oh me the Gods, you must not speak of that,  
You must desire them to think upon you.  
CORIOLANUS  
Think upon me? Hang 'em,  
I would they would forget me, like the virtues  
Which our divines lose by 'em.  
MENENIUS  
You'll mar all,  
I'll leave you: Pray you speak to 'em, I pray you  
In wholesome manner.”

---

### Turkish Studies

(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 69)

In this context, from the signs “*Plague upon’t / Hang ‘em*” Coriolanus can be considered to be under the influence of immanent component, with his judgmental component lost, just as it was the case in the previous example. Therefore, the instance seems to be a non-subject here, and it can be classified as the non-subject due to immanent component of passionate nature according to Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) categorization of non-subjects. Below are the Turkish translations of that context:

“Coriolanus

Ne diyeceğim? “Rica ederim, efendi,” –Allah kahretsin bir türlü buna dilim dönmüyor – “Bakın efendi,” – yaralarım-sizin bazı arkadaşlarınız bağırarak kendi trampetlerimizin sesinden kaçıştıkları zaman ben bu yaraları memleket hizmetinde aldım.

Menenius

Aman Allahım! böyle söylemeyin. Zihinerini kendinizle meşgul etmelisiniz.

Coriolanus

Kendimle mi? Lanet olsun. Vaizlerin iyi nasihatlerini unuttukları gibi keşke beni de unutsalar.

Menenius

Her şeyi altüst edeceksiniz. Ben gidiyorum. Rica ederim, çok rica ederim, onlarla makul bir surette konuşun.”

(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 59)

“Coriolanus

Ne diyecektim?-

“Lütfen, bayım,” –Allah belasını versin!

Nasıl alıştırayım dilimi bunu söylemeye!

“İşte bayım, yaralarım burda!

Vatanıma hizmet ederken aldım o yaraları;

O arada sizin kardeşlerinizden bir kısmı da,

Kendi davullarımızın gürültüsünden korkmuş

Böğüre böğüre kaçıyorlardı.”

Menenius

Vay canına; hey tanrılar!

Bunları söyleyemezsin;

Onlardan, nasıl biri olduğunu düşünmelerini isteyeceksin.

Coriolanus

Kim olduğumu düşünecekler ha!? Gebersin hepsi!

Beni unutsalar daha iyi olurdu;

Rahiplerimizin onlara boş yere verdiği

İnsanlık öğütlerini nasıl unuttularsa.

Menenius

Her şeyi mahvedeceksin. Ben gidiyorum.

Lütfen, rica ediyorum, şöyle güzel,

Sağlıklı bir tavırla konuş onlarla.”

(Bozkurt, B., 1994, Trans. p.80)

In both Turkish translations of the play, the signs “*Plague upon’t / Hang ‘em*” were translated into Turkish as “*Allah kahretsin / Lanet olsun*” and “*Allah belasını versin / gebersin hepsi*” by Edib-Adıvar and Turhan (1945) and Bozkurt (1994), respectively, which makes the translated work reader realize that the instance was a non-subject in this context. Therefore, no designificative tendency was determined based on Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic.

Analysis 3:

“CORIOLANUS

How? No more?

### Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic  
Volume 12/22

As for my Country, I have shed my blood,  
Not fearing outward force: So shall my lungs  
Coin words till they decay, against those measles  
Which we disdain should tatter us, yet sought  
The very way to catch them.”  
(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 79)

Coriolanus is angry with the senators of Rome in this context because of their objection to his being the Consul of Rome besides their provocation of the citizens against him. With his judgmental component lost, Coriolanus seems to be a non-subject in this context as a result of the influence of passions, a part of immanent component according to Coquet (1997; 2007). Considering Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology of non-subjects, the instance can be classified into the non-subject due to immanent component of passional nature. Below are the Turkish translations of this context:

“Coriolanus

Nasıl yetermiş? Harici kuvvetten korkmaksızın vatanım için kanımı nasıl akıttımsa, iğrendiğimiz, fakat yakalanmak yolunu ihtiyar ettiğimiz şu cüzam belasına karşı da ciğerlerim parçalanıncaya kadar konuşacağım.”  
(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 73)

“Coriolanus

Öyle mi? Demek yeter!  
Hiçbir dış güçten korkmadan  
Vatanım için nasıl kanımı akıttıysam,  
Hem yaralarımı bize bulaştırırlar diye  
Tiksintiyle kendilerinden uzak durduğumuz,  
Hem de hep elde etmenin yolunu aradığımız  
O cüzamlılara karşı ciğerlerim,  
Çürüyüp dökülünceye kadar,  
Para basar gibi haykırmayı sürdüreceğim.”  
(Bozkurt, B., 1994, Trans. p.96)

As can be seen in translations of the context, Coriolanus is really angry with the senators of Rome as was the case in the original context. Therefore, no designificative tendency was determined in Turkish translations of the play based on Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic.

Analysis 4:

“CORIOLANUS

I would they were Barbarians, as they are,  
Though in Rome litter'd: not Romans, as they are not,  
Though calv'd i' th' porch o' th' Capitol:  
MENENIUS  
Be gone, put not your worthy rage into your tongue,  
One time will owe another.”  
(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 85)

When the citizens were provoked by two senators of Rome to object to Coriolanus’ being the Consul, Coriolanus was too angry, losing his judgmental component one more time. This can be understood from Menenius’ part, “*Put not your worthy rage into your tongue*”. In this context, the instance is under the influence of immanent component, triggered by his passions. Therefore, the instance turns into a non-subject in this context. Based on Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology of non-subjects, this instance can be classified into the non-subject due to immanent component of passional nature. Below are the Turkish translations of the context:

---

### Turkish Studies

“Coriolanus

Keşke barbar olsalardı-nitekim Roma’da üredikleri halde öyledirler- Kapitol kapılarında doğan bu öküz yavrularının keşke Romalılık iddiaları omasaydı.

Menenius

Gidin, haklı olan hiddetinizi izhar etmeyin. Bizim de hesap göreceğimiz zaman gelir.”

(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 80)

“Coriolanus

Keşke bunlar barbar olsalardı-ki öyleler;

Anaları onları Roma’da yavrulamış olsa da; Romalı değiller,

Capitol’ün avlusunda buzağılanmış olsalar da.

Menenius

Git artık!

Haklı öfkeni dile getirme.

Bakarsın bugünün getirdiğini yarın götürür.”

(Bozkurt, B., 1994, Trans. p.105)

In the source text, the sign “*litter’d*” refers to “the birth in a condemned way” according to Nutku (2013, p. 311). However, there is no reference to any mother in this context. While this sign was preserved in the translation by Edib-Adıvar and Turhan (1945), Bozkurt (1994) uses “*mother*” in the translation with an over-interpretation. Moreover, the sign “*litter’d*” is used as the birth of an animal as can be proven with the use of sign “*calved*” in the source text due to the rage the instance was in, therefore there should be no reference to any human being here. This tendency by Bozkurt (1994) can be categorized into over-interpretation of meaning according to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic.

Analysis 5:

“CORIOLANUS

Well, I must do’t:

Away my disposition, and possess me

Some harlot's spirit: my throat of war be turn'd,

Which quir'd with my drum, into a pipe,

Small as an eunuch, or the virgin voice

That babies lulls asleep: The smiles of knaves

Tent in my cheeks, and schoolboys' tears take up

The glasses of my sight: a beggar's tongue

Make motion through my lips, and my arm'd knees

Who bow'd but in my stirrup, bend like his

That hath receiv'd an alms.”

(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 93-94)

In this context, Coriolanus is being persuaded into taking on gentle manners while addressing the Roman citizens, which is contrary to his personality as can be understood from the whole play. Seeing that his immediate relatives force him excessively to use gentle words, Coriolanus loses his temper and his judgmental component. The description he makes regarding a gentle manner while addressing people in this context shows that he is under the influence of immanent component, triggered by his passions. Therefore, the instance in this context can be classified into a non-subject due to immanent component of passionate nature based on Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology. The translations of this context are given below:

“Coriolanus

Peki, peki, yapmam lazım. Tabiatım değişsin, içime bir kahpe ruhu girsin!

Borulara refakat eden asker sesim bir harem ağasının veya çocuklara ninni

söyleyen bir kızın ince sesine dönüşsün. Yüzüme düzenbazların sırtışı

### Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic  
Volume 12/22

yerleşsin; bir mektep çocuğunun yaşları ile gözlerim dolsun; bir dilenci dili dudaklarımı titretsin; yalnız özengilerimde eğilen zırlı dizlerim, sadaka almış bir insanınki gibi bükülsün!”  
(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 89)

“Coriolanus  
Evet, yapmak zorundayım.  
Hadi, uzaklaşın benden gerçek duygularım!  
Gel bakalım dilenci ruhu, sar beni!  
Savaşta davuluma eşlik etmeye alışkın gırtlığım,  
Hadım sesi gibi cırtlak bir düdüğe dönsün;  
Ya da, bebelere ninni söyleyen genç kadın sesine!  
Alçakların gülüşü yanaklarımda kamp kursun;  
Okul çocuklarının gözyaşları gözbebeklerimi doldursun!  
Dudaklarımın arasında dilenci dili dolaşsın;  
Şimdiye dek yalnızca üzengideyken eğilen zırlı dizlerim,  
Sadaka almış adamınki gibi bükülsün!”  
(Bozkurt, B., 1994, Trans. p.118)

In the source text, the sign “*harlot*” refers to “a woman who is involved in sexual relationship in return for money” according to Nutku (2013, p. 248). In Turkish, this sign has some other connotations such as a person who is very changeable in his/her manners or who decides not to take part in a situation even after strict promises have been made. While Edib-Adıvar and Turhan (1945) used the term “*kahpe*” (meaning a woman involved in sexual relationship in return for money), Bozkurt (1994) used the term “*dilenci*” (a beggar) for the sign “*harlot*” in his translation. While Edib-Adıvar and Turhan (1945) could preserve this sign in their translation, Bozkurt (1994) seems to have deformed this sign, referring to the fact that Coriolanus will beg people for consulate. Based on Öztürk Kasar’s systematic (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015), because the translator used a different meaning that was not so far from the sign in the source text, this tendency by Bozkurt (1994) can be categorized as alteration of meaning.

#### Analysis 6:

“CORIOLANUS  
The fires i’ th’ lowest hell. Fold in the people:  
Call me their Traitor, thou injurious Tribune.  
Within thine eyes sat twenty thousand deaths  
In thy hand clutch’d: as many millions in  
Thy lying tongue, both numbers. I would say  
‘Thou liest unto thee, with a voice as free,  
As I do pray the gods.’” (Shakespeare, 1955, p. 98)

When some senators of Rome call Coriolanus “traitor”, he loses his judgmental component and turns into a non-subject under the influence of immanent component. As stated by Öztürk Kasar (2012) “the most primitive form of a non-subject is the one under the pretext of the immanent component” (p. 429). Therefore, based on Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology of non-subjects, the instance in this context can be classified into a non-subject due to immanent component of passionate nature. The translations of the context are given below:

“Coriolanus  
Halkı cehennem ateşi alsın! Ben onlara hain ha! Seni küstah tribün.  
Gözlerinde yirmi bin, ellerinde milyonlarca, yalancı dilinde bunların  
ikisi kadar ölüm olsa ben gene sana ilahlara dua ettiğim hür  
sesimle “yalan söylüyorsun” derim.”  
(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 94)

---

### Turkish Studies

“Coriolanus  
 Cehennem dibinin ateşi sarsın o halkı!  
 Halka ihanet etmişim ha!  
 Seni kendini bilmez Tribün!  
 Gözlerinde yirmi bin ölüm olsa,  
 Avuçlarına yirmi milyon sığsa,  
 O yalancı dilinde ikisinin toplamı barınsa,  
 Tanrılara dua edermişçesine açıkça  
 “Yalan söylüyorsun” diyorum sana!”  
 (Bozkurt, B., 1994, Trans. p.123)

While Bozkurt (1994) was able to preserve the signs in the source text, Edib-Adivar and Turhan (1945) produced the sentence “*Ben onlara hain ha!*” that is not reasonable to use in Turkish. Such a sentence can be produced by an instance as the instance is under the pretext of chemical drugs such as alcohol; however, the instance in this context is under the influence of passions. Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic states that when a translator produces a sentence that is devoid of meaning in the target language, that translator destroys the meaning of the signs in the source text. Therefore, this designificative tendency by Edib-Adivar and Turhan (1945) can be categorized into destruction of meaning.

#### Analysis 7:

“VOLUMNIA  
 Now the Red Pestilence strike all trades in Rome,  
 And occupations perish.”  
 (Shakespeare, 1955, p. 101)

When Coriolanus is exiled by the Roman senate and the citizens, his mother is so much in a psychological pain and anger that she turns into a non-subject in this context. The instance in this context loses the judgmental component, falling under the influence of immanent component triggered by passion. According to Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology, the instance of this context can be classified into non-subject due to immanent component of passionate nature. The Turkish translations of the context are given below:

“Volumnia  
 Varsın, artık Roma’daki bütün zennatları veba alsın, bütün meslekler yerin dibine geçsin.”  
 (Edib-Adivar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 98)

“Volumnia  
 Roma’da ne kadar zanaat varsa  
 Hepsini kızıl bela çarpsın;  
 Tüm meslekler yokolsun.”  
 (Bozkurt, 1994, Trans. p. 130)

It is important to note that in the source context, the sign “*red pestilence*” was translated as a specific disease “*veba*” (plague) losing the sign “*red*” by Edib-Adivar and Turhan (1945) while it was translated as a broader term “*kızıl bela*” by Bozkurt (1994) preserving the sign “*red*” in the translated text. Nutku (2013) states that the sign “*red*” is used by Shakespeare “as an adjective to refer to a skin disease” (p. 439). While plague is an infectious disease and the sign “*pestilence*” can be associated with plague, the sign “*red*” was lost in Edib-Adivar and Turhan’s (1945) translation, which can be considered “wiping-out of meaning” based on Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic. On the other hand, while Bozkurt (1994) preserved the sign “*red*” translating it as “*kızıl*” in Turkish, the sign “*pestilence*” was translated as “*bela*” (any unwanted

situation or occasion). Regarding that Nutku (2013) defined the sign “red” as an adjective used for skin diseases, the Turkish sign “bela” is too broad for the sign in this context. Cambridge Online Dictionary defines the sign “pestilence” as 1) “any very serious infectious disease that spreads quickly and kills large numbers of people; 2) a serious and growing problem”. The second entry in these definitions may justify Bozkurt’s (1994) preference for the broad term “bela”, however the adjective “red” loses its connotation for an infectious disease. Therefore, Bozkurt (1994) used a term in Turkish which is potential for the sign in the source language, but not in the context in which this sign was used. This designificative tendency can be categorized into sliding of meaning based on Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic.

Analysis 8:

“AUFIDIUS

I lov’d the maid I married: never man  
Sigh’d truer breath. but that I see thee here  
Thou noble thing, more dances my rapt heart,  
Than when I first my wedded Mistress saw  
Bestride my threshold.”

(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 112)

Exiled from Rome, Coriolanus wants to take his revenge from everyone in Rome. With this aim, he resorts to his lifelong adversary and enemy Aufidius to join in his troops in the battle against Romans. Hearing this, Aufidius feels full of joy in this context and seems to lose his judgmental component, falling under immanent component triggered by passions. This can be understood from the signs “more dances my rapt heart / Than when I first my wedded Mistress saw / Bestride my threshold”. In this context, the instance turns into a non-subject due to immanent component of passional nature according to Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology of non-subjects. Below are the translations of that context:

Aufidius

Evlendiğim kadını aşkla sevmiştim. Hiçbir erkek bundan daha fazla sevemezdi; fakat ey asil insan seni burada görmek, sevgilimin düğün gecesi evimin kapısına ilk defa girdiği andan daha fazla kalbimi aşk ve heyecanla dolduruyor.

(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 111-112)

Aufidius

Evlendiğim kızı sevmiştim;  
Hiçbir erkeğin duyguları daha içten olmamıştır;  
Ama seni karşımda gördükçe, soylu varlık,  
Coşkuyla dolan yüreğim,  
Sevdiğim kadının eşiğimden adım attığı  
O ilk günden daha büyük bir heyecanla çarpıyor.

(Bozkurt, 1994, Trans. p. 146)

In Turkish translations of the context, the signs showing Aufidius’ subjectivity were translated into Turkish with no loss in meaning, which makes the translated work reader recognize that the instance is a non-subject in this context as was the case in the original text. Therefore, no designificative tendency was determined according to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic, but rather the signs proving that the instance was a non-subject in this context were preserved in the translated texts.

Analysis 9:

“Third Citizen

And so did I: and to say the truth, so did

very many of us, that we did for the best, and though we willingly consented to his banishment, yet it was against our will.”  
(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 121)

Even though the instance is not a non-subject at the time producing this discourse, it can be understood from the sentence “*it was against our will*” that Coriolanus was exiled not because of the dissatisfaction of the citizens of Rome, but because some senators forced them to do so. According to Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) typology of non-subjects, the instance was a non-subject due to transcendental phenomena as Roman citizens were not under the influence of their judgmental component at the time Coriolanus was being exiled, but rather they were under the influence of transcendental component triggered by symbolic phenomena such as submission to the stately men. Turkish translations of the context are given below:

“3. Vatandaş  
Hakikati söylemek lazım gelirse birçoklarımız yaptıklarımızı yapılacak en iyi şey bu diye yaptık. Sürülmesine muvafakat ettiğimiz halde gönlümüz buna razı değildi.”  
(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 123)

“Üçüncü yurttaş  
Dğruyu söylemek gerekirse, içimizden çoğu da öyle demişti. Yaptığımızı en iyi olsun diye yaptık ve her ne kadar sürülmesine kendi isteğimizle razı olduysak da, aslında irademiz dışı oldu bu.”  
(Bozkurt, 1994, Trans. p. 160)

In Edib-Adıvar and Turhan’s (1945) translation, the sentence “*it was against our will*” was translated as “*gönlümüz buna razı değildi*” (we were reluctant about this). This sentence in the source text is a justification that the instance is under the influence of transcendental component and the instance is forced to do what stately men tell them to do. In this translation, however, “reluctance” does not involve any transcendental conformity, therefore the instance cannot be considered as a non-subject by translated text readers. This designificative tendency can be categorized as alteration of meaning according to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic because the translated sign is not totally irrelevant to the original sign, but the former does not refer to the same sign as the latter one.

#### Analysis 10:

“CORIOLANUS  
Away!  
MENENIUS  
How? Away?  
CORIOLANUS  
Wife, Mother, Child, I know not. My affairs  
Are servanted to others: though I owe  
My revenge properly, my remission lies  
In Volscian breasts.”  
(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 129-130)

Hearing that Coriolanus is in alliance with Aufidius’ troops to attack Rome, Roman senators send Coriolanus’ close friends in Rome to persuade him not to attack Roman lands. One of Coriolanus’ closest friends, Menenius whom Coriolanus used to love more than his father in the text, goes to talk to Coriolanus for peace, however as can be seen in the context, Coriolanus does not accept him saying “*Away!... I owe my revenge properly*”. From this context, it can be seen that Coriolanus is under the influence of immanent component, triggered by his passion for revenge,

---

#### Turkish Studies

which would be the main motive in the rest of his life. Therefore, this instance can be considered as a non-subject due to identity reduced to a function according to Öztürk Kasar's (2009a) typology. Below are the Turkish translations of this context:

“Coriolanus  
Çekil!  
Menenius  
Nasıl, Çekil mi?  
Coriolanus  
Ben ne ana, ne karı, ne çocuk tanıyorum. Ben artık başkalarına tabiyim. Her ne kadar intikamım kendi hususi işim ise de, affetmek meselesi Volsiyalıların elindedir.”  
(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 135)

“Coriolanus  
Gözüme görünme!  
Menenius  
Ne? Görünme mi?  
Coriolanus  
Karı, anne, çocuk tanımıyorum.  
Hizmetimi başkalarına adadım.  
İntikamımı alacak olan benim,  
Ama bağışlama gücü Volsklerin elinde.”  
(Bozkurt, 1994, Trans. p. 173)

In translations, the signs ““Away!... I owe my revenge properly” were translated as “Çekil! İntikamım kendi hususi işim” and “Gözüme görünme! İntikamımı alacak olan benim” by Edib-Adıvar and Turhan (1945) and Bozkurt (1994), respectively, which shows that the readers of the translated text can realize the non-subject condition of the instance as was the case in the original text. Therefore, no designificative tendency was determined in translations of either in Edib-Adıvar and Turhan (1945) or in Bozkurt (1994) in this context.

#### Analysis 11:

“Second Lord  
His own impatience,  
Takes from Aufidius a great part of blame:  
Let's make the best of it.”  
(Shakespeare, 1955, p. 146)

Even though the second Lord is not in a state of non-subject in this discourse, it justifies that Aufidius was a non-subject in deciding Coriolanus to die. “His own impatience” in this context shows that Aufidius couldn't wait to kill Coriolanus because he was afraid that Coriolanus would be regarded a greater stately man than him by the citizens. Therefore, the instance was under the influence of immanent component rather than judgmental component, which means that the instance (Aufidius) was a non-subject due to immanent component of passionate nature according to Öztürk Kasar's (2009a) typology of non-subjects. The translations of the context are given below:

“2. Ş.B.  
Kendi sabırsızlığı Aufidius'un kabahatını bir hayli hafifletiyor.  
Ne ise, elimizden geleni yapalım.”  
(Edib-Adıvar, H. and Turhan, V., 1945, Trans. p. 155)

“İkinci Lord  
Aufidius da öfkeden kendinde değildi;  
Bu, kusurunu büyük ölçüde hafifletiyor.

---

### Turkish Studies

---

Bundan olabildiğince yararlanalım.”  
(Bozkurt, 1994, Trans. p. 196)

While Edib-Adıvar and Turhan (1945) translated the sign “*impatience*” in the source text as “*sabırsızlık*” in Turkish, Bozkurt (1994) translated it as “*öfke*” (rage). In deciding to kill Coriolanus, Aufidius was not angry with him or anybody, but rather he was jealous and afraid of losing his honor as a stately man as his citizens were more keen to see Coriolanus as their ruler. Therefore, Aufidius wanted Coriolanus to be killed as soon as possible. In Bozkurt’s (1994) translation, this designificative tendency can be categorized as perversion of meaning according to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematic since the translated sign has nothing to do with the original sign in the source text.

#### 4. Conclusion

Semiological analysis of the original text yielded some striking cases of non-subject states in the original play *Coriolanus* by Shakespeare (1955), but only 11 of such cases, which were found to be the most outstanding ones, were chosen and reported in this study. The component influencing the instance, thereby turning it into a non-subject in this play was generally found to be passion-based immanent component. The translation evaluation of the discourses with instances and subjectivity demonstrated that based on Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015) systematic of designificative tendencies in translation, seven of the contexts with non-subject instances were found to include designificative tendencies in Turkish translations and reported here, but in four of the examples chosen and reported here as non-subject instance contexts, the signs in the source text were preserved by the translators. The reason for the designificative tendencies analyzed in the previous section can be attributed to the fact that translators may not have conducted a semiological analysis before beginning with the translation. Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2015) report that literature is such a tricky endeavor that writers do anything possible not to ensure that the readers could fill in the gaps intentionally left for them. Therefore, semiological analysis of literary works could enable a translator to acquire the meaning universe in a text and fill in the gaps, which would otherwise be widened or removed for the target language reader, which would be a disservice to them. Tuna (2017a) states that the choices of translators might lead to some additions or losses in the meaning universe of a text. Performing a semiological analysis prior to starting a translation could allow translators to render a text into the target language without any designificative tendencies, or with minimum number of designificative tendencies. Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017) suggest that the features unique to a language might pose difficulties for translators in rendering those features into another language, the features of which are also unique, therefore translators are in need of a guide in their translation act, for which “semiotics of translation” might be proposed. Moreover, the benefits of semiological analysis are not restricted to translators, but readers of literary texts besides literary and translation studies scholars can also benefit from such analysis according to Öztürk Kasar (2009b). Translators must be aware of the fact that translating a literary text not only involves knowing the source language and target language well, but also grasping the meaning universe of the text. Tuna (2017b) seems to prove this suggesting that the translator who can read and understand signs in a source text can grasp the meaning universe that text and will perform the translation act in a more confident way. Karantay (1995) states that a play is not only written and translated to be performed on stage, but it also enjoys literary merit. Therefore, further studies focusing on the literary value of translation of the plays could be performed to find out how a semiological analysis could have helped the translator in the translation process.

## REFERENCES

- Aguiar, D., Atã, P. & Queiroz, J. (2015). Intersemiotic translation and transformational creativity. *Punctum. International Journal Of Semiotics*, 1(2), 11-21.
- Benveniste, E. (1995). *Genel dilbilim sorunları*. (E. Öztokat, Trans.) İstanbul: YKY.
- Cambridge Online Dictionary.  
<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/pestilence?fallbackFrom=turkish>  
Retrieved on: 21 January, 2017.
- Coquet, J.-C. (1984). *Le discours et son sujet*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Coquet, J.-C. (1997). *La quête du sens. Le langage en question*. Paris: PUF.
- Coquet, J.-C. (2007). *Phusis et logos. Une phénoménologie du langage*. Paris: PUV.
- Coquet, J.-C., & Öztürk Kasar, S. (2003). *Söylem, göstergebilim ve çeviri*. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Gorlée, D. L. (1994). *Semiotics and the problem of translation: With special reference to the semiotics of Charles S. Peirce*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Guillaume, A. (2009). Traduction, sémiotique et praxéologie. *Penser Et Agir: Contextes Philosophique, Praxéologique et Langagier*. 395-412.
- Guillaume, A. (2015). Intertheoricity: Plasticity, elasticity and hybridity of theories. Part II: semiotics of transferogenesis. *Human And Social Studies*. 4(2), 59-77.
- Karantay, S. (1995). Tiyatro çevirisi: Oyun dili ve çeviri. M. Rifat (Ed.), *Çeviri ve çeviri kuramı üstüne söylemler*. (93-115) İstanbul: Düzlem Publishing
- Kourdis, E., & Kukkonen, P. (2015). Introduction- semiotics of translation, translation in semiotics. *Punctum. International Journal Of Semiotics*. 1(2), 5-10.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2005). *Algılanan dünya. Sohbetler*. (Ö. Aygün, Trans.) İstanbul : Metis Publishing.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2006). *Algının önceliği ve onun felsefi sonuçları*. (Y. Yıldırım, Trans.) İstanbul : Kabalcı Publishing.
- Nowotna, M. (2005). Le sujet dans tous ses étas. M. Nowotna (Ed.), *D'une langue à l'autre*. (23-46). Paris: Aux lieux d'être.
- Nutku, Ö. (2013). *Shakespeare sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2001). *La sémiotique subjectale et la traduction*. Oral presentation at Third International Congress- Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies Abstracts. European Society for Translation, Copenhagen Business School, Kopenhagen: 24-25.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009a). Pour une typologie des non-sujets: Au carrefour de la sémiotique et de la phénoménologie. *Sémio 2007: Rencontres Sémiotiques: Les Interfaces Disciplinaires, Des Théories Aux Pratiques Professionnelles. Actes du Congrès International de L'Association Française de Sémiotique* (p. 1-6) Paris : Université Paris IV La Sorbonne. published in:<http://afssemio.com/semio2007/spip.php?article19>. Retrieved on 26 July, 2014.

- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009b). Pour une sémiotique de la traduction. C. Laplace, M. Lederer, & D. Gile (Ed.), *La traduction et ses métiers* (p.163-175). Caen: Lettres Modernes Minard, Coll."Champollion 12"
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2012). Jean-Claude Coquet ile bir dil görüngübilimine doğru. *XII. International Language, Narrative and Stylistics Symposium Proceedings*. (p. 424-430). Edirne: Trakya University.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2016a). Sémiotique de la traduction littéraire. *Les Langues Modernes*. 1, 43-51.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2016b). Interaction entre la sémiotique et la traduction littéraire. *Translation As Innovation: Bridging The Sciences And The Humanities*. 1, 243-260.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2017). Jean-Claude Coquet ve Söyleyenler Göstergebilimi. *Prof. Dr. Ayşe Eziler Kıran'a Armağan*. 183-199. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları
- Öztürk Kasar, S., & Tuna, D., (2015). Yaşam, yazın ve yazın çevirisi için gösterge okuma. *Frankofoni Ortak Kitap*. 27, 457-482.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Tuna, D. (2017). Shakespeare in three languages: Reading and analyzing sonnet 130 and its translations in light of semiotics. *IJLET International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(1), 170-181.
- Petrilli, S. (2015). Translation of semiotics into translation theory, and vice versa. *Punctum. International Journal Of Semiotics*. 1(2), 96-117.
- Primožic, D. T. (2013). *Merleau-Ponty üzerine*. (Z.Z. Esenyel, Trans.) Bursa: Sentez Publishing.
- Rozemond, M. (2009). *Descartes's dualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Saussure, F. (2001). *Genel dilbilim dersleri*. (B. Vardar, Trans.) İstanbul: Multilingual Yabancı Dil Publishing.
- Shakespeare, W. (1945). *Coriolanus*. (H.E. Adivar, & V. Turhan, Trans.) İstanbul: Pulhan.
- Shakespeare, W. (1955). *The tragedy of Coriolanus*. London: Penguin Books.
- Shakespeare, W. (1994). *Coriolanus*. (B. Bozkurt, Trans.) İstanbul: Remzi Publishing House.
- Tuna, D. (2016a). Çevirmek için çözümlenmek: Bel Kaufman'ın Sunday in the Park başlıklı öyküsünde anlam arayışı. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Journal*. 5, 76-97.
- Tuna, D. (2016b). Oktay Rifat'ın Tecelli başlıklı şiiri üzerinden çeviriyi göstergebilimle buluşturmak. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Journal*. 35, 33-52.
- Tuna, D. (2017a). Exploring the nature of translation of names in children's literature. *Turkish Studies -International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 12(15), 579-594.
- Tuna, D. (2017b). Satır aralarını gün yüzüne çıkarmak: Bir yazınsal yapıtta tarihten birkaç yaprak. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8 (1), 50-85.