

KESİT AKADEMİ DERGİSİ

ISSN: 2149-9225

The Journal of Kesit Academy

AN INTERTEXTUAL APPROACH TO THE TURKISH
TRANSLATION OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S
MACBETH

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'IN MACBETH ESERİNİN
TÜRKÇE ÇEVİRİSİNE METİNLERARASI BİR
YAKLAŞIM

Ayşenur İPLİKÇİ ÖZDEN*



Article Information/ Makale Türü/ Информация о Статье: Research Article/ Araştırma Makalesi/ Научная Статья

Citation / Atıf / Цитата

İplikçi Özden, A. (2021). An Intertextual Approach to the Turkish Translation of William Shakespeare's Macbeth. *The Journal of Kesit Academy*, 7 (27), 72-81.

İplikçi Özden, A. (2021). William Shakespeare'in Macbeth Eserinin Türkçe Çevirisine Metinlerarası Bir Yaklaşım. *Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, 7 (27), 72-81.

doi 10.29228/kesit.51121

Submitted / Geliş / Отправлено: 28.04.2021
Accepted / Kabul / Принимать: 22.06.2021
Published / Yayın / Опубликованный: 25.06.2021

This article was checked by Intihal.net. Bu makale İntihal.net tarafından taranmıştır. Эта статья была проверена Интихал.нет This article is under the Creative Commons license. Bu makale Creative Commons lisansı altındadır. Это произведение доступно по лицензии Creative Commons.

*Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Samsun Üniversitesi, aysenur.iplikci@samsun.edu.tr

KESİT AKADEMİ DERGİSİ

ISSN: 2149-9225

The Journal of Kesit Academy

AN INTERTEXTUAL APPROACH TO THE TURKISH TRANSLATION OF
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S MACBETH¹

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'İN MACBETH ESERİNİN TÜRKÇE ÇEVİRİSİNE
METİNLERARASI BİR YAKLAŞIM

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ayşenur İPLİKÇİ ÖZDEN

Abstract: A translator of drama should be conscient of the fact that the language used in the dramatic work is aimed for both reading and performing, and they should get the reader and the audience distinguish it. For that reason, a translator of drama should take notice that every line they translate to another language carries the dramatic effect that the text sets out in both performance and written form. The aim of this study is to evaluate the Turkish translation of William Shakespeare's Macbeth in an intertextual context. While taking into consideration some intertextual techniques that have important functions in forming the meaning of the text, the original and the target texts are analyzed and how the translator uses these elements of intertextuality in her translated work are touched upon. In particular, the techniques such as allusion or reference are the ones that form the basis of this study, and how they are reflected in the translated work underlies the ground for this reading. While examining the translated text and the original text; the fact that the translator possesses a good knowledge of the texts and authors the writer of the original text refers to or benefit from while writing their text, carries utmost importance. For that reason, how the translator uses this awareness and knowledge in the translated text, is also analyzed as one of the goals of this study.

Key Words: Intertextuality, literary translation, allusion, reference.

Öz: Tiyatro oyunu çevirmeni, oyundaki dilin hem okunmak hem de oynanmak için kullanıldığının bilincinde olmalı ve okur ile seyircinin de bunu fark etmesini sağlamalıdır. Bu nedenledir ki çevirmen, başka bir dile çevirdiği her satırın, metnin hem sahneye koyulmasında hem de yazılı şekilde, oluşmasını hedeflediği dramatik etkiyi oluşturabilmesi gerektiğinin bilincinde olarak hareket etmelidir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, William Shakespeare'in Macbeth isimli eserinin Türkçe çevirisini

¹ Statements of "COPE-Code of Conduct and Best Practices Guidelines for Journal Editors": No conflicts of interest were reported for this article. Ethics committee approval is not required for this article.

"COPE-Dergi Editörleri İçin Davranış Kuralları ve En İyi Uygulama İlkeleri" beyanları: Bu çalışma için herhangi bir çıkar çatışması bildirilmemiştir. Bu çalışma için etik kurul onayı gerekmemektedir.

metinlerarası bağlamda incelemektir. Metnin anlamının oluşmasında önemli işlevlere sahip olan birtakım metinlerarası yöntemler ele alınırken, kaynak ve hedef metinler tahlil edilmiş ve çevirmenin, çeviri eserinde bu metinlerarası öğeleri nasıl kullandığı üzerinde durulmuştur. Özellikle, anıştırma ve gönderme gibi teknikler bu çalışmanın temelini oluşturmakla birlikte, bunların çeviri eserde ne şekilde yansıtıldığını incelemek de yine bu çözümlemenin zemininde yer almaktadır. Çeviri metni ve kaynak metni incelerken; çevirmenin, kaynak metin yazarının eserini yazarken yararlandığı ya da göndermede bulunduğu metinler ve yazarlar hakkında iyi bir bilgi sahibi olması gerekliliği, belki de en fazla önem teşkil eden husustur. Bunun için, çevirmenin bu farkındalığı ve bilgiyi çeviri eserde nasıl kullandığını saptamak da bu çalışmanın amaçlarından biri olarak görülebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Metinlerarasılık, edebi çeviri, anıştırma, gönderme.

Dramatic translation is perhaps one of the least discussed subjects among the translation of other literary genres. While considering the reason for this, one may encounter the idea that translating drama includes not only the verbal translation but also translating for the stage. "If dramatic texts were published for just being read, it perhaps wouldn't be necessary to consider them different from stories or novels in terms of translation. However, most plays have a specific aim and function: to be staged" (Tahir Gürçağlar, 2014). Thus, the translator of a dramatic work of art should bear in mind certain auditory, visual, and backstage elements as well, such as the enters, exits, silences on the stage or the costumes and outer views of characters. When all these things are taken into consideration, and when the responsibility of the translator is kept in mind, it is not so hard to observe that the translator should be able to think and react in the way that both the playwright and the performer do.

A translator of drama should be conscient of the fact that the language used in the dramatic work is aimed for both reading and performing, and they should get the reader and the audience distinguish it. For that reason, a translator of drama should take notice that every line they translate to another language carries the dramatic effect that the text sets out in both performance and written form. They should be able to translate the text in such a way that the performers can act on the stage and readers can read it with the same effect that the playwright of the original text has intended. As Aksoy puts forth "after the text is treated by the translator and it turns out to have its final form, it should be given notice that the text bears the quality of being able to appeal to both the reader and the audience" (Aksoy, 2002). If the translated text of the dramatic work does so, it will be possible to utter that the translator has achieved their purpose.

Together with the development of translation; intertextuality has also been one of the most discussed and scrutinized approaches, particularly in literary sense, since 1960s and 1970s when it was formally and assertively propounded by Julia Kristeva with her ideas and works on the subject. In actual fact, intertextuality goes long way back to the ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure, then Russian formalists and also Mikhail Bakhtin from whose notions of dialogism and carnival in particular Kristeva was deeply influenced. Thus, this approach has been the

concern of researchers and critics for years. “Intertextuality describes [...] the itinerary or genealogy of a complex image, a conceit, or a text, and it may be itself defined as ‘the structural presence’ within a work of ‘from earlier works’ (Schoeck, 1988). In an overall sense, intertextuality can be explained as the nonexistence of any independent texts for they are produced woven by the bits and pieces of other works that exist in a large web of texts, and as getting the meaning by moving and tracing relations among them. When intertextuality is addressed, “the idea that each text exists in the domain of other literary texts written before itself and, no text can be totally free from earlier texts, prevails” (Aktulum², 2014). Hence it can be thought that a text should be read and understood by the relations among texts. As Allen (2000) also expresses “meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all the other texts to which it refers and relates, moving [...] into a network of textual relations. The text becomes the intertext”. Then it is possible to say that the reader has a very crucial role in forming the meaning as they are the ones who go between the texts and form the relations in question. In that case, the reader’s role cannot be waved aside as they deal with this interchange or conversation between two or more texts.

Translation and intertextuality are connected to each other in such a way that it is almost impossible to separate them from each other while examining a piece of literary art. “Every translation, without doubt, is a kind of comment, just like writing. When we talk about translating a work of art to another language, what is in fact meant is re-forming it in another language” (Karadeniz, 2021). While doing this, every writer or playwright cannot avoid being taken with any kind of literary works of art written before themselves. They are almost doomed to be influenced from those texts and can be seen to reflect pieces or particles from them in their work. Actually, translation itself is a way or method of intertextuality. While you translate a work of art, you are practically rewriting it in another language, so your text and the translated text form a kind of intertextual relationship.

What Andre Lefevere sets forth about literary studies, translation and earlier works may help both the translator and the reader, as he concentrates upon the necessity of the translation of earlier works:

During most of the last century and the beginning of the present one, the philological study of literature in departments of classics and in the newly emergent departments of national languages and literatures insisted on reading in the original languages both the literature of antiquity and the literature of previous periods in the evolution of a national literature. Under these conditions the translation of literature quickly became the Achilles’ heel of the young discipline of comparative literature. (Lefevere, 1992)

When it has become important to read the works of earlier times, translation has also become significantly important. By translating these works, connections among the texts of different times have started to be made. In this sense, it is possible to say that translation has also contributed to the studies on intertextuality.

² The quotations taken from sources written in Turkish have been translated to English by the author of this study.

While bearing in mind that the translated version of the texts of plays can be evaluated with some criteria determined by paying regard to the dramatic features in the play itself; what is done in this paper in particular, is to evaluate the translated text from the angles of both dramatic and intertextual lines of vision. For that reason, certain elements of intertextuality are taken and explained for evaluation, and after that the text of the play is studied in these respects. Specifically Ümmühan Yapar's translation of the text to Turkish is the related translated text that is taken as the matter of subject. While doing this, the two main dimensions that are the concerns of this paper can be given as the translated text itself, which is in fact a method of intertextuality, as the first dimension and, how the translator reflected the intertextual elements in the translated text such as allusions or other ways of intertextuality, as the second dimension.

When one considers the first dimension, it is possible to utter that while examining the methods of intertextuality, translation itself can be regarded as a fundamental way of intertextual relations. While translating the text, the translator sort of re-writes it in a new language and new culture. For that reason, in this way a strong bond between the original text and the newly produced text is established. As Chantal Wright utters, translation can be defined "as an intense form of reading that might be described as a type of literary criticism. Translators are the only readers to weigh every single word in a text" (2016). Accordingly, the translator is expected to reflect what the original text holds in itself, concerning either texture or culture. They should do this in such a way that the reader of the target language would feel the same that the original author intended for their readers. However, as this is not that easy, the translator is responsible for representing not only the basic but also the crucial elements in the text. As Venuti (2013) puts it "the possibility of translating most foreign intertexts with any completeness or precision is so limited as to be virtually non-existent. As a result, they are usually replaced by analogous but ultimately different intertextual relations in the receiving language."

When the text of the play is examined in the first dimension explained above, the reader can study these examples taken from the original text and the translated text. In Act I, Scene I, the words of the first witch can be seen to have been translated to Turkish using relevant and appropriate words; however, while Shakespeare gives us the below-mentioned possibilities in three options and in one sentence, the translator gives the reader the translated version of the text in two options and two sentences:

"In thunder, lightning, or in rain?" (Shakespeare, 1843)

"Gökler gürleyip, şimşekler çakarken mi? Yoksa yağmurlar yağarken mi?" (Yapar, 2011)

Though this translation is correct as it gives almost the same meaning; the translator expresses it by rewriting the original sentence in two separate sentences. Another way of translating the original statement would be: "Gök gürülürken mi, şimşek çakarken mi, ya da yağmur yağarken mi?" So, as seen in this example, while translating the original text, though the meaning can stay nearly the same, the structure of the statements can change; thus, the newly produced text in terms of intertextuality seems to have changed slightly.

Another example from the text can be given from Scene III. In this scene, while the first witch talks about the sailor's wife, the reader encounters the phrase "the rump-fed ronyon"

(Shakespeare, 1843) that is used for the sailor's wife; and the translator rewrites this phrase in Turkish as "kenar mahalle dilberi" (Yapar, 2011). 'Rump-fed' means 'fattened in the rump or fat-bottomed', and 'ronyon' which is an obsolete word means 'a mangy creature'. Thereupon, when we think of the rump-fed ronyon, we can visualize a fat-bottomed scabby woman. When the Turkish equivalent for this phrase is considered, 'kenar mahalla dilberi' just fits the description of the original phrase, as in Turkish culture a woman with such a portrayal can be thought to be the one that lives in the suburb and usually looks stout and sluggish because of their lifestyles. Hence here we see a culturally related intertextual image. With this example, it is possible to see clearly that intertextuality is a way of rewriting and it establishes a strong link between the original text and the translated text. Here with the phrase 'kenar mahalle dilberi', the reader of the target text can understand exactly what the original writer means by the translator's use of cultural replacements in word choice.

The fact that the translated text itself is a means of intertextuality itself can also be observed in the plaintext or the prose form that the translator prefers to use instead of the narrative in verse that the original playwright uses while producing his play. In Scene VII, Macbeth's original words are as follows:

Macbeth:

If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well

It were done quickly: if the assassination

Could trammel up the consequence, and catch

With his surcease success; that but this blow

Might be the be-all and the end-all here.

But here, upon this bank and shoal of time, —

— But in these cases.

We still have judgment here; that we but teach

Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return

To plague th' inventor. This even-handed justice

Commends th' ingredients of our poison'd chalice

To our own lips (Shakespeare, 1843).

As the reader can see, these lines are written in narrative verse. However, the translator does not use this form, instead she uses prose as follows:

Macbeth: Yapmakla olup bitseydi, bu işi bir an önce yapardım. Eğer cinayet başarıyla sonuçlanabilse, bir vuruşta sonuca ulaşılabilse şuracaktır, zamanın şu sığ ve önemsiz kıyısında öbür dünyayı gözden çıkarırdık. Ama işlerin hesabını bu dünyada vermeye başlıyoruz. Kanlı dersler öğretiyoruz, sonra bunlar dönüp öğreterinin başını götürüyor. İlahi adalet, içinde zehir sunduğumuz kadehi kendi dudaklarımıza içiriyor (Yapar, 2011).

As intertextuality is closely related with rewriting the text, in this example one can see the translator's rewriting the original text in a different format, and this makes the translated text transform into using a kind of daily language, rather than using the poetic impression of Shakespeare.

Before examining *Macbeth* and its translation to Turkish in terms of the second dimension mentioned above – namely how the translator reflected the intertextual elements in the translated text, it would be of great use to briefly review Shakespeare within the context of the subject matter of the paper and the works of the earlier centuries that affected him while writing.

William Shakespeare, who lived between 1564 and 1616, began his literary career as a playwright, probably in the early 1590s by writing comedies and history plays. By 1592 he was in London as an actor and apparently already well known as a playwright. Later he continued writing his great tragic dramas, or tragedies including *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Anthony and Cleopatra*, which were written from 1601 to 1607. Shakespeare lived at a time in England when Renaissance was on the rise and the viewpoints and the attitudes of people were incrementally changing. Renaissance flowered in Italy and then spread through Europe in a short time and, with the Renaissance – namely the rebirth, the rebirth of humanism, the rebirth of man, the rebirth of modern thought, one can add to these kinds of rebirths – humanism, the glorification of mankind, flourished again. At this time, the classical works of the ancient Greek and Rome were translated, and people started to give importance to the concept of "individual" as renaissance was the rebirth of man, rather than the perception of "mass" or "community" that was prevailing in Middle Ages. It is possible to say that the time of Renaissance was a new phase in the cultural and social lives of the European men, who were regarded and respected now as individuals. Shakespeare at this time, wrote for everybody in the society. "He faced his contemporary audience, answered their needs and contrived a drama which the Court could appreciate, and the public enjoy" (Evans, 1943).

When we take Shakespeare's works in terms of intertextuality, it'd be possible to say that William Shakespeare, considered the greatest of his time – and to many scholars the greatest of all times – cannot be thought to have that reputation or distinction without noting his getting inspired by earlier works, authors and topics of the past such as Geoffrey Chaucer (especially his *Troilus and Criseyde*), Edmund Spenser (specifically his *Faerie Queen*), ancient Roman writers including Ovid, Virgil, Cicero, Seneca and Horace, and ancient Greek and Roman mythology with all its unique stories and characters. "Shakespeare rarely invented the plots of his dramas, preferring to work, often quite closely, with stories he found ready-made in histories, novellas narrative poems or other plays." (Greenblatt, 2006). In this sense, Shakespeare's writings can be noted as optimal tools of intertextuality and intertextual relations. They can be studied going back to even the works of ancient times and their meaning can be better construed by studying these works. As noted above, the works of the ancient Greek and Rome were getting popular at the time of Renaissance and Shakespeare, a Renaissance man, used most of these topics and works of these earlier times in his writing. Of course, Shakespeare's love for reading and spending a great deal of time examining all these works and some other classical works, apart from the readings he did at the schools he attended, can be thought to play an important

role in shaping his works. For that reason, it would not be an irrational attitude to review his works in an intertextual context.

In *Macbeth*, which in overall sense, tells the story of lust for power of Macbeth and his wife, and how this rage led to their mental and physical destruction in the end, one can see his-
torification as Shakespeare uses it in many of his plays as an intertextual method. By historifica-
tion, what is meant is taking his stories into a faraway land, into the medieval times or feudal
times, and in *Macbeth*, we see that the play sets in the Middle Ages, specifically the 11th century.
In this way, the play tells us about a few centuries earlier and Shakespeare creates a world of
those times in the play. While doing this, as Shakespeare got influenced from earlier works of
art and made lots of allusions to the Greek mythology and the works of Roman playwrights, in
Macbeth one can also trace these kinds of inspirations and adumbrations. In this sense, in *Mac-
beth* the most widely used technique of intertextuality can be clearly detected as the method of
allusion. Allusion can be defined basically as an indirect reference to other literary or unliterary
works of art, or to a historical event or person. With allusion, the writer refers to that person or
event or anything they want and use this reference to get the intended meaning. The thing that
is intended to express in the work, is just instilled – not clearly commanded – by means of using
allusions. “As no complete information is given about the person or object, allusion means the
same as implicit discourse” (Aktulum, 2014). As the writer makes allusions to earlier works or
characters of earlier literary genres, they are closely associated with intertextual relations be-
tween texts. In *Macbeth*, the most widely seen allusions are mythological and historical ones. As
an example, in Act II, Scene I the reader first encounters a mythological and then a historical
allusion in Macbeth’s lines. When the servants exit and Macbeth is alone, he speaks to himself.
He first visions a dagger in the air and though he tries to catch the weapon he cannot do it.
Then he wonders if the dagger is real or a product of his mind: “Art thou but a dagger of the
mind, a false creation, proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain?” (Shakespeare, 1843). After
he sees some blood on the dagger, he thinks that all that happens is because of the unease he
feels about killing Duncan. After that, he continues to speak:

Nature seems dead, and wicked dreams abuse
The curtain'd sleep; witchcraft celebrates
Pale Hecate's offerings, and wither'd murder,
Alarum'd by his sentinel, the wolf,
Whose howl's his watch, thus with his stealthy pace.
With Tarquin's ravishing strides, towards his design
Moves like a ghost. Thou sure and firm-set earth,
Hear not my steps, which way they walk, for fear
Thy very stones prate of my whereabouts (Shakespeare, 1843).

In these lines the first allusion is a mythological one, represented with Hecate. Hecate,
the daughter of Zeus, is known to be a goddess of Greek mythology who is strongly associated
with magic, witchcraft, ghosts, and the moon. She was a master of witchcraft and taught magic.
In these lines, the three witches celebrate Hecate’s offerings. By making the witches in his play
closely related with a goddess of Greek mythology, the playwright draws a picture of witchcraft
with a sound basis. As these three witches make their offerings to Hecate, they can be thought

to follow her example and the reader can believe that what they do is real magic. Hence, by making this allusion and thereby forming a strong and effectual bond with mythology, the playwright thuswise gets involved in intertextuality. After this point, the reader can understand or interpret the above-mentioned lines in the way they conceive.

As for the Turkish translation of these lines by Yapar (2011), the reader can see them in prose translated in the way below:

Şimdi dünyanın yarısında her şey ölmüş gibi. Perdelenmiş uykuyu kötü düşler bozuyor. Büyücüler ayinde; solgun yüzlü Hecate'ye kurbanlarını sunuyorlar. Kurdun ulumasından zamanın geldiğini öğrenen korkunç yüzlü cinayet, hırsız Tarquinius'un sessiz ve hızlı adımlarıyla hedefine doğru bir hortlak gibi ilerliyor. Sağlam ve sert toprak, sen de adımlarımın sesini duyma.

The translated text, as it is given in prose, can be thought to lack the poetic impression which is possessed by the style of the original playwright, and this can cause the reader of the translated play to feel less involved in the scene. However, they can comment upon the allusion of Hecate and get the meaning of the text by using their knowledge on Greek mythology.

When the above lines and translated form of the text is considered, another allusion made is a historical one. "Tarquin's ravishing strides" is an allusion related with Tarquin – Lucius Tarquinius Superbus –, and what he did in history. Tarquin was a ruler in Rome in the 6th century BCE and was known to be a proud and tyrannical king. This allusion gets the reader think about what happened to Tarquin and what happens to Macbeth in the play. As Tarquin causes the death of Lucretia – after he rapes Lucretia, she commits suicide upon which Shakespeare also wrote his narrative poem *The Rape of Lucrece* –, Macbeth causes the death of Duncan. After reading these lines, the reader can also deduce that if Macbeth had the power over throne, he would possibly be a proud, arrogant, and tyrannical king as Tarquin was. By using these allusions, Shakespeare can be thought to have composed a narrative on which the reader can reflect and comment as they interpret the text. And intertextuality beyond question has an important role in forming the meaning and shaping the understanding of the text.

As a final word, it is possible to think that translation and intertextuality have become indissociable disciplines of study and components of literary analysis since the beginnings of 1960s and 1970s, when intertextuality became practically popular with the studies of notable critics such as Bakhtin, Kristeva, and Barthes. Intertextuality can be regarded as an effective way of literary analysis that can be applied to all kinds of literary texts beginning from the earlier centuries to our world of today since it examines the relations among texts which exist in a wide web or cloud of all texts that have been produced since the beginning of writing. While analysing these texts and getting all the possible meanings, intertextuality uses a wide range of methods among which appear translation, allusion and historical references that form the basis of this study. By using these methods, not only the historical and mythological sources Shakespeare was influenced have been put forth in this paper, but also how the meaning is affected by the use of such methods has been explained. It seems that the close relation between translation and intertextuality will continue to be the very subject matter of the studies of researchers and academics in the years to come as it has been for about sixty years.

REFERENCES

- Aksoy, N. B. (2002). *Geçmişten Günümüze Yazın Çevirisi*. İstanbul: İmge.
- Aktulum, K. (2014). *Metinlerarası İlişkiler*. İstanbul: Öteki Yayınları.
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Eco, U. (2021). *Gülüin Adı*. (Çev.: Ş. Karadeniz.). İstanbul: Can Yayınları.
- Evans, B. Ifor. (1943). *A Short History of English Literature*. London: Penguin Books.
- Greenblatt, S. (Ed.). (2006). *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. (8th edition, Volume I). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. The Modern Language Association of America.
- Schoeck, R.J. (1988). Intertextuality and the Rhetoric Canon. *Criticism, History and Intertextuality*. (R. Fleming and M. Payne, Ed.). Pennsylvania: Bucknell University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. (1843). *Macbeth*. Whittaker.
- Shakespeare, W. (2011). *Macbeth*. (Çev.: Ü.Yapar). Antik Dünya Klasikleri.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2014). *Çevirinin ABC'si*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Venuti, L. (2013). Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation, *Romance Studies*. 27(3), 157-173.
<https://doi.org/10.1179/174581509X455169>
- Wright, C. (2016). *Literary Translation*. London: Routledge.