



Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(Special Issue 1), 86-108; 2021

Coquet's "Theory of instances of enunciation" in the analysis of *Othello* from the perspective of semiotics of translation

Mesut Kuleli^{a 1} 

^a *Bandırma Onyedi Eylül University, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Kuleli, M. (2021). Coquet's "Theory of instances of enunciation" in the analysis of *Othello* from the perspective of semiotics of translation. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 1), 86-108.

Submission Date:07/08/2020

Acceptance Date:22/09/2020

Abstract

The aim of this study is to make a semiotic analysis of William Shakespeare's play titled *Othello* in the light of Jean-Claude Coquet's "Theory of Instances of Enunciation" and compare Turkish translations of the contexts analyzed in the original play from semiotics of translation point of view with a view to determining the meaning transformations in the meaning universe of the play. To this end, non-subject discourses in the source text were analyzed based on Coquet's "Theory of Instances of Enunciation" (1997, 2007). The non-subjects determined in the play were further divided into sub-categories in the light of Öztürk Kasar's (2019) typology of non-subjects. For translation evaluation, four Turkish translations of the play were analyzed based on Öztürk Kasar's "Systematics of Designification in Translation". Determination of contexts with non-subject instances in the play was followed by the classification of those non-subjects. The instances in these contexts were classified as non-subjects submissive to an immanent component under the effect of passions in dysphoric state. Translation evaluation of non-subject contexts yielded examples for eight of the nine designificative tendencies put forward by Öztürk Kasar. The findings of translation evaluation demonstrate that literary translators could benefit from designificative tendencies in overcoming the pitfalls in a literary text. Moreover, raising translator candidates' awareness of designificative tendencies could enable them to decide when and how to use or refrain from those tendencies in literary translation.

© 2021 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Semiotics of translation; literary translation; theory of instances of enunciation; non-subject; systematics of designification in translation.

1. Introduction

Studies and ideas on translation date back to early times, and it is no doubt that translation has played a significant role in intercultural communication in areas ranging from religious to political and social issues. From the early times when the act of translation was regarded as a word for word act of transferring a written text or oral speech to another language, the views on translation have undergone considerable changes. However, it was only with the groundbreaking paper of James Holmes in 1972

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: mkuleli@bandirma.edu.tr

that translation took on an academic perspective, and the act of translation has been studied in an academic framework ever since. With the paradigm shift in translation studies proposed by Holmes (1972) and accepted by many scholars, translation studies has been considered a scientific field on its own. However, as in all other scientific disciplines, translation studies is also an interdisciplinary endeavour. “Once seen as a sub-branch of linguistics, translation today is perceived as an interdisciplinary field of study” (Bassnett, 2013, p. 3). This interdisciplinary nature of translation studies has attracted a lot of attention.

By its nature, [translation studies] is multilingual and also interdisciplinary, encompassing any language combinations, various branches of linguistics, comparative literature, communication studies, philosophy and a range of types of cultural studies including postcolonialism and postmodernism as well as sociology and historiography. (Munday, 2008, p. 1).

Interdisciplinarity has been the buzz word of the contemporary era. All scientific branches develop their scope through cooperation with other disciplines as well as feeding those other disciplines with their own findings and benefiting from the findings and methodology of other disciplines, as well. Therefore, the nature of interdisciplinarity encompasses methodology besides findings from other scientific branches. Referring to the elasticity and hybridity of theories, Guillaume (2015) suggests that theories tend to be supple. While the theories inherent in a scientific field could be in close contact with other theories in this field, it is also a common occurrence that those theories could also be of benefit to other theories in different scientific branches. “The trend toward interdisciplinary collaboration and coordination is irreversible to the point of no return” (Sherif & Sherif, 2017, p. 5). It is no wonder that the umbrella term "social sciences" is also full of theories and methodological approaches that lend themselves to several scientific branches.

The concepts in language, literature, translation, and social sciences tend to be supple and flexible content-wise. The conceptual fluctuations within and among disciplines require continual updates of conceptual readings. The concept becomes richer when shared among disciplines and is transformed with a redefinition. (Kuleli & Tuna, 2020, p. XVII).

Translation studies is no exception to the rule. It benefits from and at the same time supports the methodology and findings of other disciplines not only in social sciences but also in medical and life sciences. Translation studies is in close contact with “Linguistics, Literary Criticism, Comparative Literature, History, Anthropology, Ethnography, Psychology, Gender Studies, Philosophy, Computer Science or Law and Economics” (Ruano, 2006, p. 43). Besides these disciplines, Shreve & Diamond (2016) refer to the mutual relationship between Cognitive Neuroscience and Translation Studies; Bowker & Delsey (2016) state the contact between Information Science and Translation Studies; House & Loenhoff (2016) consider Communication Studies a complement to Translation Studies; Buzelin & Baraldi (2016) associate the studies in Sociology with Translation Studies. Moreover, while Marais & Kull (2016) consider Biosemiotics closely linked to Translation Studies, Giammarresi & Lapalme (2016) build a relationship between Computer Science and Translation Studies. Despite its short history of about 50 years, translation studies seems to have found a gate to other disciplines, rendering it the quality of interdisciplinarity. Besides all these scientific endeavors, translation studies also benefits from and at the same time contributes to techniques, approaches and methodology in semiotics. Translation studies and semiotics seem to have common features inherent in their general framework. These two disciplines both pursue the principle of reaching the meaning universe of a text through detailed analysis. However, “this does not mean to suggest that translation theory and semiotics are the same thing. These two different disciplines are intent upon exploring the same process, i.e. that of semiosis, [...] but under different aspects” (Petrilli, 2015, p. 96). Petrilli & Ponzio further state that “translation occurs among signs and cannot be reduced exclusively to the linguistic-verbal order. [...] Where there are signs and semiotic processes, there is translation” (2020, p. 56). This close contact between the two disciplines

has been employed by scholars into translation studies or semiotics extensively. “It is not surprising that over the past decades, many researchers have searched for theories and research tools in the area of semiotics to explore translation issues” (Kourdis, 2015, p. 303). Therefore, a significant number of scholars into translation studies have also been ardent followers of semiotics principles and techniques.

2. Semiotics and translation studies

Since it was first coined by Ferdinand de Saussure (2001^[1916]) as a scientific field that would involve the study of signs in everyday life and also serve as a meta-scientific branch even comprising linguistics, semiotics has been in close contact with other disciplines. “[...] semiotics can become the mediator among the sciences of meaning” (Kourdis, 2015, p. 303). Translation studies also immediately recognized the potential of semiotics. However, it was even before the establishment of translation studies as a separate field of science that the relationship between semiotics and the act of translation was put forward. Kourdis & Kukkonen (2015) attribute the relationship between translation and semiotics to Jakobson’s 1959 paper in which three types of translation were put forth. As early as the mid-1970s, semiotics was considered a companion to translation studies. Ludskanov (1975, p. 5) suggested that the act of translation involves the transfer of signs in one language to signs in another language, and therefore any transformation of signs between two languages can be considered within the scope of semiotics, which makes it essential for translators to benefit from the analysis principles of semiotics. This mutual relationship did not go unnoticed in the following years and Siskin (1987) employed a semiotic theory of translation in analysis of linguistic equivalence in translation. Petrilli (1992) went even further adding a third dimension, ideology, to the relationship between semiotics and translation theory. Gorlee (1994) also drew similarities between the focus of semiotics and translation studies, referring to Charles Sanders Peirce’s concepts and theory of semiotics.

The relationship between semiotics and translation studies has been of central attention, particularly since the dawn of the new millennium. Labeling semiotics of translation as a relatively young interdisciplinarity, Torop (2001, p. 46) suggests that “the semiotics of translation examines different aspects of translatability, starting with the linguistic worldview and ending with the functioning of a translation text as a cultural text. For translation studies, the semiotic aspect of text analysis [...] is important”. Torop (2001) also touches upon the reciprocity between semiotics and translation stating that both semiotics and translation benefit from this cooperation. This view perfectly matches the ideal type of interdisciplinarity proposed by Snell-Hornby (2006, p. 72). “The [...] highest stage of development is reciprocal interdisciplinarity, which brings gain for both sides: two or more disciplines cooperate on equal terms, jointly developing methods and concepts, resulting in mutual enrichment” (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p. 72). Therefore, translation studies does not only borrow methodology from semiotics, but it also contributes to the methodology in semiotics. Hartama-Heinonen (2015, p. 42) maintains that semiotics of translation will continue to contribute to semiotics more than now in the future. Sütiste & Torop (2007, p. 187), attributing the “methodological innovation” in translation studies to the contribution of “semiotics steps”, elaborate on the term “semiotranslation” to refer to “the possibilities of methodological synthesis between translation studies and semiotics”. These studies point to the inseparable link between semiotics and translation studies.

Translation process begins much earlier than the translation of the first sign of a source text just as it does not end with the translation and typing of the last sign of that text. Rather, translation process involves an extensive procedure, starting with the decision of the text to be translated, the formal and legal issues to protect the copyright issues of the target text, analyzing that source text with an intensive and elaborate reading to accomplish the meaning universe, making important translation decisions and choosing the appropriate translation strategies, the actual translation of the signs into the target language and finally editing process following the act of translation. The contribution of semiotics to translation

begins with the analysis of the source text with a view to accomplishment of the meaning universe, and continues during the actual act of translation. However, semiotics is not limited to these two steps. Semiotics might also help with the editing process of the translated product. Therefore, the act of translation requires the analysis of signs in a source text to render them into another language with the signs of the target language culture, just as semiotics deals with the capture of meaning through the analysis of signs.

The methodology in semiotics helps in three stages of translation. a) as a reading and analysis method for a "model reader", a concept good translators identify themselves with [discourse level]; b) as a method of reading and comparing translated text(s) to the source text as well as a method of analysis for editors [interdiscourse level]; c) as a method of reading and comparing translated text(s) to the source text for critics and scholars who conduct studies in translation studies [meta-discourse level]. (Öztürk Kasar, 2009a, p. 173)

Öztürk Kasar (2009a, p. 173) proposes the methodological contribution of semiotics to the act of translation in three stages. The first stage of "reading and analysis method for a model reader" helps not only readers of a literary text but also translators to analyze the signs, thereby reaching the meaning universe of a source text. This refers to the benefits of semiotics in "discourse level". Therefore, semiotics could help literary translators in the pre-translation period to help them choose the appropriate translation strategies and make informed translation decisions. The second stage of "reading and comparison method for editors" helps in the "interdiscourse level" for translators and editors who would like to assess and evaluate the quality of a translated product and edit necessary parts in the target text. This stage refers to the benefits of semiotics in post-translation process. The third stage of "reading and comparison for critics and scholars" helps in meta-discourse level for scholars who conduct studies on translation and translated products. In this "meta-discourse" level, semiotics could play the role of a compass to translation scholars in comparing a target text to the source text so that practical results could be obtained for literary translators or literary translator candidates.

With a view to establishing a model for the analysis of signs in a source text before the actual act of translation (discourse level benefits of semiotics of translation), Öztürk Kasar (2009a) adopted certain text analysis steps proposed and used within the framework of the studies by Paris School of Semiotics and suggested the use of these steps in analysis of the source text for translation (Tuna & Kuleli, 2017, p. 31). These steps are as follows:

The relationship between the text and the elements that surround it, the role of the receiver of discourse in the production of meaning, interpretation of the title and the subheadings of the text, segmentation of the text, multiple readings of the text, intertextual and hypertextual relationships in the text, evaluation of the proper nouns in the text, narrative programs in the text, combinatory modalities of the actants in the text, transformations of the subject, veridictory modalities, enigmas in the text and their contribution in the production of meaning, contracts in the text and their contribution in the production of meaning, instance of origin and projected instances, focalization of the text, temporal relationships in the text, isotopies in the text, symbolism in the text, interpretation of the epigraphs in the text (Öztürk Kasar, 2009a, p. 166-172).

This model proves to be a useful approach to the analysis of signs and the meaning universe of literary texts for translation. However, it might not be possible to apply all these steps in a literary text. Only a certain number of literary texts might be analyzed through all the steps in that model; therefore, readers, translators, editors, or scholars studying on semiotics of translation could use some of these steps a source text lends itself in that model. However, some of these steps are sure to be applied in all literary texts (Tuna & Kuleli, 2017, p. 43-44). This model has been used in the analysis of source texts for translation evaluation of literary texts from different genres (Kuleli, 2018a, Kuleli, 2018b; Öztürk Kasar & Batu, 2017; Öztürk Kasar & Kuleli, 2016; Tuna, 2016a, Tuna, 2016b; Tuna & Avaz, 2019; Tuna & Kuleli 2017).

The steps in this model by Öztürk Kasar (2009a) have been applied to various literary texts, both holistically and in isolation. The step titled “transformations of the subject” has particularly been applied in isolation (Kuleli, 2017, Kuleli, 2018c; Öztürk Kasar & Kuleli, 2016). This step was adopted from Coquet's “Theory of Instances of Enunciation”. In this study, “transformations of the subject” was applied to Shakespeare's play titled *Othello*, and Turkish translations of those contexts identified as transformations of the subject in the source text were evaluated in the light of semiotics of translation.

2.1. “Transformations of the subject”: A phenomenological approach to semiotics of translation

The interdisciplinary nature of translation studies and semiotics also attracted theories from phenomenology. Öztürk Kasar (2012, pp. 427-428) states that it is through the adoption of Jean-Claude Coquet's “Theory of Instances of Enunciation” that semiotics of translation has taken on a phenomenological perspective. According to Öztürk Kasar (2020a, p. 4), Coquet was inspired and influenced by the eminent linguist Emile Benveniste and adopted certain concepts coined by Benveniste in proposing the “Theory of Instances of Enunciation”. Öztürk Kasar (2017, pp. 183-184) also states that the prominent phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty was another scholar who greatly influenced Coquet in development of “Theory of Instances of Enunciation”. The primacy of body in phenomenology and Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological ideas greatly shaped the major premises of “Theory of Instances of Enunciation” by Coquet. Coquet (1997) makes it clear that his perspective of linguistics and semiotics involves phenomenology. “Coquet's 2007 book titled *Phusis et logos: une phénoménologie du langage* demonstrates the level of excellence Coquet achieved in applying phenomenological thoughts and ideas in linguistics and semiotics” (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 185). Öztürk Kasar (2017, p. 187) further adds that “instance” is one of the major concepts in Coquet's “Theory of Instances of Enunciation”, and this “instance” is the *sine qua non* condition of a semiotics model built upon phenomenological considerations.

“Coquet considers an instance to be made up of four major components: fundamental component, judgmental component, immanent component, and transcendental component” (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 187). “Fundamental component” is the body, and it is through the five sensory organs in our body that we receive the external stimuli. The stimuli that an instance receives through the fundamental component are exposed to the filtering process and transferred to our “judgmental component”, that is, our mind and reason. Our mind re-judges the stimuli after the filtering process. The fundamental and judgmental components make up the “autonomous domain” of an instance (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 188). On the other hand, an instance might also be under the influence of “immanent component” or “transcendental component” in a context, which make up the “domain of heteronomy”. “Immanent component” is made up of *pulsions* like hunger, thirst, or impulse for survival and *passions* like love, jealousy, fear or curiosity. “Transcendental component” is the cosmic powers or symbolic powers that exert their influences on an instance, thereby causing an instance to act or behave without any judgmental process (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 188-189). As can be understood from the explanations given here, Coquet interweaved the phenomenological considerations with concepts of semiotics. The reason for labelling the fundamental component and the judgmental component under the autonomous domain could be attributed to the fact that an instance could produce a discourse in a conscious manner when under the pretext of judgmental component, rendering that instance the quality of “autonomous”, the power of self-control. In contrast, the underlying reason for labelling immanent component and transcendental component as the domain of “heteronomy” could be tied to the fact that an instance suffering from pulsions or passions and affected by cosmic powers like earthquakes or symbolic powers like social taboos would not be able to produce or receive a discourse in a conscious manner, thereby rendering that instance lack of self-determination.

As part of his “Theory of Instances of Enunciation”, and building on his concepts of components of an instance, Coquet (2007) categorizes an instance into three states based on the criteria of presence or absence of judgment: “a) subject: the presence of judgment; b) quasi-subject: almost presence of judgment; c) non-subject: the absence of judgment” (Coquet, 2007, p. 37). In line with these definitions, a “subject” is the one who produces a discourse in total consciousness. Therefore, a “subject” can be described as the instance using judgmental component without the effects of immanent or transcendental components that tend to block the judgmental component. In short, a “subject” produces discourse using his / her reason. On the other hand, a “quasi-subject” is the instance that does not produce a discourse in total consciousness, but not in total unconsciousness, either. Öztürk Kasar (2017, p. 190) gives the example of an instance that wakes up from a nightmare in the middle of the night. That instance cannot differentiate between what is real and what is not for a short time. In the first few seconds, that instance cannot use his / her judgmental component and cannot recognize it was just a nightmare despite being awake. However, a few seconds later, that instance comes round and can realize that it was just a nightmare, turning to a “subject”. As can be seen in this example, the state of an instance between total consciousness and unconsciousness, but turning to total consciousness in a short time, is labelled as “quasi-subject” by Coquet (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 190). Another example Öztürk Kasar (2017) gives for the “quasi-subject” is people having recently experienced an earthquake, who cannot identify themselves right afterwards, but regain their consciousness in the course of time, turning to a “subject” again. Therefore, if an instance produces a discourse in an unconscious manner for a few seconds but regains his/her awareness in a very short time, the time between that unconsciousness and consciousness can be considered as the “quasi-subject” state. A final example would be a person opening the refrigerator to look for, say, a plate in an unconscious manner, who, after coming round, heads towards the cupboard. Öztürk Kasar (2017, p. 190) calls this issue a matter of “short-circuit in the mind” since even the instance himself/herself cannot explain the reason for such a behaviour a few seconds later.

The third state of instance is labelled “non-subject” by Coquet (2007). This term refers to an instance that produces discourse in total unconsciousness. The reason for this unconsciousness results from immanent or transcendental components that block the judgmental component. As the judgmental component is not active during production of a discourse, the instance is affected by internal or external forces that prevent the reasoning process, as a result of which the instance turns into a “non-subject”. These three states of the instance between “subject - quasi subject - non-subject” are what Öztürk Kasar (2009a) calls “transformations of the subject” in Coquet's (1997, 2007) “Theory of Instances of Enunciation”. The translation of the contexts with non-subject instances attracts particular attention as the target text reader must be able to differentiate between the “subject” and “non-subject” just as the source text reader does for the joy and satisfaction of reading literary texts. In order to adopt this term of “non-subject” into the theory of semiotics of translation, Öztürk Kasar developed a typology of non-subjects with several sub-categories.

2.2. Typology of “non-subjects”

The typology of “non-subjects” was first put forward by Öztürk Kasar in 2003 (Coquet & Öztürk Kasar, 2003). Then, this typology was revised by Öztürk Kasar (2012, 2017). The final version of this typology was proposed in 2019, and the determination of non-subjects in this study was based on its final version.

1. Non-subjects by nature: Children until the age of seven years have not achieved the age of reason; therefore they are not even held liable in case of criminal activity.
2. Pathological non-subjects: Patients with mental disorders, Alzheimer's, schizophrenia [and related disorders] may not be able to build connections between reality and non-reality.
3. Non-subjects under the effect of therapeutic substances: Patients under the effect of anesthetic substances or other medical substances causing delirium might produce discourses totally unconsciously.

4. Non-subjects under the effect of chemical substances: Those instances under the effect of alcohol or other sedatives like drugs that cause addiction lose their reasoning ability.
5. Non-subjects submissive to immanent components:
 - 5a. Non-subjects under the effect of pulsion
 - Instances suffering from hallucinations or delirium due to prolonged hunger or thirst.
 - Instances with physical instability due to profound hormonal changes in the body like craving for a particular type of food during pregnancy.
 - 5b. Non-subjects under the effect of passion: When instances are in a euphoric condition, they could lose their reasoning ability to produce a discourse during a great excitement, joy or happiness and produce discourses unconsciously that they cannot assume later [and make promises they might regret later or even do not remember]. On the other hand, when an instance is in a dysphoric condition, severe and profound sorrow or psychological pain might deprive that instance of reasoning ability and cause that instance to produce a discourse in an unconscious manner. Finally, conditions like nausea from seasickness or car sickness, and nausea from certain machines like roller coasters in amusement parks might cause an instance to produce a discourse unconsciously that they cannot assume or even remember later.
6. Non-subjects submissive to a transcendental component: This category is divided into two sub-categories.
 - 6a. Non-subjects under the effect of cosmic phenomena: Certain cosmic events like earthquakes with big magnitudes, hurricanes, tsunamis, or related disasters might cause an instance to lose the ability to reason.
 - 6b. Non-subjects under the effect symbolic phenomena: Certain extremist religious issues, long-held traditions in conservative societies, devotion to political parties and feud issues could cause instances to lose their reasoning ability and produce discourses without judgment of the reality or rationality; some instances might even go further and commit organized suicides and a massacre with suicides.
7. Programmed non-subjects: An instance programmed to complete a task without asking any questions like a robot and repeating the same signs told to him/her over and over cannot produce discourses consciously.
8. Non-subjects reduced to one single identity: form-subject: This category is divided into two sub-categories.
 - 8a. Non-subjects reduced to institutional identities: The instances devoting themselves to institutional phenomena like political or religious causes (as in the case of priests or monks).
 - 8b. Non-subjects reduced to individual identities: The instances devoting themselves to individual causes like obsession with scientific inventions or dedicating themselves to their disabled child(ren) take themselves away from any other worldly phenomena and produce their discourses in line with their assumed function in life. (Öztürk Kasar, 2019, pp. 242-244).

As can be seen from the typology above, the instance type “non-subject” (coined as “non-sujet” by Coquet, 2007, p. 37 in French) could be of great help in analysis of a source text for translation since an instance might belong to one of these categories as put forward by Öztürk Kasar (2019) and the translation decisions to be taken by the literary translator could change depending on the instance type. The discourse produced by a non-subject or quasi subject could involve signs distinctly different from the signs a “subject” uses. Particular attention should be attached to the translation of discourse by a “non-subject”. Besides this typology, Öztürk Kasar (2009b) developed Systematics of Designificative Tendencies in Translation with a view to semiotics of translation model. However, this systematics was further developed (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015, p. 463) with the addition of a new tendency to the designificative tendencies in translation. Finally, Öztürk Kasar (2020b) developed the final version of this systematics re-labelling the designificative tendencies and dividing the nine levels of designificative

tendencies into three major categories. The title of the systematics was also updated as Systematics of Designification in Translation (Öztürk Kasar, 2020b).

2.3. Systematics of designification in translation

Developing a model for the analyzing the source text prior to the actual act of translation compiling certain analysis steps of Paris School of Semiotics in the framework of semiotics of translation, Öztürk Kasar also developed Systematics of Designification in Translation to help during and post-translation act. While this systematics was first proposed by Öztürk Kasar (2009b) in French with eight degrees of designificative tendencies, it was later updated with the addition of one more level of designificative tendency by Öztürk Kasar (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015) in Turkish. 2015 version of this systematics was translated into English by Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017a). This systematics was recently updated by Öztürk Kasar (2020b) in French. Evaluation of translation in the contexts with transformation of subjects in the play *Othello* by Shakespeare was based on Öztürk Kasar's 2020b version of the systematics in this study; however, English translations of the designificative tendencies were based on Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017a). Degrees of designificative tendencies in translation are as follows:

1. Over-interpretation of the meaning: Producing a commentary in excess on the meaning of the original text or rendering that meaning explicit while it is provided implicitly in the original text. [This tendency] results in excessive meaning or excessive translation.
2. Darkening of the meaning: Making meaning ambiguous [while it] is obvious in the original text. [This tendency] results in ambiguous meaning.
3. Under-interpretation of the meaning: Providing incomplete information, producing insufficient meaning. [This tendency] results in sufficient meaning.
4. Sliding of the meaning: Producing one of the potential meanings of a sign though the original text does not evoke that connotation. [This tendency] results in other meaning [of the sign].
5. Alteration of the meaning: Producing a false meaning albeit one that is not utterly irrelevant to the meaning in the original text. [This tendency] results in false meaning.
6. Opposition of the meaning: Producing a meaning that is contrary to the meaning in the original text. [This tendency] results in opposing meaning.
7. Perversion of the meaning: Producing a meaning that is totally irrelevant to the meaning in the original text. [This tendency] results in anti-meaning.
8. Destruction of the meaning: Producing a meaningless utterance; in which case, the target text utterance does not make sense to the reader yet certain pieces of the source text still remain in the translated product. [This tendency] results in meaninglessness.
9. Wiping out of the meaning: In this tendency, a unit significant for the meaning universe of the text is omitted in the target text, which results in absence of translation. Therefore, a sign and its meaning are totally eliminated from the text with no traces of the sign in the target text. [This tendency] results in non-translation and absence of the sign [in the target text]. (Öztürk Kasar, 2020b, p. 160)

The field of signification for the first three designificative tendencies in this systematics is specified as “within the field of meaning” by Öztürk Kasar (2020b, p. 160). This specification implies that these designificative tendencies still preserve the meaning of the signs in the target culture to a large extent, with mild modifications. The next three designificative tendencies are specified as “peri-meaning” (Öztürk Kasar, 2020b, p. 160) explicating it as “at the limits of the field of meaning of the sign”. Finally, the last three designificative tendencies are specified as “outside the field of meaning of the sign” and labelled as “meaninglessness” (Öztürk Kasar, 2020b, p. 160). The term “meaninglessness” refers to the lack of signification or non-presence of signs in the target text.

Systematics of designification in translation has been used in translation evaluation of literary texts from different genres (Kuleli, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d, 2019; Öztürk Kasar, 2009b, 2016, 2020b; Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015, 2017a, 2017b; Öztürk Kasar & Kuleli, 2016; Öztürk Kasar & Batu, 2017; Tuna, 2016a, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b, 2020a; Tuna & Kuleli, 2017; Tuna & Avaz, 2019; Ural & Akdağ, 2017; Yanya, 2020). Four Turkish translations of the play *Othello* were evaluated through this systematics in this study.

3. An overview of the play *Othello*

The year *Othello* was written in remains a controversy just like many other plays by Shakespeare. Experts on Shakespearean plays tend to date the composition years based on certain cultural and socio-political intertextual elements in the play, generally referring to the events and details Shakespeare tends to integrate into his plays. According to Vaughan (1996, p. 4), the year 1604 is generally accepted as the first performance of the play *Othello*, and 1603-04 could be accepted as the composition year of the play. In the Introduction to *Othello* by Penguin Popular Classics published in 1994, some records are claimed to attribute the performance of the play *The Moor of Venice* to November 1, 1604. It is further pointed out that it is highly likely that the play must have been written no more than two years before that performance, which refers to the years of 1603 or 1604 for the composition of that play. It is stressed in this Introduction that the earliest records of the play *Othello* date back to a quarto of 1622, the First Folio of 1623, and another quarto of 1630. While all these texts have small differences, the First Folio is admitted to have been the most carefully prepared text (Introduction to *Othello*, Penguin Books, 1994, pp. 17-18).

The play *Othello* was [most likely] derived from the tale *Hecatommithi* by the 16th century Italian writer Giovanni Battista Giraldi, writing under the pseudonym of Cinthio (Sidney Lee, 1898; cited by Davis, 2011, p. 120). In the Introduction to *Othello* by Penguin Books (1994, pp. 15-17), it is clearly stated that “no English version of this tale [published in 1566] is known, and it differs in so many details from the play [Othello]”. This contention stands to reason as almost all plays by Shakespeare (whether they are derived from Plutarch's accounts of the lives of Ancient Greeks and Romans or other sources) greatly differ from the origins of plays in recounting details while the main themes and characters are built upon classical sources. The play *Othello* is no exception to the rule.

The protagonist of the play is Othello, referred as The Moor due to his origin in the play almost 60 times, most of which can be attributed to the character Iago, the conspirator against him. Desdemona, daughter of one of the senators, elopes with Othello. Objecting to this in front of the senate members and the Duke, Desdemona's father (called Brabantio) accepts the situation in pain when his daughter confesses she eloped at her will. Learning that a large Turkish fleet is headed for Cyprus, the Duke of Venice appoints Othello to Cyprus to help with the defense of the island. Upon Desdemona's insistence on accompanying her husband Othello, she is also allowed to go to Cyprus. When they arrive in Cyprus in different ships, they learn that Turkish fleet was wrecked in a storm, and they do not need to fight to defend Cyprus. Iago, the villain in the play, feels frustrated that Othello assigned the position of lieutenant to Cassio passing him over. Therefore, while he provokes Roderigo, a gulled gentleman in love with Desdemona, in favor of his own bloody plans on the one hand, he doesn't fail to evoke jealousy in Othello deceiving him into believing that his wife Desdemona is in a love affair with his lieutenant Cassio on the other hand. As part of his plans, he gets Cassio to drink too much alcohol in a celebration, as a result of which Cassio loses his consciousness and starts a big fight. As a result of this big fight, Othello takes Cassio away from his service as his lieutenant. Following this accomplished plan, Othello also easily falls prey to Iago, who plots and makes up several scenarios to make Othello believe in Desdemona's disloyalty manipulating reality and playing on Othello's passion of jealousy. As a result of

all this conspiracy and the passion of jealousy, Othello kills Desdemona. Thereafter, learning the truth from Emilia, Iago's wife working at Desdemona's service, Othello also kills himself.

A short summary of the play was provided in the paragraph above without going into detail in order to show the effect of passions. All conspiracy plans by Iago stem from his anger and frustration for losing the lieutenant position (the relevant literature is full of other comments and possibilities for his villainy, though). Othello is also easily deceived by Iago due to jealousy and kills his loyal wife. Othello also kills himself due to regret and sorrow on learning his wife's real loyalty. Jealousy, anger, frustration, regret, and sorrow are all passions exerting their influence on the instance, according to Öztürk Kasar (2019, p. 188). Two contexts from the text make the influence of passions on the instance clear. While addressing the reader about his plans, Iago says, “*I put the Moor, / At least into a jealousy so strong. / That judgement cannot cure*” (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 56). Iago openly states that judgment falls short against jealousy, which means that as the immanent component takes over the control of an instance, judgmental component loses its effect, transforming an instance into a non-subject. As another example, when Othello says “*Then you must speak / Of one that lov'd not wisely, but too well / Of one, not easily jealous, but being wrought / Perplex'd in the extreme*” (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 137), he admits that even his big love for Desdemona (as can be understood from the expression *lov'd not wisely, but too well*) was overwhelmed by the extreme jealousy evoked in him. This passion of jealousy was too strong for him to think and behave wisely. Therefore, while the source text of the play could have been analyzed on several steps as suggested by Öztürk Kasar (2009a), a close reading of the text readily manifests itself to be a play of passions. As the whole text is interwoven with passions, which play on the consciousness of instances leading to transformation of the subject as a non-subject, the analysis of the source text was confined to the determination of contexts produced by non-subjects in this study. Translation evaluation of the text was also confined to the translations of contexts with non-subjects in order to determine how the signs of subject transformation were preserved or to what extent these signs were “modified, transformed or deteriorated” in four target texts (TT) in Turkish.

4. Results

In this part, first the contexts identified as non-subject utterances in the source text are presented. Following the determination of the category of non-subjects based on “typology of non-subjects” (Öztürk Kasar, 2019, pp. 242-244), translations of the signs or expressions in the source text, in which designificative tendencies were found, are presented in four target texts with their categorization based on “Systematics of Designification in Translation” (Öztürk Kasar, 2020b, p. 160). Examples were found and presented for eight of the nine designificative tendencies. The contexts below were organized to show examples for each of the designificative tendencies except for destruction of the meaning, for which no example was found in any of the four translated texts.

Context 1

BRABANTIO

It is too true an evil. Gone she is,
 And what's to come of my despised time
 Is nought but bitterness. Now Roderigo,
 Where didst thou see her? (Oh unhappy girl)
 With the Moor say'st thou? (Who would be a father?)
 How didst thou know 'twas she? (Oh she deceives me
 Past thought): what said she to you? Get moe tapers:
 Raise all my kindred. Are they married, think you?
 (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 28)

Learning that his daughter Desdemona eloped with Othello, Brabantio, one of the senators in Venice, loses his temper and consciousness as can be understood from the expressions “*It is too true an evil... And what's to come of my despised time / Is nought but bitterness*”. The instance is under great suffering and agony due to losing his daughter to a man. Therefore, the instance can be said to be under the effect of immanent component (passions) in this context, proving the transformation of the subject to a non-subject. Considering the typology of non-subjects, the instance in the context can be considered a non-subject submissive to an immanent component, under the effect of passions in dysphoric state. Designificative tendencies in translations of this context in target texts (TT) are given in Table 1:

Table 1. Turkish translations of context 1

Source Text	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
And what's to come of my despised time / Is nought but bitterness.	Şu kahrolası ömrüme, acıdan başka / Bir şey kalmıyor artık.	Artık âhir ömrüm hor hakit sade acıyla geçecek.	Artık ömrümü acılar içinde geçireceğim.	Bir daha yüzüm gülmeyecek ömrüm boyunca.
(Oh she deceives me / Past thought) (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 28)	(Beni nasıl aldattın, aklım almıyor!) (Shakespeare, 1965, p. 13)	Ah, beni nasıl aldattı aklıma sığmıyor. (Shakespeare, 1966, p. 8)	Beni aldattığına imkanı yok inmanamıyorum. (Shakespeare, 2011, pp. 9-10)	Ah, nasıl geldim ben bu oyuna! (Shakespeare, 2014, p. 20)

The sign “despised time” in the source text contributes to the non-subject nature of the instance in this context as the instance is in great pain here, producing discourse in an unconscious manner by referring to the rest of his life as something to be abhorred. While this sign was preserved with the sign “kahrolası ömrüm” in TT1, this sign was wiped out in TT2, TT3 and TT4 referring to the sign of “time” (ömür in Turkish) without any adjective to refer to the sign “despised”. The omission of the sign “despised” in the target texts alleviates the pain the instance is in, understating the non-subject state of the instance. Since a meaningful sign was not transferred to the target culture at all in these three target texts, this designificative tendency could be considered wiping out of the meaning.

On the other hand, the sign “past thought” also contributes to the meaning of the context to show the instance is a non-subject. The instance implies it gives him further pain to think of his daughter's disloyalty to him, and he finds it hard to believe in this. While the sign “past thought” was translated as “aklım almıyor, aklıma sığmıyor, inanamıyorum” in TT1, TT2 and TT3 respectively, it was under-interpreted in TT4 while the non-subject state of the instance was preserved to some extent. Therefore, the tendency in TT4 can be categorized as “under-interpretation of the meaning”, providing an insufficient meaning to the target text reader.

Context 2

BRABANTIO

Good your Grace pardon me.

Neither my place, nor aught I heard of business

Hath rais'd me from my bed; nor doth the general care

Take hold on me. For my particular grief

Is of so flood-gate, and o' erbearing nature,

That it engluts, and swallows other sorrows,

As it is still itself.

(Shakespeare, 1994, p. 35)

Still under great suffering from his daughter's eloping with Othello, the senator Brabantio's discourse “For my particular grief / Is of so flood-gate, and o' erbearing nature, / That it engulfs, and swallows other sorrows” shows the extent of his grief. Moreover, as a senator expected to be devoted to his country, the expression “Neither my place, nor aught I heard of business / Hath rais'd me from my bed; nor doth the general care / Take hold on me” does not fit with his personality as a senator as he even dismisses his position and the condition the country is in. Therefore, the instance can be regarded under the effect of immanent component (passions like grief or agony) in this context, which confirms the transformation of the subject to a non-subject. This instance can be considered a non-subject submissive to an immanent component, under the effect of passions in dysphoric state. Designificative tendencies in translations of this context in target texts (TT) are given in Table 2:

Table 2. Turkish translations of context 2

Source Text	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
... nor doth the general care / Take hold on me. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 35)	... genel kaygı da / Dokunmuyor bana. (Shakespeare, 1965, p. 20)	... ne de umumun endişesi bana dokunuyor. (Shakespeare, 1966, p. 15)	... Kıbrıs meselesine de, elimde değil, üzülemiyorum. (Shakespeare, 2011, p. 15)	Ø (Shakespeare, 2014, p. 28)

In this context, the sign “*the general care*” refers to the Turkish fleet's heading for Cyprus. The Senate of Venice is in a meeting to find ways to defend Cyprus against the Turkish fleet. However, a senate of Venice, Brabantio does not seem to care about this urgent state issue referring to the issue with the sign “*general care*”, which means the worries of others in the senate. Even this sign can prove the non-subject state of the instance in this context since the instance considers this only a matter of other senates. While this sign was translated as “genel kaygı, umumun endişesi” in TT1 and TT2 respectively preserving the sign in the target culture, it was translated as “Kıbrıs meselesi” (Cyprus issue [back-translation]) in TT3. While the instance does not even seem to know the issue the state is in with the sign “*general care*”, it was over-interpreted in TT3 since the readers of TT3 might not recognize the non-subject state of the instance seeing that this instance is well aware of the issues around. On the other hand, this sign was not translated at all in TT4. Therefore, the tendency in TT3 can be considered over-interpretation of the meaning while that of TT4 is wiping out of the meaning.

Context 3

RODERIGO

I will incontinently drown myself.

[...]

It is silliness to live, when to live is torment.

(Shakespeare, 1994, p. 43).

Roderigo, a gulled character in the play and suffering from the great psychological pain caused by his love for Desdemona, decides to kill himself, seeing that he can no longer achieve her love as she is married to Othello. The signs “*drown myself*” and “*to live is torment*” clearly show that he cannot use his judgmental component due to immeasurable grief. Instances in full consciousness cannot decide to kill themselves. The signs “*to live is torment*” confirm that the instance is not threatening the other party stating he will kill himself, but this is his real passion during the production of discourse. Therefore, the instance here is under the effect of immanent component (resulting from grief as a passion), and therefore in a state of non-subject. This instance can be further considered a non-subject submissive to an immanent component, under the effect of passions in dysphoric state. Translations of these signs are given in Table 3:

Table 3. Turkish translations of context 3

Source Text	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
... drown myself. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 43).	... denize atacağım kendimi. (Shakespeare, 1965, p. 29)	... kendimi denize atacağım. (Shakespeare, 1966, p. 23)	... kendimi denize atacağım, boğacağım. (Shakespeare, 2011, p. 21)	Kendimi boğacağım. (Shakespeare, 2014, p. 38)

The sign “*drown*” in the source text refers to killing oneself or others unable to breath under water (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary; Online Oxford Learners' Dictionary). Therefore, the instance is going to kill himself under water, losing his consciousness. This sign was translated as “denize atacağım kendimi; kendimi denize atacağım; kendimi denize atacağım, boğacağım' in TT1, TT2 and TT3 respectively. The sign “*drown*” was preserved in three target texts. However, it was translated as “kendimi boğacağım” in TT4. The sign “boğmak” in Turkish refers to killing oneself / others, whether by choking, drowning, or causing that person not to be able to breath and killing that person in the end (not confined to underwater death). A specific sign (*drown*) in the source text was translated with a more general meaning in TT4. Though TT4 also shows that the instance is going to kill himself, it is not clear by which means he is going to kill himself. Therefore, this sign was darkened in TT4, producing an ambiguous meaning on how the instance will kill himself. Consequently, the designificative tendency in TT4 can be considered darkening of the meaning.

Context 4:

RODERIGO

What should I do? I confess it is my shame to be so fond, but it is not in my virtue to amend it. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 44)

In this context, Roderigo is talking about how “*fond*” of Desdemona he is. Though the sign “*fond*” might not suffice on its own to consider an instance a non-subject, as this sign is accompanied by “*not in my virtue to amend it*”, the instance in this context can be safely regarded a non-subject. Seeing that Roderigo cannot activate his judgmental component for his love for Desdemona, a woman married to one of the most prestigious commanders of Venice, he is sure to be under the effect of immanent component. However, his love for Desdemona does not make him happy; on the contrary, he is sorrowful all the time. Therefore, this instance can be considered a non-subject submissive to an immanent component, under the effect of passions in dysphoric state. Translations of this context are given in Table 4:

Table 4. Turkish translations of context 4

Source Text	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
... it is not in my virtue to amend it. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 44)	... bunu değiştirmek elimde değil ki. (Shakespeare, 1965, p. 29)	...bu dertten kurtulmak elimde değil. (Shakespeare, 1966, p. 24)	... elimde değil ki. (Shakespeare, 2011, p. 22)	... iyileşmek faziletine sahip değilim. (Shakespeare, 2014, p. 38)

In the sign “*to amend it*”, the pronoun “*it*” refers to Roderigo's fondness of Desdemona. The sign “*amend*” is used as a transitive verb in this discourse. Therefore, the sign “*amend it*” refers to changing or improving his (Roderigo's) fondness of Desdemona. This sign was translated as “bunu değiştirmek” in TT1, preserving the meaning of the sign. In TT3, this sign was not translated at all, leading to the lack of a meaningful sign. Therefore, this could be considered wiping out of the meaning. In TT4, the sign “*amend it*” was translated as “iyileşmek” (to get better [back-translation]). One of the meanings of the

verb “amend” is “get better”; however, this meaning does not fit with this context due to the transitive form of the verb. Therefore, the verb “amend” should refer to the verb “change” in this context. Since one of the possible meanings of a sign not actualized in the source context was used in TT4, this could be considered sliding of the meaning among designificative tendencies. In TT2, this sign was translated as “bu dertten kurtulmak” (to recover from this problem[back-translation]). This tendency could also be considered sliding of the meaning because Roderigo does not want to recover from this problem, causing him to be considered a non-subject. What Roderigo wants is to change his situation. Hence, another potential meaning of the verb “amend” was used in TT2 while this meaning is not compatible with the discourse. That is because if Roderigo were willing to recover from this love, he would not fight for Desdemona until the end of the text.

Context 5:

OTHELLO

I think my wife be honest; and think she is not:

I think thou art just, and think thou art not:

I'll have some proof. My name that was as fresh

As Dian's visage, is now begrim'd and black

As mine own face.

(Shakespeare, 1994, p. 86)

Since Othello is in confusion to believe in Desdemona and Iago's loyalty as can be understood from the discourse “*I think my wife be honest; and think she is not*” and “*I think thou art just, and think thou art not*”, he cannot control the flow of turbulence in his mind. All this confusion points to the non-subject state of that instance as he cannot use his judgmental component. This instance is under the effect of immanent component. Therefore, this instance can be further considered a non-subject submissive to an immanent component, under the effect of passions in a dysphoric state. Translations of the signs in this context are given in Table 5:

Table 5. Turkish translations of context 5

Source Text	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
My name that was as fresh / As Dian's visage, is now begrim'd and black / As mine own face. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 86).	Diana'nın yüzü kadar / Temiz olan adım lekeli şimdi, ve kara/ Suratım gibi. (Shakespeare, 1965, p. 74)	Diana'nın yüzü kadar taze olan onun adı şimdi artık kirlendi, benim yüzüm kadar kara. (Shakespeare, 1966, p. 73)	Diana'nın yüzü kadar temiz olan adım, şimdi kendi suratım gibi karardı. (Shakespeare, 2011, p. 60)	Onun Diana kadar güzel yüzü / Gözümde çirkin, benimki kadar kara şimdi. (Shakespeare, 2014, p. 97)

The sign “*My name that was as fresh as Dian's visage*” is in simple past tense in this context, which means that Othello does not consider himself honourable anymore. The instance is in non-subject state in this context as he confesses he lost all his dignity and honour with this sign. It was translated as “Diana'nın adı kadar temiz olan adım” in both TT1 and TT3, preserving the meaning of the sign with no designificative tendencies. On the other hand, it was translated as “Diana'nın yüzü kadar taze olan onun adı” and “Onun Diana kadar güzel yüzü” in TT2 and TT4 respectively. The sign “onun adı” (her name [back-translation]) in TT2 refers to Desdemona, while it refers to Othello in the source text. This can be considered alteration of the meaning as a false meaning is produced for the sign “my name”. On the other hand, the sign “onun yüzü” (her face) to refer to Desdemona in TT4 is totally irrelevant to the

source text sign “my name”. Therefore, the designificative tendency in TT4 for this sign could be categorized as perversion of the meaning.

Context 6:

OTHELLO
O monstrous! monstrous!
IAGO
Nay, this was but his dream.
OTHELLO
But this denoted a foregone conclusion,
'Tis a shrewd doubt, through it be but a dream.
...
I'll tear her all to pieces.
(Shakespeare, 1994, p. 87)

Trying to deceive Othello into believing his conspiracy plans, Iago finally succeeds in taking away Othello's ability to differentiate between dreams and reality. Iago tells Othello that Cassio is in love affair with Desdemona, and he heard Cassio talking about Desdemona in his dream, even going further by kissing Iago in his dream mistaking him for Desdemona. As a result of this, Othello cries “*O monstrous! monstrous!*”. As part of his conspiracy and trying to convince Othello about his honesty, Iago says this was just a dream. Despite this, Othello cannot differentiate dreams from reality and says, “*this denoted a foregone conclusion*”. His inability to differentiate between the dreams and reality stems from jealousy and agony, two passions activating the immanent component in discourse production of the instance. Therefore, the instance can be considered a non-subject in this context, and he can be regarded a non-subject submissive to an immanent component, under the effect of passions in dysphoric state. The transfer of these signs into the target language is given in Table 6:

Table 6. Turkish translations of context 6

Source Text	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
this denoted a foregone conclusion. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 87)	Geçmiş bir işi gösteriyor ama. (Shakespeare, 1965, p. 76)	Ama daha önce işlenmiş bir iş olduğunu gösteriyor. (Shakespeare, 1966, p. 74)	Bu da daha önce seviştiklerini gösterir. (Shakespeare, 2011, p. 61)	Bir kehanetten farksız. (Shakespeare, 2014, p. 99)

The sign “*foregone conclusion*” refers to “something that happened in the past” (Nutku, 2013, p. 212). Othello's attributing a (made up) dream to a previous affair between Cassio and Desdemona is a sign of his state of non-subject as an instance. This sign was translated as “geçmiş bir iş” and “daha önce işlenmiş bir iş” in TT1 and TT2 respectively preserving the meaning of the signs. However, it was translated as “daha önce seviştiklerini” in TT3. Othello implicitly refers to the on-going love and sexual affair between Cassio and Desdemona with the sign “*foregone conclusion*”. However, this sign was over-interpreted in TT3, translating “*conclusion*” as “sevişmek” (having sex with someone [back-translation]). On the other hand, this sign was translated as “kehanet” in TT4. The sign “kehanet” refers to a prophecy or prediction about future events rather than past events. This tendency can be considered opposition of the meaning since the sign “kehanet” implies that Othello has not been convinced of this love affair, but it could come true in the future. On the contrary, just the opposite holds true in the text and in this sign.

Context 7:

OTHELLO

Lie with her? lie on her? We say lie on her, when they be-lie-her... Handkerchief: Confessions: Handkerchief. To confess, and be hang'd for his labor. First, to be hang'd, and then to confess. I tremble at it. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 98).

When Othello falls prey to Iago's conspiracy, he believes Cassio lies with Desdemona. He goes on to denounce death for Cassio saying “to confess, and be hang'd”. Though this expression stands to reason, the following expression “first, to be hang'd, and then to confess” clearly shows Othello's non-subject state as it is impossible to get someone to confess his guilt after being killed. This contention is confirmed by Othello's expression “I tremble at it”. Othello, as the instance, is under the effect of immanent component (passions like jealousy, agony, and fury), and therefore this instance can be considered a non-subject submissive to an immanent component, under the effect of passions in dysphoric state. Below are the translations of this context in Table 7:

Table 7. Turkish translations of context 7

Source Text	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
Lie with her? lie on her? (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 98)	Onunla yatmak, onun üstüne yatmak ha? (Shakespeare, 1965, p. 89)	Birlikte yatmak! Üstüne yatmak! (Shakespeare, 1966, p. 86)	Yatmışlar ha? Demek karımla yatmış ha? (Shakespeare, 2011, p. 71)	Onunla ha! Onun üstünde, öyle mi? (Shakespeare, 2014, p. 115)

In this context, the sign “lie on her” is significant as the instance goes on to say “we say lie on her, when they be-lie-her” which implies that the sign “lie on her” drives the instance crazy. Therefore, the sign “lie on her” is of more significance than “lie with her” in analysis of non-subject in this context. “Lie on her” was translated as “onun üstüne yatmak, üstüne yatmak, onun üstünde” in TT1, TT2 and TT4 respectively preserving the meaning of the sign. However, it was translated as “karımla yatmış” (had sex with my wife [back-translation]) in TT3, designifying the sign “be-lie-her” in the context. While the Turkish sign in TT4 bears some traces from the source text, a false meaning is produced as a result, which can be considered alteration of the meaning.

5. Discussion

“Theory of Instances of Enunciation” is a move towards a phenomenology of language in semiotics (Öztürk Kasar, 2012, p. 427). With the emphasis on four components of an instance, Coquet seems to have incorporated phenomenology into semiotics. The type of an instance might change across contexts due to the dominant component on the instance during production of discourse (Öztürk Kasar, 2012, p. 430). Transformation of subjects is a significant step among the operations of analysis Öztürk Kasar (2009a) compiled from the studies of Paris School of Semiotics within the framework of her approach to semiotics of translation In this study, out of the nineteen operations of analysis, transformation of the subjects was used to find out to what extent this semiotic analysis helps in translation. As literary works are demanding pieces with puns and gaps of meaning deliberately left by writers, literary translators could greatly benefit from a tool to help them with the act of literary translation. Öztürk Kasar (2016, p. 243) also proposes semiotics of translation to contribute to the analysis and reproduction of meaning in literary texts. “A semiotics analysis of a literary text could serve as a guide to the act of translation” (Tuna, 2020b, p. 137). Tuna (2020b) also states that the interdisciplinary nature of semiotics is also suitable for translation studies. It is this interdisciplinary nature of semiotics that could enable literary translators to overcome the challenges posed by literary texts. According to Kourdis & Kukkonen (2015,

p. 5-6), semiotics and translation studies have been in close contact ever since the emergence of translation studies as a field of science, and these two branches continue to nurture one another. Therefore, it is not that the field of translation is the sole beneficiary of this relationship, but semiotics can also benefit from the models and findings of translation studies. “Translation entails a complex semiotics process [...] translation scholars should study the emergence of these semiotics patterns” (Marais, 2019, p. 168). It is through the studies in academic circles that the applied field of literary translation can be extended to adopt new models of analysis to reach the meaning universe of source texts. However, these studies should not be left to their destiny in printed or electronic journals. The findings and recommendations of these studies should be shared with the practitioners through workshops or joint projects.

Can Rençberler (2020, p. 555) points to the implicitness of meaning in literary texts and suggest that a literary translator should seek the exact meaning in a text. Semiotics of translation could be a suitable tool for the achievement of precise meaning in a literary text. Can Rençberler (2019, p. 139) further states that the more studies are conducted on semiotics of translation, the more the reciprocity between semiotics and translation can be reinforced. This points to a well-established need for the contribution of semiotics to translation. Semiotics of translation has taken a huge leap all over the world with international conferences, journals or books on semiotics of translation from prominent publishing houses. Such organizations or endeavours have ensured dissemination of ideas or findings to the applied field. “Semiotics provides a viable model for the core of translation activities” (Steccconi, 2007, p. 15). According to Öztürk Kasar (2020c, p. 3), semiotics of translation helps translators overcome the difficulties in translation. As this relationship between semiotics and translation is well-established today, literary translators, editors, readers of literary works, and literary translator candidates should be familiarized with the model and systematics presented in this study.

Semiotics of translation is not a translation criticism; on the contrary, it lends itself to the applied field of literary translation showing literary translators how to analyze the source texts for translation besides demonstrating designificative tendencies in already translated texts. The findings obtained from the translation evaluation in this study do not undervalue the significance of translation of the play *Othello* by Shakespeare, but rather show literary translators the reasons for designificative tendencies with examples. Even the attempt to translate Shakespearean works is a worthwhile venture. While some designificative tendencies of literary translators are indeliberate actions, there are also times in which meaning transformations are employed deliberately for various reasons like patronage issues, simplification of texts for children, or translation norms to name a few. With a thorough awareness of designificative tendencies, literary translators could make informed decisions on how to overcome or alleviate the degree of those tendencies in literary translation.

6. Conclusions

This study presents a semiotics analysis of Shakespeare’s play titled *Othello* to find non-subject discourses in the light of Coquet’s (2007) “Theory of Instances of Enunciation”. These contexts were further analyzed to determine the components of instance during production of discourse and classify those non-subjects according to the “Typology of Non-subjects” by Öztürk Kasar (2019). It was found that the play *Othello* is based on the passions of jealousy and agony. When jealousy and agony are dominant on an instance, these passions could transform the instance into a non-subject. While 17 contexts were identified as non-subject discourse in the text, only seven of them were presented in this study (all seven of them were classified as non-subjects submissive to immanent component under the effect of passions in dysphoric state while this type of non-subject was determined in 15 of all 17 non-subject contexts in the whole text). That is because another objective of this study is to evaluate Turkish translations of the text based on “Systematics of Designification in Translation” (Öztürk Kasar, 2009b,

2020b; Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2015, 2017a). At least one example for eight of the nine tendencies in this systematics was presented; however, no example was found for the tendency of “destruction of meaning” in any of the four Turkish translations. Therefore, rather than providing examples for non-subject contexts in isolation, those contexts with designificative tendencies in Turkish translations were presented in this study. The underlying reason for this association between non-subjects and translation evaluation was to show how semiotics could help in the act of literary translation. While a play can be translated for performance on the stage, it can also be translated for its literary merit (Karantay, 1995, pp. 109-114). “The role of a play translator is quite complicated as plays could be translated for performance, literary merit or analysis” (Ergil, 2020, p. 28). Though *Othello* is a play as a literary genre, the source text was analyzed for its literary merit. The discourse with non-subjects utterances was also evaluated for translation with a view to revealing the literary merit of the play. Even if the four target texts evaluated in this study might have been translated for performance, translations of all contexts with non-subjects were considered only in the framework of literary quality. As a result of the evaluation of four Turkish translations, all tendencies but destruction of meaning were found in translations and presented in this study.

7. Ethics Committee Approval

The author(s) confirm(s) that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country (Date of Confirmation: 08/07/2020).

Acknowledgements

- This study is an extended version of the oral presentation delivered at “*The 8th Congress of the European Society of Comparative Literature*” in Lille, France on 26-30 August 2019.
- This study was supported by the Scientific Research Projects Unit of Bandırma Onyediy Eylül University, Turkey with the project number of BAP-19-1009-067.

References

- Bassnett, S. (2013). *Translation studies* (4th ed.). London & New York: Routledge.
- Bowker, L. & Delsey, T. (2016). Information science, terminology and translation studies: Adaptation, collaboration, integration. In: Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Border crossings: Translation studies and other disciplines* (pp. 73-96). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Buzelin, H. & Baraldi, C. (2016). Sociology and translation studies: Two disciplines meeting. In: Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Border crossings: Translation studies and other disciplines* (pp. 117-140). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Can Rençberler, A. (2019). Çeviri göstergebilimi ekseninde özgün metin okuma ve çözümleme modeli ile anlam arayışı. *Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(18), 125-141.
- Can Rençberler, A. (2020). Uncovering the farthest reaches of the meaning universe of a short story and its translations through semiotics of translation. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 18, 539-556.
- 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: PUF.

- Coquet, J.-C. & Öztürk Kasar, S. (2003). *Söylem, göstergebilim ve çeviri*. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Davis, F. (2011). The 'learned' vs. the 'unlearned' Shakespeare. *The Oxfordian*, 13, 117-134.
- Ergil, B. (2020). Batı kanonu hayal perdesinde: Tiyatrotem yeniden yazım ve yeniden çevirilerinde “absürd”, “tragedya” ve “komedy” kavramlarının dönüşümü. *Dünya Dilleri, Edebiyatları ve Çeviri Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 26-58.
- Giammarresi, S. & Lapalme, G. (2016). Computer science and translation: Natural languages and machine translation. In: Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Border crossings: Translation studies and other disciplines* (pp. 205-224). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gorlée, D. L. (1994). *Semiotics and the problem of translation: With special reference to the semiotics of Charles S. Peirce*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Guillaume, A. (2015). Intertheoricity: Plasticity, elasticity and hybridity of theories. Part II: Semiotics of transferogenesis. *Human and Social Studies*, 4(2), 59-77.
- Hartama-Heinonen, R. (2015). Herding together: On semiotic-translational branches, fields and disciplines. *Punctum. International Journal of Semiotics*, 1(2), 39-52.
- Holmes, J. (1972). *The name and nature of translation studies*. Amsterdam: Translation Studies Section, University of Amsterdam.
- House, J. & Loenhoff, J. (2016). Communication studies and translation studies: A special relationship. In: Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Border crossings: Translation studies and other disciplines* (pp. 97-116). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Karantay, S. (1995). Tiyatro çevirisi: Oyun dili ve çeviri. In M. Rifat (Ed.), *Çeviri ve çeviri kuramı üstüne söylemler* (pp. 93-115). İstanbul: Düzlem Yayınları.
- Kourdis, E. (2015). Semiotics of translation: An interdisciplinary approach to translation. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *International handbook of semiotics* (pp. 303-320). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kourdis, E. & Kukkonen, P. (2015). Introduction- Semiotics of translation, translation in semiotics. *Punctum. International Journal of Semiotics*, 1(2), 5-10.
- Kuleli, M. (2017). Analysis of subjectivity in literary translation from semiotics of translation point of view: Analysis of subjectivity in the play "Coriolanus" and translation evaluation. *Journal of Turkish Studies- Language / Literature*, 12(22), 511-532.
- Kuleli, M. (2018a). Analysis of narrative programs and Turkish translations of a short story through semiotics of translation. *Journal of Turkish Studies-Social Sciences*, 13(26), 861-877.
- Kuleli, M. (2018b). Çeviri göstergebilimi yaklaşımının bir öykünün çeviri değerlendirmesine uygulanması. *Journal of Turkish Studies-Language / Literature*, 13(28), 597-638.
- Kuleli, M. (2018c). Öznellik yetisi: Bir göstergebilimsel çözümleme adımı ve çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla bir tiyatro metninde çeviri değerlendirmesi. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13, 33-72.
- Kuleli, M. (2018d). Intertextuality in translation: Analysis of intertextual signs and evaluation of translation of a short story. *IJLET - International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 6(3), 317-330.

- Kuleli, M. (2019). Shakespeare'in Antony and Cleopatra oyunundaki anlatı tekniklerinin çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla çözümlenmesi ve çevirilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *IJLET-International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 7(2), 190-207.
- Kuleli, M. & Tuna, D. (Eds.) (2020). *Dil, edebiyat ve çeviri odağında kavramsal okumalar. Conceptual readings in language, literature and translation. Lectures notionnelles de la langue, de la littérature et de la traduction*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Ludskanov, A. (1975). A semiotic approach to the theory of translation. *Language Sciences*, 35, 5-8.
- Marais, K. (2019). *A (bio)semiotic theory of translation: The emergence of social-cultural reality*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Marais, K. & Kull, K. (2016). Biosemiotics and translation studies: Challenging 'translation'. In: Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Border crossings: Translation studies and other disciplines* (pp. 170-188). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Retrieved on April 26, 2020 from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/drown>.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. (2nd ed.). London & New York: Routledge.
- Nutku, Ö. (2013). *Shakespeare sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Online Oxford Learners' Dictionary. Retrieved on April 26, 2020 from: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/drown?q=drown>.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009a). Pour une sémiotique de la traduction. In C. Laplace, M. Lederer & D. Gile (Eds.), *La traduction et ses métiers* (pp. 163-175). Caen: Lettres Modernes Minard, Coll. "Champollion 12".
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009b). Un chef-d'oeuvre très connu: Le chef-d'oeuvre inconnu de Balzac. Commentaires d'une traduction à l'autre laissant des traces. In M. Nowotna & A. Moghani (Eds.), *Les traces du traducteur* (pp. 87-211). Paris: Publications de l'INALCO.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2012). Jean-Claude Coquet ile bir dil görüngübilimine doğru. In *XII. Uluslararası Dil, Yazın ve Deyişbilim Sempozyumu Book of Proceedings* (pp. 427-433). Edirne: Trakya University.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2016). 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. In İ. Onursal Ayırır & E. Korkut (Eds.), *Prof. Dr. Ayşe Eziler Kıran'a armağan* (pp. 183-199). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2019). Analyser pour traduire *La Route Des Flandres* de Claude Simon. Approche sémiotique entre phisis et logos. In F. Lautel-Ribstein & C. Pineira-Tresmontant (Eds.), *Des mots aux actes, sémantique(s), sémiotique(s) et traduction* 7(pp. 237-255). Paris: Classiques Garnier.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2020a). Tracer un itinéraire sémiotique pour une traduction expérimentale: Traduire en turc *La Route des Flandres* de Claude Simon. In M. Kuleli & D. Tuna (Eds.), *Dil, edebiyat ve çeviri odağında kavramsal okumalar. Conceptual readings in language, literature and translation. Lectures notionnelles de la langue, de la littérature et de la traduction* (pp. 1-32). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2020b). De la désignification en traduction littéraire: Les Gens d'en face de Georges Simenon dans le contexte turc du point de vue de la sémiotique de la traduction. *Parallèles*, 32(1), 154-175.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2020c). Çeviri göstergebilimi ile kent göstergebiliminin bütünleşik bağlamında özde çeviri kavramının incelenmesi. *Dünya Dilleri, Edebiyatları ve Çeviri Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 1-25.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Tuna, D. (2015). Yaşam, yazın ve yazın çevirisi için gösterge okuma. *Frankofoni Fransız Dili ve Edebiyatı İnceleme ve Araştırmaları Ortak Kitabı*, 27 (pp. 457-482). Ankara: Bizim Grup Basımevi.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Kuleli, M. (2016). Antony and Cleopatra oyununun göstergebilimsel çözümlemesi ve çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla Türkçe çevirilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *RumeliDE-Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5, 89-123.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Tuna, D. (2017a). Shakespeare in three languages: Reading and analyzing sonnet 130 and its translations in light of semiotics. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(1), 170-181.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Tuna, D. (2017b). Le non-dit derrière les discours masqués. *IJLET International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(3), 754-767.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. & Batu, E. (2017). Oscar Wilde'nin *Bencil Dev* öyküsünün göstergebilimsel çözümlemesi ve çeviri göstergebilimi bağlamında Türkçe çevirilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(4), 920-950.
- Petrilli, S. (1992). Translation, semiotics and ideology. *TTR. Etudes sur le Texte et ses Transformations*, 5(1), 233-264.
- Petrilli, S. (2015). Translation of semiotics into translation theory, and vice versa. *Punctum. International Journal of Semiotics*, 1(2), 96-117.
- Petrilli, S. & Ponzio, A. (2020). A semiotic approach to translation: Otherness, iconicity and encounter. In M. Kuleli & D. Tuna (Eds.), *Dil, edebiyat ve çeviri odağında kavramsal okumalar. Conceptual readings in language, literature and translation. Lectures notionnelles de la langue, de la littérature et de la traduction* (pp. 53-77). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Ruano, R. (2006). Conciliation of disciplines and paradigms. A challenge and a barrier for future directions in translation studies. In F. Duarte, A. A. Rosa & T. Seruya (Eds.), *Translation studies at the interface of disciplines* (pp. 43-53). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Saussure, F. (2001^[1916]). *Genel dilbilim dersleri*. (Trans. Berke Vardar), İstanbul: Multilingual Yabancı Dil Yayınları.
- Shakespeare, W. (1965). *Othello*. (Trans. A. Vahit Turhan & A. Turan Oflazoğlu), İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Shakespeare, W. (1966). *Othello*. (Trans. Orhan Burian), İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Shakespeare, W. (1994). *Othello*. London: Penguin Books.
- Shakespeare, W. (2011). *Othello*. (Trans. Ülkü Tamer), İstanbul: Mitoş Boyut.
- Shakespeare, W. (2014). *Othello & Titus Andronicus*. (Trans. Ezgi Ovat), Ankara: İtalik.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. (Eds.) (2017). *Interdisciplinary relationships in the social sciences*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Shreve, G. & Diamond, B. (2016). Cognitive neurosciences and cognitive translation studies: About the information processing paradigm. In Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Border crossings: Translation studies and other disciplines* (pp. 141-168). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Siskin, J. (1987). A medieval semiotics of translation. *Semiotica*, 63(1-2), 129-142.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Steconi, U. (2007). Five reasons why semiotics is good for translation studies. In Y. Gambier, M. Shlesinger & R. Stolze (Eds.), *Doubts and directions in translation studies* (pp. 15-26). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Sütiste, E. & Torop, P. (2007). Processual boundaries of translation: Semiotics and translation studies. *Semiotica* 2007, 163, 187-207.
- Torop, P. (2001). The possible fate of the semiotics of translation. *Interlitteraria*, 6(6), 46-62.
- Tuna, D. (2016a). Bir edebiyat dersinde bir şiiri çevirileriyle okumak: Walt Whitman’ın O Captain! My Captain! başlıklı şiiri ile Fransızca ve Türkçe çevirileri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36, 59-78.
- Tuna, D. (2016b). Oktay Rifat’ın Tecelli başlıklı şiiri üzerinden çeviriyi göstergebilimle buluşturmak. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35, 33-52.
- Tuna, D. (2017a). What do poem titles say, what do translators do? *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic (Prof. Dr. Tahsin Aktaş Armağanı)*, 12(7), 669-686.
- Tuna, D. (2017b). Traumas of everyday life in common people’s poetry: Six poems and twelve translations. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9, 114-127.
- Tuna, D. (2020a). La surinterprétation en traduction littéraire et ses conséquences dans la réception des textes traduits. Quelques réflexions depuis la Turquie. *Fabula La Recherche en Littérature / Les colloques, Lire et travailler avec la traduction par temps de mondialisation*. Retrieved on April 29, 2020 from: <http://www.fabula.org/colloques/document6607.php>.
- Tuna, D. (2020b). Ataerkil yaşantılar üzerine etnometodoloji ve göstergebilim kavramları ekseninde feminist bir okuma. In M. Kuleli & D. Tuna (Eds.), *Dil, edebiyat ve çeviri odağında kavramsal okumalar. Conceptual readings in language, literature and translation. Lectures notionnelles de la langue, de la littérature et de la traduction* (pp. 103-138). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Tuna, D. & Kuleli, M. (2017). *Çeviri göstergebilimi çerçevesinde yazınsal çeviri için bir metin çözümleme ve karşılaştırma modeli*. Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Tuna, D. & Avaz, M. G. (2019). Analyzing, transmitting, and editing an Anatolian tale: A literary translation project as process. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi Special Issue* 6, 533-554.
- Ural, G. & Akdağ, T. (2017). Analysis of figurative elements in the novel The Daughter of Smyrna. *Journal of Educational & Instructional Studies in the World*, 7(2), 47-54.
- Vaughan, V. M. (1996). *Othello: A contextual history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yanya, S. D. (2020). Kuramdan uygulamaya uzanan yol: Çeviribilim ve göstergebilim açısından çevirmenin rolü, ideolojisi ve “aradalık” kavramı. In M. Kuleli & D. Tuna (Eds.), *Dil, edebiyat ve*

çeviri odağında kavramsal okumalar. Conceptual readings in language, literature and translation. Lectures notionnelles de la langue, de la littérature et de la traduction (pp. 139-163). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla *Othello*'nun çözümlenmesinde Coquet'nin “Söyleyenler Kuramı”

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, William Shakespeare tarafından yazılan *Othello* başlıklı oyunu Jean-Claude Coquet'nin “Söyleyenler Kuramı”na dayanarak çözümlmek ve çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla özgün metinde çözümlenen söylemlerin Türkçe çevirilerindeki anlam dönüşümlerini saptamak ve değerlendirmektir. Bu amaçla, Coquet'nin (1997; 2007) “Söyleyenler Kuramı” temel alınarak özgün metindeki yükümsüz özne söylemleri çözümlenmiştir. Özgün metinde saptanan yükümsüz özneler Öztürk Kasar'ın (2019) yükümsüz özneler sınıflandırması temelinde alt sınıflara ayrılmıştır. Çeviri değerlendirmesi için, oyunun dört Türkçe çevirisi Öztürk Kasar'ın “Çeviride Anlam Bozucu Eğilimler” dizgeselliği temel alınarak çözümlenmiştir. Özgün metnin çözümlenmesi sonucunda oyundaki yükümsüz özne söylemleri saptanmış ve bu söylem üreticilerinin eseniksiz durumda, tutkular türündeki içkin bileşenin etkisi altındaki yükümsüz özneler olduğu belirlenmiştir. Çeviri değerlendirmesi sonucunda, özgün metindeki yükümsüz özne söylemlerinin Türkçe çevirilerinde, Öztürk Kasar tarafından öne sürülen dokuz anlam bozucu eğilimin sekizine örnekler bulunmuştur. Çeviri değerlendirmesi bulguları, yazın çevirmenlerinin yazınsal metinlerdeki gizli anlam tuzaklarını aşabilmek için anlam bozucu eğilimlere başvurabildiklerini göstermektedir. Çevirmen adaylarında anlam bozucu eğilimlere dair bilinç uyandırmanın yazınsal çeviride bu anlam bozucu eğilimlere ne zaman ve nasıl başvurabilecekleri veya bu eğilimlerden nasıl kaçınabilecekleri hakkında bilinçli kararlar vermelerine yardımcı olabileceği sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Çeviri göstergebilimi; yazınsal çeviri; söyleyenler kuramı; yükümsüz özne; çeviride anlam bozucu eğilimler dizgeselliği.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Kuleli holds PhD in Interlingual and Intercultural Translation Studies. He currently works in the Department of Translation and Interpretation at Bandırma Onyedli Eylül University. His major publications are on Semiotics of Translation and literary translation.