

TRANSLATING THE PRISON CULTURE: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY UPON THE CULTURE SPECIFIC ITEMS IN THE TRANSLATIONS OF ORHAN KEMAL'S 72. KOĞUŞ¹

Adem AKALIN²

Aslı Özlem TARAKÇIOĞLU³

Geliş Tarihi:24.11.2018

Kabul Tarihi:21.12.2018

Abstract

It is a general fact that translation plays a fundamental role in the interaction and communication of different nations, languages and cultures. Many words and phrases have been translated because of the fact that humankind needed to communicate among themselves within the variety of languages and cultures on earth throughout history. As literature stands for one of the components constituting the language and culture, it spreads all over the world and may get into connection with a lot of foreign languages. For this reason, a translation of a work of art bears high importance in terms of its being understood by the target reader completely and its transference to the target language without any loss from its essence. In this study, two translations of '72. Koğuş' by Orhan Kemal will be studied in terms of analyzing the translation of prison culture into English as the target language. The main purpose of the study is to examine the translation methods and strategies that were utilized during the process of translating the culture specific items (CSIs) related with prison and its culture in the novella, '72. Koğuş' by Orhan Kemal, within the framework of Newmark's translation procedures. As a result of this study, 14 culture-specific items about prison life that were used by the author of source text were determined and examined in their translations into English in order to detect the decisions that were taken by the translators while applying the procedures and strategies during the process of translation. After the CSIs related with prison culture are determined and analyzed via Newmark's translation procedures, the general overview of translations will be evaluated according to Venuti's '*foreignization and domestication*' strategies.

Key Words: Prison Culture, Culture Specific Items, Translation Strategies, Peter Newmark, Orhan Kemal, 72. Koğuş.

INTRODUCTION

There have been many different civilizations and cultures on earth since the beginning of humankind. In order to get into an interaction in terms of being informed about other cultures and nations, something in common was needed by these civilizations. The interaction among the civilizations has been supplied by the help of translation. As a means of communication, translation has the role of being a bridge between different nations, cultures, and civilizations, by this way humankind has been in touch with his environment permanently.

Even though translation has an old history and has been utilized by humankind through centuries, no significance had been given to it as a field till its independence as a discipline was declared under the name of 'translation studies' in the late of the 20th century by James Holmes,

¹ Prepared as part of PhD dissertation going on at the Department of Translation and Cultural Studies at Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara / Turkey.

² Lecturer - School of Foreign Languages, Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen University, Ağrı/Turkey. E-mail: aakalin@agri.edu.tr

³ Assoc. Prof. Dr., Department of Translation and Interpreting, Faculty of Letters, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara/Turkey. E-mail: asli.tarakcioglu@hbv.edu.tr

a Dutch-based American scholar. Thanks to his paper named as ‘The name and the Nature of Translation’, translation gained its unique and independent form and accepted as a phenomenon separated from other disciplines, but bound to other scientific fields in some way (Holmes, 1972). It was an initial step to declare the translation as an independent discipline apart from others. However, translation is bound up to them in some ways. Since it deals with a great diversity of languages, cultures, traditions, societies and shortly everything that constitutes language and its components, an interaction with disciplines that are related with language is inevitable for translation. For that reason, translation occurs as an interdisciplinary field that has a relationship with other sciences. Since gaining its independence in the 1970s, the field of ‘translation studies’ has made progress considerably. The act of translating started to be handled with culture since it was realized that culture is an inseparable part of the process of translating.

The definition of translation has been made by many scholars and theorists, simply it is the act of transferring written or oral items from a language into another (Brockhaus, 1957). Venuti (1997: 17) defines translation as the replacement of the chain of source language’s signifiers with the ones in the target language. Additionally, Derrida presents language as an endless chain in which the signifiers are bound together and states that translation is differential and differed entity that never submits the genuine form because of the meaning is derived from the relations, similarities and differences of the signifiers. Newmark (1988: 51) states that the process of translation is an act of transferring the sense in a text into other languages within the way of source language author’s intention. Besides these definitions, there have been some explanations about the relationship between translation and culture. Translation is such a differential phenomenon that it has been influenced by the customs, traditions, and changes in languages. As Lewis (2006: 4) states, the variety of cultures is so huge and splendid. According to O’Neil, (2006) it is hard to submit a great number of various cultures that are scattered over the world.

The reflection of this multi-cultural existence can be seen in literature in which specific and social affairs, customs, traditions, religious thoughts and so on are declared by the authors of various cultures. Language and culture are bound together in such a way that differentiate a nation from the others in terms of its lifestyle, the unity of spirit in owning the same senses, feelings, and thoughts. Each society has a national identity since it owns a distinctive and unique structure within itself which makes it different among the others. Culture has a certain role of mirroring the social characteristics and features of a nation and these culture-based materials are firstly created in the original culture by the authors to the literal world and transformed into another language or form by the help of a set of symbols, language. For this reason, there exists a concrete connection between culture and literature since a great number of cultural items can be weaved into the literal world by the authors during the process of creating their works.

In this study, the culture-specific items related to prison life in 72. Koğuş, a well-known novella by Orhan Kemal, and its two different translations made into English will be analyzed descriptively in terms of the translation strategies that the translators utilized during the process of translation.

The novella tells the story of prisoners living in harsh conditions in jail within poverty, misery, hunger and corruption of the human soul but the victory of human dignity against this corruption. Since the novella also narrates the life in prison, its culture and a unique jargon in jail that the prisoners develop, the reader of target language may not be informed about these culture-specific items, it makes the translation of this masterpiece into another language much more difficult; by the way, it is of high significance to examine the translations strategies in their transference into target culture and its reader.

The reason to choose this novella is its being a work of art which includes culture-specific items mostly and the fact that Orhan Kemal is a well-known author over the world whose works have been translated into a lot of languages and plays have been performed in many countries. The novella was turned into a play and screenplay afterward and has been translated into a lot of languages as well. The novella was translated into English by Nevzat Erkmen with the name of ‘Ward 72’ in 1993 and by Cengiz Lugal as ‘The Prisoners’ in 2003. In this study, it is aimed to examine the culture-specific items related to prison life in source text (ST) ‘72. Koğuş’ descriptively and to detect which strategies were applied by the translators in their translations, ‘Ward 72’ and ‘The Prisoners’. In this study, TT1 stands for Target Text 1 and it refers to ‘The Prisoners’ and the term Target Text 2 is abbreviated as TT2 referring to ‘Ward 72’.

As a novella 72. Koğuş and Prison Culture

One of the works by Orhan Kemal who is a well-known and fundamental master in Turkish literature, 72. Koğuş narrates the worst situation in which the human soul is defeated. Orhan Kemal who kept his belief and goodwill for the humankind almost in all his works makes his reader hear the voice of rebellion against all the cruelty, misery and poverty even while narrating the lives of degraded men in the shade of a prison. In the novella, Orhan Kemal narrates the hope for human dignity that cannot be defeated by misery, poverty, and corruption of the human soul in a prison where uneducated people are jailed. Since the prisoners are illiterate and uneducated and belong to the lower class of society, utterances of prisoners in the novella mainly consist of proverbs, idioms, and phrases related to the local culture. According to Friedrich Maurer and Hans Naumann (cited from Röchrich and Mieder, 1977), uneducated and illiterate people make use of proverbs and idioms mostly in order to get rid of the labor of thinking, on the other hand, educated people have the ability to utter whatever they think with their words per se.

In his novella, Orhan Kemal makes his characters speak in local dialect and they, especially prisoners, reflect their social class. Because of the fact that their education level is low and they are isolated away from society, they make use of slang and sometimes utilize from idioms and proverbs in order to enrich the narration. (Uslu, 2013) The social environment where the prisoners live is limited in terms of space, they develop their own language and culture. Therefore, it makes a translation of these culture-specific items difficult for translators to detect and transfer into another culture to be readable and understandable for the target reader. Moreover, some formations and settlements that target culture do not have are mentioned and figured in the novella. These settlements can be defined as legal and illegal administrations. While legal affairs and items related to them may not be considered as strange by the target reader, illegal ones may not exist in target language and culture and by this way, target reader may not be informed about these terms within illegal administration such as agha, baseman, entrance tax that is taken from newcomers to the ward by agha and illegal facilities such as gambling with dice and pacing the floor. Since the living conditions and styles are different in and out the prison, the difference between them would be reflected when associated in terms of culture. (Ayalı, 2012)

In this study, the 29th press of 72. Koğuş was handled as the source text whose translations into English were made by Nevzat Erkmen in 1993 under the name of ‘Ward 72’ with the support of Ministry Culture and by Cengiz Lugal in 2003 under the name of ‘The Prisoners’. The first version of the novella was presented to the reader with eleven stories in 1953, however, it was printed as a unique work of art apart from other stories. Afterward, it was performed as a play

on various stages of different countries throughout the world and translated into a lot of languages. In 1987, the novella was also transferred into the screen by Erdoğan Tokatlı and again by Murat Saraçoğlu in March 2011. In order to identify the methods and strategies used during the process of translating into English, two target texts, *Ward 72* as Target Text 1 (TT1) and *The Prisoners* as Target Text 2 (TT2) were handled.

METHOD

Each nation owns a unique culture which involves traditions, customs, clothes, folklore, and belief differing itself from the others. Since the words and phrases are inseparable units of language, it is hard to transfer them into another language or culture. These phrases may be related with the culture of a language and have a specific effect for the source language users. For that reason, transference of these culture-specific items into another language may be troublesome or may not create the same effect in the target language. (Yıldırım, 2015)

The term, “Culture-specific item”, has been used by many scholars in order to identify the words and phrases that are related to the culture since there exist a great number of different cultures. As Lewis states “cultural diversity is vast and formidable” (Lewis, 2006: 4). By this way, it causes difficulties in confirming the number of cultures since items related to society are not different in order to promote them as separate groups (O’ Neil, 2006). For that reason, there is no certain knowledge in dividing the cultures over the world.

There may be similar items in many cultures for the fact that different cultures contact to each other, however, these cultural items may be utilized by the societies in different ways (Zare-Behtash and Firoozkoobi, 2010). The cultural items may be understood in his own perspective by target culture reader rather than the view of source culture and the original text’s author and this situation will cause a pitfall in the translation of cultural items. However, it may be easy to find similar equivalent when the languages and cultures are close to each other (Larson, 1998).

Because of the various diversity of cultures, many theorists and scholars have studied upon the categorization of culture-specific items. Studies upon translation were launched to shape in three distinct subtopics of this empirical science as descriptive, theoretical and applied after 1980s with the presentation of Holmes’ basic map of ‘Translation Studies’ (Toury, 1995). Nida (2001), on the other hand, supports the idea that target culture reader and audience should have the flavor and pleasure of the equivalence in his own language after the source culture is translated by the translator.

Many definitions have been made in order to detect the words and phrases that are special and unique for the culture and rename these items in the terminology of that newly-developed discipline. Nord (1997: 32) assigns the term as ‘cultereme’, Baker (1992: 21) coins the term as ‘culture-specific concepts’, Gambier develops these items as ‘culture-specific references’ and Robinson settles the terms of ‘relia’ and ‘culture-bound phenomena’. In his book, ‘A Textbook of Translation’, Newmark (2004) refers to these materials as ‘cultural words’. Lastly, Davies (2003) uses the term ‘culture-specific items’ in his dissertation and it is approved and has been used mostly by many scholars studying in the field of translation. In addition to these concepts, some functional theorists have claimed that translated text and target culture items bear higher significance than the source text and its culture (Tekalp & Tarakçıoğlu, 2016).

In this study, culture-specific items related to prison life and culture will be determined and analyzed in terms of the decisions that were taken by the translators of target texts. In order to minimize the problems and difficulties faced during the process of translation, Newmark (2004)

proposes some procedures that translators can utilize to transfer CSIs into the target language. From a long list that constitutes 16 translation procedures, 9 translation strategies were selected to determine the decisions that are applied by the translators. These translation strategies are listed as follows:

1) Literal Translation: The cultural items are translated by this strategy when they are clear and lucid. That is mostly used and one of the fundamental ways of translation applied in semantic and communicative texts.

2) Transference: Another basic method of translation is transference by which culture-specific items in SL are transferred into the target language as they are. When CSIs that do not exist in target language or culture such as geographical and historical places, names and nicknames of people, names of the institution, journals, and newspapers, etc., are detected in the source text, they can be moved into target text. This translation strategy can be named as ‘loan words’ by which the translator preserves source culture in target languages.

3) Adaptation: Newmark (1988: 46) defines this strategy as the replacement of CSIs in source culture with similar ones in the target culture. However, the usage of this translation strategy may disappear CSIs’ uniqueness.

4) Neutralization (Descriptive / Functional Equivalent): This way of translation are applied to cultural items by making them culture-free words in the target language. When the culture-specific items cannot be transferred into the target language, they are neutralized and universalized in order to be understood by the target reader.

5) Cultural Equivalent: when the culture-specific items are not involved by target culture, it is replaced presumably by a target cultural word.

6) Explanation: It is a way of adding an extra word for the culture-specific items since it is understood by the target reader.

7) Deletion: Culture-specific items can be removed by the translators from the target text occasionally. However, it is not recommended if there is no need for the omission.

8) Paraphrase: This type of translation strategy is applied to culture-specific items by expanding or rewriting the target text in order to be comprehended by the target reader.

9) Naturalization: This strategy resembles ‘transference’. However, by this strategy, culture-specific items are adapted to target language morphology.

To constitute a general overview of analysis, the findings will be evaluated via the strategies ‘*domestication and foreignization*’ that were developed by an American scholar and translator, Venuti. Venuti (1995) condenses his studies on a culture-based analysis of translation between different languages. With his work ‘*Translator’s Invisibility*’, he relates the fluency of target text with the invisibility of translator but visibility of source text and its author. In the process of developing such an approach that divides the kind of translation within the scope of culture, Venuti may have been influenced by a 19th-century theologian and translator Friedrich Schleiermacher since, in a lecture given in the Royal Academy Science, Schleiermacher (1813/1992) introduces two paths of translating; moving the reader to author that can be named as alienating (foreignization) or moving the author to the reader that is domestication. These two ways have been referred to as the opposite sides in the sample of literal and free translation within in the scope cultural context of a language (Lindemann, 2016).

If the translator decides to move the author to the reader, the foreignness of the source text is minimized by eliminating source language’s syntactic features and cultural figures. In this context, a translator may make use of methods such as adaptation, neutralization, cultural equivalent, deletion and naturalization in the process of transferring the CSIs into the target language. Otherwise, he can submit the CSIs to the acceptance of target reader via the methods

literal translation, transference, explanation and paraphrase within the framework of foreignization with the aim of moving reader to the author.

Analysis of Culture-Specific Items

In this study, the samples including the CSIs related with prison culture in the novella, 72. Koğuş, will be analyzed with the ones in its two translations, ‘Ward 72’ and ‘The Prisoners’ in terms of Newmark’s translation procedures and Venuti’s strategies that are given above in order to determine which strategies are benefitted by the translators in transferring the prison culture across the languages and cultures.

Sample 1:

ST: “İçlerinden biri arada **koğuştan** içeri şöyle bir dalıyor...” (p.2)

TT1: “Every now and then, one of them would enter the **ward**,...” (p.2)

TT2: “Now and then one would come into the **dormitory**,...” (p.8)

Used to define a big room in which a group of people shelters themselves in some places such as military posts, schools, hospitals, and prisons, ‘**koğuş**’ is translated as ‘ward’ in TT1 via the literal translation within the scope of foreignization while it is transmitted into the target language as ‘dormitory’ that means a large bedroom for a number of persons in TT2 by making use of neutralization in the framework of domestication.

Sample 2:

ST: “Yahu idareden çağırıyorlar dedik, **başefendi** çağırıyor dedik be!” (p.5)

TT1: “Hey, I told you they’re callin’ you from the office. I said the **Head Warden**’s callin’ you, man!” (p.6)

TT2: “Man, I told you they wanted you at the office. **The Gov’nor**’s waiting!” (p.12)

As a title that is for seniors in government offices or army among the soldiers, ‘**başefendi**’ is translated as ‘head warden’ in TT1 by the use of literal translation while it is applied to target text as ‘the gov’nor’ via adaptation by finding a similar equivalent item in the target language. In this sample, we can derive from the translations that translator in TT1 utilized from foreignization while the latter one decided to make use of domestication in order to make the CSI familiar with the target reader.

Sample 3:

ST: “**Başgardiyan**a uzun uzun baktı.” (p.6)

TT1: “He raised his eyes to the **Head Warden**...” (p.6)

TT2: “He gave **the Governor** a long look.” (p.12)

Bearing the same meaning with ‘başefendi’, ‘**başgardiyan**’ stands for a government officer that works in prison as head of guardians. This term is translated via literal translation by use of foreignization in TT1 while the translator in TT2 decides to adopt the CSI into the target language again as he did in the translation of ‘başefendi’. For that reason, it can be stated that the translator of TT2 prefers to use a similar equivalent that is appropriate for target cultural and linguistic norms.

Sample 4:

ST: Bütün başlar hırsla döndü:

“Niye?”

“**Meydancı!**”

“Allah Allah...” (p.9)

TT1: All the heads turned with greed:

“As what?”

“His **gofer**, his **dogsboddy!**”

“Holy cow..” (p.9)

TT2: Everyone suddenly turned to him angrily.

“What for?”

“**Crawler!**”

“As if he would!” (p.15)

In almost every prison, ‘meydancı’ exists as an assistant who helps the agha in some aspects such as doing his laundry service, getting news from the other sections of the prison and trying to supply whatever the agha needs (TDK, 2011). This cultural word is translated in TT1 as ‘gofer and dogsbody’ via adaptation method since the terms that are selected by the translator bear the meaning of ‘office boy’ who runs errands in a film set or office. For this reason, it can be stated that translator in TT1 decides to domesticate the CSI by choosing a term that is common in the target culture, by this way, the target reader may feel the text closer for themselves. Meanwhile, it is translated as ‘crawler’ in TT2 which is commonly referred for a person in the hope of gaining favor from the others. Hereby, we can state that it is translated via cultural equivalent within the scope of domestication.

Sample 5:

ST: “**Ağam** değil mi?” (p.11)

TT1: “Isn’t he my **Agha**?” (p.12)

TT2: “Listen, I’m looking out for the **boss**.” (p.17)

‘**Agha**’, having various meanings in Turkish culture, bears here the meaning of a person who dominates one or more parts of the prison illegally and reigns over other prisoners thanks to the power and wealth in Turkish prison culture. The system of being ‘ağa’ symbolizes the power and money (Ayalı, 2012). This term may be known by the target reader since its denotative meaning is included in some target language dictionaries. However, the term is transferred into target culture in TT1 via naturalization by making arrangements upon the word in order to adapt it to target language morphology. However, in TT2, this culture-specific item is translated within the scope of adaptation by finding a similar equivalent in the target language. The second method may have caused the CSI to lose its uniqueness and originality in the target text. For that reason, we can state that both translators decide to domesticate the cultural word in the target language.

Sample 6:

ST: “Parayı alırken söyle başgardiyana, seni efendi koğuşuna versin.” (p.12)

TT1: “When you get the money from the Head Warden, ask him to put you in the **effendi ward**.” (p.14)

TT2: “When you go to get your money, tell the Governor to transfer you to one of the **Gentlemen’s Dormitories.**” (p.19)

In prison culture, ‘**efendi koğuşu**’ bears the meaning of a cell or prison only rich and elite persons in Turkey and the Middle East. This culture-specific item is translated in TT1 as ‘effendi ward’ by utilizing from transference and as ‘gentlemen’s dormitory’ in TT2 within the framework of neutralization by applying culture-free word. Therefore, we can infer that foreignization is applied by the translator of TT1 while the culture-specific item is transferred by the use of domestication.

Sample 7:

ST: “**Adembabalar** sanki bunu bekliyorlardı, çeviriverdiler.” (p.13)

TT1: “As though the **Adembabas** had been waiting for this, they immediately encircled the Captain.” (p.14)

TT2: “The **prisoners** were all over them the moment they stepped in.” (p.20)

Defined as the person who is hungry without any penny in worst conditions in jail, the term ‘**adembaba**’ is translated in TT1 as ‘adembaba’ again by use of transference method within the scope of foreignization, so that the cultural word is introduced to the target reader. However, the translator of TT2 utilizes from neutralization by making it a cultural-free word that can be understood by the target reader easily. Hereby, we can derive from the translations that the translator of TT1 decides to apply foreignization while the other one prefers to translate it via domestication.

Sample 8:

ST: “Kaya Ali’nin **başköşeye** sermekte olduğu yatağın yanına geldiler.” (p.24)

TT1: “They both went to the side of the mattress Kaya Ali was putting in the **place of honor.**” (p.27)

TT2: “They went over to the mattress that Rock Ali had now spread out in the **corner.**” (p.33)

As a culture-specific item, ‘**başköşe**’ signifies a place where is reserved for a respectful person or elders to sit (TDK, 2011). This culture-specific item is paraphrased in TT1 as ‘the place of honor’ while it is neutralized by the translator of TT2 with a simple descriptive equivalent, ‘corner’, in the target language. Accordingly, it is clearly seen that the translator of TT1 prefers foreignization while the other one makes use of domestication in the translation of this culture-specific item.

Sample 9:

ST: “Sonra hamama gider, güzelce yıkanır, yeni çamaşır, yeni üst başını giyer, geçerdi **beyler koğuşuna.**” (p.38)

TT1: “He would wear his new clothes and go to the **gentlemen’s ward.**” (p.44)

TT2: “Then he’d go to the baths, have a nice wash, put on his new underwear and his new clothes, and move into the **Gentlemen’s Dormitory.**” (p.51)

Like ‘**efendi koğuşu**’, the culture-specific item ‘**beyler koğuşu**’ stands for the ward in which elite and rich prisoners stay. Both translators utilize from a literal translation by translating the CSI as ‘gentlemen’ ward or dormitory in the scope of foreignization.

Sample 10:

ST: “**Karakol komutanı** sigarasını tablada ezdi.” (p.60)

TT1: “The **commander of the guard** crushed his cigarette in the ashtray and said:” (p.73)

TT2: “The **head of security** stubbed his cigarette out in the ashtray.” (p.80)

‘**karakol komutanı**’ which is a common military term that is used for the head of patrol or guard is translated in TT1 as ‘commander of the guard’ by giving its denotative meaning in the target language via literal translation by means of foreignization. However, this CSI is handled with neutralization in the framework of domestication with a basic and universal translation of the CSI, ‘head of security’, to be familiar with the target reader.

Sample 11:

ST: “Kaç kere verdik **başçavuş**.” (p.60)

TT1: “We’ve given them again and again, **Sargeant**.” (p.73)

TT2: “But I’ve given them so many light-bulbs, **sergeant-major**.” (p.80)

One of the military ranks in the Turkish army, ‘**başçavuş**’ can be defined as CSI since it belongs to a specific military culture of a nation. This term is translated in TT1 via literal translation method in the scope of foreignization by both translators.

Sample 12:

ST: “Berbat basıp gitmese de şimdi burada olsa, o gece konuştukları gibi, Bobi’yi ayarlar, hastane ya da dişçi dümeniyle müdürden bir **kapı kağıdı**...” (p.66)

TT1: “If Berbat hadn’t walked off and had been here, he would have gotten Bobi to chisel from the Head Warden a **pass** under the guise of visiting the hospital or the dentist as they had been talking that night.” (p.79)

TT2: “If Foul hadn’t upped and left they could have gone to him, just like they’d talked about, and wangled themselves a **hospital or dentist’s pass**...” (p.87)

Known as a permission that is mostly desired by the prisoners to get out of the prison to hospital for their dental and medical care, ‘**kapı kağıdı**’ can be taken in some cases from the administration of the prison. In the early history of the prison, this application was used out of its purpose and it was given for wealthy prisoners to run their errands outside. This culture-specific item is translated by the translator of TT1 as ‘pass’ by the use of neutralization within the framework of domestication and handled in TT2 as ‘hospital or dental pass’ via the method of paraphrase in the scope of foreignization by expressing the CSI in other words.

Sample 13:

ST: “Burada kim, ne bilecekti Aysel’i? Görüşme günlerinde gelir, **avlunun** kıyısında bir yana çekilirler, diz dize, soluk soluğa...” (p.60)

TT1: “Not minding what everyone else would say, for who could know here about Aysel? On visiting days she’d come, and they’d sit in a corner of the **garden** knee to knee and their breaths close together...” (p.80)

TT2: “She could come and see him on visiting days, and they could sit together to one side of the **yard**, knees touching, feeling each other’s breath...” (p.88)

From the early years till the end of 20th century, the culture-specific term, ‘**avlu**’, was narrated as a place that gives relief to the prisoners with its open-air and roofless structure under which prisoners can meet with their visitors and relatives. However, this structure was altered during the time and ‘avlu’ was changed as a place which is better than the worst. Thus, it was narrated by some authors such as Kemal Tahir as a rotten hollow in their works (Ayalı, 2012). This CSI is translated in TT1 as ‘garden’ via neutralization by finding out a similar but different equivalence in the target culture and so making use of domestication. In contrast to former translation, the translator of TT2 utilizes from a literal translation by translating the CSI with its denotative meaning, that is, ‘yard’ within the scope of foreignization.

Sample 14:

ST: “Gündüzleri elleri arkasında, kendi kendine tenhalarda **volta vurarak** Fatma’yı düşündükten başka, geceleri âdembabalar uyuduktan sonra tünediği pencereden gözlerini kırmızı kiremitli yapıya dikerek Fatma’yı, hep Fatma’yı düşünüyordu.” (p.87)

TT1: “During the day, with his hands behind him, **walking up and down** in solitude, he kept thinking of Fatma. And during the night, after the Adembabas went to bed, fixing his gaze on the red-tiled building, he kept thinking of Fatma, always Fatma.” (p.104)

TT2: “The Captain didn’t just spend his days **pacing up and down**, thinking of nothing but Fatma. At nights too, once all the others were asleep, he would climb out of his bed and perch on the window-sill, stare at the red-tiled building, and think only of her. He thought of nothing else.” (p.113)

As the best way of discharging the anger and getting rid of gloomy atmosphere, ‘**volta**’ can be defined as walking up and down in a line at a trot by caring other prisoners to keep away from shouldering them and ceasing their movement since it adheres as ‘a disrespectful motion and by so a challenge for the rival to fight’ in prison culture. Both translators benefit from neutralization by translating the CSI with culture-free words in target culture with the aim of domestication.

CONCLUSION

In recent years, studies upon cultural components of literary works have gained importance. Besides the differences between the languages in terms of syntax and linguistic aspects, cultural diversity makes the process of translation hard for translators. Culture is shaped and constituted with the diachronic evolution of a community by means of language, translation from one language to another can be appreciated as a cross-cultural transference. Since the thoughts, beliefs, traditions, lifestyles, and concepts are effective in creating a nation’s culture, these cultural items are involved when the literary works are being shaped (Ünalın, 2004).

As a literary work, ‘72. *Koğuş*’ owns a splendid place in world literature in reflecting fundamental cultural values of Turkish society. Even though it has been translated into many languages and performed on the stage a lot of times, there exist some shortcomings in submitting the whole of culture to the target language and its reader. In this study, it is aimed to detect and analyze translators’ decisions during the process of translating culture-specific items related to prison culture in terms of translation methods. 14 culture-specific items in the source text were detected in its two translations ‘Ward 72’ that was translated by Nevzat Erkmen in 1993 and ‘The Prisoners’ that was translated by Cengiz Lugal in 2003 and these CSIs were analyzed within the framework of Newmark’s translation procedures and Venuti’s strategies, ‘*foreignization and domestication*’ to submit an overall analysis upon the translations of CSIs.

After data was gathered, it is clearly seen that in the translations of CSIs related with prison culture, the mostly used method that the translator of TT1 utilized is literal translation while it is neutralization that is used by the translator of TT2. However, this information should not be an overall implication for the whole text that the two translations of the source text tend to move in the same direction since there exist some evidence about the fact that the translators have utilized from various techniques different from themselves which may lead them in reverse directions.

Considering the CSIs that are studied, it is clearly seen that the literal translation method is used by TT1 translator with a higher percentage (%43) than the other target text rate (% 21). TT1 translator has heavily used this method in the translation of CSIs related to prison culture. It is detected in the study that the methods from which the translator of TT1 has never utilized are explanation, cultural equivalent, and deletion. The methods that the translator has rarely applied to TT1 are paraphrase, adaptation, and naturalization with the rate of %7 in all. When the translations of CSIs are associated with Venuti's strategies, it is clearly claimed that the translator prefers to utilize from foreignization since, in 9 samples, he decides to use the methods that are related with the strategy of foreignization. This data shows that the rate of utilizing from foreignization by the translator of TT1 is %64 while the rate of taking decisions in favor of domestication is %36. As it can be derived from this explanation, TT1 translator has aimed to introduce the flavor of the source culture to target reader and wanted these CSIs to be known by target reader while transferring the cultural words across the languages. Hence, his decision that is spread throughout the text is supported by his explanation that is given for the description of the characters' names at the beginning of novella.

As to the CSIs' analyses in TT2, it is seen that mostly used translation method is neutralization. The rate of neutralization (%43) makes a significant sense when the rates of other translation methods that are used by the translator are considered. The translator has utilized from the methods; adaptation and literal translation with the rate of %21. The methods that are not used by the translator in TT2 are transference, explanation, deletion, and naturalization. Paraphrase and cultural equivalence can be defined as the least used methods since the translator has benefitted from each of them once. In an overall point of view, the translator of TT2 has utilized from the methods that are related with the strategy of domestication 10 times while he prefers foreignization only for 4 items during the process of translating the culture-specific items into the target language. From this data, we can infer that the translator has benefitted from domestication with the high rate of %71 while he applies foreignization only for %29 of all items. Therefore, the translator pursues the goal of submitting an easy-understanding for target reader to give him the impression just like reading in his own literature rather than introducing source culture components.

In conclusion, according to the data that is gathered and evaluated, it has been determined that two different goals were pursued by two different translators of the same source text in translating items related with prison culture into the same target language. In the whole source text, 14 CSIs can be detected and their analyses are dealt with the methods or procedures that are developed by Peter Newmark. Later these methods matched with Venuti's strategies, the choices and decisions have been brought into the light. While one of the translators applies foreignization with the rate of %64, the other one carries out the process of translation in favor of domestication with the rate %71. On the one hand, the translator of TT1 has decided to introduce the variety and richness of source culture to target reader, on the other hand, the other one chose to apply a better understanding of source culture elements for target language users. By this way, it is aimed to enlighten translators' decisions and choices in transferring a culture

into another language. In a further study, the opinions of translators may be asked in order to clarify the reasons in employing the translation methods and some subtopics such as proper names, idioms, slang, and metaphors may be adopted into the classification of cultural words.

REFERENCES

- Ayalı, Şaziye. (2012). *Hapishane Romanları (1950-1980)*. Master Thesis, Balıkesir University, Balıkesir
- Baker, Mona. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Büyükkol, Semih. (2017). Çeşme Kültürünün Türk Resmine Yansımaları. *İdil Dergisi*, 6(39), 3245-3256.
- Davies, Eiries E. (2003). “A Goblin or a Dirty Nose? The Treatment of Culture-Specific References in Translations of Harry Potter Book”. *In The Translator*, 9(1,6): 65-100.
- Der Große Brockhaus. (1957), 16. Press, Wiesbaden, Germany.
- Holmes, J. S., (1972). *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Kemal, Orhan. (1954/2015). 72. *Koşuş*. 29. Ed. Everest Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kemal, Orhan. (1954/1993). *Ward 72*. (Trans.) Nevzat Erkmén. Publications of Ministry of Culture, Ankara. ISBN: 975-17-1235-1
- Kemal, Orhan. (1954/2003). *The Prisoners*. (Trans.) Cengiz Lugal. (Ed: Denise Mcqueen) Anatolia Publishing, İstanbul.
- Kubbealtı Lugatı, Accessed 07 June 2018, <http://lugatim.com/>.
- Larson, Mildred L. (1998). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence 2nd ed*. University Press of America, Inc.: Lanham and Maryland
- Lewis, Richard. D. (2006). *When Cultures Collide: Leading across Cultures*, Nicolas Brealey International, Boston and London
- Lindemann, Verena. (2016). *Friedrich Schleiermacher’s Lecture “On the Different Methods of Translating” and the Notion of Authorship in Translation Studies*. (Eds. Seruya, T. & Justo, J. M.) in *New Frontiers in Translation Studies / Rereading Schleiermacher: Translation, Cognition and Culture*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg
- Newmark, Peter. (1988). *Textbook of Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, Peter. (2004). *A Textbook of Translation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Nord, Christiane. (1997). “Text Analysis in Translation.” *In Annotated Texts for Translation: English-German. Functionalist Approaches Illustrated*. Schäffner, Christina and Uwe Wiesemann. Frankfurt: Multilingual Matters, 24.
- Nord, Christiane. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Nida, Eugene. A. (2001). *Contexts in Translating*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- O'Neil, Dennis. 6 June 2006. *World Diversity Patterns*. Accessed on 7 June 2018. http://anthro.palomar.edu/ethnicity/ethnic_5.htm
- Röhrich, L. & Wolfgang M. (1977). *Sprichwort*. Stuttgart: Metzler
- Schleiermacher, F. (1813/1992). *On Different Methods of Translating*. (Ed. L. Venuti, 2004), pp. 43-63.
- Şaziye, Ayalı. (2012). *Hapishane Romanları (1950-1980)* Master Thesis. Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.
- Tekalp, Selen. and Tarakçıoğlu, Aslı Özlem. (2016). Translating Popular Fiction: A Descriptive Study on the Turkish Translation of The Hunger Games. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 4(2), 112-122. DOI: 10.15640/ijll.v4n2a14
- TDK Türkçe Sözlük, (2011). Prepared by: Şükrü Haluk Akalın. 11. Ed. Türk Dil Kurumu, Ankara.
- Toury, Gideon. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins Publishing Co., Philadelphia, PA 19118, USA.
- Uslu, Arzu. (2013). *Kerimcan Korcan'ın Hapishane Konulu Hikâye ve Romanlarında Hapishane Gerçeği*, Master Thesis, Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.
- Ünalın, Şükrü. (2004). *Dil ve Kültür*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- Venti, Lawrence. (1997). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, Routledge, New York.
- Yıldırım, Ceylan. (2015). Amin Maalouf'un Afrikalı Leo ve Semerkant Romanlarında Kültürel Unsurların Çevirisi Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 8(39), 222-232.
- Zare-Behtash, Esmail and Sepideh, Firoozkahi. (2010). *Culture-Specific Items in Literary Translations..* Accessed 08 June 2018. <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/51culture.htm>