

Can Yücel's implicit translation strategies on Shakespeare: Rewriting possibilities for *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*¹

Yeşim Deniz ÇINAR²

APA: Çınar, Y. (2018). Can Yücel's implicit translation strategies on Shakespeare: Rewriting possibilities for *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (13), 15-24. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.504249

Abstract

In today's world, translation and rewriting are both considered as umbrella terms to define translated literature though differing in content. Translation as an umbrella term may bring forth the idea of 'conformity' to the target text whereas rewriting may recall 'changes' made to the original. The term "rewriting" has been used to define works that are 'inferior' examples of the target text. To oppose this traditional view, theorists like Gideon Toury, Rosemary Arojo and Kaisa Koskinen claim that all texts refer to one another in many ways, and the concept of rewriting should still be handled carefully as discussions on translation and textual production still continue. In the Turkish literary system, Can Yücel's translation of William Shakespeare's sonnets and three plays, namely *Hamlet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *the Tempest* have stood out as examples of free translation. Yücel called himself 'Türkçe Söyleyen' (Rewriter in Turkish) to escape from harsh criticism that said his work was "not translation". Such discussions are likely to fade away because today's translation theories see textual production since the beginning of history as rewriting. In such a case, the 'loyalty' to target text should be considered as a paradigm because it may be challenged as well as the umbrella terms like translation or rewriting. According to modern translation theorists it is the translators' choices that make literature 'different' from one another and these should be respected.

Key words: Rewriting, loyalty, dynamic influence, imagery.

Yücel'in Shakespeare'de örtülü çeviri stratejileri: *Hamlet* ve *Bir Yaz Gecesi Rüyası* için yeniden yazma olanakları

Öz

Günümüz dünyasında, çeviri ve yeniden yazma birbirinden farklı edimler kabul edilseler de, çeviri edebiyatı tanımlamak için çerçeve terimler olarak kullanılırlar. Çeviri terimi, 'sadakat' kavramını akla getirirken, yeniden yazma genellikle kaynak metne yapılan 'değişiklikleri' ifade etmek için kullanılır. Bu bağlamda 'yeniden yazma' kaynak metinle karşılaştırıldığında 'görece az değerli' kabul edilmektedir. Bu geleneksel görüşe karşı çıkan kuramcılardan Gideon Toury, Kaisa Koskinen ve Rosemary Arojo, metinlerin birbirleriyle bir çok şekilde bağlantılı olduğunu öne sürerek, çeviri ve yazınsal üretim sürecinin dinamikliği nedeniyle 'yeniden yazma' kavramının dikkatlice ele alınması gerektiğini belirtmektedirler. Türk edebi dizgesinde, Can Yücel'in William Shakespeare'in soneleri ve üç oyun çevirisi, *Hamlet*, *Bahar Noktası ve Fırtına* geçmişte 'serbest çeviri' olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Can Yücel ise yapıtlarının 'çeviri olmadığını' iddia eden yapıcı olmayan eleştirilere cevap olarak kendini "Türkçe Söyleyen" olarak adlandırmıştır. Günümüzde ise bu tartışmaların sonu

¹ Part of this paper was presented as an oral presentation at Düzce University International Conference on Language (DU-ICOL / WRITING - 2018) held on 18-20 October, 2018.

² Öğr. Gör. Yenyüzyıl Üniversitesi, Dil Okulu, (İstanbul, Türkiye), jadeandsea@yahoo.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3111-0256 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 27.11.2018-kabul tarihi: 22.12.2018; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.504249]

gelmek üzeredir çünkü çeviri kuramları artık 'yeniden yazma' kavramını tarihin başlangıcından beri üretilmiş metinleri tanımlamak için kullanılmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, 'metne sadakat' bu çerçevede terimler gibi sorgulanabilir bir paradigma haline gelmiştir. Çağdaş çeviri kuramlarına göre, edebi metinleri birbirlerinden farklı kılan saygı duyulması gereken çevirmen seçimleridir.

Anahtar sözcükler:Yeniden yazma, sadakat, dinamik etki, imge.

1. Introduction

In literary history, translation and rewriting have both been considered as umbrella terms to define translated literature although what to call a 'translation' is still a challenge. The main argument of this study is that both terms pose limitations over translated Shakespeare. What may be the drawbacks of calling his works translation or rewriting then? Translation as an umbrella term will traditionally bring forth the idea of *loyalty* to the target text whereas rewriting may point mostly distorting the original. As mentioned above both terms are problematic because they tend to label and pinpoint translated Shakespeare. Is it an absolute necessity to describe and categorize literary translations then? How can such labelling be replaced for the good of translated literature?

Translation theorists, namely Rosemary Arojo and Kaisa Koskinen claim that all texts refer to one another in many ways. Therefore, using the term '*rewriting*' that would classify translations as 'inferior' examples of the target text according to norms is mostly avoided. Translation has not been merely associated with secondariness or failure. To take the argument further, Rosemary Arojo, claims that the translator's activity has been related to evil and blasphemy, to indecency and transgression. (Arojo, 1995:21) Kaisa Koskinen, on the other hand, clarifies the translator's role in the hierarchical opposition where the original text and its author are placed on the upper level while second hand interpretations and interpreters on the lower (Koskinen, 1994:447). As formerly stated by Roland Barthes, the image of literature to be found in ordinary culture is tyrannically centered on the author (Barthes, 1988: 143). Therefore, positioning and repositioning of the translated literature have always been problematic. Traditionally any radical abridgement or shortened forms of translated literature have fallen under this category. As an outstanding example of rewriting, William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has been translated from Arabic to English and English to Arabic many times. In the Turkish literary system, however, the discussions of rewriting are centered around Can Yücel's translation of William Shakespeare's sonnets and three plays, namely '*Hamlet*', '*A Midsummer Night's Dream*' and '*the Tempest*'. Yücel was mostly criticized by his radical style as well as using explicit words in translation.

As a result Yücel had to call himself 'Türkçe Söyleyen' (Rewriter in Turkish) (Çelebi, 1999: 38) to escape from harsh criticism that said his work was "not translation". Yücel's translation choices did not comply with the norms imposed on translated Shakespeare. Other translators of Shakespeare such as Bülent Bozkurt (1991) and Talat Halman (2001) have both claimed in the prefaces to their translated work that they stuck to the norms imposed mostly by the academia to make Shakespeare meaningful to the Turkish reader. It should be considered that both translators have explained their translator choices in the modern sense. However, Can Yücel could not explain himself well because rejection of such norms was his translator strategy. The literary world embraced both Halman and Bozkurt's translations which were well explained. However, they were Can Yücel's translation strategies that better reflected the multiplicity of meaning in Shakespeare. This eventually led to controversy and his style was mistakenly labelled as rewriting.

Such discussions are likely to fade away because today's translation theories see textual production since the beginning of history to define the term rewriting. In such a case, the 'loyalty' to target text and the image of ideal translator may be challenged. It would then be possible to ask who would determine the loyalty of textual production. Is there a touchstone for all texts? All literary texts and their translations form a polysystem, as Itamar-Even Zohar (1990) claims, that no one will have total control over. Therefore, Shakespeare translations of Bozkurt, Halman and Yücel are actually correlated. They exist to form one another in a polysystem of literature despite the severity of discussions over Shakespeare in Turkish. Therefore, what is Shakespearean and what is not will not be decided by any critic, translator or writer because it is admitted that the conscious or subconscious translator choices form the perspective on a literary work.

2. Critical work over Can Yücel's rewriting

To take the argument further, Can Yücel's translation of *Hamlet* and *Midsummer Night's Dream* as examples of dynamic equivalence is worth considering. In this work, highlighting discussions on 'rewriting' will be the main focus with theories from Itamar-Even Zohar, Rosa Maria Olher, Dirk Delabastita. To exemplify, comparison of the two translations of William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* by Can Yücel will be the method as well as *Hamlet* by Bülent Bozkurt published in 1999. Yücel's *Hamlet* dates back to 1992 but the second edition was published in 1997 with no preface and criticism. Instead, in an interview made by Suat Karantay (1989) titled '*Can Yücel ile Söyleşi*' Yücel claims that there is an obligation to translating poetry such as "conveying the counterparts of what is being said and the components of organic unity" (Yücel, 1989:11- see also. Demirkol, 2006: 47).³

To exemplify what was received as translation and rewriting, it would be apt to say that Can Yücel's *Hamlet* has no editorial or preface while Bozkurt (1991) has chosen to include four critical works. Yücel's free translations seem to lack the tone that 'academic translation' calls for and it is surprising to remember that Yücel had never called himself a Shakespeare translator. Interestingly, *Bahar Noktası* can also be read as a political allegory to criticise marriage and politics. Therefore; during Yücel's time it remained unclear whether *Bahar Noktası* was rewriting or not.

It was Başar Sabuncu (2002) who helped clear the argument when he agreed to write a documentation of the staging and dramaturgical process of '*Bahar Noktası*' by explaining 'rewriting process' for the stage. Sabuncu openly claimed that Yücel rejected the idea of a Shakespearean fairy tale. Yücel viewed '*A Midsummer Night's Dream*' as a covered up depiction of everyday reality or the other side of the coin. There are endless possibilities when it comes to personal choices in the hidden realm but they are regularized with the practice of marriage as a social contract. In the play when Hermia refuses to marry her suitor, macho ruler Tezeus says that she will have a life but give no birth. Consequently, in this play, there is a king who *defines* what is life what is not. Yücel's translations comply with Sabuncu on his comment that the play is completely based on the idea of swapping partners to exemplify an alternative political atmosphere.

From the critical piece by Başar Sabuncu (2002; 11), it is possible to learn *Bahar Noktası* is a successful translation because the paralelism between the Turkish culture and an English fairy play made the play stageable. Titania, the fairy queen was translated as 'Müzeyyen' because the name looked capricious enough in Turkish. Oberon becomes 'Babaron', with implications on his manly power. So, the audience

³ Translated by Yeşim Deniz Çınar

is drawn into the play without much effort because if it had been presented as an English fairy play, it would not have become the symbol for resistance for actors who were expelled from Municipality Theatre due to political reasons.

According to drama critic Cevat Çapan (1981), on the other hand, Can Yücel “translates allusions made by Shakespeare to the sources that only his people would understand in such a skilful way that, the power of connotation and richness in meaning is retained.”⁴(31) Cevat Çapan (1981), also claims that Shakespeare is now free because it is being ‘understood’ by the Turkish audience. Because the actors did not find it problematic to set the play in the Turkish context, the perspective of Sabuncu worked well. When Müzeyyen complains about not being able to gather with her minions because of the fight between her and Babaron about the slave boy, she uses the word ‘cem etmek’⁵ for their gathering. The whole play was contextualized in such a way that the audience finds relevancy between two cultures. According to Çapan (1981), it was nothing but use of imagination that made this staging very different from what he calls ‘*kaknem akademiklik*’⁶, in English. Eventually, ‘*Bahar Noktası*’ became the Shakespeare comedy to laugh at.

The paratextual analysis Can Yücel translation of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, according to Itamar-Even Zohar's (2000) theory, places Shakespeare's plays and translations in Turkey into the center because they were culturally both presented and represented. According to Zohar, no piece of literature is independent of social and linguistic systems that it belongs to as translated works or literature correlate in at least two ways:

“(a) in the way their source texts are selected by target literature, the principles of selection never being uncorrelatable with the whole co-system of the target literature (to put it in the most cautious way); and (b) in the way that they adopt specific norms, behaviours and policies- in short, in their use of the literary repertoire-which results from their relations with the other co-systems” (Zohar, 2000: 192)

Also to Itamar-Even Zohar (1990), the effect of a translation is directly linked to the ways that:

“they adopt specific norms, behaviours and policies-in short, in their use of the literary repertoires which results from their relations with the other home co-systems and the place of a work is determined by ‘innovatory (“primary”) or conservatory (“secondary”) repertoires, depends on the specific constellation of the polysystem underneath them.” (Zohar, 1990: 46)

To take the argument further, under the light of Susan Bassnet and André Lefevere's ‘*rewriting of literary works*’ it would be proper to focus on Can Yücel's *Hamlet* to trace dynamic equivalence in ‘*Can Babaca*’ (Canese) translation. Considering the effect of the rewriting of ‘*Bahar Noktası*’, it can be said that the influence is directly be linked to the functional equivalence. Therefore, dynamic equivalence between the source text and Can Yücel translation needs to be studied. Obviously, critics who found his work almost ‘*vulgar*’ because Yücel made *Hamlet* swear on stage, failed to recognize that slang and swear are the two basic ways of shifts in everyday language that may function as elements of poetic discourse if used diligently.

As a negative example of reception, the marketing strategy of ‘*Okuyan Us Yayınları*’ for ‘*Bahar Noktası*’ pushes Shakespeare into the periphery by labelling it as erotic literature. Editorial work should retain unbiased perspective about the work; however, *Bahar Noktası*, a play which became the flag for the

⁴ Translated by Yeşim Deniz Çınar

⁵ A religious gathering in Bektashi context

⁶ rigid academic perspective

intellectual resistance to the coup d'état management- suffers under such a sub-category and as an attempt to undercover its strong political influence. Consequently, this may be interpreted as censorship because publishing houses may impose limitations when it comes to choice of works especially of political nature. Yücel's translation was mostly received as rewriting because the political perspective remained hidden.

3. Can Yücel's contextualization in drama

As Turkish theatre embraced Shakespeare's plays as the result of modern culture planning, the Ministry of Education led by Hasan Ali Yücel, editors, dramaturgists, and translators of the project seemed to have stayed away from the Ottoman Drama tradition. It could be argued if culture planners of the modern Turkish Republic had embraced Darülbedayi of the Ottoman world and saw the relevance with 'the people's theatre', rewriting of Shakespeare translations in Turkish would be better appreciated. As in the example of Can Yücel's *Bahar Noktası*, Yücel's creativity seems to be rooted in the characterization techniques of traditional Turkish theatre.

As the example of the translation of tragedy, Yücel's word choice and use of imagery, contributes to the dynamic equivalence of the translation by disclosing the ambiguity in *Hamlet*. The reason why his approach was not praised shows he was ahead of the translation scholars in terms of stage adaptation methods. Yücel's context and cultural shifts were mostly condemned in his time. As Dirk Delabastita puts it, "most decisive steps to such a flexible approach to translation were taken by Gideon Toury, who aptly summarised the historical variability of translation as 'difference' across cultures, 'variation' within a culture and 'change' over time" (Delabastita, 2010:196). In a way, his translator choices made this rewritten *Hamlet* both stageable and readable in Turkish because Yücel seems to have promoted cultural equivalence. This shows that he also had extensive knowledge about stageability.

After Yücel's translation was published, there was a huge dispute among scholars of translation and literature. He was severely criticised for not 'being loyal' to source text, constructing an Ottoman world in Elsinore by his use of old Turkish made up of both Farsi and Arabic words. Moreover; he was accused of making the play 'unstageable' because of analogies like "*bir ihtimal daha var o da ölmek mi dersin?*"⁷(Yücel, 1992: 62) which reminds the audience a famous drinking house song in Turkish. Unfortunately, very few people in his time paralleled this choice as a 'deliantion effect' of modern drama tradition but as of an insult to Shakespeare cannon. He also made use of slang which vexed the intellectuals in the academia who believed that Shakespeare's royalty would never swear. Yücel was so severely criticised that he gave up calling himself an interpreter and said, "*I am a rewriter in Turkish!*" (Çelebi, 1999: 38). As Delabastita (2010:197) summarises the end of the argument of 'translatability', as a part of the multiplicity of meaning in the cultural context that the "cultures should be left to decide themselves and for reasons which are proper to them what constitutes 'literature' and 'translation' and what they can be expected to do within the total range of discursive options" (Delabastita, 2010: 197). The perspective of Delabastita did not exist at a time that Yücel was mostly criticised for his method by individuals without flexible approach to cultural paradigms.

In addition to the criticism made by scholars to Yücel's translation of *Bahar Noktası* with its explicit word choice and imagery, the work is mostly pinpointed by its contextualization. In other words, Yücel changed the names of certain characters and placed the whole play into a 'mahalle' (district) context, where the rage and fury of the characters looked paralel to Turkish culture. Therefore; how Yücel's texts

⁷To be or not to be; that's the question.

were received by Turkish theatres and how their performance choices add to the value of his translations are also critical. In this context, the role of Boğaziçi Oyuncuları should be remembered because they staged '*Hamlet*', '*Fırtına*' and '*Bahar Noktası*' in different times to display that rewriting(s) of these plays were possible. Can Yücel's *Bahar Noktası* translation is an example of rewriting because the translation also gives room for experimental dramaturgical work as exemplified by Boğaziçi Oyuncuları's performance. Translation theorists today are able to explain how texts may communicate. As Rosa Maria Olher (2004) puts it, in modern sense we should see translation as '*a communication activity, not as a mere product.*' (75) Therefore, Olher's theory is the next step to Toury's polysystem theory because 'social, cultural and psychological dimensions' of the text are the dominating factors to become counterparts in modern staging.

Since there are no footnotes in Yücel's translations it may be assumed that both *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* were only for staging. In his famous soliloquy, when Prince Hamlet says "Var olmak ya da olmamak"⁸ in Bozkurt's (1991: 114) translation the audience wonders why Hamlet's so called depression leads him to philosophical questions since in English, 'to be' may both mean to live and to survive. The interpretation of his words would be "To live or to survive, that's the question" because there is a great danger for him to get murdered in Elsinore like his father.

Therefore; Can Yücel (1997) translates the first lines of the famous soliloquy as "*bir ihtimal daha var, o da ölmek mi dersin?*" (62); which are also the first lines of a famous classical Turkish song.⁹ With this translation, theme of death is introduced to the play very ironically. Translation scholar Işın Bengi Öner stresses the complexity of his translations because they "do not fit so we call them acceptable but his texts is in total concordance with the source text while in staying total harmony with the target text." (Öner, 1997: 101)

In Yücel's translation, Hamlet is talking about not only his death but also the death of Elsinore. Yücel's Hamlet 'foresees' the fact that all characters except Horatio die at the end of the play by murder. Shakespeare chose to write this in an implicit way, However, Yücel (1997) chose to elaborate it to ready the audience for the terrible cycle of 'unnatural deaths' on the stage. Unlike his father's death, Hamlet's murder of Polonius has a big impact on the audience because as a tragedy character, at the very moment, Hamlet loses the chance of a decent future or being throned as the King of Denmark.

Although generally being consistent and more explicit as a critic, on the other hand, Bülent Bozkurt's *Hamlet* is harder to grasp as a theatrical text because Bozkurt's translation strategies look contradictory. As an example, Bozkurt makes two controversial comments on Shakespeare's *Hamlet* firstly by saying "to know Shakespeare is to be Western literature, culture and theatre." and we see in the play "ourselves and humanity as well as today and the past". (Bozkurt, 1991: 9). Secondly when he regards western culture as a tool for the readers to culturally perfect themselves we understand we are in the realm of hierarchical positioning of the source text as superior to the translation produced.

Bozkurt effortlessly passes the responsibility of 'constructing meaning' to the reader by saying "The reader should push the limits of his/her imagination by swapping roles of the audience, actor, director or producer and stage the play inside his/her mind (Bozkurt, 1999: 10). Bozkurt looks totally against the

⁸ Original Text: "*To be or not to be; that's the question.*"

⁹ Eng. Translation: "*Per chance death is awaiting us?*"

idea of the role of the translator as a reader and translator's *choices* that make texts different from each other.

From this critical perspective, in "The Preface to the Second Edition" Bozkurt tried to devise his own methods to criticise Yücel when he wrote:

"for me, the priority is not rewriting Hamlet 'the play of plays in Turkish', therefore by no means interested in translating the play closer to Turkish culture in concordance with the Turkish language." (Bozkurt, 1991:6)

However, Bozkurt contradicts with his perspective while saying "*his initial aim was not to change and distort Hamlet*" (Bozkurt, 1991:17) instead of making it "*understandable and flowing*. Consequently, it was Can Yücel who gazed Shakespeare imagery from different perspectives to excel in Turkish throughout *Hamlet*.

Bozkurt (1991) repeats himself when in his article "Hamlet'i Türkçe'ye Çevirirken" (Translating Hamlet) while explaining his views on translation:

"...understanding and conveying carries an obligation of changing or interpreting a work because of one's perspective" (Bozkurt, 1991: 18).

Bozkurt also openly claims that:

"...the duty of the translator to change as less as possible." (Bozkurt, 1991:17)

Here, he denies two things: First, the role of the translator as a reader and the fact that multiple readings form 'a perspective'. If there is one ideal text that cannot be changed and translated, it is pretty clear that the writer is not Shakespeare because of the mind-tickling mystery surrounding his plays and the playwright's identity. Bozkurt seems to reject the perspective of the translator while saying, "in this translation, the reader has been regarded as a part of the audience not the reader of a poem or a novel" and suggests the reader to find meaning in the mimics and gestures of an actor. Bozkurt's diligent work on the translation of *Hamlet* seems to be backstabbed by vague translation strategies. Interestingly, Bozkurt admits that drama writers, filmmakers or television series producers are 'free to adapt (Bozkurt,1991:9). Therefore; in his perspective, translating a literary text should conform to the concept of "fidelity".

4. Can Yücel's translation of cultural elements

Yücel's translations are different not only because of translating 'Shakespeare's language' but also because of reconstructing a Shakespearean world in Turkish using the words or jargons compatible with the contexts in plays. As extraordinary examples, it is possible to spot the two different Muslim worlds in two different plays. Yücel's *Hamlet*'s uses Muslim jargon when he says:

"Kefaretsiz, kelime-i şهادetsiz, çıkarmadan günah, Kimseyle helallaşmadan yollandım Sırat Köprüsü'ne" 10 (Yücel, 1992:32, 33).

This could be a mixture of Muslim and Christian jargons and Yücel seems to do it on purpose to explain the old king was buried as if he did not have any faith. His choice is remarkable because instead of using

¹⁰ Original text: "Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin/Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd,/No reckoning made/but sent to my account/With all my imperfections on my head: ..."

the common word “kitapsız”¹¹, he lists all possible words or jargons that would convey the meaning to the audience to contribute to the context. It has not been made clear by Shakespeare and Yücel respects this gap. This is one example of the appreciation of multiplicity of meaning that Shakespeare's plays require.

In the context of *Hamlet* for example, it is critical because it is a ‘play within a play’. Yücel's use of authentic vocabulary to reflect *Hamlet*'s rebellion against the king using Turkish jargon was received as a problem. Yücel's *Hamlet* is a prince who says ‘*anamın namusu lekelenmiş*’¹². Therefore, the text is not only translated linguistically but culturally. Therefore, a textual analysis on the ‘cultural translation’ is needed to justify Yücel's translator choices. *Hamlet*'s father was described as ‘kahpece öldürülmüş’¹³, to make the play more understandable for the Turkish audience.

Another consideration to study his *Hamlet* is the use of semi-religious vocabulary. Some of the idioms concerning faith may well be interpreted as a Muslim context but may also be regarded as a universal idea about fate. When *Hamlet* learns about his father's murder by his uncle from his ghost he thinks of wiping all his ‘*elifba*’¹⁴, in English, he means the basic book for manners to be able to murder his uncle both for the revenge and the kingdom. As for *Bahar Noktası*, clarification of the idiom use and word choice is even more important. There are five different contexts in the play. First, it is possible to set the play into Turkish district context. Then with the arrival of Titania, and her reference to their religious rituals as “cem”¹⁵ one may assume that the whole play was going to take place in a sanctuary in Turkey. When we hear the amateur actors speaking, we can assume that the play was going to take place among gypsies and non-Muslim community in İstanbul like Balat.

In terms of religious vocabulary, *Bahar Noktası* displays an interesting cultural shift. In the play Müzeyyen (Titania) complains about the dispute between her and Babaron (Oberon) like this:

“Baksana erişti erişeli beri Nevruz, ne orman, ne çayır, ne kumsal, ne pınar, ne fiskiyeli havuz, senin bu deli saçmaların yüzünden cem olup buluşamıyoruz.” (Yücel, 2003: 54)¹⁶

The quotation shows that Yücel chose to contextualize fairy gathering into Bektashi context who would celebrate the arrival of spring as Nevruz.¹⁷ These are remarkable translational choices and these comply with modern translational norms and embrace the multiplicity of meaning in Shakespeare. With the exchange of lovers to the end of the play, we can assume that the dream was taking place in gentlefolk who are really confused about love. Only with Puck's final speech at the end, we understand that we are in theatre.

5. Conclusion

Can Yücel (Çelebi, 1999:38- see also. Çavuşoğlu, 2007:1) had to call himself a “rewriter” in Turkish because his choices or perspectives were not well understood in his time. As mentioned above, he was severely criticized for using explicit vocabulary in Shakespeare plays. Yücel's translations, like every other theatrical text, are bound to change according to editors' or theatre directors' choices. Despite the criticism, his translations are mostly staged or adapted. It would be the the corpus of an upcoming article

¹¹ Eng. translation: lacking faith

¹² Eng. translation: “*my mother's honour has been disgraced*”

¹³ English meaning ‘*slaughtered villainy*’

¹⁴ First two letters of Arabic alphabet, used to talk about basic things

¹⁵ Religious gathering in the Bektashi context

¹⁶ Original text : “ To dance our ringlets to the whistling wind/But with thy brawls thou hast disturb'd our sport.”

¹⁷ Persian spring festival time

to study the world of Prospero, the magician who creates the island in people's minds. Using Yücel's translation of it as *Fırtına*, which is open to lots of possibilities while offering limitations to the translator's word choice may form the basis of a good academic work. Contextualization in this play is critical because what is true or imaginary cannot be said until the end. The reception and how Prospero's world is recreated is very much dependent upon choices of translators. Therefore, the discussions on Can Yücel's *Fırtına* may double because his translation was considered as 'rewriting' of an imaginary world.

To conclude, it may be problematic to set clear boundaries over literature because translational norms and theories are mostly prone to change over time. Therefore, it is better to be cautious while calling a piece of translated literature as rewriting, free translation or adaptation. Apparently, such labelling works both against the work and the translator.

References

- Arrojo, Rosemary (1995). *The Death of The Author and The Limits of the Translator's Visibility in Translation as Intercultural Communication* (Ed. Mary Snell – Hornby Z. Jettmarova, K.Kaindl), Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.21-32
- Barthes Roland (1988).» *The Death of The Author*» in *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* (ed. David Lodge), London and Newyork: Longman
- Bozkurt, Bülent. (1994) *Bir Yaz Gecesi Rüyası*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi
- Bozkurt, Bülent. (1991) *Hamlet*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi
- Çapan, Cevat. (1981) *Özgürlüğü'ne Kavuşan Shakespeare*. İstanbul:Adam Yayınları
- Çavuşoğlu, Özgür (2007), "Türkçe Söyleyen" Can Yücel: The "Rewriter" Par Excellence (Thesis), Boğaziçi University
- Çelebi, Bünyamin (1999), Can Yücel: "Hayatta ben en çok babamı sevdim." İstanbul; Tarih Vakfı İstanbul Dergisi, No: 29 (April), pp. 34-40 Retrieved from: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/38324689.pdf> (2018, July 17)
- Delabastita, Dirk. (2010), *Literary Studies and Translation Studies, Handbook of Translation Studies (Volume 1)* (ed. Y.Gambier –L.v. Doorslaer), Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 196–208
- Demirkol, Neslihan. (2006), Can Yücel'in Shakespeare Çevirilerinde "Sadakat" (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Bilkent Üniversitesi Türk Edebiyatı Bölümü Retrieved from: <http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0003084.pdf> (2018, June 16)
- Even- Zohar, Itamar (1990). "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem." In *Polysystem Studies (= Poetics Today 11:1)*, pp. 45-51.
- Even- Zohar, Itamar (2000). *The position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem in the Translation studies Reader* (ed.Lawrence Venuti).London &New York, Routledge, pp. 192-197
- Koskinen, Kaisa (1994). « (Mis) translating the Untranslatable: The Impact of Deconstruction and Post Structuralism on Translation Theory» in *Meta: Translators Journal*, Vol.39,no: 3, pp.446-452
- Munday, Jeremy (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies Theories and Applications*, Routledge
- O'Connell, Michael (1985). *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm, Anti-Theatricalism, and the Image of the Elizabethan Theater*. ELH, 52(2), pp.279-310
- Olher, Rosa Maria, (2004). *Translation and Discourse, Acta Scientiarum. Human and Social Sciences Maringá*, v. 26, no. 1, p. 73-79
- Öner, Işın Bengi, (1997), *Çeviri Kuramlarını Düşünürken*, Sel Yayıncılık
- Sabuncu, Başar. (2002), *Bahar Noktası'nda Şenlikli Direniş*, Bahar Noktası, İstanbul: Okuyan Us, pp.11

Yücel, Can. (1991), *Bahar Noktası*, İstanbul: Adam Yayınları

Yücel Can (2003), *Bahar Noktası*, İstanbul: Okuyan Us Yayınları

Yücel, Can (1989), "Can Yücel ile Söyleşi," *Metis Çeviri*, (haz. Suat Karantay), 8 (Yaz 1989), pp. 11-18

Yücel, Can. (1997) *Hamlet*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları