

# Facing the Tension in Translation of Reduplications in Turkish: The Case of *Kuşlar da Gitti* by Yaşar Kemal

DOÇ. DR. MESUT KULELİ\* - ARŞ. GÖR. ALİ FUAT ALTUNTAŞ\*\*

## Abstract

The aim of this study is to find out the reduplications in the novel titled *Kuşlar da Gitti* by Yaşar Kemal and categorize them based on their semantic qualities. This categorization system yielded eight semantic categories, namely “duration, quality/manner reinforcement, ordinary reinforcement, motion, spatial approximation, vagueness, temporal-immediacy, onomatopoeia” in accordance with the dominant semantic quality in each category. Following the categorization of the 134 reduplications found in the novel, a translation evaluation is conducted on the English translation of the novel titled *The Birds Have Also Gone* in order to see how the tension arising from the differences between the functions and structural formation of reduplications in Turkish and English can be overcome in literary translation. Translation evaluation is based on “Systematics of Designification” by Öztürk Kasar (2020). The translation evaluation showed that under-interpretation of the meaning is the most commonly used designification in English translation of Turkish reduplications. It is suggested for Turkish–English translators that reproducing a reduplication with its radical, though it should give insufficient meaning and lead to the loss of the structure and the style of the writer, could still enable translators to sustain the reduplicated sign within the field of meaning in the target text.

**Keywords:** reduplication, translation, sign, meaning, literary translation, Yaşar Kemal

## TÜRKÇE İKİLEMELERİN ÇEVİRİSİNDEKİ GERİLİMLE YÜZLEŞMEK: YAŞAR KEMAL’İN *KUŞLAR DA GİTTİ* ROMANI ÖRNEĞİ

### Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı Yaşar Kemal’in *Kuşlar da Gitti* başlıklı romanındaki ikilemeleri saptayarak bu ikilemeleri anlam özelliklerine göre bu çalışmada öne sürülen sınıflandırma sistemi temelinde sınıflara ayırmaktır. Bu özgün sınıflandırma sistemi, “sürek, nitelik/durum pekiştirme, olağan pekiştirme, hareket, uzamsal yakınlık, muğlaklık, zamansal yakınlık, yansıma” başlıklı sekiz sınıfa ayrılmıştır. Sınıflandırmadaki başlıkları adlandırmada her bir sınıfta yer alan ikilemelerin en belirgin anlamsal özelliği kullanılmıştır. Romanda saptanan 134 ikilemenin sınıflandırılmasının ardından, Türkçe ve İngilizce arasında ikilemelerin oluşumları ve işlevleri arasındaki farklardan kaynaklanan gerilimin yazınsal çeviride nasıl üstesinden geldiğini anlamak için romanın *The Birds Have Also Gone* başlıklı İngilizce çevirisi üzerinde çeviri değerlendirmesi yapılmıştır. Çeviri değerlendirmesi, Öztürk Kasar (2020) tarafından öne sürülen

\* Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Un. Dep. of English Trans. and Int, mesut.kuleli@ibu.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-3477-0412.

\*\* Bandırma Onyediy Eylül Un. Dep. of Turkish Lang. and Lit. aaltuntas@bandirma.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-3063-4835.

Gönderim Tarihi: 24.01.2022

Kabul Tarihi: 29.03.2022

“Anlam Bozumu Dizgeselliği” temel alınarak yapılmıştır. Çeviri değerlendirmesi sonucunda, Türkçe ikilemelerin İngilizce çevirisinde en yaygın kullanılan anlam bozucu eğilimin anlamın eksik yorumlanması olduğu bulunmuştur. Türkçe-İngilizce dil çifti üzerine çalışan çevirmenlerin, hedef metinde eksik bilgi vermekle sonuçlanan, yapısal bozulmalara ve yazarın üslubunda kayıplar yaratacak olmasına rağmen anlamın eksik yorumlanması ile Türkçede ikilemeden oluşan bir göstergenin İngilizcede göstergenin kökü ile çevrilmesi sayesinde hedef metinde göstergenin anlam alanı içinde kalabilecekleri önerilmiştir.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** ikileme, çeviri, gösterge, anlam, yazınsal çeviri, Yaşar Kemal

## INTRODUCTION

The writer of short stories, poetry, essays, commentaries and novels, Yaşar Kemal is known for his affinity to themes concerning the nature and society in his literary works, comprising frequent use of the signs belonging to the local language, with which he was familiar from his upbringing. Translated into more than forty languages worldwide, Kemal’s works have also been subject to academic analyses of language use from linguistics or translation studies perspectives (Yılmaz, 2013; Haldan and Mutlu, 2014; Balcı, 2015; Korkmaz, 2016; Aslan 2021). Despite an abundance of studies on language use by Yaşar Kemal, translation of reduplications, one of the most frequently used linguistic units in his works, has not been given as much emphasis. Rather than a particular emphasis on the use and translation of reduplication in Kemal’s works, this linguistic unit has often been integrated into analyses of his general language use. Coşkun (2020) analyzed reduplication in a particular work by Kemal and discussed the use of reduplications based on their meanings in particular contexts. However, this linguistic unit in Kemal’s works has not been studied for translation yet.

This study aims to analyze the novel titled *Kuşlar da Gitti* by Yaşar Kemal (1978) to find out the reduplications in the text and suggest a categorization based on the semantic value of the reduplications. Moreover, the contexts with reduplications in the source text are compared to those in the target text. Even if both the source (Turkish) and the target (English) languages are known to comprise reduplications, the aim of the translation evaluation is to see how much these two languages differ from each other in this respect and how the source text reduplications are translated in the target text so that prospective literary translators should not feel helpless when faced with Turkish reduplications in literary works in their professional lives.

## 1. REDUPLICATION IN TURKISH

Reduplication is not a universal linguistic unit. These linguistic units are frequently used and formed in various ways in Turkish. A diachronic look into reduplication in Turkish shows that this linguistic unit is quite common not only in daily life but also in the literary world. The first mention of the use of reduplication can be traced to *Dîvânu Lugâti’t-Türk*, the oldest dictionary of Turkish, specifying that a reduplication is formed with a radical and a dependent (Ercilasun and Akkoyunlu, 2015, p. 187). Seeing that reduplications of Turkish were defined and discussed as

early as 1070s, it would be possible to gather that these linguistic units have been in use in Turkish even longer. According to Korkmaz and Korkmaz Bulut:

Turkish is quite rich in reduplications. The multitude of reduplications arises from the generative quality of this language. Reduplications have been in use in all texts since the times of Old Turkish. They can frequently be seen in prose, poetry, and even in idioms or proverbs [...] Reduplications tend to occur in fixed patterns and structures. As such, when one of the signs in a reduplication is replaced with its synonym, that reduplication can no longer hold that meaning.<sup>1</sup> (2017, p. 242-243).

As regards the purpose and function of reduplications in Turkish, Hatipoğlu (1981, p. 9) states that reduplication “renders the discourse more emphatic, reinforces the meaning and enriches the concept in question”. While Vardar (2002, p. 119) also associates reduplications with the function of emphatic discourse in Turkish, Zülfikar (2018, p. 161) expands the function of reduplications as “enunciative of duration or continuity, sematic enrichment and reinforcement, contribution to the harmony or rhythm, approaching the natural sound, naming a concept with two words, attainment of a communally shared new semantic unit”. Therefore, the term “reduplication” is defined as “repetition of the same words, juxtaposition of close phonemes and semantically close or opposite words in order to make the meaning stronger [in a context]”. In parallel with this definition, reduplications in Turkish can be formed through the systematic combination of two or more than two words (Üstünova, 1997, p. 20; Sev, 2004, p. 498-508). The systematicity here refers to the structural and semantic variations by which two “or more” signs combine to form reduplications. The variations here could be attributed to the semantic, structural, sequential, or functional qualities of reduplications. Therefore, the categorizations of Turkish reduplications vary in the relevant literature.

In this study, reduplications are found in the novel titled *Kuşlar da Gitti [The Birds Have Also Gone]*<sup>3</sup> by Yaşar Kemal (1978). They are categorized in the light of their semantic qualities besides structural features, and the following categories are found based on those qualities:

A) duration: This semantic unit is obtained through the repetition of the radical or the juxtaposition of the radical with its antonym, mainly with addition of ablative in the first sign and dative inflection in the second sign in Turkish, with the nominative case no exception. This results in the semantic unit of extension of time period needed for an action.

B) quality/manner reinforcement: While reinforcement is one of the main functions of reduplications, quality/manner reinforcement is solely used to refer to the reinforcement of an adjective or an adverb obtained through the addition of one of the four consonants in Turkish, namely [p], [m], [s], [r] to the repeated first syllable of the radical. This type of reduplication reinforces the degree of the adjective or adverb.

C) ordinary reinforcement: Unlike quality/manner reinforcement, ordinary reinforcement is not reserved for adjectives and adverbs. This type of reinforcement is applied to signs from all

<sup>1</sup> Translation ours. Unless stated otherwise, English translations of cited sentences or paragraphs of Turkish origin belong to the authors of this study here and henceforth.

<sup>2</sup> <https://sozluk.gov.tr/> Access Date: 03.06.2021.

<sup>3</sup> This novel was translated into English with this title by Thilda Kemal in 1987.

parts of speech, with the repetition of the radical, close phonemes and signs, or invention of a second word, the initial of which is changed into [m] sound with the rest of the radical preserved. This reduplication reinforces the multitude or severity of a phenomenon (whether as an adjective, a noun, or a verb). The word “ordinary” is chosen here due to the application of this reduplication to any sign from all parts of speech and its noticeability on account of its linguistic features (direct repetition of the radical or the existence of an invented sign bearing a close rhythm to the radical).

D) motion: This semantic unit is obtained through the repetition of the bare or inflected radical or juxtaposition of two opposite signs. What differentiates the motion category from other categories is that it involves the reduplications that refer to an action in progress; however, it does not extend the duration of the action unlike the “duration” category defined above.

E) spatial approximation: In order to emphasize the physical proximity of two or more agents, the radical is repeated, with the second one generally added a dative inflection in Turkish.

F) vagueness: With the juxtaposition of two numbers or affirmative and negative forms of a sign, the reduplication gives the clear idea that what is being said is not an exact phenomenon, but rather an estimation or presumption.

G) temporal-immediacy: The repetition of a verb with the phonemic versions of -ar/-er suffix in the former one followed by -mez/-maz suffix in the latter refers to the immediacy of events. On the other hand, the repetition of a verb with the simple past tense inflection in the former followed by the future tense inflection in the latter also signals a temporal immediacy, referring to the imminence of the phenomenon.

H) onomatopoeia: While juxtaposed onomatopoeic signs serve to reinforce the phenomenon or action in terms of duration or degree, they still need to be taken in a separate category in our analysis due to the very nature of onomatopoeic signs as the only prescriptive linguistic units of any linguistic system.<sup>4</sup>

As can be seen in this categorization, the reduplications in the Turkish novel are analyzed in the light of their semantic qualities. Rather than adopting an already established categorization system of reduplications, this categorization is developed as a result of the semantic analysis of all reduplications found in the source text. Several examples are discussed from each category in this study.

## 2. REDUPLICATION IN ENGLISH

While reduplications are common phenomena in Turkish language, English cannot be considered among languages rich in the use of these linguistic units. It sure has reduplications, yet the formation and function of those linguistic units are not comparable to Turkish in terms of quantity and quality. According to Sapir:

---

<sup>4</sup> This categorization is compiled and adapted from the suggestions of the scholars cited in this part of the study. However, the labels for each category and the final version of this categorization belong to the authors of this study. It is important to note that this categorization is adapted and developed only based on the findings from the analysis of one novel; therefore, the number of categories in this list can be reduced or new categories might be added in future studies.

Nothing is more natural than the prevalence of reduplication, in other words, the repetition of all or part of the radical element. The process is generally employed, with self-evident symbolism, to indicate such concepts as distribution, plurality, repetition, customary activity, increase of size, added intensity, continuance. Even in English it is not unknown, though it is not generally accounted one of the typical formative devices of our language. (1921, p. 34)

Discussing the formation, structure and function of reduplication, Sapir rules out English as a language with a high potential of reduplications. Sapir further adds “it can hardly be said that the duplicative process is of a distinctively grammatical significance in English” (1921, p. 34).

The term “reduplication” is defined as “an often grammatically functional repetition of a radical element or a part of it occurring usually at the beginning of a word and often accompanied by change of the radical vowel”<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, reduplication is formed through the repetition of the whole or part of the radical with a change in a vowel or consonant. In line with this definition, English words like “bling-bling, thump-thump, snip-snip” are obtained through the repetition of the radical sign. It is also possible to find reduplications formed through a change in the vowel as in “ding-dong, tittle-tattle, wishy-washy” or a with change in the consonant as in the examples of “hugger-mugger, hoity-toity, namby-pamby”. The semantic qualities of reduplications in English are as follows:

[i] to imitate sounds, eg: rat-a-tat (knocking on the door), tick-tock (of clock), ha-ha (of laughter), bow-wow (of dog)

[ii] to suggest alternating movements, eg: seesaw, flip-flop, ping-pong

[iii] to disparage by suggesting instability, nonsense, insincerity, vacillation, etc: higgledy-piggledy, hocus-pocus, wishy-washy, dilly-dally, shilly-shally

[iv] to intensify, eg: teeny-weeny, tip-top

(Quirk et. al., 1986, p. 1579-1580, cited in Okamura, 1991, p. 8)

The semantic categorization of English reduplications above shows some similarity to the semantic categories of Turkish reduplications put forward in this study. The reduplication in [i] is parallel to the “onomatopoeia” category suggested for Turkish reduplications in our categorization. The definition and examples in [ii] can be associated with the “motion” category in Turkish reduplications while the category of [iii] is quite similar to quality/manner reinforcement. Finally, the category in [iv] shows parallelism to ordinary reinforcement category put forth for Turkish reduplications in this study. What Okamura (1991, p. 15) finds confusing is whether to include the intensifier “and” (as in *again and again*) besides the distributive “by” and “to” (as in *day by day* or *one to one*). Even if the use of these function words may not be considered parts of a reduplication in line with the definition of “reduplication” in English dictionaries, they are counted as reduplications in this study since reduplications are analyzed in light of their semantic qualities rather than formation and structure qualities.

Now that Turkish and English are distinctly different in terms of the formation and frequency of reduplications, it is hardly surprising that the semantic values attached to reduplications in either language should also differ. As the novel titled *Kuşlar da Gitti* is interwoven with reduplications, which are indeed culture-specific semantic units, translation of

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduplication>. Access Date: 22.06.2021

that novel into English could be expected to pose challenges to literary translators in conveying the construct<sup>6</sup> to target readers. The reason for this difficulty lies in the fact that Turkish is eligible to frequent use of reduplications while English is not necessarily rich in those linguistic items. Therefore, the literary translator, as the mediator of Turkish and English cultures, must struggle to overcome such challenges arising from the gap between the two languages. This study analyzes how the reduplicated units in the novel in question are translated into English.

### 3. TRANSLATION EVALUATION OF REDUPLICATED WORDS

In the evaluation of translation of reduplicated words, "Systematics of Designification in Translation" is used in this study. "Systematics of Designification in Translation" was first put forward by Öztürk Kasar in 2009, to be updated in 2015 with the addition of one more level of designification (Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015), and its final version was given in 2020 by Öztürk Kasar. So far, this systematics has been applied in translation evaluation of a wide range of genres as diverse as short stories<sup>7</sup>, poems<sup>8</sup>, novels<sup>9</sup>, theater texts<sup>10</sup>, tales<sup>11</sup>, titles of books<sup>12</sup> or popular science texts<sup>13</sup>. However, this is the first study in which this systematics is used to analyze English translations of a specific linguistic unit, that is reduplication in Turkish, from semantic perspective. The degrees of designification in translation are as follows:

1. Over-interpretation of the meaning: Translating an implicit sign with an explicit meaning into the target culture, thereby producing an excessive commentary. Another meaning transformation resulting in over-interpretation is the addition of a non-existent sign to the source text.

2. Darkening of the meaning: While a clear and explicit meaning exists in the source text, a translator might translate it with an ambiguous or implicit sign, leading to a meaning transformation.

3. Under-interpretation of the meaning: Production of a meaning with insufficient information as compared to the sign in the source text.

4. Sliding of the meaning: The meaning transformation arising from the production of one of the potential meanings of a source sign in the target text while this meaning is not the case in the source text. This particularly happens with signs with homonymy, connotative and associative meanings.

5. Alteration of the meaning: Translation of a sign with a false meaning despite bearing some traces from the source text.

6. Opposition of the meaning: This type of meaning transformation comes out as an opposite meaning is produced in the target text for a sign in the source text.

7. Perversion of the meaning: This transformation of meaning also results from the production of a false meaning for a sign. What differentiates this type of transformation from alteration of meaning is that the sign in the target text is totally irrelevant to the meaning in the source text.

<sup>6</sup> The term "construct" here refers to a text with its inner elements as posited in Structuralism.

<sup>7</sup> For some representative studies, see Öztürk Kasar and Batu (2017); Tuna and Kuleli (2017); Kuleli (2018).

<sup>8</sup> For some representative studies, see Tuna (2016); Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017).

<sup>9</sup> For some representative studies, see Öztürk Kasar (2020); Can Rençberler (2021).

<sup>10</sup> For some representative studies, see Öztürk Kasar and Kuleli (2016); Kuleli (2017).

<sup>11</sup> For a representative study, see Yaman (2021).

<sup>12</sup> For a representative study, see Öztürk Kasar (2021).

<sup>13</sup> For a representative study, see Uysal (2021).

8. Destruction of the meaning: The production of a meaningless context that does not make sense to the target reader results in that type of meaning transformation. Though this context might bear some meaning traces from the context in the source text, the target context is far from signification.

9. Wiping out of the meaning: The omission of a significant sign or clusters of signs results in non-translation. The target context does not bear any traces from the significant sign(s) either in part or as a whole. (Öztürk Kasar, 2020b, p. 160)<sup>14</sup>

Regarding the English translations of Turkish reduplications, over-interpretation could be applied when translators try to convey the meaning of a reduplication with explanation or excessive commentary on the reinforcement since it is highly likely that some reduplications will not have semantic or structural equivalents in English. Darkening of the meaning could also be applied in translation of reduplications since a Turkish reduplication of quality/manner reinforcement could be translated with a more general quality or manner in English. Under-interpretation of the meaning would also sound quite natural in English translations of Turkish reduplications since English syntax, morphology, and semantics might not be able to reflect the degree, duration, or reinforcement of the reduplicated signs. Öztürk Kasar (2021, p. 28) considers these three designifications within the field of meaning of the sign, which means that the meanings of the signs (reduplications in our context) are still evident despite the observable meaning transformations in the target text. This points to the implication that translators could intentionally employ meaning transformations on grounds of the syntactical or morphological differences between the source and target languages, still conveying the meaning of the reduplications to a certain extent.

Sliding of the meaning, alteration of the meaning, and opposition of the meaning are assumed to bring the sign(s), reduplications in our case, to the limits of the field of meaning (Öztürk Kasar, 2021, p. 28). This points to the implication that these three meaning transformations might not be intentional choices of translators, but they could result from shortcomings in signification of reduplications. When it comes to perversion of the meaning and destruction of the meaning, the former one might arise from the mistaken signification of the reduplication in the source language while the latter one might result from poor command of the syntax of the target language. Therefore, these two designifications should not be intentional meaning transformations in translation of reduplicated signs. Finally, wiping out of the meaning could be an intentional translator choice. Seeing that the source language reduplication might sound weird in the target text with the employment of over-interpretation, darkening or under-interpretation of the meaning, a translator might directly choose to wipe out the reduplication in the target text. Öztürk Kasar (2021, p. 28) suggests that the last three designifications take the source sign outside the field of meaning, resulting in meaninglessness.

In light of this systematics, translations of the Turkish reduplications found in Yaşar Kemal's (1978) novel titled *Kuşlar da Gitti* are evaluated with a view to identifying the meaning transformations in the translated novel titled *The Birds Have Also Gone* (1987). The findings of this

---

<sup>14</sup> English translations of designifications in the systematics are based on Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017) since the 2015 update is in Turkish while the final version of 2020 is in French.

study could enable prospective translators to gain insight into what designifications could be used or which ones could be avoided in translating reduplications from Turkish to English.

#### 4. FINDINGS

This part of the study is divided into eight subheadings. Each subheading is organized around the findings of semantic categories of reduplications from the source text, with their translations also given and discussed together with the designification identified in translations.

##### 4.1. Reduplications of “duration”

The reduplications with extended “duration” implications are given in Table 1 together with their English translations and the type of designification identified in the translations.

**Table 1.** Reduplicated signs of “duration” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
ağzını türkünden türküye açıyordu (p. 5)	only opening his mouth to sing (p. 7)	under-interpretation of the meaning
durup durup gülüyor (p. 11)	was laughing (p. 11)	under-interpretation of the meaning
gece gündüz [...] avlıyormuş (p. 20)	hunting [...] day and night (p. 20)	----
kalakaldı (p. 43)	standing there (p. 42)	under-interpretation of the meaning
sabahtan akşama kadar (p. 44)	all those days (p. 42)	over-interpretation of the meaning
geldik geleli (p. 47)	ever since we've been here (p. 46)	----
bazı bazı (p. 55)	----	wiping out of the meaning
pazardan pazara (p. 56)	from Sunday to Sunday (p. 56)	----
ölümden ölüme (p. 56-57)	funeral now and then (p. 56)	----
üfleye üfleye (p. 100)	breathing a prayer (p. 99)	under-interpretation of the meaning
makamdan makama (p. 110)	from mode to mode (p. 107)	----

The Turkish reduplication “ağzını türkünden türkünden açıyordu” refers to how little the character speaks, implying that it is only to sing that the character’s voice can be heard. With the reduplication “türkünden türküye”, the duration of the character’s silence is extended in the source text. Its English translation, “only opening his mouth to sing” also refers to the fact that the character does not prefer to speak much, yet this translation fails to extend the duration of silence. As a result of this meaning transformation, insufficient meaning is produced regarding the extent of the character’s preference over silence in the target text. Another example of under-interpretation of the meaning can be seen in translation of reduplication “durup durup gülüyor” as “was laughing” in the target text. While the source text sign implies the frequency and extended duration of the “laughing” act, the target text only refers to the act without any reference to its frequency or duration, therefore insufficient meaning is produced regarding the semantic “duration” category. “Kalakaldı” is another reduplicated sign referring to the extended duration in Turkish. This sign could be used for shocking or disappointing situations, in which a character

stays still for a long time, whether in sitting, standing, or lying position. It is translated as “standing there” without any reference to the extended duration of the position, thereby producing insufficient meaning in the target text. The other under-interpretation of the meaning, arising from the translation of the source sign “üfleye üfleye” as “breathing a prayer”, also leads to insufficient meaning as regards the frequency and duration of the prayer. The target text sign points to a single event of prayer while it is a repeated and extended phenomenon in the source text. As can be seen from the examples in Table 1, due to the lack of reduplications for the original signs in the target language, the extended duration and the frequency meaning of the reduplications are under-interpreted.

On the other hand, while the source sign “sabahtan akşama kadar” implies the extended duration of an event to refer to the time from the morning to the evening, it is translated as “all those days”, referring to several days in consequence. While the target sign also comprises the duration implied in the source sign, it indeed refers to a longer time period, thereby over-interpreting the source sign. The sign “all those days” could be an intentional meaning transformation by the translator. While this sign could have been translated as “from morning(s) to the evening(s)”, this is not a reduplication in English in line with the dictionary meaning of “reduplication” in English. Therefore, seeing that no reduplication exists in English regarding the source sign here, it is translated with over-interpretation of the meaning. Another source sign, “bazı bazı” (at times, from time to time) is omitted in the target text, which can be considered wiping out of the meaning. While “from time to time” could be an appropriate translator choice equivalent to the Turkish sign both in meaning and structure, the sign is omitted in the target text.

Finally, the target signs “day and night” for “gece gündüz”, “from Sunday to Sunday” for “pazardan pazara”, “funeral now and then” for “ölümünden ölüme”, and “from mode to mode” for “makamdan makama” can convey the meaning of extended duration. While the target signs here do not comply with the definition of reduplication in English, they still attract attention as common phrases in English, in which the same or opposite signs are juxtaposed to signal the extended duration or frequency of the act. The other “duration” reduplication in Turkish, “geldik geleli” is translated as “ever since we’ve been there”, which implies an almost equivalent duration without any meaning transformation, yet the structure of reduplication is lost due to the syntax rules of English.

#### 4.2. Reduplications of “quality/manner reinforcement”

The reduplications from “quality/manner reinforcement” category are presented in Table 2 as well as their English translations and the type of designification identified in their translations.

**Table 2.** Reduplicated signs of “quality/manner reinforcement” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
upuzun (p. 5)	tall (p. 7)	under-interpretation of the meaning
ipince (p. 6)	thin (p. 7)	under-interpretation of the meaning
yusyuvarlaktı (p. 11)	round as a ball (p. 12)	over-interpretation of the meaning
sapsarı (p. 13)	yellow (p. 14)	under-interpretation of the meaning

boynu [...] uzayıp <i>ipincecik</i> <sup>15</sup> oldu (p. 18)	neck stretched to <i>creaking point</i> (p. 19)	over-interpretation of the meaning
babası <i>koskocaman</i> bekçibaşı (p. 21)	his father's a watchman, <i>no less</i> (p. 21)	under-interpretation of the meaning
yamyassı (p. 27)	flat as a board (p. 27)	over-interpretation of the meaning
kapkaranlık (p. 30)	black (p. 30)	under-interpretation of the meaning
isten <i>kapkara</i> olmuş (p. 37)	soot- <i>blackened</i> (p. 35)	under-interpretation of the meaning
apaydınlıktı (p. 39)	clear, luminous (p. 38)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kıpkırmızı (p. 43)	crimson (p. 42)	under-interpretation of the meaning
filfir fıldır gözlü (p. 46)	-----	wiping out of the meaning
kıpkızıl (p. 46)	all red (p. 44)	over-interpretation of the meaning
apak (p. 53)	very white (p. 52)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kafesler <i>bomboş</i> (p. 59)	cages will be <i>empty</i> (p. 58)	under-interpretation of the meaning
dopdolu (p. 59)	full of (p. 58)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kocaman gözleri <i>dopdolu</i> olmuş (p. 90)	his large eyes were brimming (p. 89)	under-interpretation of the meaning
dimdik (p. 109)	-----	wiping out of the meaning
yusyuvarlak (p. 110)	round (p. 108)	under-interpretation of the meaning
tertemiz (p. 112)	-----	wiping out of the meaning
yemyeşil (p. 123)	a garish green (p. 119)	under-interpretation of the meaning

Source reduplications in Table 2 are significant in that this reduplication structure is nonexistent in English. These reduplications are formed through the repetition of the first syllable of an adjective or adverb with the addition of one of the four consonants, [p], [m], [r], [s]. While structural loss is already natural in English translations of those Turkish reduplications, the analysis of meanings of the target signs reveals certain designifications. The target signs “tall, thin, yellow, black, blackened, empty, full of, brimming, clear, luminous” are not only structural but also semantic under-interpretations of the source signs. These target signs refer to the radical element of the Turkish reduplication but fail to represent the quality sufficiently. Other target signs like “very white, garish green” are also under-interpretations of the source signs despite the use of reinforcements like “very” and “garish”. Even the use of those reinforcements cannot represent the degree of the quality reinforcement of the source signs. The target sign “crimson”, which refers to a purplish bright red, could be close to the source sign “kıpkırmızı”, yet the reinforcement in the target sign is missing as compared to the Turkish sign, which also renders this translation under-interpretation of the meaning. A similar tendency can be seen in the translation of “koskocaman” which emphasizes the importance of a profession in the context. It is translated as “no less”, which cannot reflect the importance of the profession as much as in the source text.

Over-interpretation of the meaning is also observed in translation of “quality/manner reinforcement” reduplications. The “roundness” quality reinforced in the source sign “yusyuvarlak” is translated as “round as a ball”; the reinforced “thinness” of the character’s neck in “ipincecik” is translated as “creaking point”; the reinforced “flatness” in the source adjective “yamyassı” is translated as “flat as a board”; the reinforced redness in the reduplication “kıpkızıl” is translated as “all red”. The target signs are not reduplications in English, but they convey the

<sup>15</sup> Emphasis ours on words in italics in Table 2.

reinforced qualities at a higher degree than the case in the source text. Therefore, the lack of quality/manner reinforcement reduplications in English is not a barrier to the translation of those signs. Over-interpretation might be a choice for translators when faced with quality/manner reinforcement reduplications in translation from Turkish to English.

Finally, the source signs “filfir fildir, dimdik, tertemiz” are not translated in the target text. While over-interpretation or under-interpretation of the meaning could have been used by the translator as in other examples, still providing the meaning of the source text to a certain extent, they are left out of the text, which results in non-translation and absence of the sign.

### 4.3. Reduplications of “ordinary reinforcement”

Ordinary reinforcements involve the vocabulary items from all parts of speech in Turkish, and they are formed with the repetition of the radical as a whole or in part, which also exists in English. As this reduplication category is quite noticeable in both languages, it is labelled “ordinary reinforcement”. Table 3 presents the source signs of reduplication together with their translations in the target text and the designification identified in translation of the “ordinary reinforcement” reduplications.

**Table 3.** Reduplicated signs of “ordinary reinforcement” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
diken diken olmuş saçlı (p. 5)	with hair that stuck out stiff as quills (p. 7)	over-interpretation of the meaning
bağırıp çağırarak (p. 6)	noisy (p. 8)	under-interpretation of the meaning
hepsi hepsi ağlarını sermişler (p. 7)	one and all (p. 9)	-----
yitti gitti (p. 11)	disappeared (p. 12)	under-interpretation of the meaning
küçücük küçücük kuş kümeleri (p. 12)	clouds of tiny birds (p. 13)	under-interpretation of the meaning
gerisin geri veriyorlar (p. 14)	-----	wiping out of the meaning
kıvıl kıvıl (p. 15)	all crammed (p. 15)	under-interpretation of the meaning
tür tür [...] kuşlarla (p. 15)	-----	wiping out of the meaning
diri diri [...] saka (p. 16)	live (p. 16)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kovalaya kovalaya (p. 17)	work to catch (p. 18)	under-interpretation of the meaning
dedi bilgiç bilgiç (p. 19)	stated with an important air (p. 20)	-----
kuşları teker teker [...] salıvermek (p. 27)	let the birds out (p. 27)	wiping out of the meaning
uzun uzun (p. 27)	for a long, long time (p. 27)	-----
anamlı anlamlı [...] baktı (p. 31)	with a warning look (p. 30)	under-interpretation of the meaning
yüreği yanıp pare pare olup (p. 35)	her heart would burn, it would break (p. 34)	under-interpretation of the meaning
pırlıl pırlıl (p. 40)	clean (p. 39)	under-interpretation of the meaning
elleri yara bere içinde (p. 41)	his hands cut and bruised (p. 39)	-----
pantolonu lime lime olmuş (p. 41)	his trousers were in tatters (p. 39)	under-interpretation of the meaning
karnım şişti yiye yiye (p. 45)	I have a swollen belly, I ate so	over-interpretation of the meaning

	much (p. 43)	
filfir fıldır gözlü (p. 46)	---	wiping out of the meaning
yüzünü gözünü (p. 46)	his face and hands (p. 45)	over-interpretation of the meaning
koparıp koparıp yiyeceksiniz (p. 48)	wring [...] and gorge yourselves (p. 47)	under-interpretation of the meaning
çığlık çığılğa (p. 49)	shrieking (p. 48)	under-interpretation of the meaning
pırlıl pırlıl (p. 53)	gleam (p. 52)	under-interpretation of the meaning
adını, huylarını huslarını (p. 53)	habits (p. 53)	under-interpretation of the meaning
hiç mi hiç belli olmaz (p. 61)	truly unpredictable (p. 58)	-----
çalı çırpı (p. 64)	----- (p. 63)	wiping out of the meaning
durdur durdurabilirsen (p. 64)	there's no stopping them (p. 63)	under-interpretation of the meaning
türlü türlülük (p. 65)	multiformity (p. 65)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kimsiz kimsesiz bırakıp (p. 68)	leaving [...] in the lurch (p. 67)	under-interpretation of the meaning
pırlıl pırlıl (p. 68)	shining bright (p. 68)	-----
yağlı yağlı bildircin (p. 70)	juicy quails (p. 70)	under-interpretation of the meaning
parasız pulsuz (p. 71)	penniless (p. 70)	under-interpretation of the meaning
evsiz barksız (p. 71)	homeless ... (p. 70)	under-interpretation of the meaning
deste deste paralar (p. 72)	bags and bags of money (p. 72)	-----
anlata anlata bitiremiyor (p. 73)	go on for ever describing (p. 72)	over-interpretation of the meaning
yalvar yakar (p. 73)	begged and pleaded (p. 73)	-----
uyku muyku uyuyamıyor (p. 74)	he cannot sleep, he cannot rest (p. 73)	-----
sağ salim (p. 76)	safe and sound (p. 75)	-----
okşaya okşaya (p. 76)	caress and fondle (p. 75)	-----
taze taze (p. 77)	fresh (p. 77)	under-interpretation of the meaning
çirkinin çirkinini [...] apartmanlar (p. 85)	ugly concrete apartment blocks (p. 84)	under-interpretation of the meaning
yeni yeni sararmağa başlamışlardı (p. 88)	were only just becoming yellow (p. 87)	-----
uzadıkça uzuyordu (p. 93)	stretching longer and longer (p. 93)	-----
sıkısıkiya yapışmış (p. 94)	stuck tightly (p. 94)	under-interpretation of the meaning
tıkış tıkış (p. 97)	packed tight (p. 96)	-----
ışıl ışıllı perçemleri (p. 99)	glossy hair (p. 98)	under-interpretation of the meaning
iri yarı (p. 101)	a huge man (p. 100)	under-interpretation of the meaning
tepeden tırnağa (p. 104)	from top to toe (p. 102-103)	-----
özene bezene (p. 104)	---	wiping out of the meaning
dilim dilim yaparak (p. 106)	a couple of slices (p. 105)	over-interpretation of the meaning
yumuldukça yumulmuş (p. 113)	huddled in a corner (p. 111)	under-interpretation of the meaning
derin derin (p. 115)	deeply (p. 112)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kuş muş (p. 120)	a bird (p. 116)	under-interpretation of the meaning
neler neler söylemediler	shouting [...] all kinds of	over-interpretation of the meaning

(p. 122)	reasons (p. 118)	
yarıyarıya kömürleşmiş (p. 124)	charred (p. 121)	wiping out of the meaning

As can be seen in Table 3, the target signs “noisy, disappeared, tiny, all crammed, live, break, clean, in tatters, wring, shrieking, gleam, habits, multiformity, in the lurch, juicy, penniless, homeless, fresh, ugly, tightly, glossy, huge, huddled, deeply, bird” cannot reflect the degree of reinforcement in the target context. These signs sound as if they reduce the significance of the emphasis as compared to the source signs. Moreover, they provide insufficient information regarding the context, leading to under-interpretation of the meaning. The source sign “koyalaya koyalaya” is also under-interpreted with the target sign “work to catch”, which also devalues the significance of the act of “chasing several times” in the source text. The sign “warning look” is the indicator of a threat or suspect as in the source sign “anamlı anlamlı baktı”, however the former one cannot reflect the degree of the threat or suspect, which produces insufficient information in the target text. Another target sign, “there’s no stopping them” is used in translation of the reduplication “durdur durdurabilirsen”, which refers to the “impossibility” of stopping them. As the target sign cannot emphasize this impossibility despite reflecting some level of the improbability, this can be considered under-interpretation of the meaning as well. It can be understood that under-interpretation of the meaning still sustains the source sign within its field of meaning in the target text despite the loss of emphasis or reinforcement to some extent. With this implication in hand, it could be suggested that under-interpretation of the meaning could be a designification that translators could resort to in translation of reduplications in ordinary reinforcement category.

Over-interpretation of the meaning is another designification observed in translation of reduplications in ordinary reinforcement category. If the source reduplication cannot be translated with a target reduplication, which is quite natural considering the syntactic and semantic differences between the two languages, the translator could also choose to explain and provide excessive commentary for a particular sign. For instance, “diken diken saçlı” is translated as “hair that stuck out stiff as quills”, which exaggerates the ordinary reinforcement of the hair style with a simile. As another example, the source reduplication “yiye yiye” reinforces the degree of “eating for a long time”; on the other hand, “I ate so much” is an over-statement of the amount of food intake. “Yüzünü gözünü” is used for exaggerating the amount of injury that one receives on the face; however, it is translated as “his face and hands”, with the addition of other body parts in exaggeration of the amount of injury, which results in over-interpretation of the meaning. As another example, the source sign “anlata anlata bitiremiyor” implies an exaggeration of how much one speaks about a certain issue, yet it is translated as “go on for ever describing”, which is a greater exaggeration of the source sign. The sign “for ever” adds a stronger reinforcement to the target sign, which is a result of the excessive commentary of the translator in trying to paraphrase and explicate the source reduplication. Likewise, the sign “dilim dilim” in the source text is translated with the addition of the quantifier “a couple of”. While this quantifier does not exist in the source context, the translator’s excessive commentary can be observed here. The last example

of over-interpretation can be observed in translation of “neler neler” as “all kinds of reasons”, the latter of which implies an exaggerated discourse as compared to the source sign.

Apart from over-interpretation and under-interpretation of the meaning, wiping out of the meaning is also observed in translation of seven reduplications from “ordinary reinforcement” category in Table 3. This leads to absence of the sign or meaning in the target text. On the other hand, fifteen reduplications are translated without meaning transformations in Table 3. Even though the target signs are not reduplications in English, they can still convey the meanings in the target text without any over-interpretation, under-interpretation, or wiping out of the meaning, the most frequently observed designifications in this study.

#### 4.4. Reduplications of “motion”

Verbs of “motion” can be reinforced with the repetition of the radical adverb or juxtaposition of antonyms in Turkish. While this structure for “motion” reduplications does not exist in English, some commonly used phrases like “back and forth” serve to the same end meaning-wise. Table 4 shows the source reduplications of “motion” to be followed by the target signs and designification observed.

**Table 4.** Reduplicated signs of “motion” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
gidip geliyorlar (p. 15)	darted busily here and there (p. 15)	over-interpretation of the meaning
kaldırıp indiriyorlar (p. 15)	bringing down (p. 15)	under-interpretation of the meaning
havalandırıp havalandırıp indiriyordu (p. 18)	lift [...] up into the air (p. 19)	under-interpretation of the meaning
sağa sola (p. 18)	this way and that (p. 19)	-----
alçalıp yükselerek (p. 24)	surgin, sinking (p. 24)	-----
indi kalktı (p. 24)	rising, falling ... (p. 24)	-----
açıyor kapatıyor (p. 33)	opening and closing (p. 32)	-----
ağır ağır inerek (p. 88)	came spiralling down very slowly (p. 87)	over-interpretation of the meaning
ışıklar yanıp sönüyor (p. 102)	traffic lights kept blinking (p. 101)	-----
hızlı hızlı çiğneyerek (p. 107)	munching very fast (p. 105)	over-interpretation of the meaning
arka arkaya (p. 113)	one after the other (p. 110)	-----
turnalar uçuyordu, eğrim eğrim (p. 115)	Cranes in bevelled formation flew (p. 112)	under-interpretation of the meaning
el kol sallayarak (p. 120)	gesturing wildly (p. 116)	over-interpretation of the meaning
ayaklarım gerisin geriye götürüyorlardı beni (p. 124)	my feet always dragged me back (p. 121)	under-interpretation of the meaning

The sign “here and there” seems to comply with the definition of reduplication in English except for the addition of “and”. However, addition of the adverb “busily” and choice of the verb “dart”, which means “to get into action with a sudden speed”, could be considered over-interpretation of the meaning as those signs do not exist in the source text. The source sign “ağır ağır” is a reinforcement of the adverb “slowly” in English. It is translated as “very slowly”, which is of a greater degree than the source sign. Turkish sign “ağır ağır” signifies more than moderate

“slowness” while “very slow” signifies the extreme manner in “slowness”. Likewise, the source sign “hızlı hızlı” refers to a more than moderate pace while “very fast” implies an excess in speed as compared to the source sign. The source sign in the last example of over-interpretation, “el kol sallayarak” refers to a motion performed with aggressiveness or agility while the target sign “wildly” is an excess of the manner in the motion. Therefore, these examples could be considered over-interpretation of the meaning.

When it comes to the examples of under-interpretation of the meaning, the target sign “bring down” does not reflect the reinforcement of the motion, thereby presenting the motion in its basic form. Repetition and reinforcement of the radical element of motion in the source text “havalandırıp havalandırıp” is translated as “lift up into the air”, failing to reflect the reinforcement of the motion despite presenting its simplest form. Likewise, the reinforced manner of “eğrim eğrim” for the motion of flying in the source text is translated as “in bevelled formation”, reflecting the motion but not giving sufficient information regarding the reinforcement, thereby losing the reduplicated structure. As the last example of under-interpretation of the meaning, the source sign “ayaklarım gerisin geriye götürüyordu” connotes the extreme reluctance of involvement in any motion in Turkish while it is translated as “dragged me back”, which fails to reflect the excess of the reluctance of the character.

Table 4 also presents translations without meaning transformations. The signs like “this way and that” for “sağa sola”, “surging, sinking” for “alçalıp yükselerek”, “rising, falling” for “indi kalktı”, “opening and closing” for “açıyor kapatıyor”, “kept blinking” for “yanıp sönüyor”, “one after the other” for “arka arkaya” reinforce the motion from semantic perspective though those target signs are not reduplications in classical sense in English. As those signs presented here adequately reinforce the motion in the target text, no meaning transformations are observed in those contexts.

#### 4.5. Reduplications of “spatial approximation”

The reduplications referring or alluding to the spatial approximation in the novel are given in Table 5 with their translations and type of designification identified.

**Table 5.** Reduplicated signs of “spatial approximation” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
yanyana (p. 14)	side by side (p. 15)	-----
gözgöze geldik (p. 45)	his eyes met mine (p. 43)	under-interpretation of the meaning
karşı karşıya kaldılar (p. 47)	they faced each other (p. 45)	under-interpretation of the meaning
ardı ardına sıralanıp (p. 59)	queueing (p. 58)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kanat kanada (p. 61)	wing to wing (p. 61)	-----
sıra sıra [...] dizilmiş (p. 102)	lined along (p. 101)	under-interpretation of the meaning
içiçe (p. 107)	-----	wiping out of the meaning

In Table 5, the sign “his eyes met mine” cannot adequately reflect the physical closeness the source sign represents. In the source sign of “göz göze gelmek”, two characters must be quite close to each other physically; however, “meeting eyes” does not connote that much of closeness though it rules out the possibility of physical distance. Likewise, the target sign “faced each other” is not the complete representation of the source sign “karşı karşıya kalmak”, which also alludes to

a closer position than the target sign. As another example of under-interpretation of the meaning, the target sign “lined along” is all about getting in a straight row while the source sign “sıra sıra dizilmek” alludes to the closeness of the characters in the line. Almost the same meaning transformation can be observed in the translation of “ardı ardına sıralanıp” as “queueing”, not presenting the closeness of the characters in the line as specified by the reduplication “ardı ardına” in the source text. As a result, the target signs in the translated novel provide insufficient allusions to spatial approximation. However, despite the meaning transformations, the target signs discussed here are still in the field of meaning of the source signs. In contrast, the source sign “içiçe” is not translated in the target text, leading to wiping out of the meaning, taking the sign outside the field of the meaning.

The signs “side by side” and “wing to wing” sound like reduplications even though they are not, in accordance with the definition of reduplication in English language. However, their formation and meanings are equivalent to the source signs that they represent. Therefore, no meaning transformation is recognized in these two target signs.

#### 4.6. Reduplications of “vagueness”

Reduplications of vagueness refer to an estimation or presumption meaning-wise. Table 6 shows the reduplications of vagueness in the source text besides their translations in the target text and the designifications observed in each context.

**Table 6.** Reduplicated signs of “vagueness” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
altı yedi yaşlarında bir çocuğu (p. 13)	a little boy of six or seven (p. 14)	-----
olsa olsa (p. 15)	maybe (p. 16)	under-interpretation of the meaning
beş altı saka (p. 16)	half a dozen (p. 16)	darkening of the meaning
usuldan duyulur duyulmaz konuştuğunu duyuyorum (p. 18)	I could hear the boy muttering to himself (p. 19)	darkening of the meaning
bir iki kere (p. 37)	a couple of times (p. 35)	darkening of the meaning
üç dört gün (p. 39)	for [...] a couple of days (p. 38)	darkening of the meaning
yarın öbür gün (p. 82)	tomorrow or the day after (p. 82)	-----
ölüp ölmediğini (p. 82-83)	if [...] dead or not (p. 82)	-----
kargacık burgacık yazı (p. 107)	scrawled in a clumsy hand (p. 105)	over-interpretation of the meaning
belli belirsiz [...] bir utanç (p. 114)	-----	wiping out of the meaning

Table 6 is exceptional as compared to the other Tables in the number of darkening of the meaning. The sign “beş altı” (five or six) is translated as “half a dozen”, which could refer to the exact number “six” or the vague quantity “a few”. While the source sign is an estimated quantity, it still presents the rough numbers of estimation, which limits a reader from thinking of larger numbers of estimated quantity. Therefore, a restrictive estimation in the source text is translated with an ambiguous sign, leading to darkening of the meaning. The other source sign “duyulur

duyulmaz konuşmak” means talking at a very low volume, as a result of which the others around cannot hear the speaker, naturally leading to vagueness. It is translated as “mutter to himself”, which could mean talking at a low voice with the lips half-closed. However, this is not a specific sign of “inaudibility”, but a more general sign as compared to the source sign. It is important to note that the vagueness quantity of “a couple of” in English is used not only to refer to “bir iki kere” (once or twice) but also to “üç dört” (three or four). While the quantifier “a couple of” could refer to two, it could also refer to a quantity slightly higher than two, even close to “a few” in English. Despite the estimated value of the Turkish signs in question here, there is still a limit that they bring to the mind; however, the target sign “a couple of” leads to ambiguity without clearly stated limits to that estimation. As can be seen in examples here, using an obscure sign in translation for a more specific sign in the source text leads to darkening of the meaning. In contrast, when we consider the source sign “altı yedi yaşlarında”, which also involves a reduplication of vagueness as to the age of the character, it is translated as “six or seven”, which is not a reduplication in English but still conveys the meaning of vagueness with restrictions put at the numbers. Therefore, the translation of this vagueness reduplication yields no meaning transformation. The temporal vagueness sign “yarın öbür gün” in the source text refers to an indefinite but close future, two days ahead at the most. This reduplication is translated as “tomorrow or the day after”, which is not a reduplication in English but a common phrase used in the daily life, still reflecting an indefinite yet close future, two days ahead at the most. Another translation with no meaning transformation is obtained through the use of a noun clause structure of vagueness, that is “if ..... or not”. Though this structure is not a reduplication in English, it is still a common structure used to state ambiguity or vagueness. The source sign “ölüp ölmediğini” refers to an uncertainty about a character’s death, which is reflected without designification in the target text.

The target sign “in a clumsy hand” in Table 6 can be thought as over-interpretation of the meaning since the source sign “kargacık burgacık” refers to disorganized and illegible handwriting in Turkish. While such a reduplication does not exist in English, it is still translated with the excessive commentary of the translator, describing the writing hand as “clumsy”. On the other hand, the source sign “olsa olsa” refers to a possibility yet also connotating the upper limit of the estimated level or value. This source reduplication is translated with the target sign “maybe”, referring to a possibility but lacking the meaning of an upper limit, producing an insufficient meaning in the target context. All designifications discussed so far from Table 6 are within the limits of meaning, which means that the source sign’s meaning is still evident in the target text despite meaning transformations. The only designification taking the source sign outside the field of meaning can be seen in the last example of Table 5, in which the vagueness reduplication “belli belirsiz” is deleted from the text, leading to absence of the sign.

#### 4.7. Reduplications of “temporal-immediacy”

The reduplications formed through the phonemic versions of suffixes “-ar/er” and “-mez/maz” inflected to a repeated radical verb respectively are categorized as “temporal immediacy” in this study. “Temporal immediacy” refers to the short span of time elapsing

between two consecutive events or actions. This immediacy is obtained using conjunctions or conjunctive units like “as soon as, the moment, the instant, the minute” or their derivatives like “no sooner ... than, scarcely .... when, etc.”. Table 7 shows the source text reduplications with “temporal immediacy” together with their translations in the target text and the designification identified in the translations.

**Table 7.** Reduplicated signs of “temporal-immediacy” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
pençesine değer değmez (p. 16)	the instant it had them in its talons (p. 16)	-----
yakalanır yakalanmaz (p. 24)	the moment [...] captured (p. 24)	-----
çıktı çıkacaktı (p. 39)	just about to appear (p. 38)	-----
buradan ayrılır ayrılmaz (p. 42)	as soon as you left (p. 41)	-----
sen gider gitmez (p. 42)	the minute you were away (p. 41)	-----
varır varmaz (p. 71)	the minute he reached (p. 71)	-----
öldü ölecek kuşlar (p. 107)	the birds dying (p. 105)	darkening of the meaning

Table 7 stands out among all other Tables in this study in that six out of seven (85.71%) signs are translated without meaning transformations. Even if the target signs used in translation of the first six source signs are not reduplications in structure, they can still convey the meaning of temporal immediacy. The use of the conjunctive units like “the instant, the moment, the minute” and the conjunction “as soon as” could allow translators to convey the temporal immediacy in English. The source sign “çıktı çıkacaktı” refers to an imminent action expected at an immediate temporality. It is translated with the phrase “just about to”, referring to an action expected at an immediate temporality. This immediacy is particularly obtained and emphasized with the use of “just”, while the phrase “about to” could also refer to an action to happen soon, but this might lead to under-interpretation of the meaning without “just”. As can be seen in the examples in Table 7, the time clause of conjunctive units in English could allow translators to render a meaning with temporal immediacy without resorting to any designification. However, it must be highlighted that what is preserved in the target text is not the structure of reduplications, but the meaning that they present. On the other hand, when it comes to the last example in Table 7, the sign “the birds dying” implies that some birds have already died, and others are already in the throes of death. However, the reduplicated source sign “öldü ölecek” does not connote any completed death; it only implies that birds are on the brink of death. Therefore, a specific sign is translated with an ambiguous and obscure sign, which could refer to either a completed action or an action underway. This meaning transformation can be thought as darkening of the meaning according to Öztürk Kasar’s (2020) systematics.

#### 4.8. Reduplications of “onomatopoeia”

While onomatopoeia words are prescriptive linguistic units, this fact does not make them universal signs or concepts. Such words vary among languages based on their phonotactics or cultural associations. In Turkish, when the onomatopoeia words are used as descriptive adjectives or adverbs of manner, they tend to be reduplicated. However, this tendency does not hold in English. The designifications and translations of source onomatopoeia words are given in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Reduplicated signs of “onomatopoeia” category and their translations

Source Text (Kemal, 1978)	Target Text (Kemal, 1987)	Designification
pır pır [...] uçuyordu (p. 18)	-----	wiping out of the meaning
cık cık yaptı, boyununu kıvrırdı (p. 32)	-----	wiping out of the meaning
kum manvasının patpatıyla uyandım (p. 39)	I was awakened [...] by the rat- a-tat of a scow laden with sand (p. 38)	-----
vıcır vıcır [...] kuşlar (p. 51)	twittering birds (p. 51)	under-interpretation of the meaning
şakır şakır para (p. 59)	wads of money (p. 58)	alteration of the meaning
şıpır şıpır yağ damlar (p. 71)	the good juicy fat trickles (p. 71)	under-interpretation of the meaning
kıtır kıtır kesecekler (p. 86)	cut throats ... (p. 85)	wiping out of the meaning
çın çın ötüyordu (p. 109)	rang (p. 107)	wiping out of the meaning

The reduplications “pır pır, cık cık, kıtır kıtır, çın çın”, used as adverbs of manner in the source text, are not translated in the target text, leading to absence of the sign. While the verbs that they characterize are preserved in the target text, no trace of those onomatopoeia reduplications can be found in the relevant contexts of the translated novel. This might be an intentional choice of the translator since English does not allow the use of those signs to characterize verbs. While over-interpretation, darkening or under-interpretation of the meaning could have been applied by the translator, which would still keep the source sign within the field of meaning in the target text, the translator chose to delete them from the text. On the other hand, the source sign “vıcır vıcır”, referring to the voice of birds, is translated as “twittering”, a sign derived from the onomatopoeia word “tweet” for birds’ voice in English. Though it is not a reduplication, “twittering” still preserves the meaning of the source sign to some extent in the target text. However, the spirit of vividness created by the source reduplication is not reflected in the target context, which only refers to the voice that birds produce, thereby leading to insufficient meaning in the target text. Another example of insufficient meaning comes from the translation of “şıpır şıpır yağ damlar” as “good juicy fat trickles”. “The good juicy fat” in the target text fails to reflect the implication of “excess” created in the source text, therefore insufficient meaning is produced in this way.

Another onomatopoeia reduplication, “şakır şakır” describes the money that the characters own in the target text. This reduplication clearly refers to coins rather than banknotes since this onomatopoeia word can only imitate the sound of coins, and this contention can easily be confirmed thinking of the children characters aspiring to earn small amounts of money from people in return for releasing the birds those children catch and put in cages. This sign is translated as “wads of money”, which refers to quite some amount of, or a roll of banknotes. In this case, the target sign “wads of” leads to a false meaning as compared to the onomatopoeia word in the source text, which could be considered alteration of the meaning. A false meaning is produced, yet the target sign is not totally irrelevant to the source sign. Finally, the onomatopoeia reduplication “patpat”, implying the noise coming from machines outdoors is translated with another imitative reduplication sign “rat-a-tat” in English. It can safely be said that this source reduplication is translated without any meaning or structural transformation here.

## CONCLUSION

This study focuses on the categorization and analysis of reduplications used in the novel titled *Kuşlar da Gitti* by Yaşar Kemal (1978). Following the categorization of the reduplications in Turkish, their translation in the translated text titled *The Birds Have Also Gone* (1987) is evaluated in the light of “Systematics of Designification” propounded by Öztürk Kasar (2020). The categorization of the reduplications is suggested by the authors of this study. The originality of this categorization lies in the fact that this categorization is semantics-driven, which means that rather than taking a purely or mostly structural approach, the meaning that reduplications take on in the context they are used is the starting point and the main determinant of this categorization. While Turkish is a language rich in the use of reduplications, English language allows the use of reduplications to a certain limit. Moreover, the formation of reduplications varies in Turkish while it is quite limited in English. Therefore, Turkish reduplications are expected to pose a challenge in translation to English. The reason for the selection of a novel by Yaşar Kemal can be tied to the author’s frequent use of reduplications. The ultimate aim of the study is to see how Turkish reduplications are rendered to English and which designifications lead to the slightest or the most severe forms of meaning transformations.

The categorization is divided into eight categories and suggested for further studies based on the meaning that they take on in Turkish contexts. These categories are namely: duration, quality/manner reinforcement, ordinary reinforcement, motion, spatial approximation, vagueness, temporal-immediacy, onomatopoeia. The labels for each category are coined by the authors of this study based on the dominant meaning in each category. However, these eight categories should not be considered the final, but rather open to additions as new reduplications are found in other literary texts with meaning categories different from the ones suggested in this study. Therefore, researchers could adopt this categorization and extend it in further studies. What’s more, not all literary texts might include all those eight meaning categories, rather, only a few of those categories could be applied in various other texts.

In the analysis of the source text reduplications, each reduplication was categorized only once in this study. In other words, if the meaning of a reduplication did not change in different contexts of the source text and if the translation of the reduplication was given with the same sign as in the previous use of the reduplication, repeated uses of the same reduplication were taken out of the categories. The analysis of the source text yielded eleven reduplications in “duration” category. As a result of the translation evaluation, it was found that four reduplications are translated through under-interpretation of the meaning; one is translated through over-interpretation of the meaning; another one reduplication is translated through wiping out of the meaning; five reduplications are translated without any meaning transformation. These findings point to the implication that even though English language does not contain duration reduplications structurally, it is still possible to render the meaning of reduplications of “duration” without meaning transformations or through slight transformations like over-interpretation or under-interpretation of the meaning, both of which sustain the source sign within its field of meaning in the target text. The most extreme designification, wiping out of the meaning, is observed in translation of only one of the “duration” reduplications.

The analysis of the source text yielded 21 reduplications of “quality/manner reinforcement”. Translation evaluation showed that under-interpretation of the meaning is used in translation of fourteen reduplications in contexts with “quality/manner reinforcement” while four of the reduplications are translated through over-interpretation of the meaning. The remaining three “quality/manner reinforcement” reduplications are deleted from the target text through wiping out of the meaning. As English adjectives and adverbs do not easily lend themselves to the formation of reduplications, it should come as no surprise that all contexts are translated with meaning transformations. However, as stated by Öztürk Kasar (2021, p. 28), over-interpretation and under-interpretation of the meaning still sustain the meaning of the source sign to a large extent. Therefore, translating the radical of the reduplicated adjective or adverb, or reflecting part of the meaning of the reduplication of “quality/manner reinforcement” could be one of the choices of translators even if this choice is to result in losses in the style of the writer. Besides providing an insufficient meaning, a translator could also benefit from explicating or making excessive commentary on the reduplicated sign. In this way, the meaning of the source sign can also be sustained in the target text despite structural loss. Seeing that such a reduplication structure does not exist in the target language, maintenance of the meaning could be the pivotal focus in literary translation of reduplications of “quality/manner reinforcement”.

The greatest number of reduplications came out in “ordinary reinforcement” category. It is no surprise that the analysis of the source text yielded 56 reduplications from this category since this category is the ordinary, in other words, the most common way of forming reduplications not only in Turkish but also in English. Due to the common procedure of formation of that type of reinforcement, fifteen of the contexts are translated without any meaning transformation. However, it should be stressed that this is only in meaning level rather than any consideration for the structure. On the other hand, seven contexts are deleted through wiping out of the meaning. Though no exact equivalence is to be expected despite the prevalence of that type of reduplication in either language, the meaning transformation could still be made less severe with over-interpretation, darkening or under-interpretation of the meaning, which came true with the observation of under-interpretation of the meaning in 28 contexts of “ordinary reinforcement” translations. Conveying part of the reduplication through the translation of the radical can be an alternative for literary translators. Over-interpretation of the meaning, observed in translation of six reduplications from this category, is also a potential designification in translation of “ordinary reinforcement”. As in “duration” and “quality/manner reinforcement”, over-interpretation and under-interpretation of the meaning are the most common designifications in translation of “ordinary reinforcement” reduplications.

As for “motion” reduplications, fourteen contexts were found in the source text. Six of these reduplications were found to be translated without any meaning transformations. Though English does not include any such reduplications structurally, those source reduplications formed through the juxtaposition of two antonym action verbs are translated with the juxtaposition of two opposite action verbs in English, avoiding any meaning transformation. Another way of playing upon the action verbs in English is through the use of the verb “keep” followed by a gerund verb. In this way, “motion” reduplications can be translated without meaning transformations. Of the remaining eight reduplications, four are translated through over-interpretation of the meaning while the other four are translated through under-interpretation of the meaning. All this shows that “motion” reduplications can be translated into English either in their wholeness or in part,

with slight meaning transformations if any. However, the preservation of the reduplication is only in the meaning of “motion”, not in the structure.

While the number of “spatial approximation” reduplications is small as compared to other reduplications, they are still worth considering seriously since they are formed through the repetition of the radical as a whole with the addition of an inflection in some cases, which does not exist in English and could pose challenge to translators. Of the seven “spatial approximation” reduplications in the source text, four of them are translated through under-interpretation of the meaning and two are rendered without any meaning transformations, which results in the source reduplications being sustained in the target text. The frequency of under-interpretation of the meaning in translation of this category of reduplications might arise from the use of only the radical in the target text, which could make this designification an intentional choice by translators to convey at least part of the meaning. On the other hand, one reduplication of “spatial approximation” is not translated in the target text, which causes the target reader to miss the physical juxtaposition of the characters. As under-interpretation of the meaning can convey the meaning of a reduplication to a certain extent, it could be preferred by translators to avoid more severe meaning transformations.

The reduplications in “vagueness” category were found in ten contexts in the source text. Vagueness reduplications are commonly used linguistic units both in literature and in daily speech. Those reduplications are used for estimations or presumptions, therefore their translation to English is of significance for a complete understanding of the original message. Translation evaluation showed that the reduplications from “vagueness category” can be translated into English through more obscure signs particularly when it comes to indefinite numbers or quantifiers. Rather than taking the source sign to the limits or beyond the limits of the meaning of the reduplication, resorting to darkening of the meaning would preserve the meaning of reduplication in the target text even if to a lesser degree than the source text. Over-interpretation and under-interpretation of the meaning are observed in one case each. Trying to explicate the vagueness of the reduplication to preserve the traces of meaning in the target text resulted in over-interpretation of the meaning while producing a sign that does not reflect the whole meaning of the reduplication resulted in under-interpretation of the meaning in the target text. On the other hand, when two sequential numbers are juxtaposed to give a vague estimation or talk about an indefinite but close future period in Turkish, connecting them with “or” reproduces an equivalent vagueness in English. In this way, three “vagueness” reduplications were translated without any meaning transformations. While wiping out of the meaning was observed in only one case, this sign could still be sustained in part through under-interpretation of the meaning.

“Temporal-immediacy” reduplications, referring to the very short time elapsing between two consecutive events or actions, are found in seven contexts in the source text. Translation of reduplications in this category stands out among other categories in that six (85.71%) of those reduplications are translated without any meaning transformation. The reason for this could be attributed to the presence of conjunctions or conjunctive units like “as soon as, the moment, the instant, the minute” in English. Even if those units are not reduplications in English, they can still convey the whole meaning of “temporal-immediacy”. It is only in referring to an imminent future prediction that an ambiguous sign was reproduced in the target text, resulting in darkening of the meaning. Yet, this designification could easily be avoided using the structure “just about to” in

English. This designification, contrary to the designifications discussed so far in this study, is an unintentional transformation of meaning created by the translator since a similar context was translated without any meaning transformation with the “just about to” structure in the target text.

Finally, the reduplications of “onomatopoeia”, the only prescriptive signs in Turkish and English, are also worth consideration since even those prescriptive signs, imitation of the sounds of the nature, are far from being universal entities. Of the eight “onomatopoeia” reduplications identified in the source text, four of them are not translated into the target language. The reason behind the frequency of wiping out of the meaning in this category could be tied to the fact that explicating or giving one part of these signs would sound weird in a literary text. The only example of alteration of the meaning is witnessed in translation of one “onomatopoeia” reduplication, which led to a false meaning and interfered with the signification of the target reader. This could be avoided as long as the onomatopoeia words are analyzed in detail in the source text. Two reduplications of this category are translated using a partially significant sign, which led to the under-interpretation of the meaning but still sustained the traces of the meaning of the source reduplication. Another interesting finding in this category is that an onomatopoeia reduplication in Turkish is translated through another onomatopoeia reduplication in English, which is the only exact equivalent found for the translation of a reduplication in this study. Since this exact match involves only one case, under-interpretation of the meaning could be a sound alternative for translators to bear the traces of onomatopoeia reduplications in the target text.

All in all, a total of 134 reduplications were found in the source text analyzed in this study. Though translation of Turkish reduplications to English is naturally expected to pose difficulties, only 17 (12.69%) of those reduplications are wiped out in the target text, which means the translator did not prefer to convey them into the target text, depriving the target reader of the meaning those linguistic units would contribute in achieving the deep structure of the text. Moreover, it is only in one case (0.75%) that reduplication is translated with a false meaning, resulting in alteration of the meaning. Despite the false meaning produced in the target text, the traces of the sign are still obvious. As a result, the reduplication is taken to the limits of meaning. This demonstrates that alteration of meaning should be avoided by translators in order not to give the implication that the sign is misread in the translation process (before, during, and after). 16 (11.94%) of the 134 reduplications are translated with the excessive commentary or explication by the translator, resulting in over-interpretation of the meaning. Darkening of the meaning, that is producing a more general or obscure meaning for a source sign in the target text, is observed in 5 (3.73%) cases. Finally, 57 (42.54%) reduplications are translated through under-interpretation of the meaning. On the other hand, 38 (28.35%) of the reduplications are translated without any meaning transformation. As over-interpretation of the meaning, darkening of the meaning and under-interpretation of the meaning are suggested to be the designifications in the field of meaning of the source sign by Öztürk Kasar (2021, p. 28), this group of designifications, particularly under-interpretation of the meaning, turned out to be the most commonly used ones. As Turkish and English are distinctly different in the prevalence and even in the structural formation of reduplications, using the radical in the target text produces an insufficient meaning. Yet, the sign is still preserved in its field of signification. Therefore, under-interpretation of the meaning could be a sound alternative for English translators of Turkish texts with reduplications in them. Even if reduplications pose challenges to translators, awareness and a good command of “systematics of

designification" by translators could help them make informed decisions on how to avoid extreme meaning transformations or how to reproduce the meaning with the slightest loss of meaning.

## REFERENCES

- Aslan, F. B. (2021). Yaşar Kemal'in 'Yer Demir Gök Bakır' Adlı Romanın Türkçeden Arapçaya Çevirisindeki Deyimlerin Eşdeğerlik Bağlamında İncelenmesi. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(2), 341-351.
- Balcı, T. (2015). Yaşar Kemal'in Kuşlar da Gitti Romanı ve Almanca Çevirisindeki Renk Sözcükleri. *Yaşar Kemal Çukurova Ödülü*, 223-232.
- Can Rençberler, A. (2021). Analysis of *Kürk Mantolu Madonna* by Sabahattin Ali from Semiotics of Translation Perspective. In Didem Tuna and Mesut Kuleli (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Debates on Discourse, Meaning and Translation* (pp. 69-93). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Coşkun, C. (2020). Tümceye Kattığı Anlam Bağlamında İkilemeler. *Homeros*, 3(3), 113-128.
- Ercilasun, A. B., and Akkoyunlu, Z. (2015). *Dîvânü Lugâti't-Türk, Giriş-Metin-Çeviri Notlar-Dizin* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Haldan, A., and Mutlu, G. (2014). Yaşar Kemal'in "Hüyükteki Nar Ağacı" adlı Eserinin "Granatapfelbaum" adlı Çevirisine Dilsel, Toplumsal ve Çeviribilimsel Bir Bakış. *Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi*, 2(12), 26-46.
- Hatipoğlu, V. (1981). *Türk Dilinde İkileme*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları
- Kemal, Y. (1978). *Kuşlar da Gitti*. İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları.
- Kemal, Y. (1987). *The Birds Have Also Gone*. Thilda Kemal (Trans.). London: Collins Harvill.
- Korkmaz, İ. (2016). Çeviri stratejilerinin yazın çevirisinde uygulanması: Yaşar Kemal'in *Ölmez Otu* eserinin İngilizceye çevirisinden örnekler. *Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(12), 35-46.
- Korkmaz, Ş., and Korkmaz Bulut, T. (2017). Şeyyad Hamza'nın Yûsuf u Zelîhâ Mesnevisindeki İkilemeler ve Yinelemeler. *TÜRÜK Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Halkbilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(11), 240-279.
- 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. (2018). 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.
- Merriam Webster Online Dictionary. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduplication>. Access Date: 22.06.2021.
- Okamura, T. (1991). Reduplication in English. *English Review*, (5), 1-24.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009). 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 and A. Moghani (Eds.), *Les traces du traducteur* (pp. 87-211). Paris: Publications de l'INALCO.

- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2020). 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. (2021). Çevirmek, Anlamı Eğip Bükme Sanatı mıdır? In Didem Tuna and Mesut Kuleli (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Debates on Discourse, Meaning and Translation* (pp. 19-44). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. and 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., and 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. and 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.
- Öztürk Kasar, S., and Tuna, D. (2017). Shakespeare in Three Languages: Reading and Analyzing Sonnet 130 and its Translations in Light of Semiotics. *IJLET International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(1), 170-181.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language-An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt.
- Sev, G. (2004). Divanü Lügat'it Türk'te İkilemeler. *Türk Dili*, 88(634, Ekim 2004), 498-510.
- Tuna, D. (2016). Oktay Rifat'ın Tecelli Başlıklı Şiiri Üzerinden Çeviriyi Göstergebilimle Buluşturmak. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, (35), 33-52.
- Tuna, D., and Kuleli, M. (2017). *Çeviri göstergebilimi çerçevesinde yazımsal çeviri için bir metin çözümleme ve karşılaştırma modeli*. Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Türk Dil Kurumu Çevrimiçi Güncel Türkçe Sözlük. <https://sozluk.gov.tr/> Access Date: 03.06.2021.
- Uysal, N. M. (2021). An analysis on the difficulties experienced by translator candidates in the translation of popular science texts. In Nazan Müge Uysal (Ed.), *Translation-Oriented Analyses from Theory to Practice* (pp. 113-136). Ankara: Nobel Bilimsel Eserler.
- Üstünova, K. (1997). Dede Korkut Destanlarında Üçlemeler, Dörtlemeler, Beşlemeler. *Bilge Yayın, Tanıtım, Tahlil, Eleştirisi Dergisi*, (13), 20 – 25.
- Vardar, B. (2002). *Açıklamalı Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Multilingual.
- Yaman, B. (2021). Çeviri göstergebilimi bakış açısıyla Keloğlan Suskunlar Ülkesinde masalının İngilizce çevirisinde anlam evrilmeleri. In Nazan Müge Uysal (Ed.), *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Çeviri Odaklı Çözümlemeler* (pp. 137-162). Ankara: Nobel Bilimsel Eserler.
- Yılmaz, S. (2013). Yaşar Kemal'in "İnce Memed" Romanı ile Fransızca Çevirisi Üzerine Dilbilim ve Çeviri İncelemesi. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(10), 743-754.
- Zülfikar, H. (2018). *Türkçede Ses Yansımaları Kelimeler*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

