

# Intralingual and Interlingual Transformations in Human and Machine Translations of *Beowulf*: A Corpus-Based Analysis

Çağınalp İNAL, Elif TOKDEMİR DEMİREL

Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale, Türkiye

## Abstract

This study aims to comparatively examine the intralingual and interlingual translations of *Beowulf* in order to reveal the similarities and differences between human and machine translation processes in literary translation. As one of the most significant works of Old English literature, *Beowulf* provides a highly productive field for translation studies due to its historical language structure, poetic density, formulaic expressions, cultural references, and epic narrative style. Throughout centuries, the poem has been repeatedly retranslated into both modern English and various target languages, making it a multilayered text continuously reconstructed across different linguistic and historical contexts. In this respect, *Beowulf* constitutes a valuable corpus for examining both historical language transformation and literary translation strategies. The study is theoretically grounded in Roman Jakobson's classification of translation types and adopts a corpus-based translation studies approach in order to compare intralingual and interlingual translation practices. In addition, Blum-Kulka's cohesion shift theory and Nida's concept of equivalence constitute the main analytical framework of the research. The corpus consists of A. Diedrich Wackerbarth's archaic English rendering, Seamus Heaney's modern English translation, Nazmi Ağıl's Turkish translation based on Heaney's version, and English to Turkish machine translations generated by ChatGPT. Thus, the study investigates not only the stylistic and semantic differences between human translations, but also the structural and poetic distinctions between human and machine-generated translations. A multilayered aligned corpus was constructed and selected passages were divided into comparable segments for systematic analysis. The study focuses on meaning equivalence, style and tone, poeticity and metaphor transfer, cohesion and coherence, as well as human-machine translation comparison. The findings indicate that machine translation systems are generally successful in semantic clarity and structural consistency; however, they remain more limited in reproducing poetic intensity, metaphorical density, rhythm, cultural associations, and atmospheric depth in comparison to human translations. While Nazmi Ağıl's Turkish renderings demonstrate a strong tendency toward re-poeticization and creating oral narrative effect in the target language, ChatGPT outputs display higher levels of explicitation and syntactic regularization. Ultimately, the study argues that literary poetry translation should not be regarded merely as semantic transfer, but rather as a multilayered process of cultural, aesthetic, and discursive reconstruction.

**Keywords:** *Beowulf*, intralingual translation, interlingual translation, machine translation, corpus-based analysis, literary translation

*Received Date:* May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2026. *Acceptance Date:* June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2026.

© Journal of Language and Education Review.

## 1. Introduction

Roman Jakobson conceptualized translation not merely as transfer between languages but as the reconstruction of meaning through different systems, classifying it into three categories: interlingual, intralingual, and intersemiotic translation (Jakobson, 1959). According to Jakobson, translation involves not only lexical equivalence but also the cultural and contextual transfer of meaning, making this perspective particularly relevant to literary texts.

Interlingual translation refers to transferring a text from one language into another. Translating the Old English epic *Beowulf* into modern Turkish is an example of this process, requiring the transfer of linguistic content alongside atmosphere, meaning, and cultural context. Jakobson argues that complete equivalence between languages is impossible because each language structures reality differently; consequently, translation inevitably involves interpretation and reconstruction.

Intralingual translation, by contrast, refers to reformulating a text within the same language through modernization, simplification, or reinterpretation. Translating *Beowulf* into Modern English or adapting Shakespeare's works into contemporary English are examples of this process. Jakobson defines intralingual

\*ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Assoc.Prof.Dr. Elif TOKDEMİR DEMİREL, Department of English Translation and Interpreting, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale, Türkiye, E-mail address: elif6171@gmail.com, Tel: +90 531 7931922. ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1280-2679

\*ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Çağınalp İNAL, Department of English Translation and Interpreting, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale, Türkiye, E-mail address: caginalpinal@gmail.com, Tel: +90 531 8140017. ORCID ID: 0009-0004-3757-5294

translation as “rewording within the same language,” emphasizing that meaning must be reconstructed even when source and target texts belong to the same language. Such translations play an important role in making historical and literary texts accessible to broader audiences while preserving cultural and historical context (Zethsen, 2009; Pym, 2014).

Intersemiotic translation involves transferring verbal texts into different sign systems such as film, painting, music, or graphic narratives. Adaptations of *Beowulf* into cinema, opera, or graphic novels demonstrate how literary meaning may be reproduced visually and symbolically. In this respect, intersemiotic translation functions as a creative process of rewriting rather than simple linguistic transfer.

Within this theoretical framework, the present study comparatively examines different linguistic and translational representations of *Beowulf* through a corpus-based approach. The analysis focuses on A. Diederich Wackerbarth’s archaizing Modern English translation, Seamus Heaney’s Modern English translation, Nazmi Ağıl’s Turkish translation produced from Heaney’s version, and artificial intelligence–based translations generated by ChatGPT. Through this multilayered corpus structure, the study seeks to make Jakobson’s distinction between intralingual and interlingual translation visible through measurable textual patterns and comparative textual analysis.

The study also investigates differences between human and machine translation through comparable corpora rather than subjective evaluation alone. Issues frequently discussed in contemporary machine translation literature, including stylistic flattening, semantic deviation, explicitation tendencies, and the loss of poetic atmosphere, are examined through selected passages from *Beowulf*. Particular attention is given to the extent to which artificial intelligence–based systems can reproduce poeticity, metaphorical density, historical tone, and cultural atmosphere in comparison with human translators.

Ultimately, the study aims to contribute to corpus-based translation studies and current discussions concerning the capabilities and limitations of artificial intelligence in literary translation. In doing so, it approaches *Beowulf* not only as a historical literary text but also as a multilingual and multilayered translational phenomenon reconstructed across different linguistic, cultural, and technological contexts.

## 2. Literature

### 2.1. Translation Types

Translation is not merely the transfer of words from one language to another; it is a multidimensional process involving the reconstruction of cultural, social, and communicative meanings. Throughout history, translation has facilitated the transmission of knowledge, literature, science, and culture across societies and has become increasingly diversified through globalization. Consequently, translation studies recognize various translation types, each serving different communicative purposes and textual functions.

Word-for-word translation involves the direct transfer of source-language words into the target language while preserving the original syntax and structure as much as possible (Newmark, 1988). Although useful in technical texts and language teaching, this method often causes stylistic and semantic losses in literary translation. Early English translations of *Beowulf*, for example, frequently preserved Old English structures so closely that readability for modern audiences was reduced (Liuzza, 2011).

Sense-for-sense or communicative translation prioritizes overall meaning and communicative effect rather than direct lexical equivalence. Nida (1964) argues that this approach focuses on reader perception and communicative adequacy. Seamus Heaney’s translation of *Beowulf* exemplifies this strategy by recreating the spirit and voice of the text rather than reproducing its wording literally (Heaney, 1999).

Adaptation transforms cultural, historical, and contextual elements into forms understandable within the target culture (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995). Frequently used in children’s literature, theatre, and folk narratives, adaptation often simplifies or modernizes cultural references, as seen in some versions of *Beowulf*.

Explicitation refers to making implicit information explicit in the target text. According to Blum-Kulka (1986), translation naturally involves some degree of explicitation. This strategy is particularly useful in historically and culturally dense texts, such as rendering the Old English concept *wyrd* as “fate” (Orchard, 2003).

Cultural substitution replaces a source-culture element with a culturally familiar equivalent in the target culture (Hervey & Higgins, 1992). Although this facilitates reader comprehension, it may reduce textual originality. The translation of mead-hall as “feasting hall” illustrates this strategy (Gwara, 2005).

## 2.2. Translation Approaches According to Text Types

Text type plays a central role in determining translation strategies. Reiss (1971) argues that informative texts prioritize accuracy and clarity, whereas literary texts emphasize emotional and aesthetic effect (Reiss & Vermeer, 1984). Consequently, translators mediate not only between languages but also between communicative functions. According to Nord (1997), failure to identify text type may result in functional loss. In literary genres such as poetry and fiction, where form and content are closely interconnected, translation becomes a process of recreation rather than simple meaning transfer (Munday, 2016).

Poetry translation remains one of the most challenging areas of translation studies because poetry relies on rhythm, sound, imagery, and style in addition to meaning. Jakobson (1959) famously described poetry translation as “impossible” due to the inseparable relationship between poetic form and language. Nevertheless, scholars have proposed various approaches emphasizing different poetic elements. Lefevere (1992) identifies strategies such as literal, interpretive, formal, rhythmic, and creative translation. In Beowulf translations, some translators prioritize alliteration and heroic tone, while others focus on semantic fidelity. Therefore, poetry translation may be understood as the reconstruction of poetic function within the target culture rather than simple linguistic transfer (Bassnett, 2002).

## 2.3. Lexical Change and Anglo-Saxon Literary Tradition in the History of English

The history of English is generally divided into Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, and Modern English periods, each characterized by significant lexical and linguistic developments (Crystal, 2003; Barber et al., 2009). Old English was primarily Germanic, though Viking influence introduced numerous Old Norse words (Crystal, 2005). Following the Norman Conquest, Middle English absorbed extensive French vocabulary related to law, religion, and administration (Baugh & Cable, 2013). Renaissance and scientific developments further expanded English through Greek- and Latin-derived vocabulary, while writers such as Shakespeare contributed substantially to lexical innovation (Crystal & Crystal, 2002). Modern English continues to evolve through industrialization, technology, and globalization, accompanied by ongoing semantic change (Aitchison, 2012).

Produced between the fifth and eleventh centuries, Anglo-Saxon literature reflects the warrior culture, religious beliefs, and social values of early medieval England. Preserved in manuscripts such as the Nowell Codex, works including Beowulf, The Battle of Maldon, and The Dream of the Rood combine Christian and pagan elements through alliterative verse, formulaic expressions, and heroic discourse (Bradley, 1997; Greenfield, 2003). Themes such as fate, loyalty, exile, and death reveal the worldview of Anglo-Saxon society (Swanton, 1985; Liuzza, 2011). Because Old English differs substantially from modern English, translations of Beowulf provide valuable examples of intralingual translation and historical language change, illustrating how vocabulary, style, and cultural interpretation evolve across historical periods (Chickering, 2006).

## 2.4. Parallel Corpus

A parallel corpus is a digitally organized collection in which source texts and their translations are aligned and presented together (Baker, 1995). Such corpora enable researchers to compare translations across languages and analyze differences in meaning, structure, vocabulary, and expression. They are widely used in translation studies for examining translation choices, equivalence relations, and translation norms. Parallel corpora are also essential in computer-assisted translation and machine translation systems, where aligned bilingual data functions as training material and translation memory resources.

## 2.5. Machine Translation: Technological Capacity and Literary Limitations

Machine translation (MT) has developed rapidly through neural machine translation (NMT) systems such as ChatGPT (Koehn, 2020). These systems efficiently process large volumes of text, especially technical and repetitive content (Forcada, 2017). However, literary texts remain highly challenging due to metaphor, rhythm, cultural references, and stylistic complexity (Toral & Way, 2018). Although NMT systems handle context more effectively than earlier MT models, they still struggle to reproduce poetic atmosphere and creative interpretation. According to Minako O'Hagan (2016), MT may function as a supportive drafting tool in literary translation but remains insufficient for full artistic recreation. In texts such as *Beowulf*, machine translation often preserves lexical meaning while weakening alliteration, rhythm, and poetic density (Schreiber, 2021). This study therefore compares human and AI-generated Turkish translations of *Beowulf* through a corpus-based framework in order to examine how machine translation systems handle poeticity, archaic vocabulary, and cultural atmosphere.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Research Questions

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What semantic, stylistic, and poetic transformations emerge across intralingual and interlingual translations of *Beowulf*?
2. To what extent can AI-based machine translation systems reproduce the poetic, cultural, and atmospheric dimensions of literary texts?
3. What corpus-based linguistic patterns distinguish human translations from machine-generated translations?
4. How do archaization, modernization, and adaptive reconstruction strategies differ across the analyzed translations?

#### 3.2. Research Approach

This study is a qualitative-oriented comparative corpus study conducted within the framework of corpus-based translation studies. By combining quantitative frequency data with qualitative textual analysis, the study aims to reveal the systematic differences between translation products. The scope of the study is deliberately limited to a controlled and representative corpus consisting of selected passages from the *Beowulf* epic. Rather than analyzing the text in its entirety, the study focuses on passages with high representational value in order to enable detailed corpus-based comparison and close textual analysis. In this respect, the research corpus was intentionally designed to ensure the interpretability of literary, stylistic, and translational findings.

All texts were manually aligned at sentence and clause level in order to construct comparable parallel segments. Segment boundaries were determined according to semantic continuity, clause structure, and poetic units.

#### 3.3. Corpus Construction

The research corpus consists of the following sub-corpora:

##### • Source Text and Intralingual Human Translation Corpus

- Archaizing Modern English translation: “A. Diedrich Wackerbarth’s translation of *Beowulf*.”
- Modern English translation: “Seamus Heaney’s translation of *Beowulf*.”

##### • Interlingual Human Translation Corpus

- Turkish human translation: “The text translated into Turkish by Nazmi Ağıl from Seamus Heaney’s version.”

##### • Machine Translation Corpus

- Archaizing Modern English → Turkish (ChatGPT)
- Modern English → Turkish (ChatGPT)

Table 1. Structure of the Research Corpus

Corpus Layer	Passage Count	Translation Direction	Approximate Word Count		
			Grendel	Mourning	Queen
<b>Wackerbarth Corpus</b>	3	Old English to Archaizing Modern English	91	118	104
<b>Heaney Corpus</b>	3	Old English to Modern English	87	101	92
<b>Nazmi Ağıl Corpus</b>	3	Modern English to Turkish	60	94	57
<b>ChatGPT Wackerbarth</b>	3	English to Turkish	69	92	74
<b>ChatGPT Heaney</b>	3	English to Turkish	72	89	69

	<b>Wackerbarth (A. Diederich)</b>	<b>Heaney (Seamus)</b>	<b>Nazmi Ağıl</b>	<b>ChatGPT (Heaney → TR)</b>	<b>ChatGPT (Wackerbarth → TR)</b>
<b>Type</b>	220	212	199	201	207
<b>Token</b>	303	296	211	230	235
<b>TTR</b>	72.61	71.62	94.31	87.39	88.09

Note: Since the corpus is relatively small and controlled, TTR values are used descriptively rather than inferentially.

All texts were digitized, aligned, and divided into comparable segments (Appendices 1/2/3). The final research corpus consists of three primary passages and their corresponding translational variants, producing a multilayered comparative corpus structure. The corpus contains aligned sentence- and clause-level segments derived from the Grendel passage, the mourning/funeral passage, and the Queen's speech passage. These passages were deliberately selected because they represent different narrative, stylistic, emotional, and poetic functions within the epic structure.

These passages were deliberately selected in order to represent different discourse types, emotional structures, and poetic functions within the epic narrative. The Grendel passage primarily reflects violence discourse, horror imagery, and metaphorical darkness; the mourning/funeral passage represents elegiac discourse, ritualistic mourning, and collective grief structures; while the Queen's speech passage reflects diplomatic discourse, feast culture, kingship ideology, and social solidarity. This selection strategy enabled the study to compare how different translational approaches reconstruct distinct literary and discursive functions across human and machine-generated translations.

### 3.4. Analysis Procedure

The analysis was conducted in three stages:

#### 1) Corpus-Based Quantitative Analysis

- Word frequencies
- Distribution of word classes
- Average sentence lengths
- Use of conjunctions and pronouns

#### 2) Comparative Textual Analysis

- Meaning equivalence
- Style and tone
- Poeticity and metaphor transfer
- Cohesion and coherence

### 3) Human–Machine Translation Comparison

- Human translation vs. ChatGPT

#### 3.5. General Evaluation Criteria for the Three Passages (Table 1-2-3)

The three selected passages were comparatively analyzed through both quantitative and qualitative methods within the framework of corpus-based translation studies. The evaluation process focused on lexical, syntactic, stylistic, and poetic features observed across the translations of Beowulf.

The analyses were conducted according to the following criteria:

- **Word Count:** Used to determine expansion, reduction, and explicitation tendencies within the translations.
- **Clause Density:** Evaluated through the frequency of dependent and independent clause structures and overall sentence layering.
- **Archaic Vocabulary Density:** Measured according to the use of historical, epic, and non-contemporary lexical items.
- **Metaphorical Density:** Examined through figurative language, symbolic imagery, and poetic atmosphere.
- **Poeticity:** Evaluated according to rhythmic structure, oral narrative effect, aesthetic reconstruction, and poetic diction.
- **Syntactic Complexity:** Determined through sentence length, modifier accumulation, and grammatical layering.
- **Ceremonial / Emotional Tone:** Assessed through the intensity of ritualistic, epic, emotional, and dramatic discourse.
- **Adaptive Reproduction:** Measured according to the translator’s tendency to recreate poetic and cultural effect rather than producing literal transfer.
- **Cohesion and Coherence:** Evaluated through conjunction usage, logical flow, rhythmic transitions, and explicitation strategies.

All passages were divided into comparable aligned segments. Poeticity and stylistic intensity were evaluated according to recurring textual features such as metaphor frequency, rhythmic repetition, oral narrative markers, imagery density, clause parallelism, rhetorical accumulation, and adaptive poetic reconstruction. Expressions containing symbolic imagery, elevated diction, ritualistic discourse, emotional amplification, and oral-epic narration were treated as indicators of heightened poetic and dramatic intensity. In order to reduce purely subjective interpretation, these features were comparatively analyzed across all translations through aligned textual segments and supported with direct textual evidence from the corpus. Quantitative observations were then supported through close reading–based qualitative interpretation. The analytical framework was interpreted in light of Roman Jakobson’s translation typology (Jakobson, 1959), Shoshana Blum-Kulka’s cohesion shift theory (Blum-Kulka, 1986), Eugene Nida’s concept of equivalence (Nida, 1964), and contemporary machine translation literature (Koehn, 2020; Toral & Way, 2018).

Table 2. Operational Definitions of Evaluative Categories

Evaluative Level	Operational Definition
Low	Limited or infrequent occurrence of the analyzed textual feature within the passage.
Medium	Controlled and recurring use of the analyzed feature without dominant textual concentration.
High	Frequent and stylistically significant use of the analyzed feature throughout the passage.
Very High	Dense, dominant, and systematically recurring presence of the analyzed feature supported by multiple linguistic or poetic structures.

The evaluative categories used in the analysis were determined according to the frequency, intensity, and recurrence of the analyzed textual features across the selected passages. Poeticity was evaluated through rhythmic repetition, metaphor frequency, oral narrative markers, imagery density, clause parallelism, and adaptive poetic reconstruction. Metaphorical density was assessed according to the concentration of figurative language, symbolic imagery, and metaphorical layering within the text. Emotional and ceremonial intensity were evaluated through lexical emphasis, ritualistic discourse structures, elegiac expressions, dramatic narration, and rhetorical amplification. These analytical criteria were used comparatively across all human and machine-generated translations in order to minimize purely subjective interpretation and support qualitative findings through observable textual patterns.

#### 4. Findings

Within the scope of this study, three different passages selected from the Beowulf epic were comparatively examined. The analyzed passages consist respectively of the section describing Grendel's attacks, the mourning ceremony following Beowulf's death, and the Queen's speech delivered during the feast scene. In the study, Seamus Heaney's (1999) Modern English translation, A. Diederich Wackerbarth's (1849) more archaic and rhetorically dense English translation, and Nazmi Ağıl's Turkish translations were comparatively evaluated. The analysis process was conducted in accordance with the corpus-based translation studies approach, and quantitative findings were supported through close reading-based qualitative analyses.

The evaluative categories employed in the study, such as "high," "medium," and "low," were determined according to specific analytical criteria. These criteria were established on the basis of the following parameters:

- **Density of Archaic Vocabulary:** The frequency of historical and poetic lexical items that are no longer commonly used by modern readers
- **Clause Density:** The frequency of consecutive dependent and independent clause structures within a sentence
- **Syntactic Complexity:** Long sentence structures, chains of modifiers, and multilayered clause organization
- **Poetic Density:** The intensity of sound repetition, rhythmic structure, metaphorical concentration, and oral narrative effect
- **Adaptive Reproduction:** The degree of re-poeticization and functional equivalence produced in the target language rather than literal transfer
- **Explicitation Tendency:** The extent to which semantic relations within the text are made explicit through conjunctions and explanatory structures

Within this framework, the category "high" refers to the systematic and intensive presence of a given feature within the text; "medium" indicates a controlled and balanced use of that feature; and "low" refers to its limited occurrence.

Table 1. Grendel Passage – Comparative Textual Analysis

Segment No	Wackerbarth (A. Diederich)	Heaney (Seamus)	Nazmi Ağıl	ChatGPT (Heaney → TR)	ChatGPT (Wackerbarth → TR)
1	And in sad Songs of Sorrow shewn	Sad lays were sung about the beset king	Hüzünlü türküler yakıldı yenik krala	Yaslı ezgiler söylendi kuşatılmış kral için	Ve kederli şarkılarda anlatıldı
2	How Grendel, while he still renew'd Crime, vengeful Hate, and deadly Feud	The vicious raids of Grendel, His long and unrelenting feud	korkunç katliamını anlatan Grendel'in, son vermek niyetinde değildi canavar kan dökmeye	Grendel'in vahşi baskınlarını anlatan, uzun ve amansız husumetini	Grendel'in durmaksızın yenilediği suçları, kinleri ve ölümcül düşmanlığı

3	For Years 'gainst Hrothgar War pursued With ever fresh Success	Nothing but war; how he would never	barışın yakınına bile yanaşmıyordu	savaştan başka bir şey istemiyordu o	yıllar boyunca Hrothgar'a karşı savaşı hep yeni zaferlerle sürdürdüğü
4	Nor would the Life-pest ever take A golden Fee, and Treaty make With Wight of Danish Land	Parley or make peace with any Dane Nor stop his death-dealing nor pay the death-price	kan bedeli ödemeye... kimse onun tazminat ödeyeceğini tahmin etmiyordu	Hiçbir Danimarkalıyla uzlaşmaya yanaşmaz, ölüm saçmaktan vazgeçmez, kan bedeli ödemezdi	Ne altın bir bedel kabul ederdi, ne de Danimarka halkıyla antlaşma yapardı
5	But the Death-spirit dark and strong	No counsellor could ever expect Fair reparation from those rabid hands	Kimse güvende değildi	Hiçbir danışman bekleyemezdi o kudurmuş ellerden adil bir tazminat	O karanlık ve güçlü ölüm ruhu
6	Foul Monster persecuting long, Insnares and sore oppress'd the Young And Noble of the Land	All were endangered; young and old Were hunted down by that dark death-shadow	uzun gecelerde bu gözü dönmüş, ölümcül gölge, genç yaşlı gözetmeden çullanıyordu	Herkes tehlike altındaydı; genç yaşlı fark etmeksizin o karanlık ölüm gölgesi tarafından avlanıyordu	o pis yaratık, uzun süre zulmetti ülkenin gençlerine ve soylularına
7	He held in everlasting Night The misty Moors	Who lurked and swooped in the long nights On the misty moors	Pusuda bekleyip puslu bataklıklar üzerinden süzülüp geliyordu	Uzun gecelerde puslu kurup saldıran, sisli fundalıklar üzerinde dolaşan o yaratığın	Sonsuz gecenin hâkimi olmuştu; sisli bataklıkları kaplamıştı gölgesi
8	no living Wight Can e'er describe the penal Place Assign'd to Hell's dark wizard Race	nobody knows Where these reavers from Hell roam on their errands	Sahiden de, cehennem firarisi bu ifritler nerelerde dolaşır bilinmez ki	cehennemden gelen bu yağmacılarının hangi amaçlarla dolaştığını kimse bilmezdi	Hiçbir canlı tarif edemez cehennemin karanlık büyücü soyuna ayrılmış o lanetli yeri

#### 4.1. Comparative Textual Analysis

Table 2. Quantitative Findings of the Grendel Passage

Text	Word Count	Clause Density	Density of Archaic Vocabulary	Metaphorical Density	Poeticity	Syntactic Complexity
Seamus Heaney	~99	Medium	Medium	High	Medium–High	Medium
A. Diedrich Wackerbarth	~118	High	Very High	Very High	Very High	High
Nazmi Ağıl	~92	Medium	Low	High	Very High	Medium

##### 4.1.1. Meaning Equivalence

The primary semantic framework of the Grendel passage is constructed around Grendel's relentless hostility toward Hrothgar, his rejection of social order, his refusal to pursue peace, his death-dealing nature, and his threatening identity associated with Hell. Although this fundamental semantic structure is generally preserved across the examined translations, each translator employs different degrees of intensity and distinct expressive strategies.

Seamus Heaney's translation presents a balanced and controlled approach to meaning transfer. Expressions such as "His long and unrelenting feud" and "Nothing but war" emphasize not only Grendel's violence but also the continuity of his hostility. Although Heaney's lexical choices remain accessible to modern readers, the epic atmosphere is largely preserved. A. Diedrich Wackerbarth, however, reconstructs the same semantic field through

a denser and more dramatic style. Expressions such as “Crime, vengeful Hate, and deadly Feud” transform Grendel into the embodiment of hatred and destruction rather than merely an enemy figure.

In Nazmi Ağıl’s Turkish translation, meaning transfer generally follows Heaney’s version while intensifying dramatic effect in certain segments. The expression “son vermek niyetinde değildi canavar kan dökmeye” transforms Heaney’s “Nothing but war” into a more physical and violent image. The words “canavar” and “kan dökmek” strengthen Grendel’s monstrous and destructive nature within Turkish. The ChatGPT translation remains semantically accurate and structurally coherent through expressions such as “uzun ve amansız husumet” and “kan bedeli ödemezdi”; however, it lacks the emotional and cultural intensity found in Ağıl’s version. Segment-based comparison further demonstrates this distinction. Heaney’s “All were endangered” becomes the more direct “Kimse güvende değildi” in Ağıl’s translation, whereas ChatGPT produces the more explanatory “Herkes tehlike altındaydı.” Consequently, Heaney may be described as balanced, Wackerbarth as dramatizing, Ağıl as adaptive and intensifying, and ChatGPT as explanatory and semantically oriented.

#### 4.1.2. *Style and Tone*

The passage constructs an atmosphere of darkness, threat, mourning, and epic horror, although each translation recreates this atmosphere differently. Wackerbarth’s version is the heaviest and most archaic. Expressions such as “Life-pest,” “Death-spirit,” and “Hell’s dark wizard Race” transform the text into a religious and metaphysical horror discourse, while archaic words such as “Wight” intensify historical distance. As a result, the tone becomes highly ceremonial and rhetorically dense.

Heaney establishes a more controlled balance between readability and epic atmosphere. Expressions such as “dark death-shadow,” “misty moors,” and “reavers from Hell” preserve poetic darkness without alienating modern readers. Nazmi Ağıl’s translation intensifies dramatic and oral narrative effect through expressions such as “Hüzünlü türküler yakıldı,” “gözü dönmüş, ölümcül gölge,” and “cehennem firarisi bu ifritler.” Particularly, the word “ifrit” introduces strong folkloric and mythological associations into Turkish cultural context. ChatGPT’s translation, by contrast, remains more neutral and explanatory. Although expressions such as “karanlık ölüm gölgesi” and “cehennemden gelen yağmacılar” preserve semantic content, they reproduce poetic and cultural density less effectively than Ağıl’s translation.

#### 4.1.3. *Poeticity and Metaphor Transfer*

The poetic structure of the passage is primarily constructed through images of death, darkness, mist, swamps, and Hell. Heaney’s “dark death-shadow” transforms Grendel into the embodiment of death itself rather than a merely physical creature. Nazmi Ağıl recreates this metaphor more dynamically through “gözü dönmüş, ölümcül gölge,” where “gözü dönmüş” also adds psychological intensity to Grendel’s savagery. ChatGPT’s “karanlık ölüm gölgesi” preserves the metaphor more literally, although without the same level of re-poeticization.

Wackerbarth’s “Death-spirit dark and strong” carries the metaphor into a more metaphysical and religious dimension, portraying Grendel directly as a spirit of death. Spatial imagery also differs significantly across translations. Heaney’s “misty moors” establishes ambiguity and darkness, whereas Ağıl’s “puslu bataklıklar üzerinden süzülüp geliyordu” introduces movement and ghostlike presence through the verb “süzülüp gelmek.” Similarly, Wackerbarth’s “everlasting Night” transforms darkness into a metaphor for eternal evil. Overall, Wackerbarth demonstrates dense rhetorical poeticity, Heaney controlled modern poeticity, Ağıl adaptive and dramatized poeticity, and ChatGPT a more literal and explanatory poetic structure.

#### 4.1.4. *Cohesion and Coherence*

Heaney’s translation maintains cohesion through relatively controlled clause structures and clear narrative progression: mourning, Grendel’s attacks, refusal of peace, universal threat, dark setting, and connection to Hell. This organization supports readability for modern audiences. Wackerbarth’s translation, however, increases clause density considerably through accumulative and repetitive structures such as “Crime, vengeful Hate, and deadly Feud.” While these repetitions intensify epic atmosphere, they simultaneously reduce readability.

In Nazmi Ağıl’s translation, cohesion is largely established through rhythmic segmentation and oral narrative flow. Expressions such as “Kimse güvende değildi,” “Pusuda bekleyip...,” and “Sahiden de...” create a strong

storytelling rhythm. Rather than fully explicating semantic relations, the translation prioritizes atmosphere and narrative continuity. ChatGPT, by contrast, demonstrates a much stronger explicitation tendency. Logical connections are made clearer and more directly, increasing comprehensibility but simultaneously reducing poetic ambiguity and atmospheric density.

## 4.2. Human–Machine Translation Comparison

### 4.2.1. Human Translation vs. ChatGPT

The most significant difference between Nazmi Ağıl’s human translation and the ChatGPT output emerges in the reconstruction of poetic atmosphere and cultural resonance. ChatGPT successfully transfers semantic content, preserves basic metaphors, and maintains structural clarity; however, it reproduces poetic intensity only partially. Ağıl’s translation, by contrast, reconstructs rhythmic flow, oral narration, and dramatic atmosphere far more effectively.

For example, “Hüzünlü türküler yakıldı” produces a considerably stronger poetic and cultural effect than ChatGPT’s “Yaslı ezgiler söylendi.” Similarly, “cehennem firarisi bu ifritler” carries denser mythological and folkloric associations than “cehennemden gelen yağmacılar.” These differences demonstrate that human translation possesses a significantly greater capacity for aesthetic recreation and culturally embedded literary expression than AI-generated translation.

Table 3. Mourning / Funeral Passage – Comparative Textual Analysis

Segment No	Wackerbarth (A. Diedrich)	Heaney (Seamus)	Nazmi Ağıl	ChatGPT (Heaney → TR)	ChatGPT (Wackerbarth → TR)
1	The Troop of Princes rode around	Then twelve warriors rode around the tomb	Sonra at sırtında on iki savaşçı dönmece durdular mezarın etrafında	Sonra on iki savaşçı mezarın çevresinde at sürdü	Prensler topluluğu mezarın çevresinde dolaştı
2	The Beasts-of-war about the Mound	Chieftain’s sons, champions in battle	askerlerin oğulları, bükülmez bilekli	reis oğulları, savaşta ün kazanmış adamlar	savaş atları höyüğün etrafında döndü
3	In Number twelve, and they would sing	All of them distraught, chanting in dirges	ağıtlar yaktılar yana yakıla	Hepsi keder içindeydi; ağıtlar söyleyerek	on iki kişiydiler ve şarkılar söylediler
4	And call to Mind their valiant King	Mourning his loss as a man and a king	kaybettikleri insanın, hem de kralın yasını tuttular	onu hem bir insan hem bir kral olarak andılar	yiğit krallarını hatırladılar
5	Themselves would speak, pour forth their Lays	They extolled his heroic nature and exploits	Yücelttiler yaptıklarını, gözü pekliğini göklere çıkardılar	Kahramanlığını ve yaptıklarını yücelttiler	Kendi sözleriyle onun yiğitliğini anlattılar
6	His Earlship laud, his Valour praise	And gave thanks for his greatness; which was the proper thing	çokça teşekkür ettiler eli açıklığına ve doğru olanı yaptılar	büyüklüğü için şükran sundular; çünkü doğru olan buydu	asil kişiliğini ve cesaretini övdüler
7	With Praise they judg'd him, as 'tis good	For a man should praise a prince whom he holds dear	neden dersiniz: Kişi oğlu övmeli kıymetli kralını	İnsan, sevdiği hükümdarı övmeli	Onu övgülerle yâd ettiler; çünkü doğru olan
8	A Man his well-lov'd Sovereign should Extol in Words and love in Heart	And cherish his memory when that moment comes	hem de aziz tutmalı hatirasını	ve zamanı geldiğinde hatirasını yaşatmalıdır	insanın sevdiği hükümdarını sözleriyle yüceltmesi ve kalbinde taşımasıdır
9	When from the Body he must part	When he has to be convoyed from his bodily home	bedeni binasını boşaltacağı zaman	bedensel yurdundan ayrılacağı an geldiğinde	bedenden ayrılma vakti geldiğinde

10	A useless Thing henceforth to be	So the Geat people, his hearth companions	Ocak başında bunca yıl birlikte halka yapıp oturduğu Got halkı	Böylece Geat halkı, ocak yoldaşları	Artık işe yaramaz hâle gelecek olan beden geride kalırken
11	Their Sorrow for their well-lov'd Lord The Geatic People thus out-poured	Sorrowed for the lord who had been laid low	yasını böyle tuttu ölen Beowulf'un	yitirilen efendileri için yas tuttu	Geat halkı böyle döktü kederini çok sevdikleri efendileri için
12	His Comrades dear, and said that he	They said that of all the kings upon the earth	Dediler ki: Dünya kuruldu kurulu, gelmiş geçmiş kralların içinde	Dediler ki, yeryüzündeki tüm krallar arasında	yakın dostları şöyle dediler
13	Was e'en the gentlest to Mankind	He was the man most gracious	en mantıklı ve en merhametlisiydi o	insanlara karşı en nazik olan oydu	insanlara en nazik davranan oydu
14	The Man of most benignant Mind	and fair-minded	had safhada şefkatliydi halkına	en yumuşak huylu	en iyi huylu adamdı
15	The Prince most to his People kind	Kindest to his people and	—	halkına en cömert davranan	halkına karşı en cömert prensti
16	Most earnest after Worth	keenest to win fame	herkesten çok hevesliydi şöhrete	ve şöhret peşinde en istekli kraldı	ve şan uğruna en istekli olan da oydu

#### 4.2.2. Comparative Textual Analysis

Table 4. Quantitative Findings of the Mourning Passage

Text	Word Count	Clause Density	Ceremonial Tone	Emotional Intensity	Metaphorical Density	Rhythmic Structure
Seamus Heaney	~103	Medium	High	Controlled	High	Medium
A. Diedrich Wackerbarth	~126	High	Very High	High	Very High	High
Nazmi Ağıl	~111	Medium	High	Very High	High	Very High

#### 4.2.3. Meaning Equivalence

The mourning passage narrates the ceremonial grief following Beowulf's death and is structured around collective mourning, heroic memory, kingship, loyalty, and communal remembrance. Although all translations preserve this semantic core, they reconstruct it with different degrees of intensity. Seamus Heaney maintains a balanced and controlled style. Expressions such as "Mourning his loss as a man and a king" emphasize both Beowulf's personal and political identity, presenting his death as both an individual and social loss. A. Diedrich Wackerbarth, however, expands the same semantic field through a more ceremonial and hierarchical discourse. Expressions such as "His Earlship laud, his Valour praise" and "well-lov'd Sovereign" transform Beowulf into an almost sacred ruler figure rather than merely a heroic warrior.

Nazmi Ağıl's Turkish translation generally follows Heaney's semantic structure while considerably intensifying dramatic effect. Expressions such as "gözü peklğini göklere çıkardılar" reconstruct epic praise in a more emotional and oral form than Heaney's "They extolled his heroic nature and exploits." Similarly, "bedeni binasını boşaltacağı zaman" re-poeticizes Heaney's "bodily home" metaphor in Turkish. The ChatGPT translation, by contrast, remains semantically accurate yet more neutral and explanatory. While structures such as "onu hem bir insan hem bir kral olarak andılar" successfully preserve meaning, they lack the rhythmic and dramatic intensity found in Ağıl's translation. Wackerbarth's extended praise structures, including "The gentlest to Mankind" and "most benignant Mind," further intensify ceremonial glorification, a feature similarly preserved in Ağıl's Turkish rendering through expressions such as "en mantıklı ve en merhametlisiydi" and "had safhada şefkatliydi halkına." Overall, Heaney may be described as balanced, Wackerbarth as ceremonial and expansive, Ağıl as dramatizing and re-poeticizing, and ChatGPT as semantically clear and structurally organized.

#### 4.2.4. Style and Tone

The passage establishes an atmosphere of mourning, collective remembrance, and ceremonial respect, although each translation reconstructs this atmosphere differently. Wackerbarth's version demonstrates the heaviest and

most aristocratic tone. Expressions such as “The Troop of Princes,” “well-lov’d Sovereign,” and “Valour praise” strengthen monarchical and ceremonial discourse, causing the text to resemble a formal royal elegy. Long clause structures and dense archaic vocabulary further intensify this atmosphere.

Heaney adopts a more controlled modern epic style. Expressions such as “Chieftain’s sons,” “champions in battle,” and “chanting in dirges” preserve epic solemnity while remaining accessible to modern readers. In Nazmi Ağıl’s translation, however, the tone becomes considerably more emotional and oral-narrative-centered. Expressions such as “ağıtlar yaktılar yana yakıla” culturally evoke not merely mourning, but the performative lament tradition of Turkish oral culture. Likewise, “gözü pekliğini göklere çıkardılar” adapts heroic praise into a style closer to Turkish folk narration. ChatGPT’s translation remains more explanatory and restrained. Although structures such as “Kahramanlığını ve yaptıklarını yücelttiler” preserve semantic content, they reproduce the emotional rhythm and cultural density of Ağıl’s translation less effectively. Consequently, Wackerbarth appears more ceremonial, Heaney more balanced and epic, Ağıl more emotional and oral, and ChatGPT more neutral and explanatory.

#### 4.2.5. Poeticity and Metaphor Transfer

The poeticity of the passage is primarily constructed through mourning rituals, commemorative language, heroic discourse, and metaphors of death. Heaney’s “bodily home” constitutes one of the passage’s most striking metaphors by representing the body as a temporary dwelling. Nazmi Ağıl recreates this metaphor as “bedeni binasını boşaltacağı zaman,” producing a highly poetic structure in Turkish. Although not literal, “beden binası” preserves and intensifies the metaphor, while the verb “boşaltmak” reconstructs death as physical abandonment.

ChatGPT’s “bedensel yurdundan ayrılacağı an” preserves the metaphor semantically but lacks the dramatic and rhythmic density of Ağıl’s translation. Wackerbarth’s poeticity relies more heavily on rhetorical repetition and ceremonial praise. Expressions such as “Valour praise,” “well-lov’d Sovereign,” and “love in Heart” generate a strong elegiac rhythm. Ağıl’s translation, by contrast, reconstructs poeticity through oral and culturally resonant expressions such as “yana yakıla,” “göklere çıkardılar,” and “aziz tutmalı hatırasını.” ChatGPT retains poeticity only partially, adopting a more literal and explanatory structure overall. Therefore, Wackerbarth demonstrates rhetorical and ceremonial poeticity, Heaney controlled modern poeticity, Ağıl dramatic and oral poeticity, and ChatGPT a more limited but semantically preserved poetic style.

#### 4.2.6. Cohesion and Coherence

The passage progresses coherently through the sequence of funeral ritual, lamentation, heroic praise, metaphorical reflection on death, collective mourning, and the enumeration of Beowulf’s virtues. Heaney maintains cohesion through short and balanced clause structures, creating smooth and controlled transitions. Wackerbarth, however, establishes cohesion through rhetorical repetitions and extended clause chains. Expressions such as “His Earliship laud, his Valour praise” increase epic density while simultaneously making the text heavier and more ceremonious.

In Nazmi Ağıl’s translation, cohesion is largely achieved through rhythmic segmentation and oral storytelling structures. Expressions such as “neden dersiniz,” “hem de,” and “Dediler ki” strengthen narrative flow and oral rhythm. ChatGPT demonstrates a considerably stronger explicitation tendency. Logical relations between segments are expressed more directly, increasing readability but simultaneously flattening poetic and elegiac intensity. As a result, the ChatGPT version produces a clearer and more explanatory structure, while reducing the atmospheric and rhythmic complexity characteristic of the human translations.

### 4.3. Human Translation and ChatGPT Comparison

The primary difference between Nazmi Ağıl’s translation and the ChatGPT output emerges in the reconstruction of mourning atmosphere and poetic lamentation. Ağıl creates strong rhythmic flow, oral narrative effect, culturally embedded mourning discourse, and intensified dramatic expression. ChatGPT, by contrast, prioritizes semantic clarity, structural organization, and readability, while reproducing elegiac poeticity more weakly.

For example, “ağıtlar yaktılar yana yakıla” creates a considerably stronger atmosphere of grief than ChatGPT’s “ağıtlar söyleyerek.” Likewise, “bedeni binasını boşaltacağı zaman” possesses far greater poetic and dramatic

intensity than “bedensel yurdundan ayrılacağı an.” These differences demonstrate that human translation possesses a significantly stronger capacity for aesthetic reconstruction and re-poeticization within the target language.

Table 5. The Queen’s Speech Passage – Comparative Textual Analysis

Segment No	Wackerbarth (A. Diedrich)	Heaney (Seamus)	Nazmi Ağıl	ChatGPT (Heaney → TR)	ChatGPT (Wackerbarth → TR)
1	Thus spake the Queen	The queen spoke to Hrothgar	Kraliçe şöyle dedi	Kraliçe Hrothgar’a şöyle dedi	Kraliçe şöyle konuştu
2	“Receive,” said she, “This cup, my Lord, and happy be	“Enjoy this drink, my most generous lord”	“Şerefe cömert efendim”	“İçkinizin tadını çıkarın, ey cömert efendim”	“Bu kadehi kabul edin efendim ve mutlu olun”
3	Gold-prince of Men	Raise up your goblet	kaldırın kadehinizi	kadehinizi kaldırın	Ey insanların altın prensi
4	do thou address, Our Geatic Friend with Gentleness	entertain the Geats Duly and gently, discourse with them	eğlendirin Gotları, usulü gereğince, dostça sohbet edin	Gotları ağırlayın, gerektiği gibi nazıkçe konuşun onlarla	Geat dostlarımıza nazıkçe hitap edin
5	As fits thee well to do	Be open-handed, happy and fond	eli açık davranın sevin ve sevinin, mutlu olun	Cömert olun, neşeli ve dost canlısı davranın	size yakıştığı gibi davranın onlara
6	Be joyous now, and far and near With Gifts their friendly Spirit cheer	Relish their company, but recollect as well	Tadını çıkarın beraberliğin	Berberliklerinin tadını çıkarın	Şimdi sevinçli olun; yakın ve uzak herkesi armağanlarla memnun edin
7	And Amity renew	All of the boons that have been bestowed upon you	ama çıkarmayın hatırlığınızdan getirdikleri onca hediyeyi	fakat unutmayın size sunulan tüm armağanları da	dostluğu yeniden güçlendirin
8	’Tis said this Hero will be styled Henceforth as Thine adopted Child	And now the word is that you want to adopt This warrior as a son	Ve doğruysa şayet, bu savaşçıyı oğul sayacakmışsınız	ve şimdi söylenen odur ki bu savaşçıyı oğlunuz olarak kabul etmek istiyorsunuz	Bu kahramanın artık evlat edinilmiş oğlunuz sayılacağı söyleniyor
9	Now Heorot, the Heroes' hall, Once more is free from Stain	The bright court of Heorot has been cleansed	Heorot şimdi tertemiz	Heorot’un parlak salonu artık temizlenmiştir	Şimdi Heorot, kahramanların salonu, bir kez daha lekeden arınmış durumda
10	Injoy then now the Festival While yet thou may’st	So, while you may, Bask in your fortune	Sefasını sürün öyleyse imkânınız varken	Öyleyse fırsatınız varken talihinizin keyfini sürün	Öyleyse siz hâlâ hayattayken şölenin tadını çıkarın
11	thy People all And this thy fair domain	then bequeath Kingdom and nation to your kith and kin	arkada kalanlara devredin krallığı	sonra da krallığı ve halkınızı akrabalarınıza bırakın	halkınızı ve bu güzel ülkeyi akrabalarınıza bırakın
12	Leave to thy Kin when Heav’n shall call Thee hence to wend again	Before your decease	ecel gelip çatinca da, gitmeden evvel	ölümünüz yaklaşmadan önce	Tanrı sizi çağırdığı zaman

### 4.3.1. Comparative Textual Analysis

Table 6. *Quantitative Findings of the Queen's Speech Passage*

Text	Word Count	Ceremonial Tone	Use of Archaic Vocabulary	Adaptive Reproduction	Poeticity	Cohesion Density
Seamus Heaney	~96	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Controlled
A. Diedrich Wackerbarth	~121	Very High	Very High	Low	High	High
Nazmi Ağıl	~101	High	Low	Very High	Very High	Controlled

### 4.3.2. Meaning Equivalence

The Queen's speech passage is structured around themes of feast culture, diplomacy, kingship, social solidarity, and inheritance transfer. The semantic core centers on the Queen's advice to Hrothgar to maintain the festive atmosphere, treat the Geats generously, adopt the hero as a son, and transfer the kingdom before death. Seamus Heaney preserves this structure through a balanced and controlled style. Expressions such as "Raise up your goblet, entertain the Geats" and "bequeath Kingdom and nation to your kith and kin" clearly convey both ceremonial hospitality and political continuity.

A. Diedrich Wackerbarth expands the same semantic field through a more aristocratic and ceremonial discourse. Expressions such as "Gold-prince of Men" idealize Hrothgar as a sacred ruler figure, while "And Amity renew" extends friendship into the restoration of political harmony. Nazmi Ağıl's Turkish translation largely preserves Heaney's semantic structure while intensifying oral and dramatic effect. "Şerefe cömert efendim" transforms "Enjoy this drink" into a ritualistic expression associated with feast culture, while "Sefasını sürün öyleyse imkânımız varken" produces a stronger emotional intensity than Heaney's "Bask in your fortune."

The ChatGPT translation remains semantically accurate but more explanatory and neutral. For example, "İçkinizin tadını çıkarın" preserves meaning clearly, yet lacks the ceremonial resonance of Ağıl's version. Similarly, Heaney's "you want to adopt this warrior as a son" becomes "bu savaşçıyı oğul sayacaktımsınız" in Ağıl's translation, where "oğul saymak" creates a culturally stronger sense of belonging than ChatGPT's direct and explanatory "oğlunuz olarak kabul etmek istiyorsunuz." Consequently, Heaney appears balanced, Wackerbarth aristocratic and expansive, Ağıl culturally adaptive and dramatizing, and ChatGPT explanatory and semantically oriented.

### 4.3.3. Style and Tone

The overall tone of the passage is diplomatic, ceremonial, and advisory, while simultaneously containing a subtle melancholic atmosphere through references to death and inheritance transfer. Wackerbarth's version demonstrates the heaviest and most aristocratic tone. Expressions such as "Gold-prince of Men," "Amity renew," and "Heav'n shall call" transform the speech into an almost religious and monarchical discourse of counsel.

Heaney adopts a more balanced modern epic style that preserves the feast atmosphere while remaining accessible to modern readers. Expressions such as "Be open-handed, happy and fond" establish a warm and socially inclusive tone. Nazmi Ağıl's translation intensifies this atmosphere through oral rhythm and emotional expression. Structures such as "eli açık davranın sevin ve sevinin, mutlu olun" create a lively ceremonial rhythm in Turkish, while "ecele gelip çatınca da" renders the theme of death in a more dramatic and folkloric way.

ChatGPT's translation remains more explanatory and restrained. Although "Cömert olun, neşeli ve dost canlısı davranın" accurately conveys semantic content, it reproduces the rhythmic and oral qualities of Ağıl's version less successfully. Therefore, Wackerbarth appears aristocratic and ceremonial, Heaney controlled and epic, Ağıl dramatic and oral-centered, and ChatGPT explanatory and neutral in tone.

#### 4.3.4. Poeticity and Metaphor Transfer

The poeticity of the passage is built around feast ritual, kingship, friendship, inheritance, and metaphors of death. Heaney's "Bask in your fortune" creates an abstract metaphor of prosperity and happiness. Nazmi Ağıl translates this as "Sefasını sürün," producing a more culturally grounded and rhythmically natural expression in Turkish. ChatGPT's "talihinizin keyfini sürün" preserves semantic meaning but lacks the same oral and poetic fluency.

Wackerbarth's poeticity relies more heavily on ceremonial and religious metaphors. Expressions such as "Heav'n shall call Thee hence to wend again" represent death through divine calling. Ağıl transforms this into "ecel gelip çatınca da," producing a more culturally familiar and oral-narrative-centered metaphor of death. ChatGPT's "ölümünüz yaklaşmadan önce" remains semantically accurate but considerably weaker in poetic intensity.

Another important metaphor concerns the purification of Heorot. Heaney's "The bright court of Heorot has been cleansed" establishes an image of ceremonial purification. Ağıl's "Heorot şimdi tertemiz" abandons literal structure but preserves poetic rhythm and impact effectively. ChatGPT's "Heorot'un parlak salonu artık temizlenmiştir" adopts a more literal and explanatory form. Overall, Wackerbarth demonstrates ceremonial and religious poeticity, Heaney controlled modern poeticity, Ağıl rhythmic and culturally grounded poeticity, and ChatGPT a more literal and explanatory poetic structure.

#### 4.3.5. Cohesion and Coherence

The passage progresses coherently through the sequence of feast, friendship, gift exchange, adoption, purification of Heorot, death, and inheritance transfer. Heaney maintains cohesion through short and balanced clause structures, producing strong logical continuity. Wackerbarth establishes cohesion through denser rhetorical structures and longer clause chains. Expressions such as "With Gifts their friendly Spirit cheer, And Amity renew" considerably increase clause density and ceremonial rhythm.

In Nazmi Ağıl's translation, cohesion is primarily achieved through rhythmic segmentation and oral storytelling structures. Expressions such as "ama çıkarmayın hatrınızdan," "Ve doğruysa şayet," and "ecel gelip çatınca da" strengthen narrative flow and oral rhythm. ChatGPT demonstrates a stronger explication tendency by constructing clearer clause boundaries and more direct logical relations. Although this structure increases readability, it simultaneously reduces poetic intensity and atmospheric density.

The primary difference between Nazmi Ağıl's translation and the ChatGPT output emerges in the reconstruction of feast atmosphere and cultural poeticity. Ağıl intensifies rhythmic repetition, oral narration, culturally grounded expressions, and dramatic atmosphere, whereas ChatGPT prioritizes semantic clarity, structural organization, and readability.

For example, "Şerefe cömert efendim" creates a significantly stronger ceremonial atmosphere than ChatGPT's "İçkinizin tadını çıkarın." Likewise, "ecel gelip çatınca da" produces a more poetic and culturally resonant representation of death than "ölümünüz yaklaşmadan önce." These differences demonstrate that human translation possesses a considerably stronger capacity for aesthetic reconstruction and re-poeticization within the target language.

## 5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study comparatively examined intralingual and interlingual translation processes through selected passages from the Beowulf epic by analyzing A. Dietrich Wackerbarth's archaic English version, Seamus Heaney's Modern English translation, Nazmi Ağıl's Turkish translation produced directly from Heaney's version, and the Turkish outputs generated by ChatGPT. Through this multilayered corpus structure, the study aimed not only to investigate historical intralingual transformation within English, but also to evaluate the similarities and differences between human and machine translation in literary interlingual translation. The comparative corpus framework further enabled the study to observe how a single literary source text undergoes stylistic, semantic, cultural, and poetic transformation across different translational layers.

The findings demonstrate that literary translation cannot be reduced solely to semantic transfer or lexical equivalence. Particularly in epic and poetic texts, translation involves the reconstruction of rhythm, metaphorical

density, historical atmosphere, emotional intensity, oral narrative effect, and cultural associations. In this respect, the analyses revealed that the principal distinction between human and machine translations emerges not at the level of basic semantic comprehension, but at the level of literary recreation and poetic reconstruction. Machine translations were generally capable of preserving narrative continuity, character relations, and explicit semantic content. However, they remained considerably more limited in reproducing the aesthetic and atmospheric dimensions of the text.

One of the most significant contributions of the study lies in its corpus-based methodological design. Rather than relying solely on impressionistic literary interpretation, the research systematically aligned the selected passages into comparable textual segments, thereby allowing both quantitative and qualitative observations to support one another. The corpus structure enabled the identification of measurable textual patterns such as clause density, syntactic layering, lexical repetition, conjunction usage, metaphorical concentration, explicitation tendencies, and archaic vocabulary density. Consequently, literary and translational differences became observable not only through subjective interpretation, but also through recurring linguistic structures across the corpus.

The quantitative findings particularly demonstrated that human translations generally maintain higher metaphorical density, greater rhythmic variation, and stronger stylistic differentiation than machine-generated translations. Machine translation outputs, by contrast, showed a tendency toward syntactic regularization, semantic clarification, and structural standardization. In other words, corpus evidence revealed that artificial intelligence systems frequently reduce textual ambiguity and poetic indeterminacy in favor of readability and semantic transparency. This tendency was especially visible in passages involving ritualistic discourse, metaphoric imagery, and emotional intensity.

The findings concerning Wackerbarth's translation reveal a deliberate archaization strategy characterized by high clause density, rhetorical accumulation, ceremonial discourse, and historically marked vocabulary. Expressions such as "Death-spirit," "Gold-prince of Men," and "Heav'n shall call" reconstruct the epic atmosphere through elevated diction and religiously inflected imagery. While this strategy successfully preserves historical distance and heroic solemnity, it simultaneously reduces accessibility for modern readers. The corpus findings further showed that Wackerbarth's translation possesses the highest level of syntactic complexity and archaic lexical concentration among all analyzed texts. Thus, his version prioritizes historical and ceremonial authenticity over readability.

Heaney's translation, by contrast, demonstrates a strategy of controlled modernization. Rather than radically simplifying the text, Heaney reconstructs the epic atmosphere through accessible yet poetically dense modern English. The analyses indicate that Heaney successfully balances readability with literary preservation. Expressions such as "dark death-shadow," "misty moors," and "chanting in dirges" preserve metaphorical and atmospheric density while remaining comprehensible for contemporary audiences. From a corpus perspective, Heaney's translation occupies a middle position between historical preservation and modern narrative accessibility. This balance likely explains why his version became one of the most influential modern renderings of *Beowulf*.

Nazmi Ağıl's Turkish translations constitute one of the most remarkable findings of the study. Although Ağıl's translations are directly based on Heaney's version rather than the Old English original, the analyses demonstrate that his translations function not merely as derivative transfer products, but as independent literary recreations in Turkish. Ağıl reconstructs poetic rhythm, oral narrative effect, emotional atmosphere, and epic discourse through culturally resonant target-language structures. Expressions such as "Hüzünlü türküler yakıldı," "gözü dönmüş, ölümcül gölge," "ecel gelip çattınca da," and "bedeni binasını boşaltacağı zaman" illustrate a clear tendency toward re-poeticization and adaptive literary reconstruction.

The analyses further indicate that Ağıl frequently prioritizes oral fluency, rhythmic segmentation, and emotional intensity over strict lexical equivalence. This strategy enables the Turkish translations to preserve the performative and communal atmosphere characteristic of epic narration. In several passages, Ağıl's translations intensify emotional and cultural resonance beyond the semantic level found in the source text. Consequently, the study demonstrates that literary translation may function as a creative act of reconstruction rather than a merely linguistic operation.

The machine translation findings reveal a substantially different translational tendency. Both ChatGPT generally produced semantically coherent and grammatically organized outputs. Narrative progression, character relations, and direct semantic meanings were largely preserved across passages. Nevertheless, the analyses revealed that

machine translation systems consistently display explicitation tendencies consistent with Shoshana Blum-Kulka's explicitation hypothesis. Ambiguous, symbolic, and rhythmically dense structures were repeatedly transformed into more direct, explanatory, and syntactically regular discourse patterns.

Although this tendency increases readability and semantic clarity, it simultaneously reduces poetic ambiguity, metaphorical layering, and atmospheric depth. For example, culturally and emotionally charged expressions such as "Şerefe cömert efendim" or "cehennem firarisi bu ifritler" were often replaced by more semantically transparent but aesthetically weaker structures in machine-generated outputs. Similarly, poetic metaphors such as "bodily home" or "Bask in your fortune" were generally translated into more literal and explanatory forms. The corpus findings therefore indicate that machine translation systems prioritize semantic stability and structural coherence over aesthetic and cultural reconstruction.

Another important finding concerns the neutralization of stylistic and historical distinctions by machine translation systems. The corpus comparisons demonstrated that rhetorical and archaic density characteristic of Wackerbarth's translation becomes considerably flattened in machine-generated Turkish outputs. Heaney's more modern and syntactically accessible style, however, was transferred more successfully due to its relatively controlled linguistic structure. Even so, machine translations of Heaney's text still demonstrated reductions in rhythmic variation, oral narrative effect, and metaphorical intensity. This suggests that artificial intelligence systems currently process literary texts primarily as semantic information structures rather than as multilayered aesthetic compositions.

The Grendel, mourning, and Queen's speech passages collectively reinforced these findings. In the Grendel passage, human translations preserved the oppressive and mythological atmosphere more effectively through metaphorical density and oral rhythm. In the mourning passage, elegiac tone and communal grief were reconstructed more successfully through rhythmic repetition and ceremonial language. In the Queen's speech passage, feast culture, diplomatic discourse, and ritualistic atmosphere were rendered more dynamically in human translations than in machine-generated outputs. Across all passages, human translators demonstrated a greater capacity for adaptive reproduction, cultural contextualization, and aesthetic recreation.

Ultimately, this study demonstrates that contemporary artificial intelligence-based machine translation systems can produce relatively successful semantic transfer in literary texts; however, they remain considerably more limited than human translators in reproducing the poetic, historical, cultural, and atmospheric dimensions of epic literature. Literary translation involves not only transferring information, but also reconstructing rhythm, voice, symbolism, emotional resonance, and cultural memory within the target language. The corpus-based methodology employed in this study proved highly effective in revealing these distinctions systematically through measurable textual evidence rather than solely impressionistic interpretation.

In this respect, the study contributes simultaneously to corpus-based translation studies, intralingual translation research, literary translation criticism, and ongoing discussions concerning the role of artificial intelligence in literary translation. Furthermore, the findings suggest that machine translation may function effectively as a supportive or preliminary tool in literary translation processes, particularly for semantic transfer and structural organization. Nevertheless, the recreation of poetic atmosphere, metaphorical depth, oral rhythm, and culturally embedded literary expression still depends heavily on human interpretive and creative capacity.

## References

- Ağıl, N. (Çev.). (2018). *Beowulf* (S. Heaney, Trans.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Aitchison, J. (2012). *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Algeo, J. & Butcher, C. A. (2013). *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. 7th ed. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Algeo, J., & Butcher, C. A. (2013). *Problems in the Origins and Development of the English Language*. Cengage Learning.
- Baker, M. (1995). Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research. In G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 223–243). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barber, C., Beal, J. C., & Shaw, P. A. (2009). *The English Language: A Historical Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Bately, J. (1980). Old English prose before and during the reign of Alfred. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 17, 93–138.
- Baugh, A. C., & Cable, T. (2013). *A History of the English Language* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Bjork, R. E. (1993). *The Transmission of Beowulf: Language, Culture, and Text*. Cornell University Press.
- Bjork, R. E., & Niles, J. D. (Eds.). (1997). *Beowulf handbook*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication* (pp. 17–35). Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Bliss, A. J. (1967). *The metre of Beowulf*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Bradley, S. A. J. (1997). *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: An Anthology of Old English Poems in Prose Translation*. Dent.
- Calder, D. G. (1979). *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*. NYU Press.
- Chickering, H. D. (2006). *Beowulf: A dual-language edition*. Anchor Books.
- Clemons, P. (1988). *Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crossley-Holland, K. (2000). *The Anglo-Saxon World: An Anthology*. Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2005). *The stories of English*. Overlook Press.
- Crystal, D. (2006). *The Stories of English*. Penguin Books.
- Crystal, D., & Crystal, B. (2002). *Shakespeare's words: A glossary and language companion*. Penguin Books.

- Damico, H. (1993). *Beowulf's Wealththeow and the Valkyrie Tradition*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Davies, M. (2002). The corpus of historical American English: A tutorial. *Educause Quarterly*, 25 (4), 27-31.
- Fischer, O. (2000). Syntax. In R. M. Hogg (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language* (Vol. 1, pp. 207-408). Cambridge University Press.
- Fletcher, A. (1998). *Who's Who in Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon England*. Shephard-Walwyn.
- Foley, J. M. (1990). *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. University of California Press.
- Forcada, M. L. (2017). Making sense of neural machine translation. *Translation Spaces*, 6(2), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.6.2.04for>
- Frank, R. (2002). *The Beowulf Poet and His Real Monsters*. Medieval Academy of America.
- Fulk, R. D. (2012). *A history of Old English meter*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fulk, R. D., Bjork, R. E., & Niles, J. D. (2008). *Klaeber's Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburg*. University of Toronto Press.
- Garcia, I., & Pena, M. I. (2011). Machine translation-assisted literary post-editing: A new role for literary translators? *Translating and Interpreting*, 3(1), 1–15.
- Godden, M. (1994). *Literature, Learning and Language in the Later Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goossens, L. (1992). *The auxiliarization of the English modals: A functional grammar view*. In M. Rissanen, O. Ihalainen, T. Nevalainen, & I. Taavitsainen (Eds.), *History of Englishes: New methods and interpretations in historical linguistics* (pp. 111-143). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Görlach, M. (1991). *Introduction to Early Modern English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Greenfield, S. B. (2003). *A Critical History of Old English Literature*. NYU Press.
- Gwara, S. (2005). *Heroic identity in the world of Beowulf*. Brill.
- Healey, A. D. (1984). Old English glossaries: Contexts and contents. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 13, 99-109.
- Healey, A. D., & Venezky, R. L. (1980). *A microfiche concordance to Old English*. University of Toronto Press.
- Heaney, S. (1999). *Beowulf: A new verse translation*. Faber & Faber.
- Heaney, S. (2000). *Beowulf: A New Verse Translation*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York.
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (1992). *Thinking translation: A course in translation method – French to English*. Routledge.
- Hieatt, C. B. (1976). *Beowulf and Other Old English Poems*. Bantam Books.

- Hogg, R. M., & Denison, D. (Eds.). (2006). *A history of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Huppé, B. F. (1969). *The Web of Words: Structural Analyses of the Old English Poems*. State University of New York Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On translation* (pp. 232–239). Harvard University Press.
- Jones, C. (2001). *Old English Literature and Its Contexts*. Routledge.
- Jones, F. R. (2011). *Poetry translating as expert action: Processes, priorities and networks*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Juola, P., & Baayen, R. H. (2005). A controlled-corpus experiment in authorship attribution by cross-entropy. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 20 (2), 139-165.
- O'Brien O'Keefe, K. (1990). *Visible song: Transitional literacy in Old English verse*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kastovsky, D. (1992). *Historical English syntax*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kastovsky, D. (1992). Semantics and vocabulary. In R. M. Hogg (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language: Vol. 1. The beginnings to 1066* (pp. 290–408). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Keynes, S., & Lapidge, M. (Eds.). (1983). *Alfred the Great: Asser's life of King Alfred and other contemporary sources*. Penguin UK.
- Kiernan, K. (1981). *Beowulf and the Beowulf Manuscript*. Rutgers University Press.
- Koehn, P. (2020). *Neural machine translation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kohnen, T. (2000). *On the syntax of Old English directives*. In I. Taavitsainen & A. H. Jucker (Eds.), *Diachronic perspectives on address term systems* (pp. 17-34). John Benjamins.
- Krapp, G. P., & Dobbie, E. V. K. (Eds.). (1931-1953). *The Anglo-Saxon poetic records: A collective edition*. Columbia University Press.
- Lapidge, M. (2000). *The Anglo-Saxon Library*. Oxford University Press.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translating literature: Practice and theory in a comparative literature context*. Modern Language Association of America.
- Lenker, U. (2010). Discourse markers in early English. In A. Meurman-Solin, M. J. López-Couso, & B. Los (Eds.), *Information structure and syntactic change in the history of English* (pp. 223-249). Oxford University Press.
- Liuzza, R. M. (2011). *Beowulf: A new translation and commentary*. Broadview Press.
- Lutz, A. (1997). *The pragmatics of personal pronouns in Old English*. John Benjamins.
- Magennis, H. (2006). *Images of Community in Old English Poetry*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mahrt, M., & Risselada, R. (2016). Teaching digital humanities through text analysis: Reflections on the theory and practice of corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS). In *Digital humanities pedagogy* (pp. 243-262). Open Book Publishers.
- Mitchell, B. (1985). *Old English syntax* (Vols. 1-2). Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, B., & Robinson, F. C. (Eds.). (2018). *Beowulf*. Yale University Press.

- Mossé, F. (1952). *A handbook of Middle English*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.).  
Routledge.
- Neidorf, L. A. (2017). *The dating of Beowulf: A reassessment*. Cambridge, England: D.  
S. Brewer.
- Nevalainen, T. (2006). *An Introduction to Early Modern English*. Edinburgh University  
Press.
- Nevalainen, T., & Raumolin-Brunberg, H. (2003). *Historical sociolinguistics: Language  
change in Tudor and Stuart England*. Longman.
- Neville, J. (2009). *Representations of the Natural World in Old English Poetry*. Cambridge  
University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles  
and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*.  
St. Jerome Publishing.
- O'Hagan, M. (2016). *The Routledge handbook of translation and technology*. Routledge.
- Orchard, A. (2003). *Pride and prodigies: Studies in the monsters of the Beowulf-manuscript*  
(Rev. ed.). University of Toronto Press.
- OpenAI. (2025). *ChatGPT (GPT-5.5)* [Large language model]. <https://chat.openai.com/>
- Orchard, A. (2007). *A Critical Companion to Beowulf*. D.S. Brewer.
- Pintzuk, S. (1999). *Phrase structures in competition: Variation and change in Old English  
word order*. Garland Publishing.
- Pulsiano, P. (1999). *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and Their Heritage*. Ashgate.
- Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring translation theories* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Reiss, K. (1971). *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik*. Hueber.
- Reiss, K., & Vermeer, H. J. (1984). *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*.  
Niemeyer.
- Rissanen, M. (1991). *On the history of conjunctions in English*. In D. Kastovsky (Ed.),  
Historical English syntax (pp. 291-314). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, J., & Kay, C. (2000). *A thesaurus of Old English*. Rodopi.
- Robinson, F. C. (1995). *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*. Cambridge  
University Press.
- Scragg, D. G. (1991). *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons*. Cambridge University  
Press.

- Shippey, T. A. (1992). *The Road to Middle-Earth: How J.R.R. Tolkien Created a New Mythology*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Smith, J. (2009). *Language contact and syntactic change in the history of English*. In A. Bergs & L. Brinton (Eds.), *Historical linguistics of English* (pp. 334-362). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stanley, E. G. (1982). *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism*. D.S. Brewer.
- Swain, L. J. (Ed.). (2018). *Teaching Beowulf*. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press.
- Swanton, M. (1985). *English Literature before Chaucer*. Longman.
- Swanton, M. J. (Ed.). (2000). *The Anglo-Saxon chronicles*. Routledge.
- Taylor, A., Warner, A., Pintzuk, S., & Beths, F. (2003). *The York-Toronto-Helsinki parsed corpus of Old English prose*. University of York.
- Toral, A., & Way, A. (2018). What level of quality can neural machine translation attain on literary text? In J. Moorkens, S. Castilho, F. Gaspari, & S. Doherty (Eds.), *Translation quality assessment* (pp. 263–287). Springer.
- Traugott, E. C. (1992). Syntax. In R. M. Hogg (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language* (Vol. 1, pp. 168-289). Cambridge University Press.
- Treharne, E. (2005). *Writing Gender and Genre in Medieval Literature: Approaches to Old and Middle English Texts*. D.S. Brewer.
- Van Kemenade, A. (1987). *Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.
- Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager & M. J. Hamel, Trans.). John Benjamins. (Original work published 1958)
- Wackerbarth, A. D. (1849). *Beowulf: An Anglo-Saxon poem, and the Fight at Finnsburg*. William Pickering.
- Wolf, R. E. (1986). *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages*. Clarendon Press.
- Zethsen, K. K. (2009). Intralingual translation: An attempt at description. *Meta*, 54(4), 795–812.