A *UTOPIAN* JOURNEY IN TURKISH:

FROM NON-TRANSLATION TO RETRANSLATION

CEYDA ELGÜL

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2011

A *UTOPIAN* JOURNEY IN TURKISH:

FROM NON-TRANSLATION TO RETRANSLATION

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Translation

by

Ceyda Elgül

Boğaziçi University

2011

Thesis Abstract

Ceyda Elgül, "A *Utopian* Journey in Turkish: From Non-Translation to Retranslation"

This study explores the role of translation in the evolution of new contexts for foreign works. It classifies non-translation, initial translation and retranslation as the three existential forms in which translation appears and proposes that each of these forms attributes the foreign work a different translational context. Benefiting from the favorable grounds provided by the journey of Thomas More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system, this diachronic study embraces the pre- and post-translation periods synchronously with the period in which the translation first appeared.The study firstly investigates *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system as a work that appeared in the form of non-translation in the period between the Tanzimat and 1964 and questions what type of a culture repertoire this non-translation contributed to. Then, it focuses on the initial translation and seeks a position for this first translation in the context of the 1960s, referring to the social dynamics of the period in which the translation first appeared after a long phase of resistance. Here, the study touches on the agency factor and explores the historical significance of the first translation in relation to the external factors that concern the agents of the translation. Following the initial translation, which is still in print today, *Utopia* has been introduced to the Turkish literary system sixteen times and has met the expectations of various reader groups. Focusing on two of these representations of the work, the study explores the contexts drawn for *Utopia* by the retranslations within a framework that includes ideology, agency and readership. Through the analysis of this long translational journey which started in the Tanzimat Period and is still in progress, the study reveals that a number of contexts for a single literary work might appear via translation, which helps the work serve different -even opposing- ideological purposes, and that these contexts simultaneously sustain their existence in the receiving literary repertoire.

Tez Özeti

Ceyda Elgül, "Türkçede Ütopik bir Serüven: Yok Çeviriden Yeniden Çeviriye"

Bu çalışma, yabancı eserler için edebi dizgelerde yeni bağlamlar oluşmasında çevirinin rolünü incelemektedir. Yok çeviri [non-translation], ilk çeviri ve yeniden çeviri, çevirinin belirdiği üç varoluşsal biçim olarak sınıflandırılmaktadır ve bu biçimlerden her birinin yabancı esere farklı çeviri bağlamları atfettiği öne sürülmektedir. Thomas More'un eseri *Ütopya*'nın Türkçedeki serüveninin hazırladığı elverişli zeminden faydalanan bu artzamanlı çalışma, çevirinin ilk ortaya çıktığı dönemin yanı sıra, çeviri öncesi ve sonrası dönemleri de ele alır. Öncelikle, Türk edebi dizgesinde Tanzimat ve 1964 arası dönemde yok çeviri [non-translation] biçiminde beliren *Ütopya*'nın konumu araştırılır ve bu yok çevirinin nasıl bir kültür repertuarına katkıda bulunduğu sorgulanır. Ardından ilk çeviriye odaklanılır ve uzun bir mukavement [resistance] süreci sonrası çevirinin ortaya çıktığı dönemin toplumsal dinamiklerine değinilerek, bu ilk çeviri 60'lar bağlamında konumlandırılır. Bu noktada, aktör [agency] kavramına değinilir ve çeviri aktörlerini ilgilendiren dışsal unsurlar göz önüne alınarak ilk çevirinin tarihsel önemi araştırılır. Günümüzde hâlâ yayınlanmakta olan ilk çeviriyi takiben, *Ütopya* Türk edebi sistemine on altı kez sunulmuş, farklı okur topluluklarının beklentilerini karşılamıştır. Tezde bu temsillerden iki tanesi ele alınır ve yeniden çevirilerin *Ütopya* için oluşturduğu bağlamlar ideoloji, çeviri aktörleri ve okur kavramları çerçevesinde incelenir. Çalışma, Tanzimat'ta başlayıp günümüzde hâlâ devam etmekte olan bu uzun çeviri serüvenini inceleyerek, bir edebiyat eserine çeviri yoluyla nasıl birçok bağlam atfedilebileceğini, eserin nasıl farklı, hatta birbirine muhalif ideolojik amaçlara hizmet ettirilebileceğini ve bu bağlamların erek edebi repertuarda nasıl eşzamanlı olarak varlığını sürdürebileceğini ortaya koyar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

Tables

INTRODUCTION

This study pertains to the variety of translational contexts of Thomas More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system. It mainly focuses on the reasons behind the emergence of these contexts in which the work has appeared in three different translational forms, i.e. non-translation, translation and retranslation. In this way, the descriptive analysis proposed by this research might be regarded as a point of departure for further diachronic studies that encompass the pre-translation period (non-translation) and post-translation period (retranslation)[1] of the translation product synchronously with its initial translation.

The history of Thomas More`s *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system is quite interesting and lends itself to study through recent approaches in Translation Studies. The first translation of the work conducted by Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Mina Urgan and Vedat Günyol and published in 1964, has come out under three different publishing houses in the last five decades. The frequency of the re-editions of this particular translation reveals the ongoing canonicity of the work in the Turkish literary system. As for the retranslations, there are sixteen cases, the last three of which appeared in less than a year. All these make one question what sustains the popularity of the text within the publishing circle. It is well-known that *Utopia* is among the works in which the basic concerns of political science, philosophy and literature intersect; therefore, in terms of market conditions, one translation has the potential of being purchased by a great number of readers of varying interests. However, the

---

[1] One might as well use the term post-translation period to refer to the period after the last translation of a particular work appears. In this study, however, post-translation period refers to the period that proceeds the initial translation and encompasses the period in which retranslations appear.

everlasting canonicity that arises from the rich historical, ideological and literary background *Utopia* represents and the large and divergent sales potential it possesses would not alone explain the abundance in retranslations of *Utopia*. This study focuses on the target system that has imported the text multiple times after a long while of non-translation, which I would like to associate with the concept of resistance. It argues that the reasons for both the resistance and the ultimate imports of the work are in close relation to factors of space, time and agency.

To introduce *Utopia* and Thomas More briefly, the source text under focus evolved in a critical time period which involves such major historical events as the spread of humanism, the birth of reform and the establishment of the Anglican Church. Thomas More, a Catholic involved in tradition and ethics, describes an ideal land called Utopia in the book. Through this fictional depiction, he criticizes the historical matters enumerated above. However, *Utopia* has mostly been set apart from the other critical treatises of its time. The peculiar blend of More's scholarly genius and satirist character, combined with the high level of intertextuality the work employs, attributes the work a great deal of literary value. This is why *Utopia* by Thomas More is classified among the world classics today, not only in its message but also in the literariness and the fictional value it possesses.

It is generally acknowledged that More's *Utopia* initiated a new genre in literature. Thus, it occupies a remarkable position in literary history. The authors that employ this new genre in their prose explain their ideal way of life through depicting an illusionary land. The history of Western utopian literature reveals that the utopias that date after More's *Utopia* add a scientific dimension to this literary tradition of

subjective hypothetical depiction (Kılıç, "Cumhuriyet Dönemi", 23).[2] These later

works, such as Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Tommaso Campanella's *The City of

the Sun* and Johannes Valentinus Andreae's *Christianopolis,* employ the enlightened

man's ideals among their major themes; therefore, they might be regarded as more

dependent on rationalism, rather than tradition and ethics. Thus, compared to More's

Utopians who conduct a relatively primitive way of life, the societies depicted in

these works might be regarded as markedly civilized, individualistic and modern.

Most literary sources agree that the penetration of the genre of utopia into the

Turkish literary system occurred in the second half of the nineteenth century, during

the Tanzimat Period.[3] As could be inferred from the previous paragraph, by the time

the Turkish literary system imported the concept of utopia, the utopian way of

thought proposed by More's *Utopia* had already been developed via various

historical factors, mainly the Enlightenment, the French Revolution and the

Industrial Revolution. This spatial and temporal gap between the first publication of

Utopia and the first echoes of *Utopia* encountered in the Turkish context might be

---

[2] In her MA thesis titled "1980-2005 Dönemi Türk Edebiyatında Ütopik Romanlar ve Ütopyanın Kurgusu" (Utopian Novels and the Construction of Utopia in Turkish Literature between 1980-2005), Yasemin Küçükcoşkun bears the employment of religious themes in the first examples of the utopian genre in mind and makes a similar distinction between classical utopias and the utopias of the enlightened man. Küçükcoşkun categorizes the utopias preceding the eighteenth century as "the first term utopias" or "classic utopias". As will be explained in the first chapter of the thesis in more detail, *Utopia* is among the examples of the first categorization which represents a more autoritarian and religious image under the influence of the hierarchical structure of Christianity (13).

[3] These sources include Kılıç "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e", Kılıç "Cumhuriyet Dönemi", Yalçınkaya, and Küçükcoşkun. Besides these works, there are sources that reject both the date of this introduction of utopia in Turkish literature and the direction of the penetration from West to East. Sadık Usta regards utopic way of thought as a universal ability and proposes that there existed Turkish utopias even before More's *Utopia* (Usta, "Türkiye Devrimi", 11). Ahmet Sait Akçay, on the other hand, introduces another view that regards Eastern Utopias and Western Utopias as separate beings, the former being more holistic and individual, and the latter being more rational and social. I believe that the assertions in this study do not conflict with Akçay's way of thought, in that they disregard neither literature classified as Eastern utopias nor pre-Tanzimat literature based on dream fiction. As Metin Kayahan Özgül also reveals in his book on dream fiction in Turkish literature, the holistic and individual dreams of the Ottoman authors might have been transformed into social and political ones with the decline of the Ottoman rule and the rise of the Westernization movement (12). Overall, the present thesis does not disregard these different ways of thought on the concept of utopia, however, as its main focus is a piece of Western work, it defines the notion of utopia in light of the utopia represented by More and the literary convention following his work.

regarded among the reasons why one cannot see an exact correspondence between *Utopia* and the Turkish utopias, whereas the one between François Rabelais's *Gargantua* and More's *Utopia* is more apparent in many respects.[4] When it comes to comparing *Utopia* with its Turkish successors, on the other hand, there is always some theme (or element) added or excluded, which results from the historical contexts and the literary conventions the works evolved out of.

This study does not disregard the fact that the Eastern utopian way of thought and the Turkish literary conventions that might correspond to the genre of utopia existed long before; however, as the focus of the study is the literary convention initiated by More's *Utopia*, it takes as its point of departure the period in which this Western literary convention penetrated into the Turkish literary system, that dates back to the Tanzimat Period. Here, the context of the non-translation of More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system will be explored by looking at the translated and indigenous literary works that could be classified under the genre of utopia, as well as the other works by the agents that recontextualized this new literary convention in the Turkish literary system.

Utopias are the works that directly mirror the social dynamics of their periods and the period between the nineteenth century and the 1960s is a relatively large one that includes a number of grand ideological shifts in recent Turkish history. Therefore, the study categorizes its scope into three periods, namely Tanzimat and the early twentieth century, between 1923 and the 1940s, and between the 1940s and 1964. Each period is explored *vis-à-vis* the three sub-repertoires they gave rise to. The first sub-repertoire is the repertoire of the literary utopias that refer to indigenous

---

[4] Kirsti Sellevold mentions the French context *Utopia* has been posited into and cites sixteenth century French works of literature that closely correspond to More's *Utopia,* such as Rabelais's *Pantagrue*l (1532) and *Gargantua* (1534), Geoffroy Tory's *Champ Fleury* (1529) and Barthelemy Aneau's *Alector* (1560). (67-68)

literary works produced by Turkish authors before the initial translation of the work in 1964. The second sub-repertoire is the repertoire of translated utopias that are mainly the translations of the works that fall under the category of the genre of utopia. And the third one is the repertoire of non-translated utopias which are the literary utopias that were not introduced to the Turkish literary system. Chapter Three will focus on the interrelations between these three repertoires in each period and derive out some assumptions related to the non-translation of More's *Utopia* until 1964.

In the nineteenth century, the genre of utopia initiated its journey in the Turkish literary system as a means of proposing some ideology against an autocratic rule in the form of relatively short fictional narratives. The establishment of a Western and a modern way of life was a common theme of nineteenth century Turkish utopias and these works included a critique of the nineteenth century Ottoman rule. At the time, translations of some works that carry utopian features had already been published and nineteenth century Turkish authors might have been influenced by these translations, or by their originals, while writing their own utopias. On the other hand, a bibliographical research reveals that none of the canonical pieces of utopian literature were translated in the nineteenth century, although a correspondence between these works which were not translated and the early examples of Turkish utopias is observed, particularly in terms of their fictional character and the directness of social criticism they exercised. Here, the way in which the authors chose to reflect the influence of utopian thought on their original writing rather than translating these works constitutes an exception to the more common way foreign ideas and genres enter a given cultural system.

As for the beginning of the twentieth century, an increase in the number of Turkish utopias is observed. While proposing their critical attitude, early twentieth century Turkish utopias displayed a high variety in their content, some foregrounded the nationalist ideal and foreshadowed the establishment of a modern Turkish republic, whereas some promoted the Islamic ideal and proposed a revival of the Ottoman. Therefore, the rebellious attitude adopted by these works might be regarded as the only common feature they shared since in principle they all belonged to different social and political standpoints and proposed solutions that would serve their own discourse worlds.

With the establishment of the Turkish Republic, a shift in the literary convention of writing utopias occurs. In contrast to its critical (and even anarchist) origin, Turkish utopias started to impose the state's dominant ideology, rather than proposing an alternative for the existing system. This might owe to the fact that almost all nineteenth century revolutionary utopian thoughts were actualized with the rise of the Turkish Republic[5] and this time Turkish utopias started to propose a further hypothesis as to what would happen if the society kept up this progress, which corresponded with the progressive view of a westernized Kemalist Republic.

The same type of correspondence between the state ideology and the translated works which were included in a government initiative after the First National Publishing Congress of 1939 is also observed. With the gradual evolution of Turkish Humanism and the ensuing translation movement under the auspices of the

---

[5] In his article "Türkiye Devrimi'nin Ütopyaları" (Utopias of Turkish Revolution), Sadık Usta touches on this point with these words:
"When analyzed, it is seen that all reforms, political discussions and social projects that were foreseen in the Republican era have been verbalized by the utopias written in the past century. These projections in the utopias firstly searched for a dreamy land for themselves but later, as in the novel Ankara, reached a happy end with the Republic." (Usta, "Türkiye Devrimi", 9)
[İncelendiğinde görülecektir ki Cumhuriyet döneminde gerçekleştirilen bütün devrimler, siyasi tartışmalar ve öngörülen toplumsal projelerin tamamı son yüz yılda yazılan ütopyalarda birebir dile gelmişler. Ütopyalardaki bu öngörüler kendilerine önce hayal-i mekanlar aramışlar ama sonra Ankara romanında olduğu gibi Cumhuriyetle birlikte mutlu bir sona varmışlar. (Usta, "Türkiye Devrimi", 9)]

Translation Bureau that is closely related to this new perspective supported by the state, More's *Utopia* was included in the translation lists of the Bureau first in 1943, then in 1947. Thus one might regard this humanist, outward-looking and West-oriented view- though bound by state ideology- as a favourable context for the introduction of *Utopia* into the Turkish literary system. However, like a number of other works in these lists, the plan was not realized and the translation of *Utopia* did not come out as a product of this particular translation movement. Thus the first translation of *Utopia* did not appear in the particular context of the Translation Bureau, although the translation was done by agents that "carried the mission and activities of the Translation Bureau into the private sector" (Tahir Gürçağlar, "Presumed Innocent", 48).

An interesting finding regarding the relationship between *Utopia* and the Translation Bureau is a partial translation of the work which appeared in the Bureau's journal *Tercüme* in 1943. This translation can be considered a product of the context of Turkish Humanism which the Bureau was keen to promote and maintain (Tahir Gürçağlar, The Politics, 71-72). However, it offered merely one section of the work with a three-paragraph introduction and included a number of negative shifts[6] bringing out potential misunderstandings. Therefore, this study regards this early partial translation of *Utopia* within the context of non-translation and as an experimental translation attempt which fails to create a holistic impression about the work and in the proceeding parts of the study, 1964 translation will be referred as the first translation.

---

[6] The term "negative shif" refers to Popovic's theory on translational shifts which defines five different types of shifts, namely the "constitutive shift", the "generic shift", the "individual shift", the "negative shift" and the "topical shift". Here, the forth categorization, "negative shift", simply refers to translations that bring about misunderstandings (Popovic, A Dictionary).

The 1960s are important years for Turkish translation history in which radical

shifts in translational habits occurred in an enlivened and diversified publishing

sector. Just as the enthusiasm brought by Translation Bureau was thought to have

lost its initial impetus after the 1940s, the 1961 Constitution brought the scene a new

type of ambition for translators with the greater freedom of thought it offered. As a

major trigger for translating and publishing canonical texts of the leftist thought, the

constitution provided the intellectuals of the time with appropriate grounds to

establish publishing houses which were to introduce readable versions of these leftist

classics to the reading public in Turkish (Paker 579; Ünal 33-44). Established in

1959 by Vedat Günyol, Çan Yayınları might be regarded among the publishing

houses which offered alternative ways of thinking to the Turkish literary system as a

publishing policy. However, as seen in the selection of the works published by Çan

Yayınları in the 1960s, the attitude of both the translators and the publishing house

distinguish Çan Yayınları from the vulgar-Marxist or social realist attitude displayed

by other publishing houses which were involved in the translation of leftist works,

such as Ant Yayınları, Bilim ve Sosyalizm Yayınları, Ekim Yayınevi, Gün Yayınları,

Payel Yayınevi, Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık Yayınları, Ser Yayınları, Sol/Onur

Yayınları and Sosyal Yayınlar.[7] It can be safely argued that via Çan Yayınları,

Sabahattin Eyüboğlu and Vedat Günyol, its founders and translators, sustained the

humanist convention they had once been a part of during their involvement with the

Translation Bureau, and by doing so, they continued fulfilling their mission of

---

[7] In his thesis on the translations of the leftist books into Turkish between 1960-1971, Erkal Ünal lists
thirty three publishing houses that puslished the translations of the leftist non-fiction together with the
works they published (145-163). The examples are taken from his list. The reason why I have chosen
these nine publishing houses while exemplifying the publishing houses that adopted a leftist
publishing policy is that they reveal the most distinctive attitude through publishing the works of Mao,
Lenin, Stalin, Che, Fidel Castro and Marx. Whereas, Çan Yayınları is included in Ünal's list for
publishing the works of Sartre, Brecht, Dewey, Russel and Babeuf. The thesis will touch on the
difference in these two types of repertoires in Chapter Four in detail while explicating the position of
Çan Yayınları and its translators within the context of the 1960s.

constructing a literary canon for the Turkish literary system rather than defining their position as leftist.

In addition to the Turkish Humanist context behind the scene that sets the translations published by Çan Yayınları apart from those of other publishing houses established right after the 1961 Consitution, it should be noted that the first translation of *Utopia* was a collaborative product like many other translations conducted by Eyüboğlu and Günyol at the time. Collaborative translation, or *imece* as they called it, might be regarded as a signature for the humanist attitude they started to convey via Anatolian Humanism, which is another context to be explored while defining the position of the first translation of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system. This social movement has its roots back in Village Institutes and People's Houses and it is among the major populist events of Turkish history as it will be explored in Chapter Four (Yalçınkaya 221). Thus, all these historical movements the translators were involved in help complement the context of the 1964 translation of *Utopia*.

As for the position the translators assumed, despite the environment of equality and collaboration triggered by the movement of Anatolian Humanism and by the particular concept of *imece* introduced, it might be asserted that these intellectuals adopted the vision of enlightening the mature young generation that was once detached from its historical roots and regarded themselves as the teachers of the Turkish society. And when we consider the repertoire which was constructed by first the Translation Bureau, then Çan Yayınları, it becomes clear that the 1964 translation of More's *Utopia* into Turkish embraces the reinforcement of a world-view pertaining to the particular humanism the translators were the proponents of and the

discursive practices[8] related to this world-view. In this respect, here, the act of translation becomes a means of both preserving the position the translators once assigned to themselves as cultural entrepreneurs and strengthening their symbolic capital which had started to be developed back in the 1930s (Even-Zohar, Papers, 195; Inghilleri 280).

Published by Çan Yayınları, Cem Yayınları and İş Kültür Yayınları respectively, *Utopia* translated by Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan has been published thirteen times in the last forty five years. These reeditions reveal slight differences in the main text; their page numbers differ according to the additions and omissions in the preface. In 1984, Mina Urgan extended the preface of 1964, which Adam Yayınları published as a separate book titled *Edebiyatta Ütopya Kavramı ve Thomas More* (The Concept of Utopia in Literature and Thomas More). This might be the reason why between the years 1984 and 1999, the re-editions of the translation were not offered with a preface, but with a chronology consisting of a few pages. In 1999, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları published the translation together with the work of Mina Urgan[9] and since 1999 İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları has the rights to the translation although plagiarized versions of the translation have been occasionally published by smaller publishing houses. In 2008, İş Kültür Yayınları started to publish the translation in a special series titled Hasan Ali Yücel Klasikleri (Hasan Ali Yücel Classics). This is a compilation of Western classics, which started its journey with the translations of classic works associated with the Renaissance humanism, then

---

[8] I use the notion of discourse in terms of Foucault's argument that defines the term as a set of practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak. In this theory, discourse refers to a compound of ideas, opinions, concepts, ways of thinking and ways of behaving, which makes it quite a challenging object of study. In nature, discourses conflict with one another over the questions of truth and authority. When supported by the institutional funding, i.e. by the state, a discourse becomes the predominant one, whereas there always exist discourses that remain at the margins of the society (Foucault, The Archeology).

[9] In the footnote of this edition, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları states that they got the permission from Adam Yayınları while publishing the translation with the work of Mina Urgan (More, 1999b, 9).

extended its scope to world classics of various genres and periods by embracing Dostoevski and William Blake on the one hand and Balzac and George Sand on the other. Today, this special series initiated by İş Kültür Yayınları presents itself as a series consisting of the reeditions of the canon that was once constructed by the initiatives of Hasan Ali Yücel and the Translation Bureau.[10] Thus, one might conclude that although the work did not evolve out of the context of the Bureau directly (because it was neither translated nor published by the Bureau), it ended up in a context that aimed to remind the Turkish reader the 1940s initiatives of Turkish Humanism.

After this first translation, *Utopia* was not retranslated for thirty two years, whereas, between the years 1996 (the year of publication of the first retranslation) and 2010, sixteen retranslations of *Utopia* were published by seventeen different publishing houses.[11] Most of these translations were published in special series, among the texts that mirror Western political history as *Utopia* does, and most of them include a preface offering the reader an introduction to *Utopia* and Thomas More. As revealed by both the series the retranslations are placed in and the prefaces accompanying the main texts, the contexts introduced by these retranslations vary greatly, and here, the major question the study tackles is the type of readership these retranslations address through the contexts they either create or sustain. The present thesis will focus on the retranslations published by Dergah Yayınları (2003) and

---

[10] The fact that İş Kültür Yayınları decided to publish this series of classical literature under the name of Hasan Ali Yücel is quite reasonable. Hasan Ali Yücel is among the pioneers Turkish modernization who worked as a Minister of Education and put forth great initiatives in the establishment of such significant institutions founded in the Republican Era as the Village Institutes and the Translation Bureau. He is also closely related to İş Kültür Yayınları, in that, after resigning from the ministery owing to the shift in the predominant view as a result of the transition to the multi-party regime, he worked in this publishing house as a publishing director between the years 1956-1960 and published over forty translations in this period. (Tahir Gürçağlar, Kapılar, 39-82)

[11] The translation of İbrahim Yıldız was published by both Ütopya Publishing in 2003 and Bilgesu Publishing in 2009.

Ütopya Yayınları (2003) as case studies and explore the problematic nature of the third translational form named retranslation which recontextualizes, triggers competition and induces intertextuality *vis-à-vis* other translations.

As for the order of the chapters, Chapter One presents the theoretical background of the study and the methodology to be followed whereas Chapter Two introduces Thomas More and his *Utopia* together with the concept of utopia that has evolved out of the work. This chapter defines what the term utopia refers to throughout the thesis. It gives brief information about the translation history of the work in Europe and about how the work and the concept have been used in Turkish literary sources. Chapter Three focuses on the absence of More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary repertoire until 1964 and questions this case in light of the notion of non-translation. Here, the study refers to a periodization and analyzes the context of non-translation in three major periods, namely the Tanzimat Period, the Republican Period and the 1940s in which Turkish Humanism and the translation movement it initiated raised. Chapter Four offers a macro and micro-analysis of the first translation of *Utopia.* The data acquired from the analysis will be used in questioning such translational issues as the position of the translator and that of the target-text in the receiving literary polysystem and the reader assigned to this particular translation. Lastly, Chapter Five embarks upon the notion of retranslation and exemplifies the simultaneous existence of varying contexts for More's *Utopia* with a comparative analysis of two retranslations. As Chapter Four, this chapter also focuses on the matters of the position of the translator, the position of the target-text and the readership. It also includes such retranslational concerns as rivalry and intertextuality in its scope as well.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

Introducing translational phenomena as cultural facts in the descriptive methodology he proposes, Gideon Toury emphasizes the importance of the target context in translation research stating that "translations are facts of target cultures; on occasion facts of a special status, sometimes even constituting identifiable (sub)systems of their own, but the target culture in any event" (Toury, DTS, 29). Benefiting from this view, today, Translation Studies takes its departure from the context giving rise to the product of translation and concentrates on the factors which sets it apart from the source context. This approach enlarges the scope of translation research and enables translational phenomena to be defined in such terms as representation, rewriting and reproduction.

The translational journey of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system enables the study to exemplify and investigate the contexts of the three existential forms of translation, that are non-translation, translation and retranslation. Therefore, besides benefiting from Toury's approach which foregrounds the novelty of each individual translated text regarding the difference in the contexts they evolve out of (27), this study adds the context of the non-existence of the translation product to its scope and explores various contexts for each existential form that constitute a unique position in the Turkish literary system. The term context might be defined here as a phenomenon that embraces both the internal and the external factors of

representation;[12] therefore, it refers to the grand entity in which the spatial, temporal and personal factors function interrelatedly.

1.1 Non-Translation

The first part of this study is based on my assumption that *Utopia* was not translated into Turkish until 1964. I propose this with regard to the findings of my research covering the bibliographical studies on indigenous and translated literature between the Tanzimat Period and 1964,[13] the annual literary reports published by Varlık Publishing[14] and periodical lists of translated literature and new titles recommended for translation published by the journal *Tercüme* (including the translation lists of the Translation Bureau). Adopting the first context of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system as this context of non-translation, I will firstly focus on the employment of utopian way of thought and utopian themes in the translated and indigenous literary works in the Turkish literary system between the mid-nineteenth century and the 1960s. I will also touch upon the literary sources written before the first translation that mentioned More and *Utopia* with the aim of exploring the approach towards the work until the 1960s.

---

[12] The term context is quite problematic for the fact that there exists various terms that reveal slight differences but are simply used to define the background of the object of analysis. In his *Translating Cultures*, David Katan exemplifies theorists that regard the theoretical tools 'frame', 'schema', 'schemata' and 'script' differently and for the scope of his study in particular, he defines 'frame' and 'context' as two separate entities. In his definition 'frame' refers to 'an internal psychological state and makes up part of our map of the world' and 'context' is 'an external representation of reality' (34). Whereas, this study uses the term context to refer to the grand entity that embraces these two definitions.

[13] These bibliographical studies include Acaroğlu; Eruz; Kıbrıs; Koçak; Levend; Özege; Özkırımlı; Sevük, Tanzimat; Sevük, Garptan Tercümeler; Tanpınar; *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları Bibliyografyası* (1923-1996); Klasikler Bibliyografyası (1940-1966); *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* (1928-1960).

[14] *Varlık Yıllığı* (1960-1964).

Many studies have been conducted on the product, process, agent and context of the phenomenon of translation. These studies have benefited from various perspectives offered by the social sciences, such as the post-colonial, feminist, structuralist, poststructuralist and postmodern and embarked on exploring the why's, how's, who's and when's of the existing translations. There is, however, an interesting field which has largely remained underexplored in Translation Studies, that is non-translation. Non-translations might be explored via the same perspectives and questions enumerated above and arguably their investigation would fill a major gap in translation research. The phenomena of non-translation is quite open to problematization in various contexts; therefore, various research on the subject has defined it differently. Şebnem Susam Sarajeva's study that examines the importation of structuralism and semiotics into Turkish and of French feminism into English investigates the material on the particular literary theories which were introduced and not introduced to the receiving systems and draws conclusions about the image-formations of Helene Cixous and Roland Barthes in those receiving systems. Here, the notion of non-translation refers to translational choices taken on the stages of both the pre-production (i.e. selection of texts) and the production (i.e. translating the text). Sarajeva's analysis includes the meta-discourse that evolved around the translations and non-translations of Barthes's and Cixous's works, which reveals that the post-production process of translation (i.e. representation, recontextualization and promotion) might be problematized within the context of non-translation, as well. As exemplified with the cases of Cixous in English and Barthes in Turkish, non-translations are governed by the norms prevalent in the receiving systems and they are major contributors to the images formed for the receiving systems.

In the first context Sarajeva portrays, i.e. the pre-translation stage, non-translations refer to translations that were non-available in the receiving systems (34). Just as this type of non-translation played a major role in the introductions of structuralism and semiotics to the Turkish literary sytem and that of French feminism to the Anglo-American literary system not as theories but as social practices, this study assumes that the non-translations of some works of utopian nature lead to a partial-representation of the genre of utopia in the Turkish literary system until the 1960s. Therefore, the questions Sarajeva asks in her study are quite applicable for the case of the translation of literary utopias in the Turkish literary system which embraces the retranslations of some utopias on the one hand and non-translations of a number of utopias on the other:

> (...) why were these particular texts translated, and not others? Why were some of them retranslated, and not others? Why three translations of "Que-est ce que la critique?", for instance, within a period of nineteen years, while many other texts – both by Barthes and by other writers – were waiting in pipeline? (97)

In her study, Sarajeva discusses why the works of Cixous and Barthes "could not be effectively put into (political) use within the atmosphere prevalent at the time" (5). Here, she introduces the notion of non-translation into the context of the "(non)translation of the political implications" of the texts by Barthes and Cixous (4). This owed to the predominance of the more action-based understanding of politics in both the Turkish literary critical system and the Anglo-American feminist critical system (202). For instance, in light of the non-translations of some critical essays of Barthes in his *Mythologies* and the retranslations of others, Sarajeva explains the case of the partial-representation of Barthes in the Turkish literary critical system as such:

> Marxist and socialist-realist critical tradition in Turkey defined itself, at some point in its development, in opposition to structuralism and semiotics (tropes of alterity). Therefore, Barthes's texts which carried certain political implications, those which could be regarded as borderline cases, were ignored. (196)

This approach of Sarajeva towards non-translation that relates the existence of non-translation to the predominant norms of the receiving system and to the images formed for that receiving system explains that the translated utopian works are the contributors of the partial-representation of the genre of utopia, as well. Regarding the contexts the translated utopias were located in owing to various socio-cultural reasons, this study questions the non-translational nature of the works that were actually introduced to the Turkish literary system right besides that of the works that were not introduced at all.

As for the type of non-translation the translator refers to during the process of production, Sarajeva embarks on some particular literary terms that were not translated and left as they are in their home systems. She gives the French origined term *ecriture feminine* as an example for this type of non-translation:

> Since this term was not translated into English at all and was kept in italics or within quotation marks, it was difficult for monolingual Anglophone readers to have access to its wider conceptual domain. The fact that it was sometimes translated as 'feminine writing' further increased the suspicion surrounding the term. (179)

Sarajeva states that Anglo-American translators adopted non-translation as a translation technique, which contributed to the image of French feminism formed by translation in the Anglophone world. As Sarajeva quotes from Barbara Godard, while translating the wordplays in the French feminists' writings, these translators employed the addition of a glossary, neologism and polysemy as the techniques of non-translation (161). The translation and non-translation of proper names, as well as the translation and non-translation of some intertextual references in the translations of More's *Utopia* might be problematized with a similar approach. Thus, this

particular contextualization of non-translation might be applied to the forth and fifth chapters of the thesis in which the existing products will be focused upon.

In the article titled "The Politics of Non-Translation: A Case Study in Anglo-Portuguese Relations", Joeao Ferreire Duarte explores the absence of Shakespeare translations into Portuguese between 1890 and 1899 in light of the notion of non-translation. The article resorts to a non-translation typology and defines seven categories, namely omission, repetition, language closeness, bilingualism, cultural distance, institutionalised censorship and ideological embargo (Duarte 96-98). Considering the 1880s anti-British nationalism across Portugal as the main reason behind the non-translation of Shakespeare's works, Duarte categorizes this particular case under the seventh category, ideological embargo, which is defined as "non-translation that results from the clash of a community's system of values and some shattering political event" (98). Ideological embargo, as Duarte asserts, differs from institutionalized censorship in terms of not being a "state-enforced ban but rather the spontaneous action of civil society of sections of it" (ibid.). Since the non-translation of *Utopia* embraces a relatively large period of time, it would not be right to conclude the case with one categorization as Duerte does in the article. However, the institutionalized censorship is more likely to appear than ideological embargo, since, especially after 1923, Turkish culture repertoire was dominated by the culture planning of the Republican government.

The MA thesis of Sevcan Yılmaz on the absence of *Satanic Verses* in the Turkish literary system is another example that questions the notion of non-translation. Yılmaz's unpublished thesis probes the reasons behind why this particular work by Rushdie had not been translated into Turkish, and tackles different dimensions of ideology, namely that of the author, translator, institutions, countries

and theories. As the work is widely known by the Turkish audience owing to the sensation aroused by Khomeini's fatwa and it was only recently that the full translation of the work appeared[15]- although some parts of the work were published by *Aydınlık* in 1993- this case of non-translation might be classified among the significant cases of Turkish translation history. The fact that *Utopia* was not translated until 1964 is certainly associated with the underlying ideological dynamics. However, the period Sevcan Yılmaz focuses on is the one between 1988 (when the source text was published) and 2007, which is relatively shorter than the period of non-translation this study focuses on; therefore, the ideological dynamics revealed by this study will display a wider variety. Besides, this study argues that not all dynamics behind the non-translation of *Utopia* until 1964 concern ideology. The period between the 1940s and 1960s, for instance, reveals coincidental factors behind the non-translation of the work, which has never been the case in the non-translation of *Satanic Verses*, as Sevcan Yılmaz displays in her thesis.

Another study that contextualizes the phenomena of non-translation is a paper by Min-Hsiu Liao, which compares the strategies of writer-reader interaction in the translations and non-translations of works of popular science in Taiwan. Here, the term non-translation simply refers to the indigenous works written by local authors which carry the potential of being influenced by translated works; whereas, this thesis will refer to what Liao calls non-translation as indigenous works. Similarly, Buescu and Duarte define non-translation differently in their study. Their article on the literary project of Portuguese poet Herberto Helder called "poems changed into Portugese" problematize how the poet used translation as a means of creating "cross-

---

[15] It is a small publishing initiative Kara Güneş Basım that got involved in this process. They announced the publication of this translation in January 2011. For more information see http://karagunesbasim.blogspot.com/

cultural intertexts" (Buescu and Duarte 174). Non-translation, in this context, is among Helder's experimental techniques of rejecting cultural translation, which Buescu and Duarte define as "a radical act of estrangement, of deterritorialisation of the target language, suddenly made foreign to itself" (ibid.: 185). This type of non-translation is different than the non-translation adopted within the translations of the wordplays of *ecriture feminists* exemplified by Sarajeva, in that, here, non-translation is a means of proposing a text full of otherness to impose the receiver an estrangement to his/her own culture; whereas, in the context Sarajeva mentions, the otherness triggered by non-translation is aimed to be compensated via such techniques as addition of a glossary, neologism and polysemy (161). As mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the translations of *Utopia* reveal examples for the second type of non-translation, which will be discussed in the forth and fifth chapters of the study.

In the case of the translation of More's *Utopia,* exploring the context of non-translation necessitates the observation of quite a long period of time since it is acknowledged that the first penetration of the genre of utopia into the Turkish literary system dates back to the Tanzimat period (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 74; Kılıç, Cumhuriyet Dönemi, 41; Yalçınkaya 178; Küçükcoşkun 38). Therefore, I will investigate the non-translation of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system in three sections, namely the periods between Tanzimat and 1923, 1923 and 1940, and 1940 and 1964. Here, I categorize the utopic works that appeared in the Turkish literary system in these three periods as the indigenous utopias written by Turkish authors, the utopias that were translated and the utopias that were not translated. I regard these three categorizations as the sub-repertoires of the culture repertoire of the three periods under focus. I use the term repertoire as it is used by Even-Zohar, as "the

aggregate of laws and elements (either single, bound, or total models) that govern the production of texts" the status of which is "determined by the relations that obtain in the (poly)system" (Even-Zohar, Polysystem, 17-18). Although Even-Zohar does not include a repertoire of non-translations in his theory, I believe that the repertoire of non-translations leads one to conclusions that lend themselves to be explained via Even-Zohar's systemic approach, which I will explain in detail in Chapter Three.

While exploring the absence of Thomas More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system before 1964, the chapter on the non-translation of *Utopia* benefits from Even-Zohar's assertions on the formation of culture repertoire which he defines as "the aggregate of options utilized by a group of people, and by the individual members of the group, for the organization of life" (Even-Zohar, The Making of Repertoire, 166). Even-Zohar introduces two procedures in the formation of this entity, which are "invention" and "import", and states that "import has played a much more crucial role in the making of repertoire, and hence in the organization of groups, and the interaction between them, than is normally admitted" (ibid. 169). When the imported goods are integrated into a home repertoire, they are defined as "transfer", and as Even-Zohar indicates, this transformation of import into transfer necessitates organization and marketing skills. Transfer might exist on the level of passive repertoire or on the level of active repertoire regarding the effect and function of the transfer on the home repertoire, which is considerably related to the organization and marketing skills of the agencies involved in the transfer (ibid. 171-172).

In his *Papers on Culture Research*, Even-Zohar furthers this context he draws for the formation of culture repertoire and specifies a number of agencies involved in this formation, i.e. "idea-makers", "cultural entrepreneurs" and "makers of life images" (Even-Zohar, Papers, 201). These are the contributors of the culture

repertoire that "proliferate options by putting forward new ideas" (ibid. 191). Idea-makers are the agents that have this ability of offering new options to the existing repertoire. They produce and preach their ideas, and in some occasions, they "become active in attempts towards their implementation" and become cultural entrepreneurs (ibid. 195). Regarding literature as a major contributor of "potential models of life", Even-Zohar asserts that the agents involved in the formation of culture repertoire might also become "makers of life images" that "provide tools for both understanding and operating in actual life" (ibid. 199). The options proposed by these agents might either "reinforce socio-cultural control by promoting preferred interpretations of life circumstances" or "turn out to be at odds with the prevailing preferences" (ibid.).

While portraying the translational context of the non-translation of More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system in the period between Tanzimat and 1964, I aim to explore the role of translation in the transfer of the genre of utopia in the Turkish literary system and the types of agencies and the nature of their proposals involved in the context of the formation of the three periods' culture repertoires in light of this translational context Even-Zohar portrays and the culture-planning activities of the three periods under focus.

1.2 Translation

In his *Translation in Systems*, Theo Hermans defines translation as a phenomenon that both provides an insight into the mechanisms of the receiving systems and participates in the formation of the culture repertoire and the relations dominating it. The first translation of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system provides us with a clear example of the simultaneous existence of these two roles attributed to translation.

The fact that translations both mirror and shape the receiving systems they evolve out of requires a consideration of ideology, which "operates on two different levels in translated texts and in the broader act of translation" as Tahir-Gürçağlar states (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Presumed Innocent, 38). In her article, Tahir-Gürçağlar discusses the mutual operation of these two levels of ideologies, namely the "implicit ideology" and "explicit ideology", within the context of translation activities in Turkey. The explicit ideology mainly refers to the socio-political context surrounding the translation; whereas, the implicit ideology necessitates a micro-analysis of the translation itself as an encounter with foreign cultures and texts. In addition to the textual strategies employed by the translators, Tahir-Gürçağlar states that implicit ideology is to be sought in various stages of the translational practice, such as "the selection or rejection of source texts, the use of specific registers or lexical items to site the translation within a particular tradition in the home system and the use of various paratextual elements such as illustrations, prefaces and notes which all enable the translator to present the translation to the readers in specific ways" (39). While focusing on the first full translation of *Utopia* into Turkish, I will start out from this systematization of Tahir-Gürçağlar and question the relation between the implicit and explicit ideologies that operate in the text.

This study regards the notion of ideology as a tool through which the translator draws a link between the universe of discourse of the source text and that of the receiving culture, as Andre Lefevere asserts. As the first translation of *Utopia* is carried out by remarkable names in Turkish translation history, such as Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Vedat Günyol and Mina Urgan, who can be associated with a certain explicit ideology, this translation offers an opportunity to concentrate on the close relationship between ideological and translational activities. I will do this by

questioning the reason for the translators' specific involvement in this text and the way their translation has survived the many decades that have passed. Therefore, the study will resort to contextualizing the activities of the three translators within a special framework gathering literature, society and translation. In such a framework, Bourdieu's notion of symbolic capital will be utilized in explaining the prestige these translators have accumulated in the world of translation (Gouanvic). Even-Zohar has included a number of additional parameters in his discussion of symbolic capital. These include "acquired positions, levels of organizedness, mutual aid between members of the collective abilities of act, sense of self-confidence and access to enterprising options" (Even-Zohar, Culture Repertoire, 398-399). Both symbolic capital and Even-Zohar's employment of this concept will be used in order to explore the agency factor in the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish. The position of the translators of the target text in the Turkish literary system, as once the culture planners of the Republican Era then the proposers of the alternative ideologies in the 1960s, will be questioned in light of the notion of symbolic capital proposed by Pierre Bourdieu and the social context Even-Zohar draws for the formation of the culture repertoire that includes a number of agents, i.e. idea-makers, cultural entrepreneurs and makers of life images (Gouanvic; Even-Zohar, Papers).

In light of the type of agency embraced by the translation under focus, I will firstly embark on the sociopolitical context of the translation and explore the explicit ideology the translation mirrors. While investigating the implicit ideology, on the other hand, I will benefit from Toury's preliminary and operational norms that provide the translational analysis with the favorable grounds on which each stage regarding the translation event, i.e. the translation policy, the selection of the text, the decisions taken in the course of the act of translation, could be investigated. Starting

out from the implicit ideologies acquired through an analysis of the translation policy, the directness of translation, matricial norms, textual-lintustic norms and the paratexts, I aim to derive conclusions on the position of the translators in their target text and the function attributed to this particular translation.

As the aim of the analysis is not to explore the nature of the relationship between the source and the target texts, I will not carry out a query on the adequacy-acceptibility continuum. Rather, I will focus on the position of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* among the translation convention of domestication which the translators kept employing. Here, I will compare the case with the foreignization-domestication dilemma sustained by Lawrence Venuti's theory on the translator's invisibility (Venuti, Invisibility; Scandals). Basing his theory on the Anglo-American literary grounds, Venuti formulates the predominant translational context as "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and, presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text" (Venuti, Invisibility, 16). As the 1964 translation of *Utopia* belongs to a translation convention that favors fluency, a strategy that the translators applied to all sections of their target texts from paratexts to the main text, I will question the validity of the parallelism Venuti draws between invisibility and fluency in the context of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* into Turkish.

Besides, the present study regards readership as an initial dynamic that relates all three stages of the selection of the text, translation, and contextualization to one another. Bearing the high-level intentions of Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan over the Turkish society in mind, on account of which I define them as "agents of change" that introduce new options to the receiving system (Toury, Planning, 151), here I will question if there was a specific community these translations referred to or if the translators aimed to construct a community via their translations.

In his reader-oriented theory, Stanley Fish proposes the existence of reading-communities the members of which develop similar interpreting habits. What makes this theory applicable to my case is that these interpreting habits are "not natural or universal, but learned" (328). With the repertoire they constructed through similar translation strategies (from the selection of texts to the translational decisions taken during the act of translation itself), the agents of this translation might have aimed to propose their reader the interpreting habits determined beforehand and to construct an interpretative community whose members would assign the texts similar intentions. Heading from the textual analysis of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* into Turkish and the problematization of the positions of the translators both within and outside the translation, I will questions the function attributed to the translation in this particular context of readership.

1.3 Retranslation

Today, Antoine Berman's hypotesis which initiated the theoretizations of the notion of retranslation based upon the "teleological view of retranslation as a unidirectional move towards "better" target texts", is challenged by the recent theories on retranslation in a number of respects (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Retranslation, 233). Retranslation is now acknowledged as a more complex notion that needs to be embedded within "a broader discussion of historical context, norms, ideology, the translator's agency and intertextuality" (ibid.). This nature attributed to retranslation by recent theories enables the present study to observe certain relations among the translations of *Utopia* as well as the contexts surrounding them.

Following an interim period of non-retranslation between 1964 and 1996, *Utopia* was retranslated sixteen times between the years 1996 and 2010. When the

series that include these retranslations and the paratextual elements that acompany the main texts such as the prefaces, footnotes and illustrations are taken into consideration, it becomes clear that many of these retranslations introduced More's *Utopia* to a different context, therefore, today various contexts exist for the work in the Turkish literary system. The fact that the translations have the potential of recontextualizing and representing their source attributes each translation a unique position in the receiving system, as Toury also indicates:

> Being an instance of performance, every individual text is of course unique; it may be more or less in tune with prevailing models, but in itself it is a novelty. As such, its introduction into a target culture always entails some change, however slight, of the latter. To be sure, the novelty claim still holds for the nth translation of a text into a language: it is the *resulting* entity, the one which would actually be incorporated into the target culture, which is decisive here; and this entity will always have never existed before- unless one is willing to take Borges's speculations on Pierre Menard, author of the *Quixote,* at face value and apply them to the generation of translated texts. Alternative translations are not even likely to occupy the exact same position in the culture which hosts them even if they all came into being at the same point in time. (Toury, DTS, 27)

Starting out from this unique position attributed to each translation introduced to a particular receiving system, Lawrence Venuti formulates a theory on retranslation and asserts that each retranslation promotes itself differently than the preceding ones (Venuti 2004). Assuming an attempt of making difference behind each retranslation, Venuti states that these products of target culture mirror their producers' intentions which are actualized according to "a different set of values" than the prior ones (Venuti, Retranslations, 29). As a receiving system that imported *Utopia* seventeen times, the Turkish literary system has provided these translations with the favorable grounds on which such a competition on uniqueness could be practiced. Before embarking on the case studies, the chapter on retranslation will offer the general

scheme of *Utopia* translations present in the Turkish literary system in this particular context of competitive uniqueness.

In his *Method in Translation History*, Anthony Pym introduces two types of retranslations according to the disturbing influence of one translation to another, namely "active retranslations" and "passive retranslations". Active retranslations are the ones that share the same cultural location and bear disagreements over translation strategies; whereas, passive retranslations have little rivalry in between and the differences they bear are related to social and temporal aspects on the more macro-level (Pym 82-83). Applying this alternative scheme Pym draws for retranslations to the case of the retranslations of *Utopia* arises questions because here passivity remains as quite a low probability. Although translated forty five years ago, the first translation is included to the active rivalry among the retranslations that keep being published with an increasing number. As the motive behind the retranslations of *Utopia* are assumed to concern an entourage of publishers, readers and some other social rationales, the study will exclude the notion of passive retranslation from its scope. With the comparative analysis of the translation published by Dergah Yayınları and the one published by Ütopya Yayınları, the study will further the issue and problematize whether it is possible for two retranslations be regarded as separate entities that operate within their own universe of discourse excluding any type of interaction.

The two retranslations under the focus of this study display a remarkable difference in their contexts and this is arguably associated with the nature of the target readership. Here, I will once more benefit from the notion of "interpretive communities" introduced by Stanley Fish, since here the target reader is once more regarded as a community the members of which share similar interpretive strategies

and similar expectations from a text. I assume that these communities are centered around ideology, which Lefevere defines as a prominent shaping factor behind translation that "dictates solutions to problems concerned with both the 'universe of discourse' expressed in the original (objects, concepts, customs belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer of the original) and the language the original itself is expressed in" (Lefevere 41), and that the translators share the same universe of discourse as their publishing houses and their target readers. Therefore, the unique position attributed to these retranslations will be investigated in light of the interrelations among the publisher, reader and the translator, as well as the reflections of the ideologies of the translators on their target texts. The correlation Lawrence Venuti draws among the notions of domestication, fluency and the invisibility of the translator will once more be questioned in this context of the ideology oriented uniqueness displayed by the retranslations (Venuti, Invisibility).

1.4 Methodology

This study focuses on the translational journey of Thomas More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system and the three existential forms of translation the text has appeared in. The analysis of this journey from non-translation to retranslation is based on the grounds of Even-Zohar's systemic approach and Toury's descriptive methodology.

The first part of my study is based the non-translational context of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system between the Tanzimat Period and 1964. I have come to the conclusion that the work was not translated into Turkish until 1964 with regard to research covering the bibliographical studies on indigenous and translated literature between the Tanzimat Period and 1964 (i.e. Acaroğlu; Eruz; Kıbrıs; Koçak; Levend;

Özege; Özkırımlı; Sevük; Tanpınar; *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları Bibliyografyası 1923-1999, Klasikler Bibliyografyası 1940-1966,* and *Türkiye Bibliografyası* 1928-1960), the annual literary reports published by Varlık Publishing between 1960 and 1964, the translation lists of the Translation Bureau published by the journal *Tercüme* as well as web-research and the online database of the National Library. As for the research I conducted for my last chapter, since what I was looking for dated after 1960s, which is a relatively more recent period than the one betwen Tanzimat and 1964, I had the chance to use the benefits of internet more and I made frequent visits to the websites on internet sales and those of the present publishing houses in Turkey. Besides, I used the online databases of the university libraries and the database of the National Library.

As the first form in which More's *Utopia* appeared in the Turkish literary system, non-translation is explored in light of Even-Zohar's notion of "repertoire" (Even-Zohar, Polysystem, 17). The analysis of *Utopia* in the form of non-translation offers no textual analysis, it only observes which texts in the utopia genre- I will propose the definition of the genre in Chapter Two right besides what utopia refers to as a major conceptual tool of the present study- were included and excluded from the Turkish literary repertoire in the periods between Tanzimat and 1923, 1923 and 1940, and 1940 and 1964. In order to question the role of translation in the transfer of the genre and the concept of utopia to the Turkish literary system, the development of utopia as a literary genre in the receiving system is observed as well. Therefore, there are three sub-repertoires under focus, which I name as the repertoire of translated utopias, the repertoire of non-translated utopias and the repertoire of indigenous utopias.

As for the contexts of *Utopia* in the forms of translation and retranslation, the study includes the textual analysis of the 1964 translation published by Çan Yayınları, and those of the retranslations published by Dergah Yayınları and Ütopya Yayınları in 2003. All three analysis follow the methodology offered by Toury in his *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. The concerns of choice of text and choice of source text are investigated in light of preliminary norms, namely translation policy and the directness of translation. Here, the difference between the analysis of the 1964 translation and those of the retranslations appears, because the 1964 translation does not lend itself to translation analysis in which a source-target comparison cannot be conducted. Presumably the translators of the 1964 translation used more than one source text that were in different languages. Hence, the study does not include a source-target comparison in Chapter Four. Regarding translation as a product of the target culture, therefore as an object of analysis on its own, in the analysis phase of the 1964 translation of *Utopia*, the study still uses the theoretical tools of matricial norms and textual-linguistic norms in order to explore not the relationship between the source and target texts but to what the target texts aimed to represent and how they achieved it. As for the analysis of the paratexts, Gerard Genette's theory that emphasizes the influence of paratexts on the presentation and the reception of literary works complements all three analysis.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF *UTOPIA* AND
THE CONCEPTUAL TOOLS IT PROVIDES

Man has been contemplating a better world since the very beginning of his existence. No one would deny the fact that man has adopted critical thinking as his universal nature, and all sorts of creative initiatives (either philosophical, artistic or scientific ones) might be regarded as the natural outcomes of this way of thinking. Likewise, in the simplest definition, utopias are among the products of this critical practice. Distracted about the actual, the composer (or the contemplator one might call him) of the utopia puts forth his ideal with as much implications as possible upon the facts he criticizes. Although the earliest examples of such products are seen in classical culture, the most popular of which is Plato's *Republic*,[16] the work that has given both the concept and the genre the name utopia is Thomas More`s *Utopia*. Until *Utopia*, people had already started to describe their own better worlds in accordance with their own situations; thus, it cannot be denied that utopic thinking had already existed within history. Yet, regarding both the literary and the idealistic concerns More`s *Utopia* raised, scholars agree on the fact that this work has established the major characteristics of today's concept of utopia. Today, these features are regarded as the main criteria with which the utopian character of any literary work is determined.

---

[16] In his *Edebiyatta Ada* (Island in Literature)*,* Akşit Göktürk enumerates other classical works that carry utopian features as Theogony of Hesiod, *Timaeus* and *Critias* of Plato, *Sacred History* of Euhemerus, *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius and *Islands of the Sun* of Iambulus. (19-23)

2.1 The Utopia More Proposes and the Evolution of the Concept Afterwards

Originally written in Latin in 1516, Thomas More's work is titled by a word in Latin

that evokes double meanings. As defined by Susan Bruce, employing the word

utopia as a title, More implies the fictive (in terms of the 'non-existent'), the

idealistic, and the perfectionist character of the work all at once:

> Utopia is derived from Greek *ou* (non-) and *topos* (place), means no-place with a possible pun on *eu* (good) and *eutopia* meaning 'good place'. (xxi)

After More, the "non-" and "good" connotations of the word have made the work

interpreted in a number of ways and utopia has become one of the controversial

concepts of the history of Western civilization. As exemplified by the definitions of

Bruce below, since Thomas More, the term has been contextualized via a number of

definitions that vary from one another:

> 1) any printed text which invokes the possibility of a better world, 2) secularization of the myth of Golden Age, which entails a negative appraisal of present conditions, 3) a verbal artifact located in this world, characterized by its manner of functioning as a literature of historical and cognitive estrangement (ibid. li).

As revealed above, today the term *utopia* refers to the literary product itself, to the

act of critical contemplation, and to the ideal entity that enables the author to render

his critical expressions to his/her reader. Besides these three, one might include the

scheme the definition of *utopia* as a literary genre and *utopia* as a social theory as

well.[17] So far, each attempt at explaining the term has added to the plurality of the

interpretations of the concept.

---

[17]Ayhan Yalçınkaya refers to the multi-referencial nature of the term as such:
"While being defined, the term utopia is discharged of its criteria of impossibilityand migh acquire different emphasis according to the subjective evaluations of the definer, which might be related to various criteria such as the dreaminess, happiness, the perfect order and the ideal country. That's why the same term refers to a literary genre (utopian literature), a theroetical approach (utopian theory) and an attitude (utopian attitude); and it is used to qualify all plans and dreams whose actualization seem impossible." (3)

The historical development of the practice of composing utopias, which was initiated by the ancient philosophers as mentioned in the introductory paragraph, does not follow a simple and linear path either. Exposed to different contextualizations throughout history, the act displays a three staged path from the secular to the religious and back to the secular. Here, the classical roots of this type of writing might be regarded as the secular point of initiation, then the route is directed towards the myths of Golden Age, and finally to the Heaven depicted in Bible, which is also very much involved in the myth of Golden Age.

In the introductory phase of her thesis on modern Turkish utopias, Yasemin Küçükcoşkun refers to two different utopian periods regarding the development of the genre. The first term, the examples of which differ from Plato's *Republic* to More's *Utopia*, is defined as the "golden age" of the utopia writing and these works might be regarded as the "classics" of the genre (Küçükcoşkun 13). The two major characteristics of this type of utopias are the authoritarian tone of voice they adopt and the religious images they employ.[18] Here, Küçükcoşkun touches on a point that is very applicable to More's *Utopia* and indicates that the religious and doctrinal tone of voice in these works markedly correspond to the hierarchical governing structure of Christianity. On the other hand, these works also imply the penetration of the very first Enlightenment ideals, which are the emphasis on production, knowledge and science, into the literary scene, and they represent the period of transition they

---

["Ütopya terimi, tanımlanırken olanaksızlık ölçütünden başlanarak düşsellik, mutluluk, mükemmel düzen, ideal ülke gibi çok çeşitli ölçütlerle değerlendirilip tanımı yapanın yaklaşımına göre farklı vurgular kazanma eğilimi yüksek bir terimdir. Bundan ötürü aynı terim hem bir yazın dalının (ütopyacı yazın), hem bir kuramsal yaklaşımın (ütopyacı kuram) hem de bir tutumun adı olabileceği gibi (ütopyacı tutum), bunların dışında gündelik yaşamda gerçekleştirilmesi olanaksız görülen bütün plan ve düşleri nitelemek için de kullanılabilmektedir."] (3)

[18]Although not mentioned by Küçükcoşkun, since it is after Christianity that the myths of Golden Age are involved into the scene of utopia, the ancient examples are to be disregarded from this religious scheme. That's why this study proposes a three staged path as from secular, to the religious, and back to the secular, instead of a two staged one that holds the classic and religious on the one side and the enlightened on the other.

evolved out of. For instance, while introducing the main principles of religion through which Utopians conduct their admirable lives, that are "the soul is immortal, and by the bountiful goodness of God ordained to felicity our virtues and good deeds rewards be appointed after this life, and to our evil deeds punishments" (More, 1999a, 76)[19], More does not abstain from positing reason to the scheme:

> (…) Though these [principles] be pertaining to religion, yet they think it meet that they should be believed and granted by proofs of reason. (ibid.)

The quotation above exemplifies that More aimed to propose his reader religion through rational means. This aim of the author mirrors the in-betweenness brought by the transition period Europe witnessed in the sixteenth century, which affected More to a remarkable extent, in that there is religion on the one hand and reason on the other. In *Utopia*, reason is bravely introduced to the scene, but it is still used for proving the accuracy of religion. Besides, the deadlock of the myth of creation takes place in *Utopia* and it occupies a primary position within the lives of Utopians. In *Utopia* God created man with reason. But with that reason, the ultimate conclusion that man could arrive at is his indebted position against God for being bestowed with reason :

> For they define virtue to be life ordered according to nature, and that we be hereunto ordained of God. And that he doth follow the course of nature, which in desiring and refusing things is ruled by reason. Furthermore, that reason doth chiefly and principally kindle in men the love and veneration of the divine majesty. Of whose goodness it is that we be, and that we be in possibly to attain felicity. (ibid. 77)

Therefore, in *Utopia*, although there exists the humanist rationality that values human wisdom and contemplation, no one would deny that More was a man of

---

[19] Throughout the thesis, I will use this format (i.e. author, year, page number) in order to cite the thirteen different publications of More's *Utopia* which the study takes as a reference.

Catholic background and he employed religion as a major theme both in the sceptic dialogues of Book I, and in the depictions of that Elysian land in Book II. While mentioning the welfare of the utopian society, Banu Inan also touches on the fact that religious principles play a major role in this welfare:

> Every kind of detail has been taken into account for the goodness of people living in the Utopian society. It is thought that when people are happy, they will be able to display what they can actually do. However, their main concern is that all these ideas related to man's happiness are defended with the help of religion (118)

These words by Hythloday support the indispensable position of religion within the lives of the utopians:

> (…) the chief and principal question is in what thing, be it one or more, the felicity of man consisteth. But in this point they seem almost too much given and inclined to the opinion of them which defend pleasure, wherein they determine either all or the chiefest part of man's felicity to rest. And (which is more to be marveled at) the defence of this so dainty and delicate an opinion they fetch even from their grave, sharp, bitter and rigorous religion. For they never dispute of felicity or blessedness but they join unto the reasons of philosophy certain principles taken out of religion, without the which to the investigation of true felicity they think reason of itself weak and unperfect. (More, 1999a, 76)

However, both the leftist thinking, which has become the major supporter and user of utopia today, and the evolution of the genre of dystopia, the examples of which are known for their anti-religious suppositions, reveal that today utopia has returned back to its ancient secular roots. Therefore, evolved firstly out of the ancient way of thinking, then out of More's *Utopia*, the concept of utopia has been presented and contextualized differently at various stages of history.

Overall, published in 1516, More's *Utopia* is the literary work that gave the concept its name and today it is considered the archetype of the proceeding utopias. It is an acknowledged fact that all utopias- either fictive or idealistic- are associated

with Thomas More. Therefore, despite having originally emerged as a book that depicted the ideal England of a Catholic man who died because of his radical religious and traditionalist devotions, More's *Utopia* put forth a concept that went beyond the context it originated into. Through a number of historical dynamics, the concept evolved into a theory which made More's work a treatise of all ideals that are against how the functioning system exploits human. In the meanwhile, utopian literature continued to evolve into a hybrid genre which blends the real with the imaginary.

2.2 The Plot and Main Themes Besides Religion

Besides the diversity of interpretations *Utopia* has lead to and the universal and eternal existence of the text itself, More's *Utopia* might be regarded as quite a generous text that reflects a number of the historical and literary peculiarities of the sixteenth century. The historical matters it mirrors are namely the evolution of humanism, the emphasis put on the classics by the Renaissance, the technological developments such as the printing press and the voyages of Amerigo Vespucci. Likewise, the work includes some issues particular to England, such as the division of the Catholic Church, the controversies on death penalty, and the development of woolen industry in Britain. As for the literary peculiarities, *Utopia* offers its reader a blend of satire, voyage fiction and philosophical dialogue, all three of which are popular literary styles of the sixteenth century England. Hence, integrating history into fiction, the work is considered a great resource for historical and literary research.

    Utopia is composed of two books and More applies different narrative techniques in each. In "Book One", the narrator is sent to Flanders by "the most

victorious and triumphant King of England, Henry the eighth" for diplomatic purposes and there he meets Hythloday the voyager (More, 1999a, 10). Accompanied by his friend Peter Gilles, he falls into a deep conversation with this companionable voyager. In this section, More makes his characters discuss the controversial issues of the present situation in England through revealing the contra-perspectives towards the matters discussed with the help of the dialogue technique.

Following Book One, Book Two describes the land called Utopia which is a stunning island the voyager has encountered in one of his voyages. Hytholiday is so impressed by the system that functions in this land that he intends to offer the same order to Henry VIII for the wellbeing of England. This section describes the ideal land of Utopia with as many details on the matters of governing and as little human element as possible. It introduces More`s revolutionary ideals, such as the system of a democratic representation, the establishment of a universal religion, the education of classics as opposed to the Scholastic Medieval education, equal income, and eradication of private property in a more direct manner than Book I with the help of the essay technique employed.

2.2.1 Communal Life and Other Implications of a More Humanist System

Today, many of the concerns introduced by More, especially communal life and the approach towards private property, might remind strong political references, which leads the theme of religion to be degraded towards the lower levels of the book's thematic hierarchy. Regarding the themes of communal ownership, communal way of dressing, working, resting and recreation as the indications of More's admiration for the "humanitarian" aspects of the Middle Age spirit, in his *Edebiyatta Ada*, Akşit Göktürk draws a parallelism between the life at the monasteries and the one the

utopians conduct (37-38). However, as also implied by the word "humanitarian",

Göktürk stresses that the close correspondence between the monasteries and the land

of Utopia should not mean that in *Utopia* More opposes the innovatory aspects of the

forthcoming era and proposes the monastery life as a means of resisting change. On

the contrary, Göktürk emphasizes the enlightened and the broad-minded nature of the

author and indicates that regarding the land of Utopia as a religious life-model would

underestimate this unique authorial nature and contradict with Biblical ideals:

> (…) In this respect Thomas More's Utopia also carries the traces of the
> monastery ideal. Communal ownership, communal way of dressing, the exact
> designation of the working, resting and pastime hours, shared dining halls are
> all the characteristics of the life at the monasteries. There are also similarities
> between the monastery and the island, in that both are isolated from the outside
> world. It is interesting in this respect that in the Middle Ages many monasteries
> were built on islands. However, it would still be wrong to regard More's
> Utopia as a grand monastery society. Firstly, such an approach would disregard
> the influences on such a miscellaneous philosopher as More other than religion.
> Secondly, men's obtaining such a perfect order as the one in Utopia in this
> world would contradict the basic principles of Christianity. The mere exemplary
> order Christianity longs for is the Reign of the Skies that would never exist in
> anywhere on earth, in any era. (38)

> [(…) Thomas More'un Utopia'sında da bu anlamda bir manastır ülküsünden
> izler vardır. Ortak mülkiyet, ortak giyim biçimi, çalışma dinlenme oyun
> saatlerinin kesinlikle belirlenmiş olması, ortak yemekhaneler, gerçekteki
> manastır yaşayışının da özellikleridir. Manastır ile ada arasında dışa
> kapalılıkları bakımından da benzerlikler vardır. Ortaçağda birçok manastırların
> adalar üzerine kurulmuş olması bu bakımdan ilgi çekici bir noktadır. Bununla
> birlikte, More'un Utopia'sını kocaman bir manastır toplumu olarak görmek
> gene de yanlış olur. İlkin, böyle bir görüş More gibi çok yönlü bir düşünür
> üzerindeki, dinden başka etkileri görmezden gelmektir. İkincisi, insanın bu
> dünyada Utopia'dakine benzer bir eksiksiz düzene kavuşması, hıristiyanlığın
> temel ilkelerine aykırı düşer. Hıristiyanlığın özlediği tek örnek düzen,
> yeryüzünün hiçbir yerinde hiçbir çağda gerçekleşemeyecek olan Göklerin
> Saltanatı'dır. (38)]

In addition to the communal way of living, i.e. the common use of property and the

common manner of participating in all types of facilities, and the humanist-religious

grounds it is associated with, *Utopia* has become a major representative of the

humanist way of thinking in many other respects. The equality among men and

women, the reasonable working hours, the juridical system based on healing the causes of crime rather than applying strict punishments, the emphasis on sustaining peace rather than leaning towards war, the emphasis on the education of ancient philosophy, and the imposition of the ancient way of inquisitive thinking are all the innovative themes present in the work, and in virtue of them, *Utopia* is classified among the major humanist treatises of Western literary history.

All different perspectives towards the book depend on where the critics posit the text and its author, and for which purpose. The divergence among the interpretations on the work owes to the varying hierarchizations of the themes indicated above. By means of such practices, a hybrid meta-discourse is constructed around a literary work and translation plays a major role in this process, which the following chapters of the present thesis will embark on.

2.2.2 Lack of Certain Prescriptions

As More repeatedly implies in the book, *Utopia* is a product of imagination. And while stating that "More has given the English language a word 'utopian' and throughout the ages the word has come to signify something visionary and unpractical", Jale Kövenklioğlu introduces a righteous point on the ambiguous nature of the solutions brought by this work of fiction (73). The text provides the reader with a description of an imaginary state without offering any practical prescriptions. In other words, it subjectively tells what to achieve, but does not embark on how to achieve it. According to Kövenklioğlu, this feature makes Thomas More an "imaginative idealist" rather than a "systematic philosopher", which corresponds to the unrealistic nature More tries to bestow upon his narration by using proper names that stress the imaginative nature of the work: Hythlodaeaus (the name of the

voyager) means the dispenser of non-sense, Utopia means no-place, Andryus (the name of the river) means not-water and Ademus (the title of a chief magistrage) means not-people (ibid.74). This imagery More proposes in *Utopia* makes the text elusive. The book displays the genius of the author in hiding behind the fiction and this doctrinal incompleteness sets More apart from other men of social philosophy. Presumably, it is this lack of a concrete prescription on how to achieve that perfect land in *Utopia* that brings about the variety of interpretations, which, surprisingly, might contradict one another at times.

2.2.3 The Stability

Another feature of *Utopia* to be mentioned is that the book describes the ideal as a stable being, in that, it simply offers a society without change. The work was produced in a critical period, when there existed the spirit of both the conservative Middle Age and the innovatory Renaissance. Akşit Göktürk regards this era as a period of transition which bestows neither side with a stable position:

> More is the philosopher of a transition period in which swift advancements that arose new thoughts were in progress, the middle-age worldview was crackling with all its institutions, but the new world view couldn't achieve a certainty. (31)

> [More, kafalarda yepyeni düşünceler uyandıran hızlı gelişmelerin sürdüğü, ortaçağ dünya görüşünün bütün kurumlarıyla birlikte çatırdadığı, ancak yeni dünya görüşünün de daha kesinlik kazanmadığı bir geçiş döneminin düşünürüdür. (31)]

In contrast with this dynamic scene put forth by the sixteenth century, the life in the land of Utopia is quite unchanging, steady, well-established and well-balanced. In economic terms, the import-export is at the minimum level, Utopians keep consuming what they produce themselves. Socially, there are certain time-periods to live in the same house and work for the same field of production. They get married,

have children and leave the house of their parents at a certain age. They never work more or less, they never have more or less children. They always get married and have families. Politically, they elect their governor once in a certain period of time, and every Utopian is ruled, punished and rewarded by the same pre-established and well-applied rules. So, there is very little exception in the land Thomas More proposes. Utopia is an island, which might be regarded as a symbol of this stability; there is so little possibility of any types of interaction and penetration, therefore so little possibility of change.

Akşit Göktürk regards stability as a common feature shared by all examples of island-fiction. The author who is disturbed by some radical change that takes place in his society (or by some change forthcoming) constructs a closed and everlasting structure which keeps preserving its internal functioning via abstaining from any type of external interference. Besides, being apart and far from the main land, the island proposes men an exotic, therefore a more beautiful and more ideal way of life. In these works that adopt island-settings, only the narrator manages to find the island, which increases the readers amaze towards the exemplary life introduced:

> All dreamy islands are surrounded by the sea or water, they all are enclaved. Such transitions from out to in and from in to out are quite hard. While this separation from the rest of the world is reinforced by the channels around the island and the huge walls in Atlantis and by the smoke clouds that cover the island like a garment in the island of St. Brendan, in More's Utopia it appears in the form of the half-moon shaped island's being attached to a port that strictly controls all entrance and exit activities. In this way, in the island that all eras long for, the closure both preserves the exemplary order inside the island and prevents the penetration of any disruptions coming from outside. The person who manages to come to such a dreamy island witnesses the beauty of an earth-heaven and the order of an exemplary life. In this respect, 'island' is considered a better place than 'earth'. (ibid. 202-203)

> [Bütün düşsel adalar bir denizle ya da suyla çevrilidir, hepsi dışarıya kapalıdır. Dışarıdan içeriye, içerden dışarıya bir giriş çıkış güçtür. Dışarıdan bu ayrılmışlık, Atlantis'de adanın çevresindeki kanallarla, dev duvarlarla, St. Brendan'ın adasında adayı bir örtü gibi saran sis bulutuyla pekiştirilirken, More'un Utopia'sında yarım ay biçimindeki adaya giriş çıkışın sıkı bir denet

altında bulunan tek limana bağlanmasıyle dile gelir. Böylece dışarıya kapalılık her çağın özlenen adasında, hem adanın içindeki örnek düzenin korunmasını, hem de dışarıdan içeriye sızacak bozucu etkilerin önlenmesini sağlar. Bu tür düşsel bir adaya girmeyi başaran kişinin önünde bir yeryüzü cennetinin, bir örnek yaşama düzeninin güzelliği alabildiğine uzanır. Bu durumda "ada" "dünya"dan daha iyi bir yer olarak değerlenir. (ibid. 202-203)]

Thomas More might have employed this type of a stability in order to imply his traditional ideas upon the religious matters of the time, in other words, to reveal that the Catholic Church needs to remain as a unity. However, a few centuries later, the utopian theory would adopt the same appreciating attitude towards stability and regard change as the creator of the dangers brought by the industrialist progressive system. Therefore, once more it should be noted that, the concept of utopia introduced by More gradually evolved into something out of *Utopia*, although it is still *Utopia* that is regarded as the father of this humanist way of thought against the positivist progression.

2.3 The Literary Aspects

2.3.1 *Utopia* as satire

Being closely related to all these ideological matters on the one hand, and representing a blend of the existing features of the popular genres of the sixteenth century and the classical literature, that are satire, voyage fiction, essay and skeptical dialogue, on the other, *Utopia* initiated a hybrid genre called utopian literature. Surely this particular classification emerged years after the first publication of *Utopia.* As many other works of literature that presented sensational ideas through fiction in the sixteenth century, the book was initially introduced to the literary scene as a work of satire. As mentioned by Alistair Fox, in the West, the genre got quite popular as a consequence of the renewed interest in "classical political, moral and

historical literature" (8). Thus, at the time, there was an outpour of such humanist political treatises, and *Utopia* is a representative of this satiric fiction. Today, the work is still classified as a satire, rather than as a utopia, by some.

2.3.2 The sceptic dialogues in Book I

Besides including a number of references to ancient literature and defining its nature as intertextual, the first part of *Utopia* employs one of the most popular literary methods of the classics, that is the sceptic dialogue. This literary form owes its second birth to the increasing interest in the classics, which was initiated by the Renaissance, and it is enumerated among the major features of the humanist writing that flourished in the period. Thus, the dialogues of Book I both make the book a representative of the sixteenth century humanist literature, and reveal the effect of classical literature on More's writing.

For the case of *Utopia*, one might regard the dialogue form as a more effective literary method in implementing the authorial ideal than the essay form. Firstly, as also indicated by Banu İnan, it is easier to touch on a high variety of subjects in a single text through this form (24). In Book I, via the conversations of Hytholiday, More manages to express all of his ideas that vary from the politics and juridical system, to the education system and many other issues of the sixteenth century British society in less than fifty pages. Secondly, the element of "the persuasive effect" every work of satire is expected to possess needs to be mentioned (ibid. 24). Every author of satire would like to present his criticism as righteous and if it is a sensational issue that he opens to debate, as in the case of *Utopia*, he would surely feel the need for persuading his reader. This is what More exactly resorts to in his

Utopia. To exemplify, in the quotation below, Hytholiday argues with the *layman* he

met at the table of the Cardinal of Canterbury on the matter of death penalty:

> It chanced on a certain day, when I sat at his [the Cardinal] table, there was
> also a certain layman cunning in the laws of your realm [England]. Who, I
> cannot tell whereof taking occasion, began diligently and earnestly to praise
> that strait and rigorous justice which at that time was there executed upon
> felons, who, as he said, were for the most part twenty hanged together upon
> one gallows. And, seeing so few escaped punishment, he said he could not
> choose but greatly wonder and marvel, how and by what evil luck it should so
> come to pass that thieves, nevertheless, were in every place so rife and so rank.
> 'Nay sir', quoth I (for I durst boldly speak my mind before the Cardinal),
> 'marvel nothing hereat: for this punishment of thieves passeth the limits of
> justice, and is also very hurtful to the weal-public. For it is too extreme and
> cruel a punishment for theft, and yet not sufficient to refrain and withhold men
> from theft. For simple theft is not so great and offence that it ought to be
> punished with death. Neither there is any punishment so horrible that it can
> keep them from stealing which have no other craft whereby to get their living
> (...). (More, 1999a, 18-19)

As seen, keeping his dogmatic attitude on the one hand, but escaping from

prescriptions on the other, More does not preach his proposals but invites his reader

to inquire the norms of his period with the help of the dialogue form.

2.3.3 The Essayism Displayed in Book II

The second part of *Utopia* in which More offers his reader the detailed depiction of

his ideal land is a representative of a different narrative technique, which is essay.

Indeed, in Book II, according to the plot, the conversation among Hytholiday, More

and Peter Gilles proceeds. However, as Hytholiday starts telling about his

observations in Utopia, the response to his sayings are minimized as much as

possible in order to direct the focus towards the ideal system introduced. Thus, one

might regard Book II of *Utopia* as the speech of Hytholiday upon the ideal land he

has encountered by chance in one of his voyages. Due to his long paragraphs filled

with long sentences and the way he introduces his subjective opinions along with his

objective depictions, the second part is classified under a different narrative technique than the first one. Still, although More does not switch his narration from one speaker to the other, he puts quotation marks at the beginning of each paragraph, which, supposedly, is an indicative and reminder of the fact that the dialogue initiated in Book I actually continues.

As mentioned, the fact that More establishes his ideal land on an island attributes the work a dreamy image. The definition of the name of the land as no-place would support this as well. However, the details provided for Hytholiday's narration break this sense of illusion. The depiction of the land itself is very well-structured and every single detail of the way of life Utopians conduct is given, which arises quite a concrete image of the land in the reader's mind:

> The island of Utopia containeth in breadth in the middle part of it (for there it is broadest) 200 miles. Which breadth continueth through the most part of the land. Saving that by little and little it cometh in and waxeth narrower towards both the ends. Which fetching about a circuit or compass of 500 miles, do fashion the whole island like to the new moon. Between these two corners the sea runneth in, dividing them asunder by the distance of eleven miles or thereabouts (…) The city of Amaurote standeth upon the side of a low hill, in fasthin almost four-square. For the breadth of it beginneth a little beneath the top of the hill, and still continueth by the space of two miles until it come to the river Anyder (…) Husbandry is a science common to them in all general, both men and women, wherein they be all expert and cunning. In this they be all instructed even from their youth, partly in their schools with traditions and precepts, and partly in the country nigh the city, brought up, as it were in playing, not only beholding the use of it, but by occasion of exercising their bodies practicing it also. (More, 1999a, 49-53-57)

Heading from the abundance of details in More's depictions, Akşit Göktürk sets *Utopia* apart from the other works of fiction that include the Golden Age imagery proposed by the Christian perspective:

> The island of Utopia, does not wonder around the smoke clouds or a surreal world as the islands of paradise in the Christian Middle Age or the island or St. Brendan do. It is portrayed with every detail in quite an objective manner. (33)

> [Utopia adası, hristiyan ortaçağın cennet adaları gibi, St. Brendan'ın adası gibi, sis bulutları içinde, gerçeküstü bir dünyada yüzmez, taşına toprağına varıncaya kadar nesnel ayrıntılarıyle çizilir. (33)]

In his book, Göktürk relates the existence of "objective details" in Hytholiday's depictions to More's authorial intention of proposing a social construct that is discharged of any type of individuality (ibid. 35). In *Utopia*, the ideal land of an ideal community is displayed and this ideal quality of both arises from the lack of any type of exceptions in this system. Hence, the essay technique employed in Book II also serves for an authorial intention as the dialogue technique employed in Book I does.

Overall, it could be said that, historically, the blend of all these literary features sets the stage ready for the genre of novel. Although the depictions in Book II reveal too much objectivity to be tolerated in a novel, they serve for an authorial intention and the work is of more literary quality than its alternatives. Thus, blending the unreal with real via employing the common techniques of its time's literature, *Utopia* might be classified among the primitive examples of the genre of novel (Bruce xv).

2.4 Translation History of *Utopia* in Europe

Thomas More wrote *Utopia* in Latin and this original Latin version of the work was first published in 1516. And it was after thirty five years that its translation into English appeared. Today, this English version translated by Ralph Robinson is known to be the most popular English version of the text, although it has hundreds of editions in English including the simplified, the modernized and the shortened versions.[20] This first English translation has its own historical value in that, no matter which language it is translated into, many of the translations of *Utopia* adopted this first English version of the work as its source text. Thus, in time, this translation

---

[20] Here, it needs to be noted that some of these editions also adopt the translation of Ralph Robinson as their source.

became an indispensable part of the original work, especially in terms of the historical journey of *Utopia* in other languages and cultures.

As for the translation of the work into other European languages, it was translated into German even before it was translated into English, in 1524. Following this translation, the Italian, French, Dutch and Spanish representations of the work appeared in 1548, 1550, 1553 and 1637 respectively (Cave, List of Illustrations). It is not surprising that, appearing in different periods and geographies, each of these first representations contextualized the work differently. Terence Cave refers to this adaptability of the work to this many types of contexts as such:

> The first thing that emerges when one reviews the early modern transmission of Utopia in the European vernaculars is the variety of new contexts and guises in which it appeared. Between the anonymous sixteenty-century Dutch version, bare of all paratexts save the title, a permission and a privilege, and the sumptuous panoply of letters, prefaces, poems and authorizations in which Medinilla's Spanish translation is packaged, there is an enormous difference of cultural expectations, ideological implications and aesthetic preferences. More's work seems designed to travel: it adapts itself to the interests and tastes of its new readers to an extent that very few other works of the period can rival. (3)

However, despite the variety in the objectives and contexts derived from each of these translations, one might assert that these works all have served for the spread of utopia writing in these receiving cultures. As Akşit Göktürk also states, this abundance in *Utopia* translations served for the work's initiative position in establishing social utopia as a literary genre (43).

The first translation of the work into Turkish dates far later than the European examples indicated above. In 1943, the journal *Tercüme* published the translation of the chapter titled "Of Sciences, Crafts and Occupations". This partial translation adopted an English version of *Utopia* as its source text. Later on, although the work was included in the translation lists of the Translation Bureau in 1943 and 1947, the

first full translation of *Utopia* could appear in 1964 with individual initiatives. The first translation of the work from Latin into Turkish appeared in 2009, and adopting this as a legitimizing factor to the position of the translation, the translator claims this translation to be the first real translation of the work into Turkish. In the chapter on the retranslations of *Utopia*, such assertions that create an interrelation between the retranslations will be problematized in detail.

To sum up, More's *Utopia* was introduced to history as a work of fiction that represented a blend of political, historical and literary references to the sixteenth century, as well as More's peculiar interest in classical literature and his religious background. The concept of utopia introduced by the book has displayed a great evolution; via different ideologies, it has been posited into different contexts, fulfilled different authorial intentions and met different reader expectations. As will be seen in the later parts of the study, the introduction, contextualization and recontextualization of both the work and the concept in the Turkish literary system exemplify this clearly.

2.5 A Brief Look at Utopia and *Utopia* in Turkish Literary Sources

As two major professors of English Literature in the Turkish literary history, both Halide Edib Adıvar and Mina Urgan published books on history of English literature at different stages of Turkish history and mentioned Thomas More in their works. Published in 1940, Adıvar's research investigates the position of More in English literary history within the context of the Renaissance way of thought, classic humanism and Erasmus, who is believed to have a great influence on the progress of English humanism. Enumerating Thomas More among other English humanists such as Thomas Linacre, John Colet, John Fisher, Sir Thomas Elyot and Thomas Wilson,

Adıvar indicates that More is the only literary genius among them (198). In her

book, she allocates each humanist one page while allocating fifteen to the life,

thoughts and works of More. Surely, More is a significant name of the sixteenth

century transition period and in light of his sensational life and death, both the

personal characterization of Henry VIII and the establishment of the Anglican

Church could be historicized. After giving a chronology of his life and quoting the

letters of Erasmus on More's character, Adıvar introduces the distinct religious

position More assigned to himself apart from being a Renaissance humanist:

> Among More's works in English and Latin that constitute an esteemed corpus, the one that still occupies a significant position in world literature is his *Utopia*. However, the rest of his works are also worth scrutinizing so as to illuminate his ideas and personality. In his verse, some beautiful pieces are found. His prose, on the other hand, mostly includes argumentative and religious pieces. What stands out in his prose in respect to religion is that this man, one of the major stars of the Classic Renaissance, had drawn certain boundaries to the matters of religious reform. Just like Erasmus, he is an anti-Lutheran and is also an opponent of Tindale, who had translated Bible into English in the most competent manner ever. (ibid. 208)

> [More'un hatırlı bir yığın teşkil eden ingilizce ve latince eserleri arasında bugün hala dünya edebiyatında yer tutanı Utopia'sıdır. Fakat öteki eserleri de gerek More'un fikir ve karakterini, gerek zamanını anlatmak için tetkika değer. Şiirlerinin arasında bazı güzel parçalar vardır. Nesri umumiyetle kısmen dini parçalarını, kısmen de münakaşalarını teşkil eder. Bunlarda dini bakımdan göze çarpan şey, Klasik Renaissance'ın büyük yıldızlarından olan bu adamın; dini teceddüt meselelerinde bazı hudutlar çizmiş olmasıdır. O da tıpkı Erasmus gibi Luther'e muarızdır, ve İncili ilk en güzel ingilizceye tercüme eden Tindale'e de itiraz etmiştir. (ibid. 208)]

While explaining the content of *Utopia*, Edib mentions that the work raised a great

interest, became a classic of Western literature in a short time, and therefore was

translated into a number of languages (ibid.). However, she does not touch on the

fact that the work was not introduced to the Turkish reader yet. In this respect, she

might have attributed this mission to this volume of hers on English literary history.

In the book, Adıvar states that *Utopia* reveals an influence from Augustine's

The City of God (Allahın Beldesi), Plato's *Republic* (Republik)[21] and Vespucci's

journeys, and she adds that the genre initiated by *Utopia* eventually became an

ideology embodied by literature, just as the concept itself became the expression of

an imaginary land as a certain plan to be followed in literature (ibid. 209). Here,

Adıvar relates this ideological orientation of the concept to the work's ever-lasting

validity in the contemporary world and touches on the relation among the major

themes of the book such as the equal work hours, the strong emphasis on education

and health reforms and the social projects that were 'under construction' in her time:

> Reading the work today, one inevitably draws a correspondance between some
> parts of the book and the current discussions and reviews concerning the social,
> economical and various other malignancies of this day – especially the ones
> that are published among Cemiyeti Akvam's publication. Such concerns as
> decreased working hours, public and compulsory education and especially the
> projects on sanitary improvement bear a great deal of resemblance to today's
> projects that are partly put into practice, which means that More's fantasy was
> able to see beyond the centuries. More's piece has set a model for the later
> works that discuss the world order, especially inspiring Francis Bacon's *Nova
> Atlantis*. Even in our day, in an age where everybody cries out for a new world
> order, it is impossible to ignore the influence of *Utopia* in the discussions, be it
> consciously or unconsciously. (ibid.)

> [Bugün eseri okurken bir çok parçalarını zamanımızda- bilhassa Cemiyeti
> Akvam neşriyatında- bahis mevzuu olan içtimai, iktisadi ve sair fenalıkların
> münakaşa ve tahliline benzetmemek imkanı yoktur. Mesai saatlerinin tahdidi,
> tahsilin umumi ve cebri olması bilahssa sıhhi ıslahat projeleri bugünün kısmen
> tahakkuk eden projelerine çok benzer. Yani More'un hulyası asırların ötesini
> görebilmiştir. More'un bu eseri kendinden sonar yazılan bu nevi dünya nizamı
> eserlerine modellik etmiş, bilhassa Francis Bacon'un Nova Atlantis'ini ilham
> etiştir. Hatta bugün herkesin dünya için yeni nizam diye feryat ettiği devirde
> konuşulan şeylerde şuuri yahut gayri şuuri bu eski Utopia'nın tesirini
> görmemek mümkün değildir.(ibid)]

Establishing a relation between the sixteenth century England and the mid-twentieth

century Turkey, Adıvar acknowledges that More's *Utopia* is an ideal that is "quite

inclined towards the left, indeed, towards a radical socialism" ["haylı sola doğru,

---

[21] The Turkish titles of the works are taken from Adıvar 1940.

hatta bazılarına göre müfrit bir sosyalizma kaçan bir ideal"] (ibid. 209). However, here she sets the rationales behind More apart from those of the contemporary socialists through indicating that at the time his people were witnessing a great poverty and as a man devoted to his state he had to be by the poor. Adıvar also adds that, the book includes conservative manners which the radical socialists of today would by no means affirm.

Overall, acknowledging the leftist associations the book reveals, Adıvar sets *Utopia* apart from other socialist treatises and posits it as a literary work that offers a genius literary simplicity and beauty (ibid. 213). She concludes the Thomas More section of her book with a statement upon the conflict between the radical Catholicism More practices and the freedom of conscience he offers in his *Utopia*, which implies that she does not approve every single detail deployed in the book.

Two and a half decades after Halide Edib's book, when socialism was enjoying its high popularity among the Turkish literary circle, Erdoğan Başar published a dictionary titled *Sosyalizm Sözlüğü* (A Dictionary of Socialism) in which Thomas More is defined as the founder of utopian socialism. This definition Başar adheres to More is adapted to the context of the 1960s and might be regarded as a clear example of the subjective hierarchization of the themes in the book in order to recontextualize the concepts it offers:

> THOMAS MORE: (More,Thomas) (1478-1535) Founder of utopian socialism. The well-known humanist erudite Thomas More is the author of the famous work Utopia, published in 1516. He was criticizing the bourgeois society that was in its juvenile era at the time. He was explaining the suffer and exhaustion people encountered as a result of the capital accumulation process, which Marx would call 'primitive accumulation' far later. These problems were caused by the fact that the lords that embarked upon animal husbandry because of the eradication of the village communities, the pasturagization of the agricultural area and the profit brought by woolen sales deprived villagers of their lands.
>   The characters of More, who was critical of the fifteenth century English society believed that "in a place where private property and money

corresponded to everything, it is hard, and indeed impossible, to ensure a government belonging to the community and a general state of prosperity.

  Thomas More proposed an ideal system called Utopia as opposed to the system based itself upon private property. This ideal system had its grounds on communal ownership and communal production. Utopia means 'the country of no-where'. More assumed the existence of his ideal system in an island named as such. Utopia of Thomas More is the first initiative in history that portrays a socialist community. Today, his term 'utopia' is used to explain all imaginary socialist systems preceding scientific socialism. (141-142)

[THOMAS MORE: (More, Thomas) (1478-1535) Utopyacı sosyalizmin kurucusu. Tanınmış humanist bilgin Thomas More 1516'da yayınlanan Utopia adlı meşhur eserin yazarıdır. Daha çocukluk çağını yaşayan burjuva toplumunu eleştiriyordu, Marx'ın çok sonra 'ilkel birikim' adını vereceği capital birikmesi sürecinin halka çektirdiği acıları ve sıkıntıları uzun uzun anlatıyordu. Bu sıkıntılar köy topluluklarının ortadan kalkması, ekilen toprakların mer'a haline getirilmesi, yün satışlarının çok karlı hale gelmesi nedeniyle hayvan yetiştiriciliğine girişen beylerin, köylüleri topraklarından etmelerinden ileri geliyordu.

  XV. yüzyıl ingiliz toplumunu eleştiren More'un başlıca kahramanları "özel mülkiyetin ve paranın herşeyin ölçüsü olduğu bir yerde, topluluğa adil bir hükümet ve genel bir refah halinin sağlanmasının zor, ya da imkansız" olduğuna inanmışlardır.

  Thomas More, özel mülkiyet üzerine kurulmuş olan sistemin karşısına Utopia adındaki ideal sistemi çıkarıyordu. Bu ideal sistemin temelinde sosyalleştirilmiş mülkiyet ve sosyalleştirişmiş üretim yatıyordu. Utopia "hiçbir yer ülkesi" demektir. More, ideal sistemini bu ismi taşıyan bir adada kurulmuş sayıyordu. Thomas More'un Utopiası tarihte sosyalist bir toplumun başlıca çizgilerini çizen ilk girişimdir. Kullandığı terim "utopia", bilimsel sosyalizm öncesi bütün hayali sosyalizm sistemlerini anlatmak için kullanılır oldu. (141-142)]

As seen, Başar's portrayal of More and *Utopia* does not mention the religious roots behind the communal property and communal production, rather, he chooses to relate these major themes to the capital theory of Marx. Published in the same period of time, *Edebiyat Terimleri Sözlüğü* (The Dictionary of Literary Terms) by Sami Akalın (1966) offers a more neutral definition of the term signifying the idealistic and unattainable nature of the concept:

UTOPIA: the ideal human community and country in the form of thought. Such philosophers as Plato, T.More, Bacon and Campanella have written works on society and state that are ideal according to their own standpoints.

(Plato: Republic, T.More: Utopia, Bacon: New Atlantis, Campanella: The City of the Sun) Utopia, in general, is used in terms of unachievable ideal. (175)

[ÜTOPYA: İdeal insan topluluğunun ve ülkesinin, düşüncedeki biçimi. Eflatun, T.More, Bacon, Campanella gibi filozoflar, kendi anlayışlarına uygun düşen toplum ve devlet üzerine ayrı ayrı eserler yazmışlardır. (Eflatun: Devlet, T.More: Utopia, Bacon: Yeni Atlantis, Campanella: Güneş Ülkesi) Ütopya, genel olarak, ulaşılamayacak ülkü anlamına da kullanılır. (175)]

A similar attitude towards the concept is also introduced by the *Ansiklopedik Edebiyat Sözlüğü* (The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Literature) by Seyit Kemal Karalıoğlu published in 1969. As seen below, the work is classified among the same literary works and it's the idealistic nature of the concept that's stressed:

UTOPIA: 'Fr. Utopie, En. Utopia', proposal or thought the realization of which is impossible, visionary and imaginary. Idealistic society constructed by ideal people. Platon 'Republic', Bacon 'New Atlantis', Thomas More 'Utopia', Campanella 'City of the Sun' all describe this ideal in their works. The ones who are taken up with utopias are defined as 'utopist, utopian'. (Karalıoğlu 762)

[ÜTOPYA: 'Fr. Utopie, İng. Utopia' gerçekleştirilmesi olanaksız tasarı veya düşünce, muhal, hayali. İdeal insanların meydana getirdiği ülküsel toplum; Eflatun: Devlet, T.More: Utopia, Bacon: Yeni Atlantis, Campanella: Güneş Ülkesi eserlerinde bu ülküyü anlatırlar. Ütopyalara kapılan kimse 'ütopist, ütopyacı' adını alır. (Karalıoğlu 762)]

The same dictionary defines Thomas More as an English humanist philosopher who criticizes the society he lives in and as the creator of the country in which people would be well-educated, conduct good lives and obtain freedom of thought and conscious (ibid. 464). Here, the dictionary also touches on the tragic death of More resulting from his rejecting the superiority of the king over church (ibid.).

As a product of the 1980s, the series of Mina Urgan titled *İngiliz Edebiyatı Tarihi* (The History of English Literature) adopts a similar approach towards More and his *Utopia* as Halide Edib does in her study. Introducing the work and More within the context of Renaissance humanism, Urgan touches on how More and other

humanist works enlightened by classicism wrote their masterpieces in Latin (Urgan, İngiliz Edebiyatı, 29) and how More departs from other humanists in terms of rejecting a religious reform (ibid. 121). Indicating that the English Renaissance, as opposed to the Italian Renaissance, is devoted to the notions of ethics, religion and nation, Urgan provides her reader with a justification to the conservative manner More displays in his *Utopia*. As Halide Edib does, Urgan also regards More as the most creative and significant authors among English humanists, and she states that if More had written *Utopia* fifty years later, he would have written it in English and they would have included *Utopia* among the works to be analyzed in that volume. Thus, the study of Urgan does not offer an elaborate discussion upon More and *Utopia* as the study of Edip does. Instead, it gives a reference to another work of Urgan, *Edebiyatta Ütopya Kavramı ve Sir Thomas More* (Utopia in Literature and Sir Thomas More), for further information (ibid. 129). The book Urgan refers to with a footnote is an extended version of the introduction of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* and will be mentioned in the next chapters. Lastly, the study of Akşit Göktürk titled *Edebiyatta Ada* (Island in Literature) enumerates *Utopia* among the significant examples of island literature and discusses both the work and More in detail. His approach towards the work has already been offered under previous titles of this chapter.

Utopia, both as a genre and as a concept, has aroused interest in the Turkish literary circle at different periods of time, thought it has always revealed a tendency towards remaining at the periphery of the literary system. There have been a number of attempts of introducing various approaches towards the term, for which both translation and critical writing have been used as a tool. Utopia as a term has kept

being included to the dictionaries of literary terms,[22] periodicals have offered special editions on utopia,[23] and a dictionary of utopias has been translated into Turkish,[24] all of which reveal the active functioning of the concept and the genre in the Turkish literary system.

Overall, this chapter introduced the concept of utopia, its historical evolution, and the role More and his *Utopia* played in this conceptualization throughout both Western and Turkish literary history. In the proceeding chapters, the study will focus on the translational journey of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system and explore the varying natures and roles adopted by translation within this specific journey.

---

[22] See Özkırımlı 178; Karataş 501.

[23] See *Kitaplık* 76 (2004); *Milliyet Sanat* 216 (1989).

[24] Riot-Sarcey, Thomas Bouchet, Antoine Picon. *Ütopyalar Sözlüğü.* (trans) Turhan Ilgaz. İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2003.

CHAPTER 3

UTOPIA AS A CASE OF NON-TRANSLATION UNTIL 1964

This chapter of the study focuses on the absence of Thomas More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system until 1964. In light of the notion of non-translation, this absence of the work is regarded as the first context of the work in the target literary system and it is subjected to a translational analysis. As the majority of the literary sources on Turkish utopias, the study assumes that the penetration of the genre of utopia into the Turkish literary system dates back to Tanzimat Period; therefore, the scope of this part of the study will be the period between the nineteenth century and 1964.

While questioning the appearance of *Utopia* in a specific existential form of translation, i.e non-translation, this chapter benefits from Sebnem Susam Sarajeva's assertions on non-translation in her *Theories on the Move*. In her book, Sarajeva mentions that the notion of non-translation exists in a number of ways. Firstly, non-translation refers to non-available translations in a particular receiving system, which makes the researcher ask the question why some works are translated and others not (Sarajeva 34). Thus, the context of non-translation also requires an investigation of the norms of text selection and repertoire construction adopted by the agents in the target literary system. As Sarajeva portrays in her study, non-translation brings about a different contextualization of both the authors themselves and the ideas proposed by them, which makes them partially-represented in semantic terms in the receiving system. In her book, the case is explained with the example of the non-translation of the political implications of the texts of Roland Barthes in Turkey and Helene Cixous

and in the Anglophone world. Sarajeva questions "why their work could not be effectively put into (political) use within the atmosphere prevalent at the time" in light of the notion of non-translation and relates the semantically partial representations of these authors and their works to the action-based understanding of politics prevalent in the target literary systems (202).

Texts involved in non-translation might reflect decisions taken in various stages of translation process, which are mainly the pre-production process, i.e. text-selection, the production process, i.e. exercising omissions, and the post-production process, namely promotion and presentation. Besides investigating the utopias that were not translated at all, this part of the present study benefits from the concern of partial-representation explored by the study of Sarajeva and refers to the notion of non-translation in order to investigate the partial-representations of what are considered utopias in their source systems in the Turkish literary system. It might seem interesting to question the nature of the works that even appeared as retranslations within the context of non-translation. However, I believe that according to the predominant norms of text-selection and contextualization, these works were the semantically partial representations of their sources and I will examine them in the context of non-translation, right besides the utopias that were not translated at all. Besides, Sarajeva asserts that when a lexical item in the source text is left as it is in the target text, it becomes an example of non-translation as well (ibid. 179). Overall, adopting the scheme portrayed by Sarajeva, throughout this study, I will refer to the notion of non-translation with such qualifiers next to it. I will use "textual non-translation" for the works that were not translated at all, "semantic non-translation" (or semantically partial translation) for the works that were translated but still are related to the context of non-translation, and "lexical non-

translation" for non-translations on the level of word-choices. Since this chapter analyses its case at the level of repertoire-making, recontextualization and representation of the concept of utopia, it does not include textual analysis. Therefore, the third type of non-translation, that is "lexical non-translation", will not be used as a tool of analysis.

Utopias are works that directly mirror the social dynamics of their periods and the period between Tanzimat and 1964 includes a number of grand ideological shifts in recent Turkish history. Therefore, regarding these major ideological shifts- namely the initial efforts to create cultural modernization and to establish a parliamentary government in the Ottoman Empire, the establishment of the Turkish Republic, the rise of Turkish Humanism which initiated a great translational movement, and the ideological shift brought by the 1961 Constitution- the study categorizes its scope in three periods, namely the Tanzimat and the early twentieth century, 1923 and the 1940s, and the 1940s and 1964. Here the study benefits from Even-Zohar's notion of repertoire which is explained as "the aggregate of laws and elements (either single, bound, or total models) that govern the production of texts", and it aims to explore the non-translational nature of More's *Utopia* by defining three sub-repertoires these three periods gave rise to (Even-Zohar, Polysystem, 17-18). The first sub-repertoire is the repertoire of the literary utopias that refers to the indigenous literary works produced by Turkish authors. The second sub-repertoire is the repertoire of the translated utopias that are the translations of the works that fall under the category of the genre of utopia. And the third one is the repertoire of the non-translated utopias which are the literary utopias that were not introduced to the Turkish literary system. Although Even-Zohar's notion of repertoire refers to an aggregate of existing facts, this study continues utilizing the notion while exploring the repertoire of non-

translations. The polysystem theory is quite applicable to this body of works which do not exist in the Turkish literary system, especially when the changing, local and temporal nature of the repertoires of both the existing and the non-existing translations are considered. Besides, the status of the repertoire of non-translations as "determined by the relations that obtain in the (poly)system" and the notions of "innovatory elites" and "conservatory elites" can also be employed *vis-à-vis* the exploration of the textual and semantic non-translations in the Turkish literary system (ibid. 17-18).

A point which needs to be emphasized at the outset is that the three repertoires portrayed by the study do not claim to be exhaustive. Further studies might adopt what I briefly describe and analyze here as non-translation as their focus and produce a more detailed scheme. The aim here is to give a brief analysis of the context of More's *Utopia* before it was translated in 1964. Moreover, my selection of certain texts as representative of the genre of utopia is not without controversy. Utopia is an elusive genre and the definitions of utopia vary from one point of view to another.

For the purposes of the present thesis, I utilized from the perspectives offered in a series of articles, MA theses and books dealing with the concept of utopia and literary utopias. These are mainly *Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (The Encyclopedia of Turkey from Tanzimat to the Republic) by Murat Belge, "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyete Edebi Ütopyalara Bir Bakış" (A Look Towards Literary Utopias from Tanzimat to the Republic) by Engin Kılıç, *Eğer'den Meğer'e: Ütopya Karşısında Türk Romanı* (From 'If' to 'It Seems That': Turkish Novel Facing Utopia) by Ayhan Yalçınkaya and "1980-2005 Dönemi Türk Edebiyatında Ütopik Romanlar ve Ütopyanın Kurgusu" (Utopian Novels and The Setting of Utopia in

Turkish Literature between 1980-2005) by Yasemin Küçükcoşkun for the repertoire of indigenous utopias, and *Avrupa Edebiyatı ve Biz* (European Literature and Us) by İsmail Habib Sevük, *Çokkültürlülük ve Çeviri: Osmanlı Devleti'nde Çeviri Etkinliği ve Çevirmenler* (Multiculturalism and Translation: The Act of Translation and the Translators in the Ottoman Empire) by Sakine Eruz and *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü* (The Role of Translation in the Eras of Revival) by Hilmi Ziya Ülken for the repertoires of translated and non-translated utopias. As for the contextual background provided for the periods and the position of translation in these periods, *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960* by Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, *Translation and Westernisation in Turkey* by Özlem Berk and "Turkish Tradition" by Saliha Paker are the main sources used.

3.1 A Brief Introduction to Turkish Utopias

Since the sixteenth century, the concept of utopia proposed by Thomas More has been developed both into a literary genre and into a social theory via a number of recontextualizations differing from one another. After *Utopia*, Western civilization witnessed major historical events that caused grand shifts in human way of thinking, namely the Enlightenment, the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. Throughout these periods, *Utopia* accompanied man in their manifestations against the existing system, just as it accompanied More and his people in its own period. Thus, though the book does not prescribe a systematic path to humans in achieving the heaven on earth, so far, everyone has found an answer to their own hows within the depiction of the ideal land in the book. Perhaps, without being employed as a means of manifesting the rejections towards the present, *Utopia* would have

remained as a mere historical document reflecting the pre-Anglican era of the Tudor England.

It is three centures later that the concept of utopia proposed by More enabled the Turkish intellectuals to find answers to their own hows. In the Turkish context, the first problematic pondered upon through utopia was Westernization. Thus, it could be asserted that utopia was introduced to Turkish literary system as a consequence of the rise of the Westernization ideal:

> Towards the beginning of the 19th century, the major aim was to empower the central state. However, this necessitated the introduction of a new tax system that would finance the military, which required a modern bureaucratic organisation that would be enabled through the educational institutions training modern bureaucrats. For this reason, modern schools were established under the supervision of the European educators. In this way a generation came out that was educated in these institutions, benefited from resources other than the traditional education methods and realised the benefits of the Enlightenment; it is this new generation that would play a major role in the social and political transition the country witnessed in the second half of the 19th century. After this point, a cultural Westernization that could not be easily controlled (which was denounced as 'European snobbery' by the conservative Tanzimat novelists) started to crack the traditionalist crust of the Ottoman. We see that in such an atmosphere, in which the military and governmental transition disseminated into culture and the culture was put under the effect of the West, the thought of utopia penetrated into the Turkish literature together with other innovations. (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 74)

> [19. yüzyılın başında başlayan süreçte ana hedef askeri modernizasyon yoluyla merkezi devletin güçlendirilmesiydi. Ancak orduyu finanse etmek üzere yeni bir vergi sisteminin getirilmesi, bunun için modern bir bürokrasi teşkilatı, onun için de modern bürokratları yetiştirecek eğitim kurumları gerekmekteydi. Bu yüzden Avrupalı eğitimcilerin nezaretinde modern okullar kuruldu. Böylece bu kurumlarda eğitim gören, ilk kez geleneksel eğitim yöntemlerinden farklı kaynaklardan beslenen, Aydınlanma'nın getirileriyle karşılaşan ve 19. yüzyılın ikinci yarısında ülkenin yaşadığı siyasal ve toplumsal değişimde önemli rol oynayacak olan bir kuşak yetişti. Bu noktadan sonra artık o kadar kolayca denetlenemeyen (hatta muhafazakar Tanzimat romancılarının 'alafranga züppelik' diye yaftaladığı) bir kültürel Batılılaşma da Osmanlı kültürünün geleneksel kabuğunu çatlatmaya başladı. İşte böyle bir ortamda, yani askeri/idari dönüşümün kültür alanına da sirayet ettiği, kültürü de Batı'nın etki alanına soktuğu bir atmosferde Türk edebiyatına diğer yeniliklerle beraber ütopya düşüncesinin de girdiğini görüyoruz. (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 74)]

As quoted above, following the critical nature of the utopian tradition, Young Ottomans (Genç Osmanlılar) imported utopia to Turkish literary system as a means of proposing their reformist ideas on the existing system. To bring a solution to the social contradictions of their time, they offered fictive solutions to the Turkish reader of the nineteenth century.

Here, it needs to be stated that, today one might encounter different approaches towards the penetration of the genre of utopia in Turkish literary system. What the studies mostly diverge at is the starting point of the genre's development. The MA thesis titled "1980-2005 Dönemi Türk Edebiyatında Ütopik Romanlar ve Ütopyanın Kurgusu" (Utopian Novels and The Setting of Utopia in Turkish Literature between 1980-2005) by Yasemin Küçükcoşkun, for instance, regards the utopias written before twentieth century as "pre-utopias" and exemplifies the works that date after the beginning of the twentieth century as "the more apparent" examples of the genre (38). The study titled "Türk Romanında Siyasi ve Sosyal İçerikli Gelecek Kurguları" (The Political and Social Fiction on Future in the Turkish Novel) by Halil İbrahim Ülser, on the other hand, dates this date of initiation in Turkish literature as 1960s. "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebi Ütopyalarında İdeal Toplum Tasavvurları" (The Envisions of an Ideal Society in the Literary Utopias of the Republican Era) of Engin Kılıç adopts a different point of view, which neither Küçükcoşkun nor Ülser would oppose, and regards Turkish utopias as a genre of its own which started to be developed in Tanzimat Period. Because of the socio-political factors dominating Turkish literary history, as he asserts, Turkish utopias have not been able to pass beyond the Turkish boundaries and become real utopias that would comment on all humanity.

All products classified under the genre of utopia could easily be regarded as the works that propose "a critique of dominant idology, offering its readers an imaginary or fictive solution to the social contradictions of its own time", though this definition would not be able to limit the boundaries drawn by the genre (Bruce xv). As mentioned before, since these works are dependent on their periods and geographies, they differ from one another to a great extent. Likewise, as the initiator, *Utopia* itself is a work in which various genres are blended. Thus, as much as it is difficult to define whether a work of literature is utopia or not, it is quite easy to categorize a work carrying utopian features under a different literary genre. Touching on this elusive nature of utopias, Küçükcoşkun enumerates some of the genres that either embrace or are embraced by utopias:

> Structurally, utopias have often been confused with other genres, or thought as one within the other. Such genres that have been developed in similar structures as fantastic, tale, science-fiction or political essay might appear in certain nets of relationships with utopia. (3)

> [Ütopyalar yapı olarak başka türlerle sık sık karıştırılmış, iç içe düşünülmüştür. Benzer yapılarda gelişen fantastik, masal, bilimkurgu, siyasetname gibi türler ütopya ile belirli ilişkiler ağının içerisinde varlık bulabilir. (3)]

Perhaps this is among the main reasons as to why there exists a disagreement on the point of departure of Turkish utopias. One might easily regard the works that date far before Tanzimat, such as fantastic, tale (*masal*) and political essays (*siyasetname*), as utopias, just as one might regard each of these as separate genres that embrace the features of the genre of utopia. In the first hypothesis, the genre of utopia encompasses a local genre; whereas in the second, the local genre is the predominant one that embraces utopia as a mere literary feature.

In his book titled *Türk Edebiyatında Siyasi Rüyalar* (Political Dreams in Turkish Literature), Metin Kayahan Özgül follows the second path and focuses on

utopia in Turkish literature as a categorization under the genre of political dreams

(*siyasi rüya*). In his book, Özgül explores the evolution of political dreams in Turkish

literature as the works which narrate a dream in order to propose a political criticism.

In his book, he enumerates forty two examples for these works from Turkish

literature four of which could not be found but have only been heard of. As seen

below, his definition of this particular genre corresponds to the definition of the

genre of utopia introduced by Thomas More:

> On the basis of the political dreams, there lie disfomforts. Any political,
> governmental, financial or military problem that disturbs a nation or at least a
> certain community is interpreted, analyzed or criticized in dreams; ideal
> solutions are proposed (…) Historical events are the reasons of the dreams and
> dreams are the attempts of changing history. (Özgül 21)

> [Siyasi ruyanın temelinde rahatsızlıklar yatar. Milleti yahut en azından, belli bir
> grubu rahatsız eden siyasi, idari, mali, askeri bir problem ruyalarda tefsir, tahlil
> ve tenkid edilir; ideal çözüm yolları gösterilir (…) Tarihi hadiseler ruyaların
> sebebidir ve ruyalar tarihi değiştirme teşebbüsleridir. (Özgül 21)]

In his study, Özgül categorizes political dreams according to the periods they

evolved, as "dreams of consolation" (*teselli rüyalari*), "critical dreams" (*tenkid*

rüyalari) and "utopic dreams" (*ütopik rüyalar*), and stresses that especially

throughout the periods of decline, Turkish literature witnessed an abundance of such

works, although it was not not until Tanzimat that the authors started to fall against

the rule (ibid. 12-18). According to Özgül, the works that fall under the third

category, "utopic dreams", came right after Abdülhamid rule and they employed

major historical events of their period as their main themes:

> After the rule of Abdulhamid Khan, many dreams were seen on Balkan War,
> the new constitutional governments, Ankara Government, the elections and
> Atatürk. In this respect, it is seen that certain ideologies, systems and ideal
> projects have been embodied as utopic dreams. (ibid. 16)

[Abdülhamid Han'dan sonra, Balkan Harbi, yeni meşruti hukumetler, Ankara Hukumeti, seçimler ve Atatürk hakkında görülmüş pek çok ruya vardır. Bu meyanda, bir kısım ideoloji, düzen ve ideal projelerin ütopik ruyalar halinde şekillendigi de görülür. (ibid. 16)]

Instead of embracing utopia as a literary feature employed by dream fiction as Metin Kayahan Özgül does above, another scholar questioning the position of utopia in Turkish literature, Ayhan Yalçınkaya, adopts this particular period of decline as the initial date for Turkish utopias, considering the fact that Turkish literature started to employ utopic features then (179).[25] Therefore, today, depending on the standpoint, literary sources on Turkish utopias (and on utopian features in Turkish literary works) investigate the same works within the scopes of different literary traditions. As for this thesis, since the main focus is the transmission of the genre of utopia initiated by Thomas More to the Turkish literary system, it will contextualize the selected literary work under this particular genre and disclude other literary traditions mirrored by these works from its scope.

3.2 Between Tanzimat and 1923

3.2.1 The Repertoire of Indigenous Utopias

As mentioned in the introductory paragraphs of this chapter, from the second half of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century, Turkish authors employed utopia as a means of proposing the ideal of Westernization. In these works, the authors proposed the modern aspects of the Western rule as an alternative to the Ottoman rule. In *Rüya* (The Dream,1869), for instance, Ziya Paşa offered Sultan Abdülaziz to establish a parliament; whereas, in *Rüya* (The Dream,1872), Namık

---

[25] However, Yalçınkaya also states that one needs to consider the particular literary traditions behind the utopia-like works, instead of categorizing these works as utopias merely (179). Thus, he does not contradict with the view adopted by Özgül which foregrounds the Ottoman literary tradition while explicating the works of Tanzimat as utopic dreams, instead of as utopias.

Kemal reproved the conservative and traditionalist manners of the society and suggested to construct railways, libraries and enhanced communication channels.[26]

However, one might find more apparent utopian traces in the project introduced by Servet-i Fünun[27] proponents, which is referred as the New Zealand project. The project, which was developed by such remarkable names of Turkish literary history as Tevfik Fikret, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın and Mehmet Rauf, is regarded as a utopia itself because it proposed a communal way of life in an island isolated from the rest of the world as opposed to the suppression brought by the Abdülhamid rule and this dream could never be realized. As a product of this escape plan, came out "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" (The Imaginary Life, 1897)[28] by Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın. As mentioned by Ayhan Yalçınkaya, this work carries typical utopian features such as it employs an isolated island separated from the ocean by high rocks and in this ideal land people get along so well with nature and conduct every aspect of living together (185-186). However, considering the fact that the work does not depict a systematic way of governing as More's *Utopia* does, Yalçınkaya finds it more appropriate to classify "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" as an "arcadia", which is a "primitive version of utopia" that proposes a less systematic and more naturalist way of life compared to the products of the utopian convention initiated by Thomas More (ibid. 187).

---

[26] The examples are taken from Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e.

[27] Servet-i Fünun (known as The Wealth of Knowledge) was an avant-garde journal published by such writers of the new literature as Halid Ziya, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın and Tevfik Fikret in order to inform the Ottoman reader about the European, particularly French, cultural and intellectual movements. The movement was named after the journal and it was initiated by the same agents who tried to establish a Western-based literary convention in the Turkish literature.

[28] There is not a consensus upon the exact date of this work. There are literary sources that give the date of the work as 1899 as well (Yalçınkaya 184)

The study classifies "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" within the repertoire of indigenous utopias. The work reveals the intentions of Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın in changing the present system and the author himself admitted the influence of such literary utopias as *Utopia* and *City of Sun* on him while the thought of a better system was evolving in his mind (Huyugüzel 47). As for the translational value the story possesses, one might define the work as a concealed translation, because among all Turkish utopias, "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" is the literary work which corresponds to More's *Utopia* the most. For such cases, Toury embraces the concealed translations and pseudotranslations as significant constituents of the translational phenomena and introduces the term "assumed translation" (Toury, DTS, 35). He defines three postulates through which the translational value of such works as "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" could be explored:

> (...) an assumed translation would be regarded as any target-culture text for which there are reasons to tentatively posit the existence of another text, in another culture and language, from which it was presumedly derived by transfer operations and to which it is now tied by certain relationships, some of which may be regarded- within that culture- as necessary and/or sufficient. (ibid.)

Heading from the "the relationship postulate", one might draw a parallelism between *Utopia* and "Hayat-ı Muhayyel", in that, both propose their reader a primitive society that conducts a communal way of living in an isolated land separated from the rest of the world by high rocks. Heading from these thematic resemblances, one might conclude that the story confirms to the three postulates offered by Toury and could be defined as a concealed translation. However, it would always be safer to regard the work among the indigenous utopias that evolved out of the Servet-i Fünun context. "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" is a story that carries the traces of the oppressive Abdülhamit rule on the one hand, an it reveals an influence from the utopian tradition

initiated by More on the other. That's why this study classifies the work among the indigenous utopias, although it acknowledges that futher studies might explore the nature of the case with a detailed comparative analysis and provide clear justifications that would present the work as a concealed translation.

The study of Yalçınkaya presumes the first example of literary utopia in Turkish literature that proceeds "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" as *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde* (In the Land of Free People, 1930) by Ahmet Ağaoğlu; whereas, both Yasemin Küçükcoşkun and Engin Kılıç exemplify a number of utopias that appeared in the period between 1897 and 1930. Indeed, they both assert that at the beginning of the twentieth century, an increase in the literary utopias is observed (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 75; Küçükcoşkun 39). In his article, Kılıç relates this abundance to the forthcoming collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the emergence of the necessity of an immediate solution to this (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 75). Besides Ziya Gökalp's "Kızıl Elma" (The Lurid Apple, 1913) and Ali Kemal's "Fetret" (The Interregnum, 1913), the most apparent utopia of the period is regarded as *Yeni Turan* (The New Turan, 1912) by Halide Edip Adıvar. In his article, Engin Kılıç classifies the work among the well-known examples of the nationalist literature and states that as other works of this type of literature, it aims to create a glorious past for the Turks (ibid. 76). Kılıç describes Edib's book as an envision that aims to unite everyone under one identity and as other proposals of the period, it is markedly "centralist", "turkist-islamist" and "authoritarian" (ibid.).

In the same period, there also appeared utopias of the islamist-nationalist ideology. Two examples Kılıç gives to this type of Turkish utopias are *Rüyada Terakki ve Medeniyet-i İslamiyeyi Rüyet* (Seeing The Development of an Islam Civilization in a Dream, 1913) by Molla Davutzade Mustafa Nazım Erzurumi and

Ruşeni'nin Rüyası: Müslümanların "Megali İdeası" Gaye-i Hayaliyesi (The Dream of Ruşeni: The Megali Idea and the Intended Dream of the Muslims, 1915) by Hasan Ruşeni. Though written three decades earlier under different political conditions, "Darürrahat Müslümanları" (The Muslims of the Land of Comfort, 1887) by İsmail Gaspıralı might be added to the scheme of islamic utopias as well.

Overall, the period between Tanzimat and 1923 posesses a heterogenious repertoire of indigenous utopias. This heterogenity brought by the simultaneous existence of a number of ways of thought in the period put forth various solutions to the decline of the Ottoman Empire. Although the works in the repertoire of indigenous utopias diverge at some ideological issues, their abundance indicates that in this period utopia as a literary genre was transferred to the Turkish litearary system.

3.2.2 The Repertoire of Translated and Non-Translated Utopias

In her article on Turkish translation tradition, Saliha Paker defines Tanzimat as "the series of political, social and institutional reforms that initiated in 1839 the gradual but conscious shift towards a Western outlook" (552). In these reforms, the main focus of which was improving the sociopolitical condition of the Ottoman Empire through Westernization, translation, and the translation chambers played a remarkable role. Paker regards this period among the two major periods of acculturation in the Turkish realm and defines the sociopolitical atmosphere of the period and the position of translation chambers in this atmosphere as such:

> [The translation chambers] served as the most important institutional centre for the penetration of European ideas (mainly through French) and for the education of the most distinguished statesmen, thinkers, scholars and literary innovators of the time. Despite conquests that reached into central Europe and active diplomatic and commercial relations, the Ottomans had generally

remained indifferent to the ideas of the Enlightenment. It was only in the nineteenth century that the weakening Empire, forced by economic and political circumstances to turn to Europe, began to discover the stimuli for intellectual revival; the foundations of the Westernist modern Turkish Republic were laid in the nineteenth century. (ibid.)

As mentioned by Paker, as a result of the translational initiatives actualized by the nineteenth century intellectuals who aimed an economic, political and intellectual revival of the Ottoman, three new literary genres were introduced to the Turkish literary system by 1860. These are namely "Western poetry", by the translations of La Fontaine, Lamartine, Gilbert and Racine, "philosophical dialogue" by a selection of the translations of the dialogues of Voltaire, Fenelon and Fontenelle and the "novel" by the translation of Fenelon's *Les Aventures de Telemaque* (ibid. 556). In his article "Utopia in Turkish Literary and Intellectual History" (Türk Yazın ve Düşünce Tarihinde Ütopya), Arslan Kaynardağ regards *Telemaque*, the first novel translated into Turkish, as a utopia, because it depicts an island society governed by an ideal governing structure, as opposed to the French society under the reign of Louis XIV (12). Affirming the assertions of Kaynardağ, this study classifies this work under the repertoire of translated utopias.

The 1860s also witnessed the popularity of the serialized versions of some examples of Western canonical fiction, most of which were later published as a book, either retranslated or in the form they first appeared (Paker 557). Among these, there exists a literary work that might be classified under the genre of utopia, namely *Micromegas* of Voltaire translated in 1871. Narrating the adventures of the space voyager Micromegas from the planet Sirius who ends up coming to earth and witnesses the follies of the humankind, this work is considered to have been influenced from Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, which might be considered another example of utopian fiction. While explaining the influence of Western fiction on

Hüseyin Cahit Yücel's utopia "Hayat-ı Muhayyel", Yalçınkaya exemplifies both of these works along with Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, the first translation of which appeared in 1864 (188). In his article, Arslan Kaynardağ touches on the fact that in this period the translations of such utopias as *Robinson Cruzoe* (1864) and *Gulliver's Travels* (1872) and a number of Jules Verne's books appeared succesively (11). Kaynardağ does not mention the possible reasons behind the succesiveness of these translations. But he asserts that the critical vision offered by these utopias have become a great influence on the fictional dreams of such Turkish authors as Ziya Paşa, Namık Kemal and Abdullah Cevdet, which are classified among the first examples of Turkish utopias, as mentioned in the previous section of this chapter (ibid. 12).

The assertions of Kaynardağ exemplify the elusive character of the genre once more. In his article, besides *Telemaque, Micromegas, Robinson Cruzoe* and *Gulliver's Travels*, the books of Jules Verne are considered utopias as well. Although the books of Jules Verne do not offer a specific ideal land, the fact that their author criticizes the existing system referring to non-existing phantasy settings might have lead him classify the fiction of Jules Verne as utopic. However, I assume that the phantasy settings provided by Jules Verne contribute not to the critical but to the fictional (therefore entertaining) level of the works. In other words, although one might find some utopian elements in the works of Jules Verne, these works are not regarded as utopias, but as books of adventure based on the adventures of the rationalized man who is able to conduct space, air and underwater travels. Therefore, the sudy does not include the fiction of Jules Verne to its repertoire of translated utopias.

Micromegas, Les Aventures de Telemaque, Robinson Crusoe and *Gulliver's Travels* were all retranslated shortly after their initial translations appeared. *Robinson Crusoe*, the first translation of which appeared in 1864 with the title "Robenson Hikayesi", was retranslated firstly in 1870 with the title "Hikaye-i Robenson" and then in 1886 with the title "Robenson". *Gulliver's Travels*, on the other hand, firstly appeared in 1872 with the title "Güliver'in Seyahatnamesi", then in 1913 with the title "Gülliver'in seyahatnamesi yahud, Cüceler memleketinde". *Micromegas* first appeared in Turkish with Armenian letters in 1869 as "Hikaye-i Filozoffiye-i Mikromega", then its serialized translation was published in 1871. As for *Telemaque*, the first translation appeared in 1862, and it was retranslated in 1881. As Paker states in her article, both *Micromegas* and *Telemaque* were retranslated to improve on the first serialized versions (Paker 557).

Between the years 1877 and 1907, over thirty translations of Jules Verne's books were translated. İsmail Habib Sevük classifies the books of Jules Verne under the category of *fenni roman* (scientific novel) and regards other popular genres of the period as *polis ve macera romanı* (detective and adventure novel) and *komik roman* (comedy novel) indicating the interest of the sultan towards these genres:

> The abundance in the translations of detective and adventure novel increased even more in the era of İstibdat (Autocracy). Abdülhamit himself was interested in these type of novels as well. When looked at the dates of publication indicated in their pages, it is immediately realized that a plenty of these ones belonged to the era of İstibdat. It is also in the era of İstibdat that there was a remarkable increase in the translations of Jules Verne in the genre of science novel. Between the years 1890 and 1905, merely the Jules Verne translations by Ahmet İhsan were around 20. And there are around 16 other translations. In comedy novel, the translations of Paul de Cock can be regarded as the same. (Sevük, Garptan Tercümeler, vol.2, 602)

> [Polis ve macera romanlarındaki tufan halini alan tercüme bolluğu asıl İstibdad devrinde koyulaştı. Bu gibi romanlara zaten Abdülhamid de meraklıydı. Bunlara ayrılan inci sahifelerdeki fasıldan intişar tarihlerine göre İstibdada devrine aid olanların çokluğu derhal anlaşılır. Fenni romanda Joles Verne'den

yapılan tercümeler de asıl İstibdad devrinde büsbütün bollandı. Yalnız Ahmet İhsan'ın Jül Vern tercümeleri 1890 la 1905 aralarında 20yi bulmuştu. Diğer tercümeler de 16 kadar tutuyor. Komik romanda Paul de Cock'dan yapılan tercümeler de böyle. (Sevük, Garptan Tercümeler, vol.2, 602)]

Since the translations and retranslations of *Micromegas, Les Aventures de Telemaque, Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver's Travels* also date to the same period, supposedly these works were classified under the same group of reading material as the fiction of Jules Verne and met the same type of expectations of the reader community of the time, among which, as Sevük states above, Abdülhamid took place.

As for the repertoire of the non-translated utopias, while exemplifying the works that influenced Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, Sadık Usta touches on the more canonical works of utopic fiction the translation of which did not exist at the time, namely More's *Utopia* and Campanella's *City of the Sun* (Usta, Türkiye Devrimi, 24). Besides, other canonical examples of Western utopic fiction, namely Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* and Henry Neville's *Isle of Pines* were not translated in the period between Tanzimat and 1923.

What was the difference between the works of utopian fiction that were translated and the ones that were not translated? Perhaps, because they depicted their arguments more explicitly, *Utopia, New Atlantis, City of the Sun* and *Isle of Pines* were regarded as works of more critical and less-fictive nature than the ones that were retranslated shortly after their first translations appeared. The translated works of utopic nature seem to have corresponded to the popular categories of the period, which Sevük classifies as *fenni roman, komik roman* and *macera romanı* (Sevük, Garptan Tercümeler). Besides, one might infer the political motive behind these non-translations from these words quoted from Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın's memoirs:

Such works as *Utopie, Cite de Soleil* which we read secretly arose in our souls the ideas of constituting a clean society and living together like brothers, like real people without the thoughts of 'yours' or 'mine'. (Huyugüzel 47)

[Gizli gizli okuduğumuz *Utopie, Cite de Soleil* gibi eserler, bizim ruhlarımızda 'senin', 'benim' düşünceleri olmadan kardeş gibi, hakiki bir insan gibi bir arada yaşamak ve temiz bir sosyete teşkil etmek fikirlerini uyandırmıştı. (Huyugüzel 47)]

As indicated by Saliha Paker, the period witnessed a censorship in the reign of Abdülhamid II and it was not until the Constitutional Revolution of 1908 and the deposition of Abdülhamid II that the translation of canonical literary works revived (557). Such translations of Abdullah Cevdet as *Del Principe e delle lettere* (1906) and *Della Tirannide* (1908) written by the Italian defender of freedom of thought Vittorio Alfieri might easily be related to the suppression under the rule of Abdülhamid (Sevük, Garptan Tercümeler, vol 1., 163-164). Besides the appearence of these two translations right next to the absence of the translations of the canonical utopias, it is also interesting that Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın read *Utopia* secretly, but published "Hayat'ı Muhayyel" in a daily paper without any hesitance. Regarding the other Turkish utopias produced in the period besides "Hayat-ı Muhayyel", it might be asserted that in contrast with the traditional path of introducing new ideas to a literary system, that is translation, Tanzimat intellectuals chose to write their own utopias through which they could express their criticisms towards their societies.

3.2.3 Conclusions to the first period

To conclude the analysis of the three repertoires of the period between Tanzimat and 1923, Even-Zohar's theory on culture repertoire and the notion of transfer seems to be the best option to be utilized. Culture repertoire is defined by Even-Zohar as "the aggregate of options utilized by a group of people and by the individual members of

the group, for the organization of life" (Even-Zohar, Making of Repertoire, 166).

This aggregate of options "is neither generated nor inherited by our genes, but need

be made, learned and adopted by people"(ibid. 168). The process of its construction

is continuous and the agents involved in the case either remain anonymous or are

"openly and dedicately engaged in this activity" (ibid.). Even-Zohar introduces two

types of procedures in the making of repertoires, namely "invention" and "import".

Invention, as he proceeds, "may relate the labor involved in the making within the

confines of the home system without any link to some other system" although it is

always a possibility that import is involved in the process of invention (ibid. 169).

Either procedure is applied, the process of repertoire construction follows as such:

> When goods- material or semiotic- are imported, if they are successful on the
> home market, they may gradually become integral part of the target repertoire.
> This occurs if we can observe that they may have become obvious, self-
> evident, for the target group, indeed indispensable for life…I would like to call
> the state of integrated importation in a home repertoire 'transfer'. Transfer, in
> short, is the process whereby imported goods are integrated into a home
> repertoire, and the consequences generated by this integration. (ibid.)

Even-Zohar indicates that not all transfers occur on the same level. There are

transfers on the level of passive repertoire in which "transfer can plant images of the

world that will at least be compatible, or tolerated, by the home repertoire", and there

are transfers on the level of active repertoire in which "the transferred repertoire may

have direct consequences for the way people begin to act in their immediate

environment" (ibid. 171-172). Thus, the goods transferred either enable people to

perceive or instruct them how to act.

To apply the translational context of Even-Zohar's theory to this case, firstly,

the analysis of the period between Tanzimat and 1923 revealed that in the case of the

evolution of the sub-repertoires of literary utopias in Turkish literary system, the

agents involved in this process were not anonymous but "known members who are openly and dedicately engaged in this activity" and these agents embraced both invention and import as the procedures in the making of these repertoires (ibid. 168). However, the process of import in this context is problematic, because the utopias whose fictive character were more dominant than their critical character were selected to be translated. The translated utopias were introduced to the receiving system not as utopias, but as serialized fiction, juvenile fiction and adventure books. Likewise, the analysis of the repertoire of non-translated utopias revealed that there was a resistance towards the import of some particular works, namely those that reflected a more critical and less entertaining nature.

Therefore, the line that sets the repertoire of translated utopias apart from the repertoire of non-translated utopias is an elusive one. This is because instead of being introduced as utopias, the works that were imported were introduced to the receiving system under the sub-repertoires of different literary genres. Under these circumstances, their existence in the repertoire of translated utopias is quite debatable, since, as mentioned, they did not actually exist in the receiving system as utopias. Perhaps, it might be safer to regard the works included in the repertoire of translated utopias as semantic non-translations. As indicated in the beginning paragraphs of this chapter, this type of non-translation refers to the non-translation of a semantic content of the source text that brings about a different contextualization and reception of the source text in the receiving system, which is believed to conform to this case.

As for the nature of this particular transfer, in light of the abundance of literary utopias written in the period between Tanzimat and 1923, it might still be asserted that utopia as a genre was transferred to the Turkish literary system, although the

genre was blended with the literary conventions and the historical contexts that were present in the Turkish literary system. However, the role of translation in the process of this transfer is problematic, because it is observed that, the "innovatory elites" of the period preferred to write their own utopias under the influence of the Western canonical works of the genre (Even-Zohar, Polysystem). There existed a repertoire of translated utopias, but the absence of the critical utopic content in the works that were classified under this repertoire ambiguates the position of these translations in this repertoire. Besides, it is observed that there is a higher correspondance between the indigenous utopias and non-translated utopias than the one between the indigenous utopias and translated ones. Thus, the genre is transferred to the Turkish literary system in an unconventional way because it is acknowledged that, throughout history, translation has played a signicant role in the path of the transfer of genres, theories and ways of thought; whereas in this case, the imported goods served for the transfer of other literary traditions, i.e. adventure and juvenile fiction, more than the transfer of the genre of utopia.

Lastly, the formation of the culture repertoire in the Turkish literary system between Tanzimat and 1923 embraces the transfer of utopia as a literary genre. This might be regarded as a transfer not on the level of "active repertoire" that would generate a new set of instructions to act in the world, but on the level of "passive repertoire" that introduced images that could only be tolerated by the home repertoire (Even Zohar, Making of Repertoire, 172), because, as Engin Kılıç states, literary utopias have always remained out of the literary canon in Turkey (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 85).

3.3 Between 1923 and 1940

3.3.1 The Repertoire of Indigenous Utopias

In modern Turkish history, the transition to the multi-party system, which dates to 1946, is regarded as the second major historical shift after the establishment of the Republic. As works following the political agenda of their periods, Turkish utopias that appeared between the establishment of the Republic and the transition to the multi-party system adopted the year 1946 as a period of change and developed common characteristics according to this historical event. However, as the main focus of this study is translation, it takes the effect of the rising translation movement of the 1940s on the repertoires of the translated and non-translated utopias into consideration and determines the second period under its focus as the period between 1923 and 1940.

After the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, two major ideals that had already started to appear in the eighteenth century, namely modernization and westernization, were the leading actors of the historical scene. The sporadic Westernization efforts before 1923 were replaced by a systematic state-governed "culture planning" which Even-Zohar defines as "a deliberate act of intervention, either by power holders or by 'free agents' into an extant or a crystallizing repertoire" (Even-Zohar, Papers, 97). Therefore, in the context of Turkish history, power holders, namely the state, took control of the intervention and this was quite effective in every aspect of the socio-cultural and political life in the 1920s and 1930s. Some of the Republican reforms, as the constituents of the upcoming culture repertoire in Turkey, might be listed as the abolishment of Caliphate (1924), the establishment of a unitary education system (1924), the adoption of Western timing and Western calendar (1925), the termination of the religious sects and brotherhoods

(1925), the admission of the Civil Code of Switzerland (1926), the adoption of the international numeric system (1928), the alphabet reform (1928), the reformation on women's rights (1930) and the enactment of *Soyadı Kanunu* (Surname Law) (1935) (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Politics, 50; Bozkurt 38).

This process of building a Westernized Turkish nation "equipped with a unique Turkish identity" and detached from its Ottoman roots lasted throughout the first twenty years of the Republic and was mirrored by the Turkish utopias written in the period (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Presumed Innocent, 49-50). As explained by Engin Kılıç, the utopias of the Republican period considerably confirmed to the instructions of the state-governed culture planning, therefore are not as heterogeneous in nature as the utopias of the period between Tanzimat and 1923:

> Utopias of the Republican Era were written in an atmosphere in which the single-party regime was in progress in Turkey and in relation to this, an etatist and solidarist-corporatist economic and social order was aimed to be established; the nationalist, the Westernization partisanship, the positivist, monist and totalitarian tendencies were predominant; and culture was shaped by this progress. That's why they include envisions that do not contradict the premises of this atmosphere. (176-177)

> [Cumhuriyet dönemi ütopyaları, Türkiye'de tek parti rejiminin benimsendiği, bununla bağlantılı olarak devletçi, solidarist-korporatist bir ekonomik ve toplumsal düzenin kurulmasının hedeflendiği; milliyetçi, radikal Batılılaşmacı, positivist, monist ve totaliter eğilimlerin hakim olduğu; kültürün de bu yönde biçimlendirildiği bir ortamda yazılırlar. Dolayısıyla bu ortamın öncülleriyle çelişmeyen tasavvurlar içerirler. (176-177)]

Both Kılıç and Küçükcoşkun exemplify *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde* (In the Land of Free People, 1930) by Ahmet Ağaoğlu as the first utopia of the Republican Era (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 76; Küçükcoşkun 39). It might be assumed that all utopias of the nineteenth century intellectuals that were based on Westernization were realized by the establishment of the Republic and this might be regarded among the reasons as to why there appeared so few utopias in the period between 1923 and

1930. As the most obvious example of the utopian vision embraced by the dominant Kemalist ideology of the time, *Serbest İnsanlar Ülkesinde* (1930) tells the journey of a fugitive who ends up in a land of freedom. This ideal land of Ağaoğlu is a civilization that lives on the modern means of science and production, and it has enhanced cultural, health and education institutions. Another example of the period that follows the Kemalist Republican politics is *Semavi İhtiras* (The Celestial Desire, 1933) by Raif Necdet Kestelli that tells the Turkey of the 1950s. Although there is a real time and space in this book, the setting is quite ideal; Turkey potrayed by Kestelli is a powerful land of wealth that has solved all its socio-political problems. The third example of the repertoire of indigenous utopias of the period is *Ankara* (1934) by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu. The book tells the three major periods of Turkish history, namely the period of War of Independence, the period of the establishment of the Republic and the period after the establishment of the Republic. It is the third part in which the author presents his utopic ideals on Turkish Republic, which again does not pass beyond the boundaries drawn by the Republican reforms.

3.3.2 The Repertoire of Translated and Non-Translated Utopias

Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar defines the Republican era in Turkey as a unique period in which translation became a vehicle for nation building (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Politics). Used as a tool for cultural transformation, translation was assigned the mission of creating a national literature, especially for the use of young generation. For this reason, after the proclamation of the Republic "Telif ve Tercüme Heyeti" (Committee on Original and Translated Works) was established as a branch of the Ministry of Education in 1924. As Seyhan Bozkurt states, the state adhered an

importance to the works which "disseminated information about the new regime to the public and also helped spread ideas about contemporary science, technology, and trends in education" rather than focusing on the translations of the literary works (43). This Committee continued its progress until 1926, followed by a second planned translation activity, namely the launch of the series by Ministry of Education titled "Cihan Edebiyatından Nümuneler" (Samples from World Literature) in 1927. In her study, Seyhan Bozkurt states that in the period private sector was much more active in publishing translated literature than the state (44). However, owing to the great shift brought by the proclamation of the Alphabet Reform in 1928, the dynamic in the private sector fell into a period of stagnation as well.

This scene does not provide the repertoires of translated and non-translated utopias with drastic changes. The period between between 1923 and 1940 includes an interesting abundance of the retranslations of *Robinson Crusoe*. The forth retranslation of the work appeared in 1923 and the fifth one was published in 1932. In 1938, it was retranslated three more times, which bestowed the period with five retranslations of the work in total. Besides, the third retranslation of *Gulliver's Travels* appeared in 1935.[29] In 1938, the translation of Plato's *Apology* appeared, leaving the most canonical utopia of the world literary history *Republic* excluded from the Turkish scene of translated literature. A similar case had occurred in 1899,

---

[29] In order to establish a continuity among the three periods under focus and observe the paths the repertoires of these periods followed, this study assumes that the translational journeys of both *Gulliver's Travels* and *Robinson Crusoe* initiated before the establishment of the Republic. Therefore, here the translations of these works that date to the Republican era are referred as retranslations. However, owing to the complexity brought by the Alphabet Reform to the scene of translation, the retranslational existence of the translations that date after 1930s is quite problematic. In her *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey*, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar devotes a chapter to the translations of *Gulliver's Travels* (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Politics, 265-305). As for the studies on the translations on Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, *Çevirinin Tanıklığında Medeniyetin Dönüşümü* and *Osmanlıcada Robinson* by Ayşe Banu Karadağ and the MA thesis by Aslı Ekmekçi titled "The Shaping Role of Retranslation in Turkey: The Case of Robinson Crusoe" could be exemplified.

when it was Goethe's *The Sorrows of Young Werther* that was translated rather than his most canonical piece *Faust*, the first translation of which appeared in 1926.

On the other hand, the repertoire of non-translated utopias remained exactly the same as the repertoire of the period between Tanzimat and 1923. None of *Utopia, Cite de Soleil, New Atlantis* or *Isle of Pines* were introduced to the Turkish literary system, neither any other works that could be classified under the genre of utopia entered the repertoire.

3.3.3 Conclusions to the Second Period

Although the definition of utopia includes a rejection and a critic of the existing system, the examples in the repertoire of the indigenous utopias revealed that in the period between 1923 and 1940, the utopias produced were closely obedient and grateful towards the dominant ideology of the state, leave aside criticising its manners. As for the other two repertoires, the utopias of more critical nature continued to remain as absent in the Turkish literary system; whereas, the ones that were introduced under different literary conventions, therefore were defined as semantic non-translations, in the first period sustained their popularity and continued their journeys in the form of retranslation.

3.4 Between 1940 and 1964

3.4.1 The Repertoire of Indigenous Utopias

Compared to first two periods, the period between 1940 and 1964 does not include as many works of utopian nature. Most of the utopias produced in this period are influenced by the movement of ruralism put forth by the Republican government. This movement has its roots firstly in "Türk Ocakları" (Turkish Hearts) launched in

1912, then in "Halkevleri" (People's Houses) set up in 1932. These institutions were "the agents of the ruling Republican People's Party" and "served to disseminate the six principles of the party: republicanism, nationalism, populism, etatism, secularism and reformism" (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Politics, 73). They aimed to disseminate the cultural reformation among the local communities and had various brances of cultural activity.

The 1940s encountered a more systematically structured version of these institutions, namely the Village Institutes. As Tahir-Gürçağlar states, "the Institues were set up with the aim of educating the rural population, who would, in turn, educate their fellow villagers and help combat illiteracy and general backwardness" (ibid. 77). For this planning activity, a number of professors and translators who also worked for the Bureau, such as Professor İrfan Şahinbaş, Vedat Günyol, Saffet Korkut Pala and Sebahattin Eyüboğlu, were employed (ibid. 80). These people continued practicing their teacher-positions they acquired via the Institues throughout their lives. It is known that the translations of the Western classics from antiquity to modernism published by the Ministry of Education were included to the curriculum of the lessons conducted, which reveals the significant role this planning activity adhered to translated works. On the other hand, the Village Institutes are regarded as the remarkable constituents of the culture planning of the government. Proposing equality and opposing religious conservatism, they introduced the ideology of the new Republic to the countryside and contributed to the identity construction process that was initiated in the 1920s.

Owing to the transition to a multi-party regime in 1946, together with the external and internal political developments, i.e. the requirements of the UN, the establishment of the Democrat Party, the Republican People's Party was obliged to

change its philosophy and policies and this intensive period of culture planning

entered a period of stagnation (ibid. 83-84). Referred as a period of "de-planning of

culture" by Tahir-Gürçağlar, the period after 1946 witnessed the liberalization

policies of the government, which required some revisions and restrictions from the

education institutions mentioned above. Tahir-Gürçağlar explains the process the

Village Institutions underwent as such:

> While, until 1946, the Institutes had stood as a monument of the future vision
> of the country and a major instrument for the creation of a national identity for
> the rural population, after this year the liberalization policies of the government
> revised and restricted their activities. After Hasan-Ali Yücel, the Minister of
> Education and Hakkı Tonguç, the director of the Village Institutes, were forced
> to resign from their posts, the Institutes came under attack, mainly due to
> allegations of communist propaganda at the Institutes (Karpat 1959: 380). A
> series of resolutions by the government adopted in 1947 altered the basic
> principles underlying the Institutes. This was the same Republican People's
> Party that had approved the establishment of the Institutes in 1940. (ibid. 84-
> 85)

Owing to a turn towards the religious concerns and the fear of communism that

started to dominate the majority of the Grand National Assembly, the progress of the

education institutions which once aimed a cultural revolution was called off.

However, the agents involved in this culture planning activity never abandoned the

teacher position they acquired via the Institutes and continued to contribute to the

cultural revolution to which they devoted themselves via their personal initiatives.

Engin Kılıç explicates this ruralist attitude of the Republican People's Party in

terms of corporatism, which is "a movement initiated by the ruling class that has no

relatedness with the life in the rurals and that seeks for an answer to the question how

to establish a corporatist system based on a consistent and stable way of life in the

rurals." ["(…) bu hareket, köy hayatıyla ilgisi olmayan yönetici kadronun, istikrarlı

ve durağan yaşantıyı esas alan korporatist düzenin kırsal alanda nasıl sağlanabileceği

sorusuna cevap arar."] (Kılıç, Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e, 84). The utopias of the period are considerably influenced by this movement and they question how to establish a systematic order in the rurals, as well as a unity among the rural and the urban. In these works, as Kılıç asserts, the villagers are taught to establish a modern settlement for themselves and start living in that wellfare happily ever after, which might be regarded as the ideal aimed to be actualized by the Village Institues (ibid.). Memduh Şevket Esendal's story titled "Yurda Dönüş" (Back to the Homeland, 1940) is an example that describes Turkey as a grand village in which people are committed to their land, trade body and region. Although appearing twenty years later, *Toprak Uyanırsa: Ekmeksizköy Öğretmeninin Hatıraları* (If the Land Awakens: The Memoirs of the Teacher of Ekmeksizköy, 1963) might be included in the repertoire of the indigenous utopias of this period, regarding the similar ruralist ideology that aims to reform the rurals foregrounded by the work.

Not all utopias of the period included the ruralist ideology. *Yalnızız* (Us Alone, 1951) by Peyami Safa and *Aganta Burina Burinata* (1945) by Halikarnas Balıkçısı (The Fisherman of Halicarnassus) are the two works that were not written under the influence of ruralism. Yasemin Küçükcoşkun regards these two examples as partial-utopias, because not all parts of the works confirm to the utopian tradition (40). In the former example, the ideal land portrayed by the novel's main character Samim named Simeranya is quite a utopian depiction, but this utopic land constitites only a part of the novel. *Aganta Burina Burinata,* which tells about the lives of the people who devoted their lives to sea, is said to be in a similar situation, in that, a number of parts of the novel include utopian elements although the work on the whole cannot be classified as a utopia.

3.4.2 The Repertoires of Translated and Non-Translated Utopias

The present chapter analyzed the indigenous utopias in light of the ruralist constituent of the Culture planning of the Republican Party; whereas, it will focus on the repertoires of the translated and non-translated utopias of the period in light of another constituent of the same Culture Planning, that is Turkish Humanism.

Followed by the First Publishing Congress that was held in 1939 to generate a systematic program for the publishing activities carried out by state and private publishers, firstly a Translation Commitee (1939) then a Translation Bureau (1940) was set up with the intention of "reinforcing the new language policies and organizing a programme for cultural revival" (Paker 557-558). These advancements initiated one of the most productive eras in Turkey in terms of translation. For firstly the Commitee then the Bureau, academics and prominent men of letters were gathered and asked to introduce world classics- beginning with those of humanist culture- to the Turkish reader. The Bureau operated between the years 1940 and 1967. Its most productive period was the one between the years 1940 and 1946, when Turkey was still ruled by a single-party regime. Between the years 1940 and 1944, 109 works were translated, however, the change in government policies and the dismissal of the leading members of the Bureau led it loose its initial impetus after 1950 (ibid.). This translation movement was followed by another rise in the 1960s. With the constitutional changes in 1961, the active contributions of the private publishing companies to the Turkish repertoire of translated works were integrated into the scene. What relates the movement of the 1960s to the Bureau is that, as Özlem Berk denotes, "many of the translators and writers who had worked there [in Bureau], opened their own private publishing houses after 1960 and benefited from their experiences gained in the Bureau." (141). Berk exemplifies De

Yayınları, Çan Yayınları, Ataç Kitabevi, Sol Yayınları and Sosyal Yayınlar among such publishing houses that benefited from both the greater freedom of through allowed by the 1961 Constitution and the experience some of the agents involved in these publishing houses acquired from the Bureau (ibid.).

The study sets the period between the 1940 and 1964 apart from the first two periods and argues that in contrast to the first two periods, the culture planning activities shaped by the state ideology of the 1940s started to set the stage ready for the import of *Utopia* to the Turkish literary system. It was in this period that such canonical utopias as Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1957) and Plato's *Republic* (1946) were introduced to the repertoire of translated utopias. As the most significant example of the distopic fiction, *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley was translated in this period (1945) as well. Campanella's *City of the Sun* and More's *Utopia* were both added to the 1943 list of the Bureau. The former work did not exist in the 1947 list of the Bureau, neither its translation appeared until 1964. *Utopia*, on the other hand, took part in the 1947 list, and indeed it was assigned to a translator who is not indicated in the list, but its first translation appeared in 1964. Therefore, the existence of these two works in the repertoire of non-translations is questionable, because similar works to these two were introduced to the receiving system and these works were also attempted to be introduced, which might lead one to the conclusion that they actually existed in the context of utopia translations in Turkish literary system. Another indication ambiguating the non-translational existence of *Utopia* between 1940 and 1964 is that a partial translation of the work was published by the periodical of the Bureau *Tercüme,* which was a publication that aimed to "draw attention to the activities of the Bureau" as well as to "create a critical forum for the discussion of literary translation" (Paker 558).

These all clarify that at the time, there evolved a "willingness to consume the new good", which are *Utopia* and other canonical utopias in this case; therefore, the "resistance" of the literary polysystem towards importing these texts became weaker (Even-Zohar, The Making of Repertoire, 170-171). The evolution of the state oriented humanism referred as Turkish Humanism plays a major role in this situation. Together with the 1961 Constitution, the establishment of new publishing houses and the influx of new ideas and new modes of thought, the resistance that had started to be weakened by the humanist context of the 1940s was overcome altogether and thus appeared the first translation of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system in 1964.[30]

Hence, in the 1940s, the proper context for the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish was initiated with the evolution and operation of the state oriented humanism. The translators of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* kept being the proceeders of this humanism and some other philosophies of the culture planning of the 1930s; therefore, they contributed to the evolution of this favorable context provided for the work as well. One might assert that the works translated and published by the initiatives of the Bureau and those translated and published by Çan Yayınları contributed to different repetoires, since the former were integrated in state initiatives, whereas the latter were the products of the liberal atmosphere 1961 Constitution provided for the private sector. Yet, as mentioned, the corpus proposed by Çan Yayınları is composed by the followers of the 1940s' humanism; therefore,

---

[30] One might as well say that it was a sheer coincidence that *Utopia* was not published as a product of the Translation Bureau attempts since it was included to the lists twice. In other words, it might be asserted that the resistance was not weakened but broken by Turkish Humanism. This study would not reprove that idea since it is not certainly known why the work was not translated although it was included in the lists and assigned to a translator, just as many of the works in the list. It is probable that it was not published because of the institutional complexities brought by the shifts of the state policies as approached towards the 1950s.

the thoughts proposed by the translations in these two groups cannot be claimed to contradict one another.

3.5 Conclusions to Chapter Three

This chapter aimed to explore the context of Thomas More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system between Tanzimat and 1964 as a non-translation. As revealed by the analysis of the repertoires of the indigenous utopias of the three periods, the literary convention and themes introduced by *Utopia* was transferred to the Turkish literary system although the position of translation in this process is markedly unconventional, in that, the imports of the goods occured far after the first examples of indigenous utopias appeared.

The analysis of the repertoire of indigenous utopias revealed a decrease in the number of works as approached towards the 1940s. Examples of more literary less political character such as *Ankara* by Yakup Kadri and *Yalnızız* by Peyami Safa are seen in the last two periods, though in general, the examples of the three periods reveal that the authors of the Turkish utopias made the genre serve for the dominant politics of their periods (Kılıç, Cumhuriyet Dönemi, 178). Engin Kılıç relates this confirming nature of the Turkish utopias to the fact that these works were mostly written by bureaucratic intellectuals that served for the state (179). Especially in the Republican Era, the variety revealed by Turkish utopias does not pass beyond the "eclectic nature allowed by Kemalism" (ibid.). Thus it is not a coincidence that these works include such Kemalist instructions as Westernization, modernization, ruralism, solidarity and etatism.

It is observed that bureucratic intellectuals were involved in the scene of translation as well. Especially in the second and third periods, when translation

became a more official activity employed by the culture planning of the Republican era, the nature of the translators as bureucratic intellectuals became more visible. In his *Papers in Culture Research*, Even-Zohar extends his notion of "innovatory elites" which he put forth among his first assertions on polysystem theory (Polysystem, 17-18) and defines the literary system as an industry that functions with the activities of "idea-makers", "cultural entrepreneurs" and "makers of life images" (Papers, 201). According to Even-Zohar, there exist active agents in the formations of culture repertoires who has the ability to "proliferate options by putting forward new ideas" (ibid. 191). "Idea-makers", as the agents that have this ability, "produce and preach" their ideas, and in some occasions, they "become active in attempts towards their implementation", which makes them "cultural entrepreneurs" (ibid. 195). The nature of the translators not only as producers and preachers but also as cultural entrepreneurs in the three periods under focus might be explained as such: The entrepreneurs that were active in the translational context between the years 1923 and 1964 "reinforced socio-cultural control by promoting preferred interpretations of life circumstances"- surely there always existed products that "turned out to be at odds with the prevailing preferences" (ibid. 199). The same case might be assumed for the period between Tanzimat and 1923, since in that period there existed a mission adhered to translation by state as well. However, regarding the more systematic nature of the culture planning that relates the translation activities to the policies of the government in the period between 1923 and 1964, it might be asserted that the socio-cultural and political reinforcement provided by translation is more visible in the Republican era. Besides, in the context Even-Zohar portrays, literature is seen as the contributor of the "potential models of life" that provides tools for "both understanding and operating in actual life" (ibid.). As

revealed by the last phases of this chapter, in the 1960s, the entrepreneurs that were once involved in the culture planning activities of the 1930s and 1940s continued to propose the life-model that was introduced as a constituent of the identity construction procedures of the Republican ideology. They surely developed this life-model according to their personal standpoints, which is a case to be explored in Chapter Four.

There is no consensus among the resources on Turkish utopias about the existence of the genre of utopia in Turkish literary system. Because of being over-attached to the political agenda of their periods, Turkish utopias do not "offer projections that take place in a far future, social envisions that have not been practiced in world yet", neither there exist "communist, anarchist, feminist emancipatory utopias that pass beyond Turkey and cover whole humanity" ["Türk edebiyatında, siyasi alanda ağırlığı olmayan görüşleri yansıtan ütopyalara rastlanmaz. Çok uzak bir gelecekte geçen projeksiyonlar, dünyada henüz tecrübe edilmemiş toplumsal tasavvurlar, ya da Türkiye'yi aşan ve tüm insanlığı kapsayan komünist, anarşist, feminist, özgürlükçü vb ütopyalar da mevcut değildir".] (Kılıç, Cumhuriyet Dönemi, 180). Still, this study assumes that Turkish literature transferred utopia as a literary genre, and the process was initiated in Tanzimat. Because, although considering Turkish utopias as a genre of its own with its own historical dynamics would be the most appropriate path to choose to achieve a sound analysis, one can still find certain themes and patterns Turkish utopias borrowed from the utopic tradition initiated by More. Besides, just as More's *Utopia*, Turkish utopias include high amount of historical references, thus they might be regarded as great historical documents. Regarding the peripheral position of the genre in Turkish literary canon, on the other hand, this transfer might be regarded as a transfer on the

level of passive repertoire that occupies a "tolerable" position in the receiving system rather than an "indispensable" one (Even-Zohar, The Making of Repertoire, 171-172).

While the path followed by the repertoire of indigenous utopias revealed a gradual increase in the correspondence between the dominant ideology and the works produced, the repertoires of translated and non-translated utopias remained less dynamic in nature until the translation movement of the 1940s. After the establishment of the Bureau, an expansion of the repertoire of translated literature is observed in general. This great increase in translated literary works affected the sub-repertoires of translated and non-translated utopias to a visible extent. By 1964, all works in the repertoires of the non-translated utopias of the first two periods were introduced to the Turkish literary system. Therefore, with the integration of the utopias of more critical nature in the repertoire of translated utopias, the repertoire was discharged of the semantic non-translational value it possessed; whereas, the repertoire of non-translated utopias diminished to a remarkable extent.

CHAPTER 4

THE FIRST TRANSLATION OF *UTOPIA* INTO TURKISH

As explored in Chapter Three, More's *Utopia* was not translated into Turkish until 1964 owing to a number of socio-cultural policies. Although the translation movement of the 1940s established the favorable grounds for the introduction of *Utopia* to the Turkish literary system, which we understand from the appearance of the work's name in the translation lists and the partial-translation published by the Bureau's periodical *Tercüme*, it is the context of the 1960s that the work was firstly introduced into. As mentioned in the previous chapter, by the end of the 1950s, many canonical works of the genre of utopia, such as Plato's *Republic*, Bacon's *New Atlantis*, and those of the dystopian fiction, such as Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *1984* were translated into Turkish. Therefore the translation of *Utopia* was not the first example that introduces the utopian literary convention to the Turkish literary system. However, it served for the implementation of some particular conventions other than the literary ones, which will be the major concern of this chapter.

In his *Translation in Systems*, Theo Hermans enounces the importance of systemic thinking in understanding translation as a social practice. Regarding translation as a phenomena in close relation with the social conventions, norms and rules, he attributes to translation indicative and formative roles and defines it both as an indicative of the functioning of the receiving system and as a potential restructuring factor in that system. Explaining the first role, Hermans quotes a statement of Goethe asserting that "the relations between an original and its

translation most clearly express the relations of one nation to another" (95). In this context, it is acknowledged that translation has been used as a means of cultural self-definition which makes the translation product a mirror of how the receiving culture defines itself. Right besides this autonomous and self-referent character of translation implied by the indicative role, Hermans includes heteronomy and external reference to his portrayal of the translational system. As the self-referent nature of translation "never wholly extinguishes a source text's otherness" and translation is "one of the means to irritate client systems", translation fulfills a formative role and becomes a restructuring factor in the receiving culture through combining the internal and external references (ibid. 144). As revealed in Chapter Three, throughout the history of Turkish culture planning, translation fulfilled its formative role and actively contributed to the formation and reformation of the culture repertoires. Likewise, this whole process of the formation of the culture repertoire left its traces on the products of translation and made them the indicatives of the periods they appeared in. Focusing on the first translation of Thomas More's *Utopia* into Turkish, this chapter of the present study questions what this particular text indicates and forms.

The assumption that each translation fulfills an indicative and formative role implies the existence of a certain ideology beyond each translation. In his *Discourse as Social Interaction*, Teun A. van Dijk defines ideology as an entity developed by people in order to find a solution to a specific problem (Dijk, vol. 2, 26). Once established, as he asserts, the ideologies serve for coordinating the practices of the members of a certain group or a society who are governed by the ideology makers. The coordination sustained by the ideology refers to the group cohesion and solidarity. With the ideology, the members of the group act in similar ways in similar

situations and cooperate in joint tasks (ibid.). Relating the notion with translation, Andre Lefevere defines ideology as the most prominent shaping factor in the translation process through which the translator draws a relation between the universe of discourse of the source text and that of the translator's society (41). Therefore, it is the ideology, in light of which the translator proceeds his path of translation, that brings about the shifts between the source and the target text, as well as the ones between the retranslations of a particular source text.

In her article titled "Translation, Presumed Innocent", Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar proposes two levels on which ideology operates in translated texts. "Explicit ideologies" are the surface ideologies that concern the socio-political context in which translations appear; whereas, the "implicit ideologies" define the substance and the conditions of the encounter with foreign cultures and texts (38). The 1964 translation of *Utopia* embraces the socio-political context initiated in the 1940s with Turkish Humanism on the one hand, and the social atmosphere triggered by the 1961 Constitution on the other as its explicit ideology; and the concerns on the micro-level such as the choice of texts, the positions of the translators and the translation strategies they applied all reveal a type of implicit ideology that corresponds to this explicit ideology. In this chapter, in light of the mutual operation of these two types of ideologies, the indicative and the formative roles assigned to this translation will be investigated. But firstly, the notion of agency in the context of the first translation of *Utopia* will be discussed since the translation was conducted by quite remarkable names the symbolic capitals of whom are still present in the Turkish literary system.

4.1 The Agency

In order to explore the social nature of acts of translation, recent studies on translation incorporate the social theory of the French theoretician Pierre Bourdieu to translation research and benefit from his tools, the most well-known of which are "field", "habitus" and "symbolic capital", while investigating the notion of agency within the context of translation. As defined by Moira Inghilleri, "field" refers to the "sites for the confrontation of various forces, individual and institutional, and for the production, dissemination and authorization of different forms of symbolic/material capital"; whereas, "habitus" refers to the "embodied dispositions acquired through individuals' social and biological trajectories and continually shaped and negotiated *vis-à-vis* fields" (280). As inferred from their definitions, field, habitus and symbolic capital are the tools designed for drawing a context for the social changes including the agency factor. However, the present chapter will specifically benefit from the notion of "symbolic capital" and disclude the notions of habitus and field from its scope. It will explore the role of agency in the social change brought by the 1964 translation of *Utopia* in light of the context Even-Zohar portrays for agency in his later works on the polysystem theory and the formation of the culture repertoire.

To begin with symbolic capital, the concept simply refers to the capital possessed by the agents with the help of which the agents conduct their activities in a particular literary system. As stated by Jean-Marc Gouanvic, symbolic capital is acquired not by heritage but by recognition, and it needs to be "constantly regained through new works published in the literary field" (161). As Gouanvic proceeds, the translator benefits from the capital invested in the original work; therefore, the choice of text is quite an important step for the translator and it contributes to his/her symbolic capital. As translation is a major contributor of the author's recognition in a

receiving system, the work of the translator contributes to the capital of the author in return (ibid. 162).

While explaining the formations of culture repertoires, Even-Zohar corresponds the symbolic capital of Bourdieu to his notion of wealth and states that it operates on both collective and individual levels (Even-Zohar, Culture Repertoire). Here, he cites some parameters of wealth, which are "the acquired positions", "levels of organizedness", "mutual aid between members of the collective abilities of act", "sense of self-confidence" and "access to enterprising options" (ibid. 398-399). The present chapter will investigate the agency factor in the context of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* in light of these parameters introduced by Even-Zohar.

In his *Papers in Culture Research*, Even-Zohar states that culture repertoires are formed according to the activities of the agents who has the ability to "proliferate options by putting forward new ideas" (Even-Zohar, Papers, 191). Here, he explains the functioning of the literary system and introduces a number of agencies, i.e. idea-makers, cultural entrepreneurs and makers of life images. In the context Even-Zohar portrays, the literary system is presented as an industry in which idea-makers proliferate the options in a culture repertoire via producing and preaching their ideas. Even-Zohar defines these people as a "small dedicated group of thoughtful people to get engaged in the business of thinking, generating or providing alternative or unprecedented new options" (ibid. 192). Idea makers might be involved in the implementation of the ideas they introduce, which would make them culture entrepreneurs (ibid. 195). These entrepreneurs not only make the ideas they introduce heard and accepted, but also convert them to socio-cultural reality (ibid.). Defined as "life images" that are introduced, promoted and implemented by culture entrepreneurs, these ideas are present in literature. According to Even-Zohar,

literature is a prominent contributor of the potential models of life and it provides tools for "both understanding and operating in actual life" (ibid. 199). Therefore, as makers and promoters of life images, culture entrepreneurs assign themselves the misssion of directing the society towards a particular way of comprehending life and they use literature as a tool of accomplishing this mission.

As mentioned in Chapter Three, following the establishment of the Republic, translation started to be used as a means of implementing the Republican Reforms and became a more official activity; therefore in the Republican era the nature of the translators as bureucratic intellectuals became more visible owing to the culture plannings of the Republican Regime which were considerably involved into translation. As the hegemonic state ideology was the major factor behind their agencies, their products became the indicatives of both the periods they evolved out of and the ideologies state aimed to implement in these periods. Therefore, although defined by a small dedicated group by both Toury and Even-Zohar, the group constituted by the culture entrepreneurs and the agents of change of the Republican Era was supported by the power holders, namely the state, and it seems that the options they proposed were quite legitimized compared to other groups that could be classified under the category of Toury and Even-Zohar (Toury, Planning, 151; Even Zohar, Papers, 192). When approached towards the 1960s, these same agents that were once involved in the culture planning activities of the 1930s and 1940s continued being the pursuers of the life-model proposed by the predominant ideology of those years, although by that time, the life-model that was aimed to be implemented by the power holders was exposed to radical shifts and these people had lost the support of state. Surely, also by that time, these entrepreneurs had already

started to reformulate the life model evolved out of the historical context of the

1930s and 1940s according to their personal standpoints.

In the following section, the presence of the agents of the 1964 translation of

Utopia as makers of life images and culture entrepreneurs in the Turkish translation

history will be investigated. The main focus will be on how the life images

implemented by these agents that were once "reinforcing socio-cultural control by

promoting preferred interpretations of life circumstances" turned out to be not the

dominant but the alternative way of comprehending life and where the 1964

translation of *Utopia* stands in this context (Even-Zohar, Papers, 199). The study will

start explaining this transition from the dominant to the alternative with the

biographies of these agents. Afterwards, it will direct its focus towards the translation

and relate the personal standpoints of Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Vedat Günyol and Mina

Urgan with the explicit and the implicit ideologies of the translation.

4.1.1 Biographical information on the individual agents[31]

4.1.1.1 Sabahattin Eyüboğlu

One of the most prominent intellectuals of Turkish literary history, Sabahattin

Eyüboğlu was born in Trabzon Akçaabat in 1908. He was the son of a father who

joined Mustafa Kemal in the fight for Turkish Independence and later became a

member of the new Turkish Parliament in Ankara in 1923. After finishing high

school in Trabzon, Eyüboğlu was sent to Dijon, Lyon and Paris to study French

language and literature by the Turkish government, which was followed by an eight

month visit to England where he gained his English language skills. After he came

---

[31] The references used for the biographies are Güney; Eyüboğlu H.; Dino; Dünder; Gürsoy; Günyol; Necatigil; Andaç ; Yılmaz.

back to Istanbul, he was appointed as an Associate Professor at the University of Istanbul and taught French language and literature there until he was called to Ankara by the Minister of Education Hasan Ali Yücel to become a member of the High Council of the Ministry of Education.

Following the First National Publishing Congress held in 1939, he was assigned for the most prominent translation projects of Turkish translation history, namely the Translation Bureau. Together with many other intellectual devotees of Turkish revolution that were involved in the activities of the Bureau, he introduced the most important works of World Literature to the Turkish reader. After Nurullah Ataç, he served as the chairman of the Bureau. In the meanwhile, as a strong believer of the necessity of educating the people in Anatolia in light of the reforms of Atatürk, until 1947, he gave culture and history lectures at the Hasanoğlan Village Institute. This experience as a lecturer at the Institutes contributed to the development of his particular ideas on populism, humanism and collectivism. Blending this collectivist kind of humanist spirit with his strong admiration to Western Civilization, he became one of the founders of the movement called Anatolian Humanism, which proposed considerably utopic ideals about the development of the Turkish society.

The transition to the multi-party regime and the resignation of Hasan Ali Yücel had great impacts in all these activities Eyüboğlu contributed to. Throughout his life, he kept writing on the benefits of the Institutes, the Bureau and Anatolianism, and his resentment towards the misjudgments these initiatives were exposed are clearly seen in his essays. After leaving for Paris for three years, Eyüboğlu came back to Istanbul and worked as a professor until he was expelled from the university among many other professors by the military coup in 1960. Short after, the professors were called back, but Eyüboğlu refused to return and started to conduct his life as a free-lance

translator. Together with Vedat Günyol, he translated sixty two works for Çan Yayınları. Among these, their translation of a selection of essays by Babeuf which they named as *Devrim Yazıları* (Essays on Revolution) led to accusations of communist propaganda, and the charges on Günyol and Eyüboğlu were dismissed in two years. Following the military coup of March 12th, Eyüboğlu was charged for founding a communist organization and he was prosecuted once more together with his ideal-mates Azra Erhat, Vedat Günyol and his wife. Shortly after this second trial, Eyüboğlu died due to an heart attack in 1973.

There is quite a long list of Eyüboğlu translations; Lafontaine, Moliere, Rabelais, Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Rimbaud, Omer Khayyam, Valery, Sartre, Camus and Kafka are among the authors he translated. He also translated various works of old and contemporary Turkish literature into French. His critical essays were published by such periodicals as *İmece, Yücel, Tercüme* and *Yeni Ufuklar*. He published a compilation of his essays on Turkish revolution, religious conflicts and the concern of East-West with the title *The Blue and The Black*, the blue representing art and the black representing money. Today, this book is regarded among the pioneers of the genre of essay in Turkish literature. Besides, he produced cultural and art films one of which, *The Hittite Sun*, won an award at the Berlin Film Festival in 1956; and as an admirer of the Blue Anatolia he popularized the south of Turkey with his "Blue Voyages" together with the Fisherman of Halicarnassus.

4.1.1.2 Vedat Günyol

Born in 1912 in İstanbul, Vedat Günyol graduated from *Lycee de Galatasaray* and studied law in İstanbul University. He went to Paris for his PhD, where he met two people that had a major effect on his literary career, Halide Edip Adıvar and Adnan

Adıvar. Back in Turkey after the Second World War broke out, he was called by the Ministry of Education and worked in the Bureau with Nurullah Ataç, Orhan Burian, Azra Erhat, Nusret Hızır and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu. Like Eyüboğlu, he taught at the Hasanoğlan Village Institute. In the meanwhile, he went to the US and attended important literature seminars. He worked for Adnan Adıvar in the writing committee of the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, between the years 1949 and 1959. This encyclopedic compilation on Islam aimed to display the "real Islam", as opposed to the Islam associated with radicalisms and bigotries.

Günyol started writing critical essays for the periodical *Yücel*. Especially the articles he wrote for *Yeni Ufuklar* had great contributions on development of literary criticism in Turkey. He established Çan Yayınları, which was named after Ferit Edgü's motto "tekkeye karşı çan" (bell against the lodge), in 1959 and published a great number of translations from world literature along with the indigenous works of literary criticism. After the death of Eyüboğlu, he followed the idealistic path they initiated together with his works *Devlet İnsan mı?* (Is the State Human?, 1974), *Bu Cennet Bu Cehennem* (This Heaven This Hell, 1975), *Çalakalem* (Doodles, 1977), *Orman Işırsa* (If the Forest Beams, 1979), *Daldan Dala* (One to Another, 1982), *Bilinç Yolunda* (On the Way to Conscious, 1985), *Güler yüzlü Ciddilik* (Good Humored Seriousness, 1986), *Sanat ve Edebiyat Dergileri* (Periodicals of Art and Literature, 1987), *Gölgeden Işığa* (From Shadow to Light, 1988), *Yaza Yaza Yaşarken* (Living by Writing, 1991), *Güne Doğarken* (Born towards the Day, 1992), *Dünden Bugüne* (From the Past to the Present, 1995), *Giderayak Yaşarken* (Living at the Last Moment, 1989) and *Uzak Yakın Anılar* (Memories from Here and There, 1990). In 2004, he died at the age of ninety three.

4.1.1.3 Mina Urgan

Known as one of the highest authorities of English philology in Turkey, Mina Urgan was born in 1915 in İstanbul. She graduated from the American Collegiate Institute and studied French Philology in İstanbul University. She conducted her PhD in the same university at the department of English Philology with a specialization on the Elizabethan Era and became an associate professor at the same department in 1949. She acquired her professorship in 1960 and retired from Istanbul University in 1977. She wrote various articles and books on the English literary history. Her books on Virginia Woolf, Shakespeare, Thomas More and D.H. Lawrence are among the most prominent ones and are still used as course books at the universities.

Her career as a translator of English literature is quite remarkable in Turkish literary history. Translating such authors as Thomas Malory, Henry Fielding, Aldous Huxley, Graham Greene, William Golding, John Galsworthy and Shakespeare, Urgan paid major contributions to the introduction of the Western literary canon to Turkish literature. She published her memoirs in two volumes with the titles *Bir Dinazorun Anıları* (Memoirs of a Dinosaur) and *Bir Dinazorun Gezileri* (Travels of a Dinasour), both of which raised great interest owing to her interesting experiences throughout the Republican history and her acquaintance with remarkable names of the Turkish intelligentsia, both of which Urgan wrote in these books. Although Urgan does not come from the same convention of Eyüboğlu and Günyol, she shared their ideals on education and freedom of thought. She was involved into the tradition of collaborative translation and became a representative of the ideals proposed by this tradition. She died in the year 2000 at the age of eighty five.

4.2 The Explicit Ideology

Behind the 1964 translation of *Utopia*, there lies a long history of humanism that takes one back to the 1940s. The culture planning of the Republican era adopted the creation of a new Westernized and rationalized generation as its pivotal mission. In this context, humanism was defined as the appropriation of the Western culture heritage in order to give birth to a new Turkish identity detached from its Ottoman roots, and the major path to this appropriation passed through translation. As mentioned by Tahir-Gürçağlar, in this period, translation was seen as a means of providing new reading material for the young generation. This provision did not merely aim a familiarization with the Western culture; it was also expected to trigger a self-discovery through the works of the West (Tahir-Gürçağlar, *Presumed Innocent*, 43).

The dissemination of the Republican ideology based on this type of humanism to all fields of the society required various institutions to be established the most significant ones of which were the Village Institutes and the Translation Bureau. As mentioned in Chapter Three, for both institutes, prominent men of letters were employed who either established or enriched their symbolic capital by means of the experience they acquired in these institutes. Most of these people carried the mission and the position they obtained via being employed by the power holders of the Republican era throughout their lives. Two of the agents involved in the 1964 translation of *Utopia*, namely Vedat Günyol and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, were among these people who had already possessed a remarkable symbolic capital and developed a world-view that emphasized the dissemination of humanism in every aspects of life before translating *Utopia.* As for the third agent of the translation, Mina Urgan departs from them by coming from an Anglican convention and

possessing the symbolic capital of being a professor of English Philology at Istanbul University. Her involvement in the translation as a legitimizing factor will be discussed in the proceeding sections of the chapter.

The period witnessed a specific type of humanism which developed out of Turkish Humanism of 1940s. Named as Anatolian Humanism (Anatolianism and Blue Humanism are the other names adhered to this movement), this type of humanism resides in the translation of *Utopia* as an explicit ideology. Just as Turkish Humanism proposed by Hasan Ali Yücel as "a liberal humanism which is seen as timeless and universal, transcending cultural, social and historical differences", the movement of Anatolian Humanism, followed by Cevat Şakir Karbaağaçlı (Fisherman of Halicarnassus), Azra Erhat and Orhan Burian, in addition to Günyol and Eyüboğlu, aimed to "maintain a Mediterranean culture where different cultures and civilizations had been dissolved and spread to the rest of the world" (Berk 155-156). What sets this movement apart from Turkish Humanism the most is the hybrid and the populist nature of the repertoire proposed by the latter type of humanism. As mentioned by Özlem Berk, "in Eyüboğlu's Anatolianism, poets such as Homer, Yunus Emre, Mevlana, Pir Sultan and Orhan Veli were detached from the qualities of their historical, social and cultural environments they were born to and melted in the same pot of Anatolian Humanism" (156). Born in different eras, these authors were the fellow soilmen of one another and they served for the same culture repertoire the Anatolian Humanists aimed to implement. As Berk indicates, this humanist repertoire had its bases on the humanist ideals proposed by such authors as Montaigne, La Fontaine, Shakespeare, Khayyam, Mevlana, Rabelais and Thomas More, who "shared the same values, regardless of their original cultures" (ibid.).

As mentioned, the Anatolian Humanists' influence from the hybridity provided by Anatolia's precious ability of uniting the East and the West, and their special emphasis on populism which regards the society as an entity passing beyond the boundaries of nation, ethnicity and religion set their humanism apart from the one put forth by Turkish Humanism, although both of these movements are based on the appropriation of the Western culture by the Turkish culture. Anatolianism is regarded as a distinct movement of Westernization Turkish history witnessed which chose to rewrite the history through bringing the West here instead of going towards it (Karacasu 472). It basically suggests embracing all merits evolved out of Anatolia from the Hittites, Greeks, Romans and Byzantians to Seljuks and Ottomans, which would theoretically close all the gaps between the East and the West (Akyıldız, Mavi Anadolu, 472). These humanists rejected the civilization vs. culture dilemma in the context of Westernization that had been arising from the thought of importing the civilization from the West and preserving the traditionalist culture of the self. Heading from the assumption that the culture of the West evolved out of Anatolia, they appropriated the Western culture to the Turkish culture and embraced the West in not only one aspect but as a whole. This monolithique attitude was related to Eyüboğlu's particular populist attitude that suggested to act "not like a populist but like the public itself" ["halkçı gibi değil halk gibi"], in that, Turkish people belonged to this culture by nature and were more likely to think and act according to its norms (ibid. 469). Quoting from Eyüboğlu, Akyıldız states that the rationalist Western culture was far closer to the Turkish people than the culture of the bigot Islamists by all means:

> When he focuses on the Anatolian people, Eyüboğlu depicts the scene as follows: Anatolian people are neither racists nor extreme Islamists. Neither its history nor its geography favors that sort of bigotry. On that account, bigotry in

the form of nationalism and Islamism are not characteristics that could be associated with the Anatolian people. (ibid. 470)

[Eyüboğlu, Anadolu Halkı'na odaklandığı noktada manzarayı şöyle betimler: Anadolu halkı ırkçı olmadığı gibi koyu Müslüman da değildir. Bu türden softalıklara ne tarihi elverişlidir, ne coğrafyası. Tam da bu yüzden milliyetçilik ve İslamcılık gibi yobazlıklar Anadolu Halkı'na iliştirilebilecek nitelikler olamaz. (ibid.470)]

Anatolian Humanists assigned themselves the mission of showing the Turkish people that they possessed the West by nature. This alternative path of Westernization that did not import the West but adopted it among the other values of the Anatolian culture reminds Renaissance humanism that believed in men's ability of transforming himself through self-discovery. Being among the clearest examples for literature proposing this type of Renaissance ideal, Thomas More's *Utopia* must have occupied a central position in the evolution of the way of thought proposed by Anatolianists, just as its translation was believed to play a significant role in the dissemination and internalization of the Anatolianist way of thought by Turkish people.

The ideal of Anatolian Humanism and the humanism proposed by More in his *Utopia* correspond in various ways. Both portray a life that is in harmony with nature and locate the guidance of human reason on top of all other powers. Both offer a type of freedom within the boundaries of equality, fraternity and solidarity. And both depict ideal lands, one being the Blue Anatolia and the other being the island of Utopia, in which all these utopic concerns can be actualized and practiced.

Eyüboğlu and Günyol, as humanist translators, introduced the Turkish reader the works whose canonicity had been established universally and they aimed to make their reader pass beyond the boundaries of origin, race and religion. Here, translation was seen as a means of influencing the reader with the alternative ways of life proposed in the works translated, rather than merely creating awareness to the

existence of these works. In this way, when the scheme Hermans portrayed is considered, their translations indicate this certain world-view and draw a scheme of the era it evolved out of, just as they are aimed to form a community that would internalize this humanist stance. To fulfill these indicative and formative roles, Günyol and Eyüboğlu adopted a translation strategy that has its roots back in the Bureau, namely domestication.

Özlem Berk states that Eyüboğlu, together with Nurullah Ataç, was "among the first to establish the governing translation strategies in the early Republican era" (150). Aiming not to contradict the target language's characteristics with any sort of source intervention, the translation policy employed by the Bureau was based on making the source author easier to read (ibid. 152). Berk regards this particular domesticating strategy of the Bureau that privileges acculturation as the continuation of the translation policies of the Tanzimat period, as in both periods translation was given the mission of purifying the language. As the translators belonging to the convention of the Bureau, Eyüboğlu and Günyol sustained using the domesticating style in the 1960s, when the translation norms were inclined towards showing the differences between the source and target systems rather than the similarities. In the 1960s, the mission adhered to translation changed because of the cultural atmosphere evolved after the declaration of the 1961 Constitution. As mentioned by Tahir-Gürçağlar, the 1940s were the years in which Turkish culture intended to know itself; whereas in the 1960s, the major intention was to get to know the world (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Presumed Innocent). It was the period in which the Bureau started to lose its impetus and the private publishing sector started to enliven owing to the "relatively freer environment that tolerated a wider range of political opinions and activities" enabled by the new constitution (ibid. 48). In this environment that

embraced heterogeneity, "melting different poets and authors in the same pot of fluent Turkish did not have so many supports among translators" anymore (Berk 153). Özlem Berk explains the transformation the prevalent translation norm of the 1940s' was exposed to as such:

> (…) the new generation of intellectuals and translators, beginning from the 1950s, criticized the previous one for being imitative, and wanted to create a national culture and literature by showing the differences between the source (Western) and target (Turkish) cultures in order not to get assimilated in the foreign culture, and creating, eventually, a synthesis between the two. In this context, the necessity of fidelity was emphasized more than before. (160-161)

Besides domestication, there is another particular translation strategy (or a translator attitude one might call it) adopted by the Anatolianists which is closely related to the convention of collaborative translation the translators initiated. Referred to as *imece* (collective labor), this specific type of collaboration through which the translators reflected their humanist world view to their translations left its traces on their translation of *Utopia* as well. On the blurb of the third edition of the translation (the first being the 1964 and the second being the 1968 editions published by Çan Yayınları), it is stated that "The book has been introduced to Turkish as a result of an *imece* work by Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Mina Urgan and Vedat Günyol" ["Kitap Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol tarafından imece çalışması sonucu dilimize kazandırılmıştır"] (More, 1981, Blurb). Generally, the word *imece* is used in the context of the rurals and TDK gives the definition of the work as "the villagers' handling the compulsory and optional works in the rurals under equal conditions with a collective labor" ["Kırsal topluluklarda köyün zorunlu ve isteğe bağlı işlerinin köylülerce eşit şartlarda emek birliğiyle gerçekleştirilmesi"].[32] As for the statement

---

[32] For reference see
http://www.tdk.gov.tr/TR/Genel/SozBul.aspx?F6E10F8892433CFFAAF6AA849816B2EF4376734B
ED947CDE&Kelime=imece

on the blurb of the third edition of the translation, the word-choice of *imece çalışması* (collective labor) instead of *ortak çeviri* (collaborative translation) is an indicative of the specific type of collaboration proposed by the Anatolianist collectivism that is associated with labor instead of study or work. As mentioned, this particular spirit of *imece* has its roots back in the Village Institutes and it had a remarkable influence on the translation tradition based on collaboration the Anatolianists developed at the time of the Bureau. In her article on collaborative translation, Tomris Uyar defines the notion just as it was conducted by Günyol and Eyüboğlu:

> Let us generalise the term "collaborative translation" into "collaborative work". The desire to execute a work together that requires diligence and the concern to bear the difficulties collectively predominate in the collaborative translation process, as it does in any other collaborative work. Once they believe that they have something to learn from one another, two people sit down at the same table. (58)
>
> [Ortak çeviriyi daha genelleştirelim, ortak çalışma diyelim. Özen isteyen bir uğraşı birlikte yürütme, güçlükleri birlikte göğüsleme kaygısı, her ortak çalışmada olduğu gibi ortak çeviride de ağır basıyor. İki kişi, birbirlerinden öğrenecekleri, birbirlerine kazandıracakları birtakım şeyler olduğuna inandıklarında çöküyorlar aynı masanın başına. (58)]

In the statement of Tomris Uyar, collaboration in translation refers to a compromise among the translators that is practiced at the level of fraternity. It refers to mutual dependence, mutual resistance and mutual hard work, and the reward gained in return is shared as well.

In her article, Güzin Dino uses the word it in the context of the Translation Bureau, which reveals that the populist-ruralist approach the translators acquired via the Institutes was carried to the Bureau:

> The Translation Bureau published a journal that included articles and commentaries regarding translational matters, reviews on translated works and

the summaries of translation endeavours within national and international territories. This collaborative work had a substantial influence on Turkish literature. It broadened the horizons for hundreds of translated works, opinions and literature. (105)

[Tercüme Bürosu, çeviri sorunlarına ilişkin deneme ve açıklamaların, çeviri yapıtların eleştirilerinin, ulusal ve uluslararası nitelikte tüm çeviri çalışmalarının özetlerinin yer aldığı bir dergi yayımladı. Bu imeceli çalşma etkinliğinin Türk yazını üzerinde büyük bir etkisi oldu, yüzlerce çeviri yapıt, düşünce ve yazına yeni ufuklar açtı. (105)]

Heading from this context, one might conclude that the translators of the Bureau, who produced works that would have an effect on the way of thought and literary style of the receiving system that was in the process of evolution, regarded themselves as the collective laborers of the Turkish Renaissance. Indeed, Thomas More supported the type of communal labor proposed by the convention of *imece* as well. In his *Utopia*, the division of labor and collaborative production reinforce the spirit of fraternity and equality among the Utopians just as they enhance both the quality of the product that comes out and the whole life of the community in general.

Overall, the 1964 translation of *Utopia* embraces a blend of socio-cultural factors, namely the Turkish Humanism and Anatolian Humanism, as its explicit ideology. Belonging to the convention of the Institutes and the Bureau and adopting the social positions and practices acquired from these two institutions, the translators published this translation which markedly confirmed to the translational norms of the Bureau at a period in which the translation norms were being transformed owing to the prevalence of an environment that preferred difference rather than similarity. However, this transition period had its contributions to the context of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* as well, since it provided a more explicit propagation of the humanist ideology and provided the bases for the formation of a purely humanist repertoire, which will be discussed in the next section.

4.3 The Implicit Ideology

In close relation with the explicit ideology, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar defines the notion of implicit ideology as "the awareness (or lack or awareness) of translation as a decision-making process and of the translator as an agent equipped with his or her own worldview, hence producing a representation of the source text rather than a reproduction of it" (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Presumed Innocent, 38). Stating that the Turkish translation tradition is full of examples that mirror the worldview of the translator which makes the target text not a reproduction but a representation of its source, Tahir-Gürçağlar explains this second type of ideology that mutually operates with the explicit ideology as such:

> Implicit ideologies are not limited to the textual strategies adopted by translators. These ideologies define a whole range of translational practices, such as the selection or rejection of source texts, the use of specific registers or lexical items to site the translation within a particular tradition in the home system and the use of various paratextual elements such as illustrations, prefaces and notes which all enable the translator to present the translation to the reader in specific ways. (ibid. 39)

In light of the context Tahir-Gürçağlar portrays for ideology and translation, this section of the present study will focus on extratextual concerns, mainly translation policy, text selection and contextualization, and textual concerns, such as the paratexts, textual segmentation and the use of a particular discourse in order to investigate the implicit ideology of the 1964 translation of *Utopia.*

4.3.1 Textual Analysis

This section provides a descriptive analysis of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* in order to explore the implicit ideologies of the translation and the reflections of the explicit ideology on the translation product. The methodology offered by Toury for

descriptive studies heads from a number of norms that are "expected to operate not only in translation of all kinds, but also at every stage in the translating event, and hence to be reflected on every level of its product" (DTS, 58). The analysis of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* adopts the norms offered by Toury which provide the translational analysis with the favorable grounds on which each stage regarding the translation event can be analyzed.

4.3.1.1 Preliminary Norms

Translation Policy

Classifying translation policy among the preliminary norms to be explored in a descriptive study, Toury defines the notion as the "factors that govern the choice of text-types, or even of individual texts, to be imported through translation into a particular culture/languge at a particular point in time" (DTS, 58). As Toury proceeds, "different policies may of course apply to different subgroups, in terms of either text-types (eg. literary vs non-literary) or human agents and groups thereof (e.g. different publishing houses), and the interface between the two often offers very fertile grounds for policy hunting" (ibid.). Regarding both the text-types and the human groups involved, Çan Yayınları, which published the 1964 translation of *Utopia,* reveals its translation policy clearly. Mirroring the humanist convention initiated by Anatolianism as its explicit ideology, Çan Yayınları introduced (and reintroduced) a number of authors from Rousseau, Montaigne, Rabelais, Campanella, Sartre, Russel, Babeuf, Kafka, Brecht and Beckett to Omer Khayyam and Yunus Emre to the Turkish reader of the 1960s. More's *Utopia* was a part of this repertoire that adopted the Anatolianist vision of blending authors from various geographies

114

and literary conventions in the same pot with the purpose of disseminating humanism.

As the proceeder of the periodical *Yeni Ufuklar*, which is believed to have introduced the convention of literary criticism to Turkish literature, Çan Yayınları was established in 1959 by Vedat Günyol. The publishing house displayed its major activities after the declaration of the 1961 Constitution, which owes to the fact that the Constitution enlivened the private publishing sector and became a major trigger for the translation and publication of canonical texts that introduced alternative ways of thought. Here it needs to be noted that many of the publishing houses benefiting from the favorable grounds provided by the Constitution were involved in the introduction of the leftist ideology. In his study on the translation of leftist books between the years 1961 and 1971, Erkal Ünal exemplifies Ant Yayınları, Bilim ve Sosyalizm Yayınları, Ekim Yayınevi, Gün Yayınları, Payel Yayınevi, Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık Yayınları, Ser Yayınları, Sol/Onur Yayınları and Sosyal Yayınlar among these publishing houses (145-163). Although Ünal posits Çan Yayınları among them, it would be right to state the difference between the text selection of Çan Yayınları and that of the publishing houses exemplified above. While other leftist publishing houses embarked on the dissemination of the vulgar-Marxist approach by publishing the canonical and mostly non-fictional works of such cult names as Marx, Engels, Mao, Che Guevara, Lenin and Stalin throughout the 1960s, the translation policy of Çan Yayınları adopted a more classic point of view and introduced Montaigne, Rabelais, More and Campanella to its reader. In this respect, Çan Yayınları sustained the spirit of the Turkish Renaissance initiated in the 1940s. Even Babeuf's *Devrim Yazıları* (Essays on Revolution), the translation of which lead to the prosecution of Eyüboğlu and Günyol, departs from the works of the radical

leftist names stated above, in that it might be classified among the Western classics that came out of the French Revolution rather than being a communist manifest. That is why the present study defines the attitude of Çan Yayınları in the cultural scene of 1960s as humanist, rather than leftist, and sets it apart from the left-oriented publishing houses that benefited from the environment of the 1960s.

By the end of the 1970s, over sixty translations were published by Çan Yayınları most of which were done by the agents that once worked for the Bureau, such as Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Azra Erhat, Oktay Rıfat, Ferit Edgü and Mina Urgan. As the publisher, Vedat Günyol himself was involved into the translations published by Çan Yayınları as well. Besides the translations, the publishing house introduced a number of indigenous works most of which were written by the names stated above. *Mavi Yolculuk* (Blue Voyage) by Azra Erhat*, Gelişen Komedya* (The Emergent Comedy) by Melih Cevdet Anday, *Yunus Emre'ye Selam* (Greetings to Yunus Emre) by Sabahattin Eyüboğlu and *Yeni Türkiye Ardında* (Behind the New Turkey) by Vedat Günyol can be exemplified among such works. The contents of these indigenous works and those of the translated works were in harmony and it might be stated that their arguments were reinforced by one another. Likewise, this compilation of the translations and indigenous works published by Çan Yayınları reinforced the populist, collectivist and evolutionist attitude of the Anatolianists.

The translation policy of the publishing house supported collaborative translation, which has its grounds on the Bureau and the Institutes, and it is related to the collectivist aspect of humanism supported by the Anatolianists. Günyol and Eyüboğlu were involved in most of these collaborative works among which *The Age of Reason* by Jean Paul Sartre (1961)*, Essays* by Albert Camus (1962), *Other People's Heads* by Marcel Ayme (1962), *The Problems of our World* by Bertrand

Russell (1963), *Essays on Revolution*[33] by Gracchus Babeuf (1964), *Essays and Letters to a German Friend* by Albert Camus (1965), *The People* by Vercors (1965) can be exemplified.

Lastly, heading from the translation policy of Çan Yayınları, it is clarified that the translation of *Utopia* cannot be considered an introduction of the archetype of a literary genre to a target repertoire that was in the process of evolution merely. Rather, it is an example for the particular social activisim its translators adopted. When the nature of this activism is considered, it is seen that, in contrast with Turkish utopias that appeared until 1964, the "Utopia" proposed by Çan Yayınları was not obedient to the predominant ideology, on the contrary, it was considerably critical of the existing atmosphere. This critical attitude meets 1964 translation with the original *Utopia* written by More.

Directness of Translation

Regarding translations as the facts of target culture, Gideon Toury's descriptive approach puts forth the notion of "assumed translation" which suggests that when a text is believed to possess a translational value translational research might account for a number of postulates, namely the source-text postulate, the transfer postulate and the relationship postulate (Toury, DTS). Thus, a descriptive study departs from the assumption that there is another text that has "chronological and logical priority" over the assumed translation and this other text is "presumed to have served as a departure point and basis" for the translation (ibid. 33-34). However, Toury's methodology does not attribute the source text a crucial position and states that, apart

---

[33] This is a compilation of Babeuf's essays. The book is named by the translators.

from the assumption that it exists, it does not even have to take part in the

translational research:

> The crucial thing is that it is not the source text as such, nor even the possibility
> of actually pointing to it, that is at stake here, but the assumption that one must
> have existed. Therefore concrete texts in languages other than the target's are
> not part of the necessary equipment for launching research either: even if none
> is used, the study will still pertain to Translation Studies as long as the
> assumptions of their temporal preexistence and logical priority are taken into
> account (ibid. 34)

Benefiting from this translational context Toury portrays, the present chapter on the

1964 translation of *Utopia* assumes that there exists a source that possesses a

chronological and logical priority over the translation, but the analysis conducted by

the study will not include a source text-target text comparison due to various reasons.

The case might be explored in light of the second set of preliminary norms offered by

Toury, namely the directness of translation, which "involve the threshold of tolerance

for translating from languages other than the ultimate source language" (ibid. 58).

According to Toury, the questions to be asked this stage are as such:

> Is indirect translation permitted at all? In translating from what source
> languages/text-types/periods (etc) is it permitted/prohibited/tolerated/
> preferred? What are the permitted/prohibited/tolerated/ preferred mediating
> languages? Is there a tendency/obligation to mark a translated work as having
> been mediated, or is this fact ignored/camouflaged/denied? If it is mentioned,
> is the identity of the mediating language supplied as well? (ibid.).

Searching for the source text of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* leads one to quite an

interesting story. Firstly, the edition of the translation published by İş Kültür

Yayınları states on the cover that the book is translated from its English original, but

it does not indicate a specific source text. The fact that İş Kültür Yayınları presents

its publication with the statement "translated from its English original" ["İngilizce

Aslından Çevirenler"] on the cover page legitimizes the position attributed to the

translation series in which *Utopia* is published. Named as "Hasan Ali Yücel Klasikler Dizisi" (Series of Hasan Ali Yücel Classics), this series claims to comprise the most canonical and reliable translations of canonical Western literature. As stated in Chapter Two, More wrote *Utopia* in Latin (1516) and it was translated into German (1524), Italian (1548) and French (1550) before Ralph Robinson translated the work into English (1551). Thus, an original English version of *Utopia* written by Thomas More does not exist, although in the last five centuries the translation by Ralph Robinson acquired a position quite close to its source text in terms of originality. Still, this does not answer the question why İş Kültür Yayınları presents the English version as the original *Utopia*. They simply might have preferred to present such a canonical translation as a direct translation. In Toury's terms, this may be a case of "intolerance in marking a translated work as having been mediated" which is related to the translation policy of the publishing house (DTS, 58). Besides, they might have preferred to present the work among English Classics, and the indication of the fact that the work was originally written in Latin could have confused the reader in this respect. Hence, the present study regards this misleading statement on the edition of the translation by İş Kültür Yayınları as a marketing attempt that both facilitates the presentation of *Utopia* as an English Classic and reinforces the canonicity of the translation through marking it as a direct translation. Thus the statement on the cover of the İş Kültür edition of the translation does not lead the present chapter to the assumption that the 1964 translation of *Utopia* adopted an English version of More's work as its source.

Secondly, both Günyol and Eyüboğlu are known to come from the francophone tradition due to their educations in French institutions. As for Mina Urgan, among the masters of English philology in Turkey, she states that she was not "directly

involved in the translation process, but merely wrote the preface" ["Gerçi ben o çeviriye doğrudan doğruya katılmadım. Sadece önsözü yazdım."] (Gürsoy 5). Therefore, it was Günyol and Eyüboğlu that translated the text and took the translational decisions. These people belonged to the translation tradition of collaboration, which corresponds to the collectivist attitude of Anatolianism, and while translating foreign works, they believed that the foreign idea needs to be expressed via using an intelligible language. On the other hand, they utilized various source texts to present the source author in the truest way. This was especially the case when the source text was not written in French. In the preface Eyüboğlu wrote with Mehmet Ali Cimcöz for their collaborative translation of Plato's *Republic* in 1962, they define their translation as a trial of understanding Plato with the help of other translations besides the Greek original (Eyüboğlu and Cimcöz 8). Likewise, in the translation of Campanella's *The City of Sun* by Vedat Günyol and Haydar Kazgan published by Çan Yayınları in 1965, the translators indicate that they compared the Italian, English and French versions of the source text (Campanella: Cover Page). And there are a number of more examples for this.

Considering all the facts stated above, as well as the presence of some parts that do not exist in the English translation of *Utopia,* it might be stated that Eyüboğlu and Günyol stayed within the boundaries of the particular translation tradition they developed in years and adopted more than one source texts while translating *Utopia.* That is why the present chapter assumes that the 1964 translation of *Utopia* is not suitable for a comparative analysis of the source and target texts. Instead, heading from Toury's theory that regards translations as the facts of target culture, the analysis in the following section will focus on the target text itself.

4.3.1.2 Paratexts

Paratexts, namely the material surrounding the translated and indigenous texts such as prefaces, postfaces, titles, dedications, illustrations, are the major elements that determine the presentation of the work therefore they have a strong influence on how the text is received by the reader. French literary theoretician Gerard Genette emphasizes the importance of paratexts stating that they enable to resolve the complex mediation between the book, author, publisher and reader:

> A literary work consists, entirely or essentially, of a text, defined as a more or less long sequence of verbal statements that are more or less long sequence of verbal statements that are more or less endowed with significance. But this text is rarely presented in an unadorned state, unreinforced and unaccompanied by a certain number of verbal or other productions, such as an author's name, a title, a preface, illustrations. And although we do not always know whether these productions are to be regarded as belonging to the text, in any case they surround it and extend it, precisely in order to *present* it, in the usual sense of this verb but also in the strongest sense: to *make present*, to ensure the text's presence in the world, its 'reception' and consumption in the form of a book (1)

Heading from these assertions of Genette that define paratexts as the tools of presenting a literary work, Tahir Gürçağlar denotes that any study engaged in translation needs to include a survey of the paratextual material within its scope, because "our first impressions of what distinguishes a translation from a non-translation are shaped not by the translation (or non-translation) itself, but by the way texts are packaged and presented" (Politics, 203). Being a product of the most remarkable men of letters of its time who strongly believed in the formative role of translation and the importance of representation, the 1964 translation of *Utopia* provides the translation analysis with favorable grounds on which the paratexts can be used as the major tools of exploring what type of a representation of *Utopia* its agents put forth. The text is offered with a simple cover, a forty three paged preface,

a number of illustrations drawn by the Turkish painter İvy Stangali particularly for this translation, a few footnotes and a table of contents proceeding the main text. The present section of the study will mainly focus on the cover and the preface.

The Cover

The translation is offered with quite a simple cover with the name of the author on the top, the title of the book in the middle and the names of the translators in the bottom of the page. Besides the logo of the publishing house, there are no illustrations. On the back cover, the list of works published by Çan Yayınları including both the indigenous works and the translations are written. As indicated, *Utopia* is the twenty fifth book published by Çan Yayınları.

The Preface

The translation begins with a forty three paged preface written by Mina Urgan. This preface has quite a long and interesting journey as the translation does. Its shortened version was published by the periodical *Yeni Ufuklar* in the same year as the translation was published. It did not appear in the third edition of the translation published by Cem Yayınları in 1981. Then it was extended and published by firstly Adam Yayınları as a separate book titled *Edebiyatta Ütopya Kavramı ve Thomas More* (The Concept of Utopia in Literature and Thomas More) in 1984, then by İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları in 1999 in the same volume with the translation. Since then, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları has had the publishing rights to the preface and it still publishes the preface along with the translation. Interestingly, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları has been introducing the preface not as a translator's preface but as a

complementary piece to the translation, under the title "With the Review of Mina Urgan" ["Mina Urgan'ın İncelemesiyle"] (More, 2008, Cover).

This preface basically introduces the reader the life of Thomas More and the main features of his *Utopia*. Although it is written with a simple language, the text carries the traces of the academic background of Urgan in certain aspects. For instance, throughout her explanations she quotes excerpts from various sources, such as the play of Robert Bolt on Thomas More's life, the letters by Erasmus, biographies of More and other works written by More. Furthermore, she discusses the content of More's *Utopia* via comparing the work with such other canonical literary works as Plato's *Republic* and Erasmus' *The Praise of the Folly*. Although Urgan does not cite her references at the back of the preface, her academic style might be regarded as a legitimizing factor on the translation as it introduces the work as a product of an expert on both the Elizabethan Era and the Western literary tradition and bestows the text with a sense of objectivity owing to the high level of intertextuality referred. In his theory, Gerard Genette defines the notion of authorial preface with these words: [34]

> The original assumptive authorial preface, which we will thus shorten to *original preface,* has as its chief function *to ensure that the text is read properly.* This simplistic phrase is more complex than it may seem, for it can be analyzed into two actions, the first of which enables - but does not in any way guarantee – the second (in other words, the first action is a necessary but not sufficient condition of the second). These two actions are *to get the book read* and *to get the book read properly.* These two objectives, which may be described, respectively, as minimal (to get it read) and maximal (... and, if possible, read properly), are obviously tied to three aspects of this type of preface: the fact that it is authorial (the author being the main and, strictly speaking, the only person interested in having the book read properly), the fact that it is original (a later preface runs the risk of being too late: a book that in its first edition is read improperly,and *a fortiori* not read at all, risks having no

---

[34] Within the quotation, Genette actually refers to the prefaces written by the source text authors. Regarding the translator as the author of the target text, this study classifies the preface of Mina Urgan among the authorial prefaces mentioned by Genette.

other editions), and the fact that its location is introductory and therefore monitory (this is *why* and this is *how* you should read this book).The two objectives imply, therefore, despite all the customary disavowals, that the reader begins by reading the preface. (197)

Just as Genette explains above, the preface of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* carries the traces of the explicit ideology and the translational convention that embraces the work, therefore reveals a certain "proper" way of reading the work. It is observed that the use of some particular grammatical structures (i.e. the use of subject 'we' in the assertions, the use of a particular past tense in Turkish employed in old stories), as well as the choice of local words and phrases make the preface read like a story itself. In this way, although the preface involves an academic style through all those quotations, comparisons and intertextuality, it is in coherence with the main text, in that the narrations of both have a fictive character and both are easily read. Urgan starts the preface with explaining the life of More and reveals this particular style as such:

> More and his father were inseperable with a profound love for one another. More probably had acquired his interest in law, as well as his joviality and playfulness from his father, who was also a judge himself. As they say, his father, who had experienced three marriages, had an easy going, but also a pessimistic approach towards marriage. He used to compare a man who was about to pick a spouse to someone who put his hand into a bag full of seven poisonous snakes and only one delicious eel, and he would keep suggesting that this man had such a little chance of getting the eel before a snake bites his hand. (Urgan, Önsöz, 5-6)

> [More'la babası birbirlerine büyük bir sevgiyle bağlıydılar. More her halde hukuk merakını da, bütün Avrupa'ya ün salan neşesini ve şakacılığını da, kendisi gibi yargıç olan babasından almıştı. Anlatıldığına göre üç kez dünya evine giren babasının, evlilik konusunda geniş olduğu kadar karamsar bir görüşü varmış: Kendine eş seçen adamı, içinde yedi zehirli yılanla bir tek lezzetgli yılan balığı bulunan bir torbaya elini daldıran bir kimseye benzetir, bu adamın yılanlar sokmadan balığı yakalaması için ancak yedide bir imkan olduğunu söyleyip dururmuş. (Urgan, Önsöz, 5-6)]

As exemplified above, Urgan refers to such phrases as "as they say", "perhaps", "that

might have been the reason" etc. in her narration and abstains from a didactic and

doctrinal tone of voice, although the preface is involved in the imposition of some

life practices and ways of thoughts implicitly. Another example of the fictive style

Urgan applies to her preface is seen in her explanation of the sensational marriage of

Henry VIII with Anne Boleyn:

> Turning utteryly against More on account of his attitude during the course of
> divorce, Anne Boleyn kept provoking Henry VIII in vain, trying to dig More's
> grave. Yet, More never resented the King's second wife and as if he had known
> Anne Boleyn would be executed only one year after his execution, he pitied
> her: "The poor woman will endure all kinds of suffering soon!" (ibid. 28)

> [Boşanma işindeki tutumu yüzünden More'a iyice düşman kesilen Anne
> Boleyn de, Sekizinci Henry'yi boyuna kışkırtıyor, More'un kuyusunu kazmağa
> çalışıyordu. Oysa More, Kralın ikinci karısına hiç kızmıyor, sanki kendi
> idamından bir yıl sonar Anne Boleyn'in de idam edileceğini bilmiş gibi,
> 'Zavallıcığın başına ne felaketler gelecek yakında!' diye ona acıyordu bile.
> (ibid. 28)]

Through this type of a satirical narration, Mina Urgan both facilitates the reading of a

historical event and portrays Thomas More as quite a clever, gentle and important

figure who was devoted to his family, his country and his king. On the other hand,

though it remains quite trivial alongside the praises on More's character and ideals,

as revealed by the quotation below More's devotion to tradition and the Catholic

religion is implicitly criticized (One might observe the intertextuality within the

preface in this quotation as well) :

> More suggests that rebelling against the established system corresponds to
> rebelling against God as the king who preserves the system is authorized
> directly by God.The commitment to tradition -the basic principle of political
> philosophy in the Elizabethean era- is seen in all plays by Shakespeare on
> English history as well as in Odysseus' well-known speech in Cressida in the
> exact same way, although it does not befit More's style. (ibid. 20-21)

> [More, yerleşmiş düzene karşı ayaklanmanın, Tanrıya karşı ayaklanmak
> olduğunu söyler; çünkü bu düzeni koruyan kral, yetkisini doğrudan doğruya
> Tanrıdan almaktadır. Elizabeth çağında siyasal felsefenin temeli olan bu eskiye

bağlılık, Utopia'nın yazarına pek yakışmamakla beraber, Shakespeare'in İngiliz tarihi üstünde yazdığı bütün piyeslerde ve Troilos ile Cressida'da Odysseus'un verdiği ünlü nutukta aynen görülür. (ibid. 20-21)]

In the preface, Urgan explains the ideal life portrayed in *Utopia* in correspondence with the ideal character More displayed throughout his life. She states that, More spent his life on developing better systems and rejecting the class difference, the importance of money and property and the capital punishment. He believed that the evil can only be eliminated through being cured rather than being killed, and he made his characters discuss about all these matters in the first book of *Utopia.* Besides, while comparing the ideal state in Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia*, Urgan reveals her preference on the latter regarding More's less autocratic and more humanist approach towards democracy, war, womanhood and family. Through all these, Urgan portrays Thomas More as a humanist whose ideals are to be appreciated and proposals are to be practiced. As mentioned, there is a high correspondence between the humanist ideals of More and those of the Anatolianists, which makes More and his *Utopia* the ancient supporter of the movement the translators aimed to disseminate. The preface of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* might be regarded as a clear example of this aim.

Overall, the preface of Mina Urgan does not stand apart from the main text, rather, it might easily be regarded as a part of it. By means of the particular narration employed, it confirms to how Anatolianists aimed to represent *Utopia* and offers the reader an enjoyable pastime right besides an educative session. Other partextual material present in the translation such as the illustrations and different usages of typography (the up side down triangle at the end of the chapters) sustain this representation as well.

4.3.1.3 Operational Norms

Toury's methodology assumes that besides the translation policy and the directness of translation, such concerns on the textual level as omissions, additions, changes of location, manipulations of segmentation, sentence construction and word-choices might also be norm-governed. Referred as the operational norms, this latter set of norms logically and chronologically proceeds the preliminary norms and directs the decisions made during the act of translation itself. Toury proposes operational norms as the tools of obtaining the relationship between the source and the target texts (DTS, 58). However, this section of the present chapter aims to explore concerns related to the target system, such as readership and the position of the translators rather than to investigate the relationship between the source and the target texts, therefore it employs the matricial and textual-linguistic norms in the context that stays within the boundaries of the target scheme.

Matricial norms

Toury's norm theory relates matricial norms to the reorganization of a source text in a target text text and defines them as the norms that "govern the very existence of target-language material intended as a substitute for the corresponding source-language material (and hence the degree of fullness of translation), as well as textual segmentation" (DTS, 58-59).

The textual organization of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* does not radically depart from the *Utopia* More once presented. It includes the two books and all eight chapters of Book II. Some of these chapters are accompanied by illustrations on what the chapter explains. The target text is 177 pages long, including the forty three paged-preface, two-paged table of contents and the 132-paged main text; whereas, in

the Ralph Robinson edition, the main text is 177 pages itself, and in the Latin edition the main text is 160 pages, which reveals that there are some abridgements in the target text.

To begin with, the translation lacks the three introductory pharagraphs placed before the book of *Utopia*, Book I and Book II. Right after the preface of Mina Urgan, the main text starts under the title "Kitap I" (Book I), likewise, right after Book I ends, Book II starts under the title "Kitap II" (Book II); whereas, in both the Latin original version and the English version translated by Ralph Robinson, Book I and Book II are firstly introduced with a short paragraph that gives the content of the following section. As More originally wrote Book I and Book II as separate works following one another, these paragraphs serve to introduce each section as works of their own. Besides, together with the illustrations, the rhetoric employed in the paragraphs reflects the literary conventions of the era in which More wrote the book. Omitting these introductory phrases might be the conscious choice of the translators; they might have chosen to focus on the content of the work and present the book as a whole, which might have lead them eliminate the classical and historical spirit enabled through these introductory paragraphs. On the other hand, this might be a concern of the source text, as it is the case for the other omissions revealed by the target text.

Originally, *Utopia* starts with a letter in which the narrator explains a friend that he thought the story of the land of Utopia which he heard from a voyager would be an enjoyable pastime facility for the reader, which made him to pen it. As Mildred Campbell states, this letter, together with the other notes and textual material included in *Utopia*, such as Giles's letter to Busleiden, Verses on the land of Utopia and a note from the Printer to the Reader, are "a part of the mechanism designed to

lend reality to the tale" (3). As Campbell proceeds, devices of this kind were frequently used by the humanist authors "who with obvious enjoyment went to great pains to endow their works of imagination with all the earmarks of reality" (ibid.). Thus, all this material More surrounds the main story with are the traces of the literary tradition the author comes from. However, in the translation these meta-textual materials do not exist. Although Mina Urgan mentions the narrator's letter to Peter Giles in her preface and states that this letter is a great example of More's genius sense of humor, the translation starts with Book I directly (Urgan, Önsöz, 40). In the extended version of her preface published by Adam Yayınları, Urgan explains that the translation does not have this letter and some other parts in the main text because their source text lacked these parts (Urgan, Edebiyatta Ütopya, 75). (Thus although in an interview she stated that she was not involved in the translation directly, as implied from these assertions, she witnessed the translation process.) Among these other parts that did not exist in the target text, there is the paragraph on a pre-marriage ceremony in which the bride and the groom get naked in the presence of an older person and look at each other's bodies. However, as Urgan relates all these omissions to the source text concern rather than defining them as the conscious choices of the translators, this omission does not lead to any conclusion on censorship.

Besides the omissions, the target text reveals a particular type of reorganization of the textual material which might be classified as a strategy of simplification in terms of facilitating the reading process on the one hand, and as a strategy of reinforcement in terms of marking the arguments of some sections favorable to the translators' own humanist stance on the other. As a text with long descriptions and conversations, the original *Utopia* includes almost one-page long paragraphs, which

appear in the target text as smaller and more frequent paragraphs. The manipulation

of textual segmentation becomes even more apparent, especially if a paragraph

includes a number of arguments. In such cases, the arguments are aligned one below

another rather than being enumerated side by side in a single paragraph as they are in

the Latin and English version:

> TT (Back translated): It's not as if I am not familiar with the remedies that
> could lighten the malignancies, however these are not the medicine that could
> heal the sickness. For example:
> Restricting the amount of land and money one can acquire.
> Imposing strict laws against extortion and defeatism.
> Vilifying intrigue and the desire to be promoted.
> Stop selling government positions against payment. (More, 1964, 88)
>
> [Kötülüğü hafifletecek çareler bilmiyor değilim; ama bunlar hastalığı iyi
> edemiyecek ilaçlardır.Örneğin şunlar:
> Bir kişinin elde edebileceği toprağı ve parayı sınırlandırmak.
> Zorbalığa ve bozgunculuğa karşı sert yasalar koymak.
> Yükselme tutkusu ve entrikaları kötüleyip cezalandırmak.
> Devlet görevlerini parayla satmamak." (More, 1964, 88)]

Just as this particular textual organization marks each argument more, it interrupts

the conversational character of the text. Below is another example in which the

conversation between the voyager and the narrator is converted into a course book on

politics:

> TT (Back translated): The principles of political ethics are as follows and are
> agreed upon by the governors:
> "It does not matter whether a king who feeds an army has much money, it is
> never enough."
> "Even if he wishes to, the king cannot be unfair."
> "The king is the sole owner of the nationals and their possessions. The extent
> that nationals are allowed to utilize a certain possesion depends on the king's
> will."
> "The poverty of people secures the king's existence."
> "Wealth and freedom lead to rebelling and contempt against the government.
> Free and wealthy men cannot bear injustice and extortion with ease."

"Poverty and hunger cause the hearts to collapse, blind the souls, adjusts people to suffer and to be enslaved. Poverty and hunger crush the people so badly that they lose any strength to throw off their slavery." (ibid. 80-81)

[Politika ahlakının ilkeleri şunlardır ve devleti yönetenler bunlarda anlaşmışlardır:
'Bir ordu besleyen kralın ne kadar parası olsa azdır'
'Kral, istese bile, haksızlık edemez.'
'Kral uyruklarının ve mallarının ortaksız sahibidir: Uyruklar herhangi bir şeyden, kralın keyfi istediği ölçüde yararlanabilir.'
'Halkın yoksulluğu kralın varlığını korur.'
'Zenginlik ve özgürlük devlete baş kaldırmaya, hor bakmaya götürür. Özgür ve zengin adam haksızlığa, zorbalığa kolay katlanamaz.'
'Yoksulluk ve açlık yürekleri çökertir, ruhları körletir, insanları acı çekmeye, köle olarak yaşamaya alıştırır: öylesine ezer ki onları, boyunduruklarını sarsmaya güçleri kalmaz'" (ibid. 80-81)]

As mentioned, this particular representation of some parts of the main text in the form of a list of arguments does not include any additions or omissions; rather it is based on how the translators reorganized the main text. The blend of simplification and reinforcement as a translation strategy displayed in the target text is observed on the level of word-choices and sentence construction as well, which the present chapter focuses on in light of textual linguistic norms.

Textual linguistic norms

As mentioned earlier, typical to the convention sustained by Eyüboğlu, Günyol, and therefore by Çan Yayınları, the 1964 translation of *Utopia* confirms to the translation tradition of domestication initiated by the Translation Bureau, although it appears as a product of the 1960s in which foreignization started to become the predominant translation stragtegy. Besides the simplification on the level of textual organization, the local tone of voice attributed to the target text through colloquialisms might be regarded as another strategy facilitating the reading process. The translation of Book I which More wrote in dialogue form reveals more examples of the use of colloquial

language than the translation of Book II which consists of the objective depictions of the land of Utopia in the form of essay. While depicting the scene in which a priest falls into a dispute with a fool on beggary in the presence of the Cardinal and Hytholiday, for instance, the translators make the characters talk in colloquial Turkish as such:

> TT (Back translated): "Let us not get angry dearest priest brother. What does the Bible tell us? 'You will restrain your souls with your patience."
> The theologist rushed right away: "I am not getting angry, rascal, or rather I am not commiting a sin. What does the Bible tell us? 'Get angry, and do not commit a sin."
> The cardinal intended to calm the priest with a slight reproach:
> "No," said the priest, "I cannot hush, I should not. My noble mission ecstasizes me and many men of God have born those sacred rages. That is where this saying comes from: "God, the commitment to your sacred house ruined me."
> That is how they chant in the church: "The ones who dared to mock him when Elijah was climbing up to the house of God, attracted the rage of prophets whose hair had fallen off." This sarcastic, this clownish, this indecent sod will perhaps be condemned with the same curse. (More, 1964, 74)

> ['Kızmayalım pek sevgili rahip kardeş. Kitap ne der? 'Sabrınızla ruhlarınızı dizginleyeceksiniz'.
> Dinbilimci hemen atıldı arkasından:
> 'Kızmıyorum kerata; daha doğrusu günaha girmiyorum. Çünkü Kitap ne der? 'Kızın, ve günaha girmeyin.'
> Kardinal tatlı bir sitemle rahibi yumuşatmak istedi:
> 'Hayır, dedi rahip; susamam, susmamalıyım. Yüce görevim coşturuyor beni ve nice Tanrı adamları bu kutsal öfkelere kapılmışlardır. Şu söz de oradan gelir: 'Tanrım senin evine bağlılık yedi beni' Kilisede şunu söylerler ilahilerde: 'İlyas Tanrı evine çıkarken alay etmeğe kalkışanlar, saçı dökülmüş peygamberin öfkesini çektiler üstlerine'. Bu alaycı, bu soytarı, bu yüzsüz herif de belki aynı belaya çarpılacak'" (More, 1964, 74)]

The quotation above exemplifies how the translators make a Catholic priest talk; when enraged, he articulates such colloquial words as "kerata" (rascal), "soytarı" (clownish) and "yüzsüz herif" (indecent sod). On the other hand, the fact that he constructs such sentences as "yüce görevim coşturuyor beni" (my noble mission ecstasizes me) and "nice Tanrı adamları bu kutsal öfkelere kapılmışlardır" (many

men of God have born those sacred rages) implies that this priest does not belong to this colloquial culture in every respect.

When it comes to the treatment of proper names, on the other hand, it is even harder to decide whether the translation is inclined towards foreignization or domestication because of the inconsistent path the translators followed. As mentioned in Chapter Two, the proper names in *Utopia* have meanings in Latin, i.e. 'Utopia' meaning no-place, 'Anydrus' (the name of the river) meaning not-water and 'Ademus' (the title of a chief magistrage) meaning not-people and 'Hythlodaeaus' (the name of the voyager) meaning the dispenser of non-sense. This offers each *Utopia* translator such paths as inventing new names that have the same meaning in the target language, preserving the original name but offering the meaning in the footnote, and preserving the name with no footnote. In the 1964 translation of *Utopia* examples for all these choices are found. Firstly, the name of the island is preserved as it is and is used as Utopia throughout the book without any phonetic transcription, just as the people of Utopia are rendered as 'Utopialılar' instead of 'ütopyalılar'. Similarly, other names of the places such as Amaurote and Anydra are rendered as they are in the English version of the work.[35] Merely the name of the land called Anemolia is transcribed and rendered as 'Anemolya'. The different positions of governance, 'syphogrant', 'philarch' and 'tranibore' which More refers as the magistrates, are rendered as they are in the English phonetic transcription as well, yet this time written in bold characters. It's merely the names of the neighbor countries to Utopia that the translators render in Turkish as 'Bulut-kent' and 'Kör-kent'. Here the names' transcribed versions into English phonetics are given with footnotes, which are the mere footnotes the whole book includes.

---

[35] In the Latin original, these names are Anydrus and Amaurotus.

In her study, Tahir-Gürçağlar asserts that the treatment of proper names in translation is a cultural issue and offering the readers phonetic transcription or foreign spelling are two different approaches towards the source text, the latter being the representative of the foreignizing strategy that alienates the reader from the translation therefore disrupts the fluency (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Politics, 204). However, as there is an inconsistency in the treatment of proper names in the 1964 translation of *Utopia*, the proper names cannot be regarded as the representatives of the particular translation strategy employed by the translators. Indeed, it is also hard to define the strategy heading from other parts of the text as well since the sentence constructions and word-choices are not all foreignizing or all domesticating either. Still, heading from the translation convention the translators came from and the simpler nature of the target text compared to other versions of *Utopia*, it would be safe to classify the translation as fluent and easily read just as the other translations conducted by Eyüboğlu and Günyol. Here it might be useful to bear in mind that these people are the representatives of the translation convention of domestication initiated in the 1940s and their translation of *Utopia* is a part of this convention as a product of Çan Yayınları repertoire, which aimed to reinforce the humanist foundations established by the Bureau.

Starting out from the textual and paratextual analysis of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* in light of the preliminary and operational norms, it is revealed that the translation mirrors its explicit ideology, that is humanism, in various levels. Adopting an Anatolianist attitude, the repertoire offered by Çan Yayınları aimed to blend all humanist authors at the same pot and offered the arguments of these foreign authors in a manner which the reader would internalize easily. This required the translators adopt fluent translations as their tool. That is how the strategy of

domestication is related to the standpoints of the translators as humanists. Basing his theory on the dilemma of foreignization and domestication, Lawrence Venuti introduces two indicatives of the standpoints the translators adopt, namely the text-selection and the development of a discourse to translate them (Venuti, Scandals, 10). Through text-selection, the translator either contributes to the construction of other nations' literatures as stereotypes or displays the diversity revealed by each literature. Similarly, while translating a foreign text, the translator employs a discourse that might either assimilate or represent the diversity. Posing his criticism on the Anglo-American convention of translation that is based on the creation of stereotypes and assimilation, Venuti indicates the importance of foreignization in the representation of cultures and literatures of other nations. In the context Venuti draws for translation, this domesticating convention predominant in the Anglo-American literary system which "requires fluent translations that produce the illusory effect of transparency" has its consequences on the translator, making her/him invisible in the text s/he produces, although his/her product has such powerful abilities as "enabling a foreign text to engage a mass readership" and "initiating a significant canon reformation" (ibid. 12). When a translator employs a fluent discourse in the course of translation, s/he "conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made", which contributes to the predominance of the path Venuti formulates as "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and, presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text" (Invisibility, 16).

This theory based on the Anglo-American literary convention cannot be applied to the case of the 1964 translation of *Utopia*, since in this present case, fluency in both textual and paratextual levels serves for the reinforcement of the positions of the translators in their target texts. It might safely be asserted that,

Eyüboğlu and Günyol based the translation convention they initiated on making the foreign text more available and closer to the Turkish reader, and domesticating the foreign text was a pivotal tool in achieving this mission. Furthermore, the convention they started had its great contributions to their symbolic capital. Therefore in this case, it would not be right to assume that the domesticating strategy employed by the translators defined their positions as invisible as their presence in their target text is quite visible. In fact, considering the fact that this was the first translation of Thomas More into Turkish, it might even be assumed that they were known even more than Thomas More by the Turkish society, therefore their authorial position on the text was even more dominant and visible on the text than the author. Hence, this present case exemplifies that it might be safe to consider the parallelism drawn by Venuti among domestication and invisibility, and the consequences of this parallelism, within the boundaries of the Anglo-American literary tradition.

4.3.2 The function attributed to the first translation

As mentioned earlier, the context behind the 1964 translation of *Utopia* embraces two major social events of Turkish history; Turkish Humanism that was initiated by the end of the 1930s with state initiatives, and the 1961 Constitution which enlivened the literary atmosphere of the 1960s and enabled an influx of new ideas to the Turkish literary system by preparing favorable grounds for the establishment of new publishing houses. As acknowledged by the present chapter, the translators of *Utopia* did not depart from the path of Translation Bureau they once followed. However, it should also be noted that the first full translation of *Utopia* is a product of the private publishing sector that appeared within the translation series of a publishing house that started functioning actively after the promulgation of the Constitution.

As Tahir-Gürçağlar denotes, in the 1960s an "apetite for contemporary non-fiction material" was triggered (Presumed Innocent, 48) and rather than fulfilling this new expectation, Çan Yayınları stood apart from other leftist publishing houses and kept publishing the translations of the classical works of humanist literature. Through this conventional attitude that favors the humanist spirit of the classics, Çan Yayınları repertoire aimed not only to introduce a new literary convention, but also to disseminate the Anatolianist-humanist way of thought to its reader, through which the type of social evolution Eyüboğlu longed for would be realized. One might regard this social evolution planned by the translators as an alternative culture planning that has its grounds on the culture planning of the Republican Era on the one hand and the Anatolianist approach towards humanism on the other. Toury refers to this type of agents that form a small minority and "act as producers on the level of the repertoire itself" as agents of change (Toury, Planning). While defining the acts of these agents, Toury states that "whether entrusted by the group with the task of doing so or whether self-appointed, it is mainly those persons who introduce new options, and hence act as agents of change" (ibid. 151). In this context, the 1964 translation of *Utopia* is a contributor of the alternative culture planning offered by Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan as agents of change and it aimed to introduce the Turkish culture repertoire new options, which are the humanist way of thought and living in this case.

When all these facts are considered, it might be assumed that the major concern of these agents of change was to construct a reading community that would internalize their humanist discursive practices, rather than to refer to a particular reading community that already existed. In this respect, the reader-oriented theory of Stanley Fish that introduces interpreting habits not as natural or universal but as

learned seems applicable to this case. In this theory the readers that develop similar interpreting habits form interpretative communities which are defined as stated below:

> Interpretive communities are made up of those who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words, these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what is read rather than, as is usually assumed, the other way around. If it is an article of faith in a particular community that there are variety of texts, its members will boast a repertoire of strategies for making them. And if a community believes in the existence of only one text, then the single strategy its members employ will be forever writing it. (327).

In the context Fish portrays, the position of the reader is more significant than that of the utterer who "gives hearers and readers the opportunity to make meanings (and texts) by inviting them to put into execution a set of strategies" (ibid. 328). The author might intend her/his reader to adopt a certain set of interpreting strategies; however, according to Fish s/he would still be offering one set of interpretation among many others implicit within her/his text. Thus it is always the reader who always puts the endpoint.

Who puts the endpoint in the case of the 1964 translation of *Utopia*? It is hard to define whether Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan gave their hearers and readers the opportunity to make more than one meanings. They certainly offered their reader a certain set of interpreting strategies rather than letting their reader develop these strategies on their own. In this respect, the scheme Fish draws might be too postmodern and reader-oriented for the 1964 translation of *Utopia,* which has various reasons. Firstly, there did not exist a certain group of people sharing the same type of reading habits to whom the translators attributed their translation. Secondly, here the interpretation of the text is under the hegemony of not a reading community the

members of which assembled according to the similarities in their interpreting habits, but a group of target-text authors. Thus, to apply the theory of Fish to this case, the interpretative community of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* is not a reader-group that is able to assign the texts some certain norms, but a translator-group the members of which adopted the role of the agent of change and aimed to trigger a community that would attribute the texts the function defined and taught by them, which would eventually lead them internalize the life-model proposed by them.

4.4 Conclusions to Chapter Four

'Translatorship' amounts first and foremost to being able to play a social role, i.e., to fulfil a function allotted by a community- to the activity, its practitioners and/or their products- in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference. (Toury, DTS, 53).

The 1964 translation of *Utopia* into Turkish is a product by Vedat Günyol, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu and Mina Urgan, who Toury would define as social actors. In virtue of their activities, namely those of Eyüboğlu and Günyol in the Translation Bureau, Village Institutes and in a number of other premises that were predominant in the publishing sector, and those of Urgan as a high authority on English philology, these agents already possessed the symbolic capital that enabled them to act as culture entrepreneurs in the 1960s. Surely their particular choice of text and Çan Yayınları paid great contributions to their symbolic capital as well, especially to those of Eyüboğlu and Günyol. Çan Yayınları repertoire became a major representative of their Anatolianist stance, in that, it might safely be regarded as the symbol of their ideal of melting authors from various eras and geographies in the same pot of humanism. The distinct humanist stance of this repertoire, which the

present study differentiated from the leftist repertoires evolved out of the context of the 1960s, was reinforced by both the indigenous works and translations published by Çan Yayınları, most of which carried the names of Eyüboğlu and Günyol.

As the translation under the focus of the present chapter was a product of the 1960s, the study regarded the explicit ideology it mirrors as a reformulated version of that life-model which carries the traces of the culture planning efforts of the Republican regime, namely those of the Turkish Humanism, the Bureau and the Village Institutes, on the one hand, and the particular type of humanism the translators referred as Anatolian Humanism and the favorable environment of the 1960s for the instruction of a better way of life to the Turkish society on the other. Besides mirroring this explicit ideology, the translation was regarded as an indicative of the translators' awareness of their symbolic capital, especially of the parameters of "sense of self-confidence" and "access to enterprising options" brought by the capital, through which they assigned the works they addressed to the Turkish reader a formative role with no hesitance (Even-Zohar, Culture Repertoire, 300). The present chapter proposed that these agents aimed to trigger a new type of readership, an "interpretive community" that would assign texts similar values in terms of Stanley Fish, as a part of this culture formation process. Domestication as a translation convention that has its roots back in the time of the Bureau and fluency and readability as the consequences of this translation strategy that would serve for the development of a humanist reader community were explored as the implicit ideologies of the translation, which were present in the other translations published by Çan Yayınları as well. These implicit ideologies explored by the analysis of preliminary and operational norms of the translation also revealed the mutual operation of the two levels of ideologies, i.e. the implicit and the explicit ideology, in

the 1964 translation of *Utopia*, since this readership the translators aimed to trigger and domestication as a tool of achieving this were the constituents of the Anatolianist project of the translators.

The translation under the focus of this present chapter was a part of a humanist literay repertoire. The position of the translators in their translation cannot be defined as invisible, on the contrary, on both textual and paratextual level, the target text mirrors the fact that they acted as self-appointed cultural agents who believed in the possibility of the formation of a new Turkish society that would internalize their humanist discursive practices. Here the study regarded domestication as a tool employed by the translators in this formation process, which served for their visibility on their products. Therefore, the parallelism Venuti draws among domestication and the invisibility of the translator could not be applied to this specific case (Invisibility, 16).

Overall, the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish was a product of the culture entrepreneurs, who once acquired a certain symbolic capital via being the first representatives of the life-model proposed by the Republican ideology. The present chapter assumed that Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan reinforced, or "regained" in terms of Gouvanic, their symbolic capital through publishing new works in the literary field via Çan Yayınları (161). Today, it can safely be assumed that their capital is established and stable owing to all these personal and collective initiatives cited above and that their works achieved the status of a classic, which is justified by the fact that İş Kültür Yayınları publishes their translations in the Series of Hasan Ali Yücel, a series of translation classics of Turkish translation history.

CHAPTER 5

THE RETRANSLATIONS OF *UTOPIA*

The third translational context of More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system this study embarks on is the context of retranslation. The translations of Thomas More's *Utopia* into Turkish have quite an interesting story that lends itself to be studied under the focus of retranslation hypothesis. After the first translation conducted by Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Vedat Günyol and Mina Urgan, the book was not translated into Turkish for thirty two years. In the meanwhile, this first translation kept being published first by Çan Yayınları (in 1964 and 1968), then by Cem Yayınları (in 1981, 1986, 1989, 1995 and 1997). Between the years 1996 -when the first retranslation appeared- and 2010, sixteen retranslations of *Utopia* were published by seventeen different publishing houses. In the same period, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları got the publishing rights of the first translation and started to reprint the translation once in every two years. Today, out of the sixteen retranslations, three are out of print and their source language is not known (Olympos, Düşünen Adam, Öteki). One is the plagiarized version of the first translation (Arya), one contains too many negative shifts (Oda), and there is no other information about one translation except that it exists (İm Yayın Tasarım). As for the remaining ten retranslations, three are translated from English (Gün, Ütopya/Bilgesu,[36] Dergah), three are translated from French (Cem, Alter, Say), one from German (Kaynak), and one from Latin (Kabalcı). There are also two retranslations that do not indicate their source

---

[36] The translation by İbrahim Yıldız was published by both of these publishing houses.

texts (Ulak, Bordo-Siyah). All translations are listed in the chart below along with

their translators, publishing houses, year of publications, and if exists, new editions.

Table 1. Translations of *Utopia* into Turkish along with their Reeditions

Publishing House	Translator(s)	Year/Editions
Çan Yayınları	Sabahattin Eyüboğlu Vedat Günyol Mina Urgan	1964 1968
Cem Yayınları	Sabahattin Eyüboğlu Vedat Günyol Mina Urgan	1981 1986 1989 1995 1997
Düşünen Adam Yayınları	Gönül Derin	1996
Cem Yayınları	Ender Gürol	1997 2007
Gün Yayınları	T. Gökçen Sağnak	1999
İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları	Sabahattin Eyüboğlu Vedat Günyol Mina Urgan	1999 2000 2004 2006 2008 2010
Ütopya Yayınları	İbrahim Yıldız	2003
Dergah Yayınları	Ayfer G. Cambier	2003
Öteki Yayınları	Tufan Göbekçi	2004
Bordo Siyah Yayınları	Necmiye Uçansoy	2005
Kaynak Yayınları	Sadık Usta	2005 2008
Kabalcı Yayınları	Çiğdem Dürüşken	2009
Bilgesu Yayınları	İbrahim Yıldız	2009
Alter Yayınları	İlhan Erşanlı	2009
Oda Yayınları	Fatma Gökben Aksoy	2009
Arya Yayınları	Tuna Erdem	2010
Say Yayınları	İsmail Yergüz	2010
Parşömen Yayınları (also known as Ulak Yayıncılık)	K. Türel	2010
Olympos Yayınları	Özlem Gürses	Unknown
İm Yayın Tasarım	Unknown	Unknown

Toury's norm theory that regards translations as facts of target culture assumes that "cultures resort to translating precisely as a major way of filling in gaps", therefore each translation causes a change and occupies a unique position in the receiving system (Toury, DTS, 27). As Toury states, "this novelty claim still holds for the nth translation of a text into a language" because this resulting entity "will always have never existed before" (ibid.). Perhaps this is the most significant factor that legitimizes retranslations, at least for those of *Utopia,* most of which share the same geography and period of existence, therefore need the unique position introduced by Toury to be consumed. The present chapter will firstly give a brief look at the general scheme of *Utopia* translations in the Turkish literary system, regarding the changes the retranslations attempt to introduce. Afterwards, two case studies will be proposed in order to exemplify how translation makes a single literary work serve for more than one discourse world simultaneously.

5.1 A General Look at the Retranslations of *Utopia* in light of Retranslation Hypothesis

In line with Toury's assertions that attribute each translation a unique position, the retranslation hypothesis of Lawrence Venuti proposes that it is in the nature of retranslation to promote itself as different from the others:

> Retranslations typically highlight the translator's intentionality because they are designed to make an appreciable difference. The retranslator's intention is to select and interpret the foreign text according to a different set of values so as to bring about a new and different reception for that text in the translating culture. (Retranslations, 29)

Paratexts are the significant tools of the translator (or the publisher) through which s/he reveals this difference. As Venuti states, paratexts "signal its [the translation's] status as a retranslation and make explicit the competing interpretation that the

retranslator has inscribed in the foreign text" (ibid. 33). This context portrayed for retranslations helps explain the case of *Utopia* retranslations, in that, many of these works clearly reveal the translator's (or publisher's) intentionality within the preface that accompanies the main text. Some of these prefaces relate this difference to the source text adopted, and some to the mistakes that exist in the preceeding translations. For instance, having translated *Utopia* from its Latin original, Çiğdem Dürüşken puts forth her work as the first real translation of *Utopia* introduced to the Turkish literary system since the works proposed before this translation had not been translated from the Latin original (21). Similarly, Sadık Usta introduces his translation by explicating his mission of establishing a reconciliation among certain major concepts and correcting the errors displayed in the prior translations (Usta, Çeviri Üzerine, 9). Publishing the first translation of *Utopia* among the other reputable translations appeared in the era of the Bureau, on the other hand, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları assigns its publication a historical and canonical value as revealed in the one-page introduction on Hasan Ali Yücel Series, and by doing so, it does not even plunge its publication into the rivalry among the retranslations of *Utopia*. Therefore, the retranslations of *Utopia* clearly justify Venuti's statement in that they are "designed to make an appreciable difference", which they do not hesitate to indicate (Venuti, Retranslations, 29).

Venuti introduces an interesting consequence of this type of rivalry displayed on the paratextual level, which is the intertextual nature the retranslations acquire. As seen in the examples above, while proposing their uniqueness by referring to other translations, the retranslations of *Utopia* establish a link between themselves and the prior translations. However, it is not only the intertextuality between the retranslations but also the one between the retranslations and other literary sources

that Venuti opens to discussion. In her paper titled "Thomas More's *Utopia* in Turkish: The Use of Footnotes in the Construction of Intertextuality and Contextuality in Translations", Arzu Eker-Roditakis explores this second type of intertextuality mentioned by Venuti with a focus on the footnotes of the translations of Gökçen Sağnak (1999), İbrahim Yıldız (2003), Sadık Usta (2005) and Necmiye Uçansoy (2005). As Eker-Roditakis exemplifies, the types of intertextuality retranslations get involved into differ in their scope. For instance, in order to explain the term "Barzanes" (the old name Utopians give their president), Sadık Usta gives a reference to the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, which seems to be quite a distant source to *Utopia* at first sight (14); whereas, in the translation of Necmiye Uçansoy, there are footnotes that refer to the other publications published by the same publishing house Bordo Siyah Yayınları (ibid. 19). In this particular case, footnotes are used as a site for promotion which is reinforced by intertextuality. On the other hand, benefiting from two different source texts, as one for the main text and the other for the footnotes, İbrahim Yıldız introduces another type of intertextuality retranslations have the potential of establishing (ibid. 8). Therefore, as exemplified by both the prefaces and the footnotes of the translations of *Utopia*, through paratexts, retranslations establish a link between themselves and other translations as well as with other literary sources, which reinforces their unique position in the receiving system.

The interrelatedness between the retranslations of a particular literary work proposed by Anthony Pym seems to extend Venuti's theory based on each retranslation's assumption of bearing an appreciable difference. Pym's retranslation hypothesis problematizes the rivalry between retranslations through introducing two types of retranslations, namely active retranslations and passive retranslations,

according to the disturbing influence of one retranslation on another. Sharing the same cultural location and revealing different translation strategies, active retranslations compete with each other; whereas, passive retranslations reveal little rivalry in between since their difference owes to social, temporal, geopolitical or dialectological aspects (82-83). In the context of the retranslations of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system, passivity might remain as a nominal probability in the competition among retranslations, as also exemplified through the paratextual analysis in the previous paragraphs. Although translated forty five years ago, even the first translation is involved in the competition. It is true that İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları publishes the work with a strong emphasis on its absolute canonicity; therefore, it seems to set its publication apart from the other retranslations. Still, due to carrying the remarkable names of Turkish translation history, as well as being published by such a remarkable publishing house as İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, this first translation can safely be assumed to be in the competition.

Overall, even if there is a temporal gap among retranslations, they might become the active competitors of one another, which is exemplified by the quite active position of the 1964 translation in the present scheme of *Utopia* translations. The case studies of the present chapter, on the other hand, will question how two translations that were published in the same year and that introduced More's *Utopia* to two different discourse worlds that compete with one another.

5.2 Case Studies

As Juliane House states "translation involves text transfer across time and space, and whenever texts move, they shift frames and discourse worlds" (249). Andre Lefevere relates this shifting nature of the translation to the ideology of the translator which

"dictates solutions to problems concerned with both the 'universe of discourse' expressed in the original (objects, concepts, customs belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer of the original) and the language the original itself is expressed in" (41). In the translational context Lefevere portrays, ideology of the translator is the most prominent shaping factor in the translation process and it is the ideology that draws the relation between the universe of discourse of the original text and that of the translator's society, which brings about the shift between the source and the target, and in the case of the retranslations under focus, the shift among the target texts.

The translation by Ayfer Cambier published by Dergah Yayınları and the translation by İbrahim Yıldız published by Ütopya Yayınları are good examples for the existence of divergent rationales behind the phenomena of retranslation. Unlike some of the retranslations exemplified, in neither case the motive behind retranslation is to propose a better, more correct or canonical version of the source text to the receiving system. Rather, the aim of both Cambier and Yıldız seems to be to introduce *Utopia* to the particular discourse worlds their readers belong to. Although the translators do not introduce this ideological rational behind retranslating *Utopia* explicitly in their preface, their target texts mirror their ideological stance on both the main text and the paratexts. Therefore, why these two active retranslations differ from one another is a concern of the "entourage of patrons, publishers, readers and intercultural politics", which will be explored in the proceeding sections of the present chapter (Pym 83).

In the following section, these two retranslations that were simultaneously introduced to two different universes of discourse will be analyzed in light of the interrelations among their socio-political contexts, i.e. the explicit ideology, and the

implicit ideology present in the substance and the conditions of the encounter with the foreign culture and the text, i.e. the implicit ideology (Tahir Gürçağlar, Presumed Innocent, 38). Employing Toury's preliminary norms and operational norms, various stages of the translation event from the macro concerns such as the choice of text and the contextualization of the text to the micro ones, such as the distribution of the source text material in the target text and the translators' word choices will be explored. Besides, the analysis will be complemented by a brief look at the paratexts of these two retranslations.

5.2.1 *Utopia* by İbrahim Yıldız

First published by Ütopya Publishing in 2003, İbrahim Yıldız's translation of *Utopia* is the forth retranslation of More's work following the canonical translation of Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan. The work was published by Bilgesu Publishing in 2009 with the exact same internal organization. The mere difference between these two editions is that *Utopia* published by Ütopya Publishing has the illustration of the island on its cover page whereas, Bilgesu introduces its *Utopia* with the portrait of Sir Thomas More on the cover.

İbrahim Yıldız is known to be the translator of works of non-fiction, namely the political ones. His previous translations include *Burjuvazinin Çöküşü, İmparatorluğun Yükselişi* (The Decline of the Bourgeois, the Rise of the Empire) by Fatma Müge Göçek, *Serüven Çağı : Rönesans Filozofları* (The Era of Adventure: The Philosophers of Renaissance) by Giorgio de Santillana, *Türkiye Yahudilerinin Batılılaşması: Alliance Okulları 1860-1925* (The Westernization of the Jews of Turkey: The Alliance Schools) by Aron Rodrigue and *Yabancı Politik: Marksist Devlet Kuramına Yeniden Bakmak* (The Foreign Politic: A New Look Towards the

Marxist State Theory) by Paul Thomas. Besides Ütopya Publishing, some of the publishing houses he worked for are Ayraç, Adapa, Yordam, Bilgesu and Dipnot, most of which publish historical and socio-political works that center on Marxism, globalism and neoliberalism. Regarding this scheme, one might say that the authors Yıldız translated are quite contemporary compared to Thomas More, and the works he translated are not that literary compared to *Utopia*.

5.2.1.1 The Explicit Ideology

Published by a left-leaning publishing house whose text selection includes argumentative works of non-fiction, and translated by İbrahim Yıldız who is known to be the translator of the political works, the translation under focus is embraced by a leftist socio-political context. This has been the case in many of the *Utopia* translations, since as the leftist ideology does, the work itself searches for a better way of life via proposing such fundamental themes of leftism as the eradication of private property, abolishment of the class difference, equal income, equal work hours and the communal way of life. Therefore, the fact that the translator and the publishing house referred to a leftist contextualization of *Utopia* is neither innovative nor surprising.

Here, it should be noted that the themes indicated above that correspond to the leftist ideology are not the only ones proposed by Thomas More. As mentioned in Chapter Two, religion, nationalism and family are also among the major themes of *Utopia* which constitute the more conservative and less revolutionary side of the work. Besides, the humanism More introduces does not fully correspond to leftist humanism since the former one is quite related to the Catholic doctrine. Whereas, foregrounding the leftist themes among these other aspects of the work, the context

drawn for the translation by İbrahim Yıldız makes *Utopia* a representative of the particular leftist ideology adopted by the agents of the translation. The reflections of this leftist context as the explicit ideology of the translation on the target text will be explored in the following section, in light of the notion of the implicit ideology.

5.2.1.2 The Implicit Ideology

Preliminary Norms

The translation by İbrahim Yıldız was published by Ütopya Yayınları, which is a publishing house that mostly publishes works of non-fiction under special series that combine both translated and indigenious works. Some of the series it offers are Sociology-Philosophy Series (Sosyoloji-Felsefe Dizisi), Antropology Series (Antropoloji Dizisi), The Series of City and Environment (Kent ve Çevre Dizisi), Women Series (Kadın Dizisi) and the Series of Others (Ötekiler Dizisi). The publishing house also published a Series of Literature (Edebiyat Dizisi) which does not include any translations. *Utopia*, translated by İbrahim Yıldız, is published in the Political Culture Series (Siyasal Kültür Dizisi), a series that includes canonical works of contemporary political thought such as *From Colonization to Globalization* (Sömürgecilikten Küreselleşmeye) by Noam Chomsky, *Cultural-National Autonomy* (Ulusal Sorun ve Kültürel Özerklik) by Lenin, and an illustrated version of *Mein Kampf* by Clement Moreau. Besides, the series includes indigenous works that possess the similar argumentative nature, such as *Marxism Tartışmaları/ Manifesto'nun Güncelliği* (The Discussions of Marxism/The Topicality of the Manifesto) by Özgür Orhangazi, *Liberter Teori* (The Libertarian Theory) by İlhan Keser, *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye'ye İçeriden Bir Bakış* (The European Union and a Glance at Turkey from the Inside) by Engin Erkiner, *Küreselleşmeden Sonra* (After

Globalization) by Ergin Yıldızoğlu and *12 Eylül ve Filistin Günlüğü* (September the 12th and the Palestine Journal) by Adil Okay. This particular text-selection policy adopted by Ütopya Publishing and the presentation of *Utopia* in this special series of political culture among the works exemplified above are the indicatives of the leftist contextualization of Yıldız's translation.

When focused on the translations published by Ütopya Yayınları, it is observed that the publishing house employs a consistent translation policy. Firstly, in the series, the translations are offered along with the indigenous works (except the series of literature) from which one might conclude that the publishing house prefers melting the translated works and the indigenous works in the same pot of ideology. In other words, it might be asserted that all works that belong to a particular series are presented to the reader in the same context, which is leftism in the case of the Series of Political Culture. Secondly, the publications are offered with a preface either written by the translator or by some other critic, and in most cases the main text includes footnotes. These might be taken as the indicatives of the professional and erudite stance the publishing house aims to denote. *Utopia* translated by İbrahim Yıldız includes a translator's preface in which the translator introduces More's *Utopia* and indicates the source texts he used. The fact that he was also the editor of the book might reinforce the interpretations offered in the preface. Besides the preface, Yıldız sustains his visibility in the footnotes and in the main text owing to the consistent discourse he applies throughout his work, which will be discussed in the microanalysis section in detail.

The source text of Yıldız's translation is indicated as one of the simplified

versions of Ralph Robinson's translation.[37] In the preface, the translator makes it

clear that he also benefited from Paul Turner's translation (Published by Penguin in

1965) and Robert M. Adams edition of *Utopia* (Published by Cambridge UP in

2002). The fact that he did not adopt the original Latin version of *Utopia* as its source

makes this translation an indirect translationaccoring to the viewpoint of Toury

(Toury, DTS, 58). This is a tolerable case for all *Utopia* translations since most of

them were translated from a mediating language. Lastly, at the end of his preface

Yıldız indicates his resources, which is not a common case for the prefaces written to

Utopia translations in Turkey.

Paratexts

To take a brief look at the paratexts of Yıldız's translation, the work is offered with

the illustration of the 1556 edition's cover page on its cover. The title of the work is

not translated as '*Ütopya*' but is rendered as the proper name 'Utopia'. Besides the

title, the cover includes the name of the author and the name of the series in which

the publishing house published the translation. In the book, İbrahim Yıldız is

indicated as both the translator and the editor, which reveals that the translator was

involved in all stages of the translation process, from the textual organization to the

word choices. The traces of the translator's ideology revealed by the main text,

which will be explored in the next section, correspond to those revealed by the

preface and the blurb, both of which provide the analysis with the sufficient

information on the recontextualization of the work. Likewise, they demonstrate how

the agents of the translation aimed the work to be conceived by the reader.

[37] More, Thomas. *Utopia*. Trans. Ralph Robinson. *Three Modern Early Utopias*. Ed. Susan Bruce.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. 1-149.

Operational Norms

As mentioned earlier, İbrahim Yıldız used three different source texts while translating *Utopia*. *Three Early Modern Utopias*, the one he cites as his major source text, is a compilation of three utopias that are Thomes More's *Utopia*, Henry Neville's *Isle of Pines* and Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis*. Susan Bruce as the editor of the book introduces these three utopias with an extensive introduction, and this preface is cited in Yıldız's bibliography. In the notes, Bruce states that she merely "modernized the spelling and put in inverted commas and paragraphs" to the 1556 edition of Ralph Robinson translation (xliii). She also states that her simplified version includes all extra-textual material of this 1556 edition "in order to show readers what an early edition would have looked like, and to illustrate the way in which early editions of Utopia were" (ibid.). Thus, the source text of Yıldız pursues the path below:

- The script on the title page of the 1556 edition
- The preface of Ralph Robinson titled 'The Translator to the Gentle Reader'
- More's letter to Peter Giles
- The First Book
- The Second Book (includes all eight chapters)
- The Letter of Giles to Busleiden
- The Printer to the Reader
- Samples from first Utopia editions
- Utopian alphabet
- The opening paragraph of the text's Latin version
- An Appendix: a selection of ancient greetings on *Utopia*

The translation of İbrahim Yıldız reflects the translator's intention to offer the reader as many of these sections proposed by the source text as possible. Below is the internal organization of the target text:

- The Translator's Preface
- A Chronology of Events
- The Turkish translation of the script on the title page of the 1556 edition

- Samples from first Utopia editions
- The opening paragraph of the text's Latin version
- The script on the title page of the 1556 edition
- Utopian alphabet
- More's letter to Peter Giles
- The First Book
- The Second Book (includes all eight chapters)

As seen, although the order is different, Yıldız's translation includes all extra-textual material included in the source text except "the Letter of Giles to Busleiden" and the section titled "the Printer to the Reader"; whereas, in the target text, Ralph Robinson's preface is replaced with the preface of İbrahim Yıldız's, since in this case Yıldız is introduced as the translator.

In the source text, the long titles before each section add to the ancient and classic impression Susan Bruce aims to offer her reader. İbrahim Yıldız, on the other hand, referred to short titles, i.e. Birinci Kitap (Book One) and İkinci Kitap (Book Two), while replacing Robinson's such long titles as "The First Book of the Communication of Raphael Hythloday, Concerning the Best State of a Commonwealth" (More, 1999a, 10). The translator also used the dialogue format of the Paul Turner edition (Penguin, 1965) while translating the First Book.[38] Yıldız might have employed this format to facilitate the reading process of a philosophical and intertextual conversation.

On the other hand, in contrast with his fidelity on the textual organization in terms of including all paratextual elements present in the source text to his target text, a focus on the textual-linguistic norms, namely the sentence construction, word-

---

[38]Below is an example for Turner's format:
'**RAPHAEL**: There's nothing I'd enjoy more, for it's quite fresh in my memory. But it'll take some time, you understand.
MORE: All right, let's go in to lunch straight away. Then we'lll have the whole afternoon at our disposal.
RAPHAEL: Let's just do that.
So we went indoors and had lunch....' (More, 1965, 68)

choices, and the use of different calligraphies to mark certain points (such as italicizing and capitalizing some words), displays Yıldız's flexible and domesticating attitude. Besides simplifying some of the long paragraphs by either shortening or dividing them, the translator facilitates the reading process through employing a local tone of voice:

> TT: (...) Hem, kişinin kendi meydana getirdiği şeylere toz konduramamasından daha doğal ne olabilir ki? Hani derler ya: Kuzguna yavrusu şahin görünürmüş (...) (More, 2003a, 34)

> TT (Backtranslated): (…)and what could be more expected than a man allowing no one to speak ill of something that he brought into existence. As they say, the raven considers its young one to be a falcon. (More, 2003a, 34)

> ST: (...)and verily it is naturally given to all men to esteem their own inventions best. So both the raven and the ape think their own young ones fairest (...) (More, 1999a, 17)

As seen, using such phrases as "toz kondurmak" (speak ill of something) and "kuzguna yavrusu şahin görünürmüş" (the raven considers its young one a falcon), Yıldız replaces the foreign phrases with the local ones. Below is another example for the local tone of voice employed by Yıldız. Here, the protagonist bids farewell to his beloved friend and his gentle wife through a Turkish way of offering one's respect:

> TT: (...) Elveda, aziz dostum; mükemmel eşinize hürmetlerimi sunarım. Ve lütfen beni eskisi gibi sevmeye devam edin, benim size olan muhabbetimse her zamankinden daha büyük. (More, 2003a, 25)

> TT (Backtranslated): (...)Farewell, my dear friend and please present my complements to your wonderful wife. Please keep loving me as you have always done, for my fondness of you is greater than ever. (More, 2003a, 25)

> ST: (...) Thus fare you well, right heartily beloved friend Peter, with your gentle wife, and love me as you have ever done, for I love you better than ever I did. (More, 1999, 9)

On the other hand, the target text includes particular choices on the linguistic level, i.e. his choice of using such correspondences in pure Turkish as "imgelem" (imagination), "kağşamış" (decrepit), "bağışık tutmak" (to exempt) and "imdi" (in that case), that lead the analysis beyond the translator's intention of facilitating the reading process. In contrast with the parts quoted above, rather than defining these decisions on the lexical level as optional shifts, which according to Popovic the translator resorts to while "conveying the semantic substance of the original in spite of the differences separating the system of the original from that of the translation" (Popovic, Shifts, 79); it would be more appropriate to consider them in the grand context of ideology. In other words, the interpretation of these particular word-choices considerably concerns "different policies" applied to "different subgroups in terms of human agents and groups" (Toury, DTS, 58). These different subgroups will be discussed in more detail in the following sections of the present chapter.

5.2.1.3 Conclusions to *Utopia* by İbrahim Yıldız

Published in 2003 as the forth retranslation of *Utopia*, İbrahim Yıldız's work introduces the text among the socio-political works in a series titled "Series of Political Culture". When approached this way, the choice of text seems quite suitable for the ideological stances of both the translator and the publishing house. On the macro level, regarding the amount of material (both textual and extra-textual) transmitted from the source text, the translation is faithful to its source. Including the chronology and the preface to the scheme, one might classify the work as a "thick translation" that "seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glosses to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context" (Appiah 427). However, this thick translation would not be the type of translation enabling the reader a high variety of

interpretations. Both on the paratextual level (i.e. in the preface, chronology, back cover and footnotes) and on the textual level, the target text mirrors its explicit ideology and the reader is directed towards the discourse world the translator and the publishing house belong to.

While introducing his preliminary norms, Toury suggests the researcher to question what remains to be invariant and he expects the researcher to investigate whether the translator adopted adequacy or acceptability as a path to follow. In the case of Yıldız's translation of *Utopia*, although there are no big departures from the source text such as large omissions or additions, most of the shifts do not reflect an endeavor of preserving the norm of the original (Popovic, Shifts, 79). When the translation policy of Ütopya Yayınları and the ideological stance of İbrahim Yıldız is considered, it might be concluded that the translator adopted acceptability and "subscribed to norms originating in the target culture" (Toury, DTS, 57). Whereas, the fact that the text is offered as its 1556 edition with the same cover page and introductory material such as the utopian alphabet, the translation of the introductory script and the first page of the 1556 edition implies an attempt of full representation of the source text and an inclination towards adequacy. This case seems to imply that there might not exist such clear-cut categorizations as adequate translation and acceptable translation, since, as in this case, it is easy to find justifications for categorizing the text under each.[39]

---

[39]As a matter of fact, after offering his opposing theoretical tools combined under *initial norm*, Toury also admits this point stating that "actual translation decisions (the results of which the researcher would confront) will necessarily involve some ad hoc combination of, or compromise between the two extremes implied by the initial norm." It is for methodological reasons that he offers the researcher to take the "two poles as distinct in principle" (Toury, DTS, 57).

5.2.2 *Utopia* by Ayfer G. Cambier

Dergah Yayınları published *Utopia* in the same year as Ütopya Yayınları published

the translation of İbrahim Yıldız. The translator Ayfer Girgin Cambier was the editor

of Dergah Yayınları at the time. Her other translations include More's *Private Letters*

and Machiavelli's *The Prince*,[40] both of which correspond to *Utopia* in terms of their

content and the period they represent. Besides being a translator, Cambier worked as

a journalist in *Cumhuriyet*, as an editor in Dergah Yayınları, and as an interpreter in

various institutions in Britain. Therefore, it might be asserted that literary translation

is not her major field; still, the articles she wrote and translated imply her interest in

literature.

5.2.2.1 The Explicit Ideology

Published by Dergah Yayınları, the translation by Ayfer Cambier reveals quite a

different explicit ideology than the translation of İbrahim Yıldız. Here, *Utopia* is

introduced as a philosophical work and a humanist masterpiece that proposes a

remarkable path of reorganizing human life. The case exemplifies the fact that the

formulation of the themes that are present in a source text in a different hierarchy

brings about different contextualizations, therefore different receptions. Rather than

the themes associated with the leftist ideology which the translation by Yıldız

strongly emphasizes, the translation by Cambier foregrounds More's ideals on crime,

death penalty, religion, warfare, rationalism and man's contemplation upon himself,

which implies the more humanist, spiritual and even sufist context the work is

posited into. In this respect, Dergah Yayınları presents the less rebellious and more

traditionalist aspects of *Utopia* to its reader. The reflections of this conservative

---

[40] This information is acquired from the translator's resume on the internet:
http://translatorscafe.com/cafe/member113662.htm

humanism as the explicit ideology of the translation on the target text will be explored in the following section.

5.2.2.2 The Implicit Ideology

Preliminary Norms

Founded in 1977, Dergah Yayınları determined its publishing policy as contributing to the cultural life of Turkey by building up a library of works that propose a concern and shed light on the problematic matters.[41] Initiating this path via publishing the classical works of the Turkish literary canon, i.e. Abdülhak Hamit Tarhan, Ahmet Haşim, Cenab Şahabettin, the publishing house later on directed its focus towards the works on mysticism, Sufism and Islamic tradition and strengthened its position in the literary circle as an Eastern-oriented publishing house.

Like Ütopya Yayınları, Dergah also presents its publications in special series, which are namely Turkish Classics (Türk Klasikleri), Classics of Islam (İslam Klasikleri), Contemporary Islam Thought (Çağdaş İslam Düşüncesi), Contemporary Turkish Thought (Çağdaş Türk Düşüncesi), Western Thought (Batı Düşüncesi), Eastern Thought (Doğu Düşüncesi), Turks in the Eyes of the West (Batının Gözüyle Türkler) and The Journey from East to West in North Africa (Mağrip ve Maşrik). Only three of these series, the Series of Western Thought, the Series of Turks in the Eyes of the West and the Series of Classics of Islam include translations. In the last series, the publications are translated from Eastern sources that were written in Arabic.

In the Series of Western Thought, in which *Utopia* is proposed along with Hume's *Ethics*, Montaigne's *Essays,* Plato's *Republic*, Machiavelli's *Prince*, *Five*

---

[41] http://www.dergahyayinlari.com/hakkimizda/

Classics of Existentialist Philosophy,[42] August Comte's *Islam and Positivism*, Schopenhauer's *On the Basis of Morality*, Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West*, the major subject the publishing house chooses to introduce is the philosophical fundamentals of ethics. As most of these works are retranslations, it is a high probability that they were recontextualized according to the expectations of the Dergah reader as *Utopia* was. Besides these works that carry the major names of the Western thought, Dergah also published such contemporary works as the *Return to Religion* by Henry C. Link and *Secularism in the World* by Jean Baubeort in the same series. As seen, the works in the second group do not conflict the ethical manner implemented by the works in the first group.

As for the directness of translation, the source text of the translation is Paul Turner's translation published by Penguin, though not indicated in the target text.[43] Paul Turner's version of *Utopia* is a translation itself, and it is a simpler translation compared to the Ralph Robinson edition. As most of the other translations of *Utopia* offered to the Turkish reader, Cambier's edition is also an indirect translation, which is acceptable as indicated before. A last point concerning the directness of translation is that Cambier introduces the Second Book with eight sub-headings, whereas Paul Turner edition offers Second Book as a whole, which implies that Cambier used another edition of *Utopia,* besides the translation by Paul Turner, in her translation process.

---

[42] This work introduces the reader the summaries of the works of Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Jaspers, Sartre and Marcel.

[43] This information is acquired from the translator.

Paratexts

The translation is offered with a map on its cover. The title of the work is preserved as it is, as "Utopia". On the back, there are two separate scripts, one on the life of More and the other on *Utopia*. The target text includes two different introductions, the one titled "*Sunuş*" (Introduction) by the publishing house and the other titled "*Utopia Üstüne*" (on Utopia) by the translator. The translator's introduction is accompanied by a number of visuals, i.e. paintings and photographs, and it explains the life of More, Henry VIII and the Anglican Reform. The sources to the introduction are indicated at the end in which the source text of Cambier does not exist. Besides, the translation includes only two footnotes and the main text is followed by a glossary that explains the Latin proper names made up by Thomas More.

In the book, Ayfer Cambier is introduced to the reader not with the word *çevirmen* (the translator) but with the phrase *Türkçesi* (the Turkish version), which is the case in many other translations published by Dergah Yayınları. Although not indicated in the target text, just as İbrahim Yıldız, Cambier was the editor of Dergah Yayınları at the time, which strengthens the fact that the choices on both the macro and the micro level belong to her. It is also a high probability that the introduction that carries the signature of Dergah Yayınları was written by her. Even if it was not, there is a consistency among the discourses of the two introductions (that of the publishing house and Cambier), the chronology, the main text and the blurb.

Operational Norms

When it comes to Cambier's distribution of the source text material in her target text, it is observed that the translation has a similar internal organization as the translation

of İbrahim Yıldız, in that, both provide their reader with extra-textual material on *Utopia* and Thomas More. Just as it was the case for the translation by Yıldız, the "thickness" presented by Cambier's translation might be regarded as an indication of the translator's fidelity to the source text (Appiah). Below is the internal organization of the source text:

- Introduction
- The Utopian Alphabet, a specimen of Utopian Poetry
- Lines on the Island of Utopia
- More's Letter to Peter Gilles
- Gilles's Letter to Busleiden
- Book one
- Book two
- Notes
- Appendix
- Glossary

As seen below, Cambier applies a similar pattern to her translation:

- An introduction on behalf of the publishing house titled 'Sunuş'
- Introduction of Ayfer Cambier (with no reference to the translation process)
- More's letter to Gilles
- Gilles' letter to Busleiden
- Utopian alphabet, lines on Utopia
- Book One
- Book Two (with 8 different sub-headings)
- Glossary

As seen, it is only the section titled "Notes" that the target text misses. However, in terms of content, the twenty five paged introduction of Cambier compensates this omission.

An interesting fact to be noted on the textual organization of the translation is that the translator backtranslated the proper names present in the source text; whereas, Turner offered his reader the English versions of these inventive proper names of More. Therefore, while Turner's glossary offers the reader the original

Latin versions of the names, Cambier's glossary offers her reader the Turkish explanations of these Latin names that take place in Latin in the main text.

As for the textual-linguistic norms, the translation displays over-literalisms in sentence construction and radical departures in word choice. To start with the former, Cambier's translation includes simple and short paragraphs as its source text does. In spite of this simplicity, frequent negative shifts that arose from the word-for-word strategy of Cambier block comprehension at times.[44] On the other hand, the departures of Cambier on the level of word-choice are related to the discourse world the translator represents and the readership attributed to the translation to a remarkable extent. Therefore, these types of shifts ca not be explicated via Popovic's notion of "optional shifts" since they are not employed in order to get the target text closer to its source (Popovic, Shifts). Rather, such particular word choices of Cambier which could easily be associated with the conservative explicit ideology of the translation as "malik olmak" (to have), "malumatlı şükran duygusu" (knowledgeable gratitude), "alimliğin en büyük hamisi"(the greatest tutelary of erudition), "Allah vergisi kabiliyet" (gift), "martaval"(bluster), "müşvik bir tanrı"(an affectionate God) and "hilkat inançlı bir zihin" (a mind that believes by nature) bring about shifts on the level of ideology and they are the indicatives of the target norms presented by the particular discourse world the work is located in (More, 2003b, 37, 39, 42, 108, 109, 112).

---

[44] Exampes for Cambier's negative shifts can be seen at More, 1965, 42; More, 2003b, 55; More, 1965, 46; More, 2003b, 55.

5.2.2.3 Conclusions to *Utopia* by Ayfer Cambier

Cambier's translation is a clear representative of the standpoint displayed by the publishing house. It is represented as a work on the ethical fundamentals of Western thought just as other translations published in the Series of Western Thought are. Proposing her reader the more conservative humanist aspects of *Utopia* adopting the particular discourse of the discourse world her reader belongs to, Cambier reveals acceptability as her initial norm (Toury, DTS). On the other hand, the amount of material rendered from the source text (with no obvious additions or omissions), the ordering of the internal organization, and the word-for-word renderings of the English sentence construction, at the expense of blocking the comprehensibility of the text, all imply the fidelity of the translator towards the source text. Therefore, in this case, the adequacy-acceptibility dilemma once more arises.

5.2.3 Comparison

As could be inferred from the analysis phase, the translations by Ayfer Cambier and İbrahim Yıldız are the representatives of two different standpoints present in the Turkish literary system, despite the fact that they bear a similarity in the amount of source text material they rendered into their target texts. Mirroring the ideologies of their translators and the publishing houses, these two different representations of *Utopia* imply the existence of different reading communities within the receiving system who have certain expectations that correspond to this ideology.

In this reader-oriented theory, Stanley Fish starts out from the assumption that the text is not a problem to be solved and it does not bear a correct interpretation (312). The existence of various interpretations of a single text implies the existence

of various interpreting strategies, and these interpreting strategies might be shared by a group of people, which Fish refers as interpretive communities:

> Interpretive communities are made up of those who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words, these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what is read rather than, as is actually assumed, the other way around. (327)

As Fish proceeds, these strategies through which the readers apply their pre-established intentions to the texts they read are not natural but learnt; similarly, these communities can always be created, grow larger or get smaller and dissolve. In the context of the retranslations of *Utopia* under the focus of the present chapter; the certain ideologies imposed by the translators via the distinct discourse they employ are closely related to the interpretive strategies mentioned by Fish, which are shared by the particular reading communities of Dergah Yayınları and Ütopya Yayınları. Therefore, the departures of the translators from their source texts on the level of discourse serve for the existence of both the ideologies they propose and the communities they refer to.

This section of the present chapter aims to offer a comparative analysis of the works of İbrahim Yıldız and Ayfer Cambier in light of the implicit and explicit ideologies of the translations explored by the analysis phase. Through a paratextual and a textual comparison, the social rationales behind the difference in the translation strategies of Yıldız and Cambier will be questioned. Since both translations were published in the same year, this will be a synchronic study. The motives behind these two cases of retranslation will be questioned within the context of receiving groups introduced above.

5.2.3.1 Paratextual Comparison

As mentioned, the translations by İbrahim Yıldız and Ayfer Cambier are offered to the reader with a preface and in these prefaces different aspects of *Utopia* are foregrounded. It is clear that in the process of organizing the preface, the inclusion and the exclusion of some themes present in the source text serve for ensuring that the text is read "properly" in both cases, as Genette states, just as it was the case for the preface of the 1964 translation of *Utopia* (197). Below the last paragraphs of each preface are quoted:

> Some have suggested that Utopia portrays the monastery life since it depicts the common share in the early Christian era. Some have defined it as one of the pioneering texts of socialism, while some others considered it to be a joke. Certain reviewers, bearing Thomas More's inner conflicts and his strict anti-reformism in mind, claimed that More betrayed the Utopia. Nevertheless, Utopia has taken its place among the significant works of Renaissance and Humanism as a cultural heritage, in spite of all those comments and debates. (More, 2003b, 13)

> [Kimileri Utopia'yı erken dönem Hıristiyanlığındaki ortak paylaşımı anlattığı için, manastır hayatı, kimileri sosyalizmin öncü metinlerinden biri, kimileri de yalnızca şaka diye tanımlamışlardır. Onu yorumlayanlar, bazen Thomas More'un kendi içinde yaşadığı çatışmaları ve Reformizm'e şiddetle karşı çıkışını da göz önüne alarak, 'Utopia'ya ihanet ettiğini' de söylemişlerdir. Ama ne olursa olsun, bütün bu yorumlara ve tartışmalara rağmen, *Utopia* Rönesansın ve Humanizm'in en önemli yapıtlarından biri olarak insanlığın kültür mirasında yerini almıştır. (More, 2003b, 13)]

> The focal attribute of the Utopian society is the communal property system. The other fundamental values respected by this ideal society are honesty, moderation, reason and common sense. According to Hythloday, it is impossible to accomplish a substantial reform unless private property is abolished. It is not clear, however, to what extent More agrees with Hythloday. Yet, it is clear that Utopia paved the way for a new literary genre to be born and will preserve its significance and influence forever, as long as the search for a better world is still existent. (More, 2003a, 10)

> [Utopia toplumunun asal özelliği ortak mülkiyet düzenine sahip olmasında yatar. Bu örnek ideal toplumun gözettiği diğer temel değerler doğruluk, ölçülülük, akıl ve sağduyudur. Özel mülkiyet kaldırılmadıkça toplumda esaslı

bir reform gerçekleştirilmez Hythloday'a göre. Ama More Hythloday'in bu görüşüne ne derece katılır, orası belli değildir. Belli olan, yeni bir yazınsal türün doğuşuna yol açan *Utopia*'nın insanın daha iyi bir dünya arayışı devam ettiği sürece etkisini ve önemini koruyacağı, ölümsüz bir ses olarak yarınlarda da yankısını bulacağıdır (More, 2003a, 10)]

In the quotation above Cambier concludes her words with the possibilities of different interpretations of *Utopia*, whereas Yıldız clearly indicates his leftist interpretation of the work through underlining the themes of communal way of living, the eradication of the private property and a search for a better life in *Utopia*. Besides, Cambier does not abstain from offering her reader the link between the communal way of living in *Utopia* and the way of life in monasteries in early Christian Era, whereas Yıldız prefers to relate the theme of communal life and property directly to the concern of the eradication of the private property and the contemplation upon a better world in the leftist utopic sense. That's how each preface is adhered to different types of reading communities and directs the reader towards the aimed representation.

Likewise, in the chronologies offered by the target texts, the translators represent the period starting from More's birth to his being declared as a saint by the Catholic Church (interestingly each chronology offers a different year for this event) via pointing different historical instances. Firstly, the style through which they represent the life of More is quite different. Yıldız briefly points out thirty one events along with their dates in two pages, whereas in her chronology titled *Tarihlerle Thomas More* (Thomas More in Dates), Cambier cites twenty three events in four pages with a historicizing narration. As inferred from the title, all events cited by Cambier are directly related to Thomas More, whereas Yıldız also points out some focal historical events of the period such as the voyages of Vespuci, the English-

French War, the year Machiavelli wrote *the Prince* and the initiation of the Reform

by Luther. Therefore, it could be concluded that Yıldız aims to introduce the reader

the historical environment of *Utopia*, whereas Cambier focuses on the personal life,

i.e. beliefs, way of living and ideals, of Thomas More. Below is how each translation

explains More's resignation from his position as the Lord Chancellor of England:

> 1532 Henry VIII divorced Catherine, the daughter of the King of Spain and his late brother's widow, whom he had married as a child, claiming that the marriage was not legal. Infatuated by Anne Boleyn, he wished to marry her without the consent of the Pope. More was a devout Catholic and he believed in the sanctity of Pope's authority. According to More, this marriage was inappropriate. Beholding the King's persistency in that matter, More sensed that the situation would worsen even more and resigned, presenting his health condition as an excuse. (More, 2003b, 25)

> [1532 Sekizinci Henry, çocuk yaşta evlendiği, ölen ağabeyinin eşi İspanya Kralı'nın kızı Catherine'den , evliliğinin yasal olmadığını savunarak ayrıldı. Anne Boleyn'e tutulmuştu. Papanın rızasını almadan, Anne Boleyn'le evlenmek istiyordu. More dindar bir Katolikti ve Papalık makamının kutsallığına inanıyordu. Ona göre bu evlilik uygunsuzdu. Kralın bu konudaki ısrarını gören More, işlerin daha da karışacağını hissedip, sağlığını bahane ederek istifa etti. (More, 2003b, 25)]

> 1532 Following Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon as a step in fulfilling his desire to marry Anne Boleyn, and declaring himself as the head of the English church, More resigns from his position as a Chancellor. (More, 2003a, 13)

> [1532 VIII. Henry'nin, karısı Aragon'lu Catherine'den boşanıp Anne Boleyn'le evlenme isteğini gerçekleştirme yolunda, kendisini İngiliz Kilise'sinin başı ilan etmesi üzerine More Chancellor'luktan istifa eder. (More, 2003a, 13)]

Although both explain the same event of More's resignation following Henry's

divorce from Catherine of Aragon, Cambier and Yıldız emphasize the different

aspects of the event. The former foregrounds the religious and moral aspect, i.e. the

consent of Pope, More's radical Catholicism, the inconvenience of Henry's marriage

with Anne Boleyn, whereas the latter merely offers the political aspect, that is

Henry's declaring himself as the head of the Anglican Church. Similarly,when

More's execution is condemned by the Catholic Church years after his death, Cambier declares him as *şehit* (martyr) (More, 2003b, 27); whereas Yıldız declares him as *aziz* (saint) (More, 2003a, 13)

The blurbs of the two target texts also include the indicatives of the different standpoints of Yıldız and Cambier. Like her chronology, the translation by Cambier prefers to give information on Thomas More; whereas, the blurb of the translation by Yıldız promotes the idealistic way of thought proposed in *Utopia* via a brief comparison of the Old World and the New World. Below are sentences from the blurbs of the two translations which offer a content and discourse that differ from one another:

> In 1501, More cloistered himself to the Charterhouse Monastery. Monasteries were the centre of knowledge during that era. More did readings on various matters, he fasted and prayed. (More, 2003b, Blurb)
>
> [1501'de Charterhouse Manastırına kapandı, Manastırlar bu çağlarda bilgi merkezi idi. Burada çok yönlü okumalarda bulundu, oruç tutup dua etti. (More, 2003b, Blurb)]
>
> Utopias are little islands brought into being to the sea of imagination. Utopias are fictions that reject the given social life, the network of relations and the sum of structures, that sing the songs of other 'possible' worlds and relieve the 'human' thought of absolute patterns and grant it wings to fly to the blue of imagination, providing new insights. (More, 2003a, Blurb)
>
> [İmgelem denizinde yaratılan adalar, adacıklardır Ütopyalar. Verili toplumsal yaşamayı, ilişkiler ağını, yapılar bütününü elinin tersiyle iten; başka 'olası' dünyaların şarkısını söyleyen; insane düşlüncesini donmuş, mutlaklaştırılmış kalıplardan kurtarıp düş gücünün maviliğine kanatlandıran, ona yeni açılımlar sağlayan kurgulardır. (More, 2003a, Blurb)]

5.2.3.2 Textual Comparison

It is observed that the translators applied their particular discourse which was displayed on the paratextual analysis, to their translations as well. The quotations below from the translations of Cambier and Yıldız exemplify the identification of the

translators' choices with the standpoints of the publishing houses and the

expectations of their reader communities:

> TT (Backtranslated): In ethics, they tackled with similar arguments as we did, questioning what 'good' is, distinguishing the spiritual good from the physical one and from the blessings of nature. They strived to establish whether this concept of 'good' could apply to all of those three or whether this was a concept solely concerned with the human spirit. Virtue and pleasure was discussed upon. However, they rather focused on the happiness of man. Whether happiness depended on one issue alone or on several issues was investigated. As far as I am concerned, they tended more towards the idea that happiness depended entirely or mostly on pleasure. Even more surprisingly, they attempted to refer to their religion to support their argument as their religion was grievous, strict, prohibitive and almost merciless. Happiness could never be discussed without embedding certain religious principles into phiolosphical rationalism. In their point of view, mind's efforts to reach genuine happiness are doomed to fail without those religious principles. (More, 2003a, 97)

> [Ahlak felsefesinde bizim çıkarımlarımızın aynısıyla uğraşıyorlardı: İyi'nin ne olduğunu sorguluyor, ruhsal iyiliği bedensel iyilikten ve çevrenin sunduğu nimetlerden ayırt ediyorlardı. 'iyi' sıfatının bu üçüne de uygulanıp uygulanamayacağı, yoksa sadece insanın ruhuyla ilintili bir kavram mı olduğu sorularına cevap bulmaya çalışıyorlardı. Erdem ve hazzı tartışıyorlardı, ama asıl ilgilendikleri konu insanın mutluluğuydu; insanın mutlu olmasının tek bir şeye mi yoksa birçok şeye mi bağlı olduğunu sorguluyorlardı. Bana kalırsa, mutluluğun bütünüyle, ya da en azından büyük ölçüde, haz duymaktan ibaret olduğu yolundaki görüşe inanmaya daha bir yatkındılar. Daha da şaşırtıcı olanı, bu görüşe kendi dinlerinden destek bulmaya çalşmalarıydı; çünkü ciddi olduğu kadar katı, yasaklayıcı ve neredeyse merhametsiz bir dinleri vardı. Felsefi usçuluğa belli dinsel ilkeleri ulamadan asla mutluluğu tartışmıyorlardı. Onlara göre bu dinsel ilkeler olmaksızın, usun gereçek mutluluğu bulma yolunda harcadığı tüm çabalar zayıf ve hatalı olmaya mahkumdur. (More, 2003a, 97)]

> TT (Backtranslated): In ethics, they discuss the same matters as we do. While defining correctness under three headings as physical, psychological and environmental; they focus on establishing which conditions are applicable to one of those conditions and which are applicable to all. They contemplate on virtue and pleasure. Their main focus, however, is on the source of the happiness of man. On what source or sources does human happiness depend? In that regard, they seem to lean towards hedonism that acknowledges pleasure as the fundamental goal of life, since they believe that the happiness of man depends mostly or entirely on pleasure. Surprisingly enough, they are inspired by the arguments of religion when advocating for this pleasure ethics. Even if a viewpoint is not entirely devout, it concerns a more serious aspect of life. As is seen, they resort to religious principles in discussions on happiness so as to

support their arguments. Otherwise, they would suppose that they were not adequately equipped to define genuine happiness. (More, 2003b, 109)

[Ahlak felsefesinde onlar da bizim yaptığımız gibi, aynı sorunları tartışırlar. Doğruluğu, fiziksel, psikolojik ve çevresel olarak üç şekilde tanımlamakla birlikte, hangi şartların bunların hepsine ya da yalnızca birine uygulanır olup olmadığı konusunda bir yol tutarlar. Onlar da fazilet ve zevk üstüne kafa yorarlar. Ama asıl konuları insan mutluluğunun kaynağı üstünedir. İnsan mutluluğu hangi kaynağa ya da kaynaklara bağlıdır? Bu konuda, onlara göre insanın mutluluğu fazlasıyla ya da büsbütün zevke bağlı olduğu için, hayatın esas gayesini zevk olarak kabul eden hedonizme oldukça eğilimli görünürler. Yeterince şaşırtıcıdır ki, onlar bu zevk ahlakını savunurken dinin muhakemelerinden ilham alırlar- bir şey eğer kasvetli koyu bir sofuluk değilse bile hayatın daha ciddi bir yönüyle ilişkilidir. Gördüğünüz gibi, mutluluk üstüne tam tartışmalarında, dinsel belli başlı prensiplere, kendi anlayışlarına ilave etmek üzere başvururlar. Aksi takdirde, doğru mutluluğu tanımlamak için eksik donatılmış olduklarını düşünürler. (More, 2003b, 109)]

When the quotations above are compared, it is seen that Yıldız presents the ethics of Utopians with a more scientific and philosophical jargon using such phrases as "iyiyi sorgulamak" (to question the good), "erdem ve haz" (virtue and pleasure), "felsefi usçuluk" (philosophical rationalism) and "dinsel ilkeler" (religious principles); whereas, Cambier renders the paragraph with such religious associations as "doğru" (correctness) (instead of 'iyi'), "fazilet" (virtue) and "dinin muhakemelerinden ilham almak" (inspired by the arguments of religion). Cambier's paragraph does not include the part "merhametsiz bir din" (a merciless religion) because her source text does not have such a phrase. However, this does not mean that Cambier never applied censorship to her translation. The quotation below is cited both to add to the examples on Cambier's distinct conservative discourse and to exemplify that Cambier employed omission as a translation strategy in her translation process:

TT (Backtranslated): (...) If it is thought that the punishment is given not for the steal of such small amount of money but for coming against the laws and violating the justice, isn't this notion of absolute justice wrong? The law-maker cannot be as dictatorial as to punish an irrational uprise with death penalty or cannot make a law that is based on an illogical thought that considers all missdeeds the same- after all there is no difference between stealing and

murdering; in addition to this, on an equitable basis, there are differences between them as big as rifts.

"Do not kill", God says. Is it right to kill someone for he took some money, anyway? Suppose that what God forbids is people's killing each other (...) Can we really believe that we can strangle each other, relying on man-made laws and these hangmen might be exempt from this divine justice? Is this not like claiming that divine justice has no virtue further than that of the man-made laws? At this point divine laws are turned into an incomprehensible state, so that man could enact and interpret them in the way he wants.

Even the law of Moses, enacted for slaves and rebels, which was harsh on an equitable basis, did not sentence thieves to death, but let them off with a pecuniary penalty. Yet, we assume <u>the new will of God that associates God's mercy</u> allows us to torment and kill one another with more ease than former laws did. (More, 2003b, 63)

[(...) Eğer cezanın on kuruş para çalmaya değil de, yasayı çiğnemeye ve adaleti bozmaya karşı verildiği düşünülüyorsa, mutlak adaletin bu kavramı tamamen yanlış değil midir? Yasa koyucu akılsız bir başkaldırıyı ölümle cezalandıracak kadar diktatör olamaz ya da tüm kabahatleri aynı kefeye koyan katı mantıksız bir düşünceyi temel alan bir kanun yapamaz-öyle ki yasada çalmakla öldürmek arasında ayrım yoktur, bununla birlikte hakkaniyette bu ikisi arasında uçurumlar kadar fark vardır.

Tanrı diyor ki 'öldürmeyin'- bizim biraz para aldı diye birini öldürmemiz doğrumudur [sic] ki? Diyelim ki Tanrı'ın [sic] yasak ettiği insanların birbirini öldürmesidir (...) insan eliyle yapılan yasalara güvenerek birbirimizi boğazlayabileceğimize ve cellatların bu ilahi adaletten muaf tutulabileceğine gerçekten inanabiliyor muyuz? Bu, ilahi adaletin insan eliyle yapılan yasaların izin verdiğinden öte doğruluk payı yoktur demek gibi bir şey değil midir? Bu noktada ilahi yasalar anlaşılmaz bir duruma getirilir ki insanoğlu onu istediği biçimde yasalaştırıp, yorumlasın.

Musa'nın yasasında bile, vicdani olarak ağır olan, köleler ve asiler için yapılan bu yasa bile çalmayı ölümle cezalandırmıyor sadece para cezasına çarptırıyordu. Bizse sanıyoruz ki <u>Tanrının merhametini ifade eden yeni takdiri ilahi</u> bize birbirimize zulmetme, öldürme fırsatını eski yasalardan daha fazla veriyor. (More, 2003b, 63)]

In the source text, the part underlined in the last paragraph is given as "the new dispensation, which express God's fatherly kindness towards his children" (More 1965: 50). It is clear that here the new dispensation refers to New Testament, the God of which is known to be much more merciful than that of Old Testament. Translating the book as "Yeni Takdir-i İlahi" but not as "Yeni Ahit", Cambier might have aimed to unmark the Christian elements in her source text. She might have aimed to domesticate this part of the text for her reader via a phrase associating with the

Muslim way of thought, i.e. "Takdir-i İlahi", as well. Besides, "the God and his children" concept established by the Christian way of metaphysical thought does not take place in Cambier's translation. Instead, she prefers to propose the mercy of God in the more general sense and uses the phrase "Tanrı'nın merhameti" (God's mercy), through which the text appeals to the Muslim reader who believes that God is one and has no children.

Regarding both the positions adhered to these two retranslations in the special series presented by the publishing houses and the general policies of the publishing houses, Dergah Yayınları and Ütopya Yayınları might be assumed to have a specific reader. As exemplified by the paratextual and textual comparison of the two retranslations, the *Utopias* published by these two publishing houses diverge at the level of discourse and the major motive behind the particular translation strategies adopted by the translators is to make the source text accessible to the reader of these publishing houses. As explored before, Dergah Yayınları reflects the traditional and conservative-humanist atmosphere it evolved out of, whereas Ütopya Yayınları portrays a factual, ideal-oriented and leftist standpoint. And these ideologies displayed by the publishing houses correspond to both the ideologies of the translators and the expectations of their reader communities.

From these all, it can be assumed that bestowing their target texts with consistency via employing the same discourse to both their translations and the paratexts, İbrahim Yıldız and Ayfer Cambier became the representatives of the universes of discourse they belong to. Domestication, which is a translation strategy that effaces the translator from his/her target text according to Lawrence Venuti, was related to the humanist standpoints of Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan in the previous chapter who were by no means invisible in their products. In the case of these two

retranslations, this particular translation strategy serves for mirroring the conservative and leftist stances as the explicit ideologies of the translations published by Dergah Yayınları and Ütopya Yayınları (Venuti, Scandals). In both retranslations, the foreignness of the source text is introduced to the reader via attributing it a tone of voice related to these particular explicit ideologies. In this respect, accomplishing the mission of making the source text referable to their reader communities and becoming the representatives of the discourse worlds of these communities, both Cambier and Yıldız are visible on their target texts, in which domestication plays a major role. These two cases also exemplify that fluency might be a varying factor. As displayed by the analysis phase of this chapter, producing a fluent and readable translation would require different translation strategies according to the interpretive community the text is translated for. Indeed, as this study regards ideology as the major motive behind each retranslation, it does not assume that the ultimate aim of the translators was to introduce their target reader the fluent and easily read version of *Utopia*. Rather, it puts forth that making the arguments in *Utopia* referrable to their reader, Yıldız and Cambier reinforced the positions of the conservative and the leftist discourse worlds in the Turkish literary system.

5.3 Conclusions to Chapter Five

Focusing on the translation strategies İbrahim Yıldız and Ayfer Cambier employed in their translation process, and relating them with a number of factors such as the standpoint of the translators, the correlation between these standpoints and the publishing policies of the publishing houses, and the ideology of the reader communities, the present chapter revealed that a single text might simultaneously be assigned to more than one positions in a receiving literary system. The translational

decisions mirrored by the target texts of Cambier and Yıldız on the paratextual and textual level were interpreted in order to explore the unique positions attributed to these two works. While doing so, some interrelations among the explicit and implicit ideologies of the retranslations were drawn.

Published among the works on Western ethics, *Utopia* by Ayfer Cambier contributes to the ethical context implemented by the Series of Western Thought published by Dergah Yayınları. Foregrounding the moral elements present in the source text and using words with religious associations, adds to the traditional tone of voice of Cambier and in this way, her translation appeals to the expectations of the Dergah reader. Likewise, published in the Series of Political Culture among the works of contemporary political thought by Ütopya Yayınları, *Utopia* by İbrahim Yıldız foregrounds the socio-political ideals of the source text and seems to acquire a focal position in the series. The leftist tone of voice presented by Yıldız is present on both paratextual and textual level; it might safely be assumed that the preface, the blurb and the translation carry the indications of the same discourse. These all indicate the fact that Yıldız adopted the publishing policy of Ütopya Yayınları and the expectations of its readers as a path to be followed in his translation process. The same reader-publisher-translator correlation in Cambier's translation is implied by the moral impressions in the target text, as well.

On the textual level, the present chapter observed that both translations have their own adequacies and acceptabilities, therefore these translations were not categorized under clear-cut classifications such as "adequate translation" and "acceptable translation" (Toury, DTS). Instead of focusing on the equivalence relationship between the source and the target texts, a target-oriented scheme in which discourse, publishing policy and readership function interrelatedly was

portrayed and it was explored that the translation strategies of the translators were oriented towards the expectations of their receiving groups. In this respect, the present chapter did not discuss domestication in the context Lawrence Venuti draws, rather it regarded domestication as a strategy that both made the translators the representatives of their discourse worlds and contributed to the existence of those discourse worlds.

Lastly, the present section proposed passivity as a nominal probability among the retranslations of *Utopia*. Some of these works explicitly promoted their uniqueness and difference in their prefaces, which was not the case for the two retranslations under focus. Rather, the translations by Cambier and Yıldız introduced the difference they bore at the level of discourse and ideology. Regarding the competition between these two retranslations that arose from the novelties they present as a concern of "entourage of patrons, publishers, readers and intercultural politics", the study defined them as one another's "active competitors" (Pym 83).

CONCLUSION

This thesis aimed to offer a holistic translational scheme that would embrace the pre-translation period (non-translation) and the post-translation period (retranslation) of a translation product synchronously with an exploration of its initial translation. My initial assumption was that the translational journey of Thomas More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system would provide me with a favourable ground for such a diachronic study because it was first met with a long period of "resistance", then introduced into a significant translational context regarding Turkish translation history, and later on was reintroduced in a great number of retranslations (Even-Zohar, Making of Repertoire). Therefore, I chose to focus on non-translation, translation and retranslation as three main notions enabling me to explore this long translational journey in the Turkish literary system, which is also a significant and interesting case in Turkish translation history in a number of ways, all explored in the thesis.

Overview of Chapters and their Findings

I began the thesis through presenting my theoretical framework and methodology, which might be defined as eclectic because it involved three translational notions, namely non-translation, translation and retranslaiton, each of which has been conventionally problematized via different theories so far. My eclectic framework, integrating various theories employed in exploring the three notions mentioned above, mainly includes the arguments of Şebnem Susam Sarajeva, Theo Hermans, Lawrence Venuti, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Andre Lefevere, Stanley Fish, Anthony

Pym and Pierre Bourdieu. Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory and his later complementary work integrating the factor of agency in his systemic framework has constituted the general framework of the research, and methodologically, Toury's norm theory and Gerard Genette's assertions on paratexts provided the study with the tools through which I conducted the textual analysis of the first translation and the two retranslations under focus.

After presenting my theoretical framework, in Chapter Two, I introduced the historical background of Thomas More's *Utopia* which has been imported by the Turkish literary system sixteen times. Here, I mainly defined the themes and the conceptual tools the text provides. As presented, *Utopia* is among the remarkable literary works of Western literary history that embraces a historical background including such events as the spread of humanism, birth of reform and the establishment of the Anglican Church. In the book, Thomas More describes his ideal land, called *Utopia*, through which he criticizes the socio-political matters of sixteenth century England and Europe. The fact that the work includes both revolutionary themes such as the eradication of private property, the abolishment of death penalty, the decrease in work hours and the demolishment of class difference and the conservative ones, such as the importance of religion, ethics, family and tradition in human life, has lead *Utopia* to different interpretations and contextualizations throughout history. Still, here, it should be noted that the work has mostly been posited in a leftist context owing to the revolutionary themes indicated above. Besides its content, *Utopia* is defined as an experimental literary attempt in blending a number of literary conventions that existed until the sixteenth century, namely the philosophical dialogue and satire on the one hand, and voyage fiction and essay on the other. Owing to all these factors enumerated, both the genre and the

concept of the description of an ideal land were named after this work. Today the work is classified among the pioneers of Western classics regarding both the historical significance the work bears and the literary and scholarly genius of More it reveals.

In Chapter Two I also touched on the translation history of the work in Europe and stressed the fact that the translational journey of *Utopia* was initiated far before, in the sixteenth century, in Europe whereas it was after four centuries that the first translation of the work into Turkish appeared. This section aimed to present the variety in the objectives and contexts derived from each translation that appeared in Europe and provide examples for the possibility of different contextualizations translation enables, which is exemplified by the translations of *Utopia* into Turkish as well. Besides, Chapter Two provided a brief look at the concept of utopia and More's *Utopia* in the Turkish literary sources. Whereas both Halide Edip and Mina Urgan admitted the conservative associations in *Utopia* which leftist thinking would by no means affirm, the explanations in the dictionaries that appeared in the 1960s exemplified how easily the work could be positioned in a leftist context.

Following the historical and the contextual background of *Utopia*, I focused on the absence of this remarkable work of Western literary history from the Turkish literary system until 1964 in light of the notion of non-translation. The non-availability of the translations of certain works in a particular receiving system has brought about partial representations, recontextualizations and misrepresentations of concepts, genres and authors throughout history (Sarajeva 34). As for the present study, I regarded non-translation as an existential form of translation in which *Utopia* first appeared in the Turkish literary system and analyzed this context as the first translational context of the work in the receiving system. I tried to answer the

questions as to why other works of a utopian nature were translated and *Utopia* was not and what types of recontextualizations and representations were brought by this particular case of non-translation.

In Chapter Three, I adopted my point of departure as the period in which the first echoes of utopian way of thought appeared in the Ottoman Empire, which dates back to the nineteenth century, and divided this long period between the nineteenth century and 1964 into three relatively shorter periods, as between Tanzimat and 1923, between 1923 and 1940, and between 1940 and 1964, in order to observe the dynamics of the literary scene and the position of the non-translation of *Utopia* in this scene more systematically. In order to explore why some texts were translated and others were not, I was obliged to investigate the norms of text selection and repertoire construction adopted by the agents in the target literary system. Therefore, the notion of culture repertoire, which Even Zohar defines as "the aggregate of options utilized by a group of people and by the individual members of the group, for the organization of life" was the major theoretical tool I used in this chapter (Even-Zohar, Making of Repertoire, 166). In light of this notion, I furthered my categorizations and developed three sub-repertoires that evolved in the three periods under focus, namely the repertoire of the indigenous utopias, the repertoire of the translated utopias and the repertoire of the non-translated utopias. Observing the dynamics of these three repertoires presented by each period with the help of the historical and translational developments that were taking place, I arrived at some conclusions regarding the non-translation of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system as the first context of the work in the receiving system.

As utopias are works that directly mirror the social dynamics of their periods and the period between Tanzimat and 1964 includes a number of grand ideological

shifts in recent Turkish history, it was not surprising to observe some shifts among the repertoires of the three periods according to the culture planning efforts presented by each period. Everyone had found an answer to their own hows within the depiction of the ideal land in *Utopia* so far and it was not until the nineteenth century, when utopia penetrated into the Turkish literary system among other imports of Young Ottomans (Genç Osmanlılar), that the Turkish intellectuals started to employ this literary convention and answered their own hows through fiction (Kılıç 2004a). Here, the major concern that was pondered upon with the help of utopia was Westernization. Towards the twentieth century, belonging to different social and political standpoints and proposing solutions that would serve for different discourse worlds, Turkish utopias revealed a greater variety in their criticisms towards Westernization.

The scene of translation, on the other hand, revealed the popularity of such genres as Western poetry, philosophical dialogue and novel (Paker 556). The translated works which might be included into the scope of the genre of utopia in terms of including an association between the social criticism and the depiction of a non-existent land as the major constituent of the utopian works, i.e. *Telemaque, Micromegas*, *Gulliver's Travels* and *Robinson Crusoe,* on the other hand, were enjoying their popularity under the scope of different literary genres, namely *fenni roman*(scientific novel)*, komik roman* (comedy novel) and *polis ve macera romanı*(detective and adventure novel), and were retranslated shortly after their first translations appeared (Sevük, Garptan Tercümeler, vol. 2, 602). Here, the present study assumed that these works were classified under the same group of reading material as the fiction of Jules Verne (Indeed, some sources classify the works of Jules Verne as utopias as well, i.e. Kaynardağ.) and they were aimed to meet the

expectations of the reader majority of the time. As for the utopias that were not translated, i.e. *Utopia, New Atlantis* and *City of the Sun,* the present study proposed that they used to be regarded as works of more critical and less-fictive nature compared to the works that were translated, therefore remained as non-translations in this period.

While comparing the three repertoires of the period between Tanzimat and 1923, the study observed a correspondence between the works of utopian nature which were not translated and the early examples of Turkish utopias, particularly in terms of their fictional character and the directness of social criticism they exercised, and it proposed that the way in which Turkish authors chose to reflect the influence of the utopian way of thought on their original writing rather than translating these works constitutes an exception to the more common way foreign ideas and genres enter a given cultural system. As Even-Zohar proposes, the making of culture repertoire might involve two types of procedures, namely "invention" and "import", and in this particular case, invention played a more significant role in the formation of the utopian genre in the Turkish literary system (Even-Zohar, Making of Repretoire, 169). However, as exemplified by the case of "Hayat-ı Muhayyel" by Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, which has a potential of being a concealed translation owing to various elements it includes that corresponds to those of *Utopia*, import might have taken place in the process of invention as well. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that the formation of the utopian genre in the Turkish literary system was based on pure inventive grounds, although on the surface, invention seems to have played a major role in the formation of the repertoire of utopic works in the Turkish literary system. On the other hand, since the translated works that carried utopian traces were introduced to the receiving system under different literary categories while there

existed a "resistance" to import some particular utopic works the critical nature of which were more obvious, the study regarded the nature of the repertoire of translated utopias as problematic (ibid.). Because these representations also contributed to the context of the non-translation of *Utopia* and they might easily be considered cases that are involved in semantic non-translation, which the present study defined as the non-translation of a semantic content of a source text that brings about a different contextualization and reception of the source text in the target literary system.

When it comes to the analysis of the period between 1923 and 1940, it was observed that in contrast to its critical (and even anarchist) origin, Turkish utopias started to impose the stately dominant ideology, rather than proposing an alternative for the existing system. They introduced further hypothesis on what would happen if the society kept on this progress, which corresponded with the progressive view of the Westernized Kemalist Republic. As for the translational scene of the period, with the establishment of the Republic, translation started to be used as a means of cultural transformation and was assigned the mission of creating a national literature especially for the use of young generation. However, the works that were translated concerned contemporary science, technology, and trends in education rather than focusing on the translations of the literary works (Bozkurt 43); therefore, it was not surprising to observe a stability in the repertoires of the translated and non-translated utopias. Only, there appeared an abundance number of retranslations of *Robinson Crusoe* and one more retranslation of *Gulliver's Travels*. The non-translations of the first period still remained as non-translations in the second period.

After 1940, on the other hand, the ensuing translation movement under the auspices of the Translation Bureau enlivened the translational scene to a remarkable

extent; whereas, it was the indigenous utopias that fell into stagnation this time. The study explained the context of the period between the 1940 and 1964 in light of the sociopolitical developments that took place, i.e. the Village Institutes, Turkish Humanism, the Translation Bureau, and the transition to the multi-party regime, in order to shed light upon the context that prepared the favorable atmosphere for both the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish and the other canonical works of utopian (and dystopian) literature that were finally offered to the Turkish reader, not only by the goverment- i.e. Translation Bureau- but also by private publishers. These works include the partial translation of *Utopia* published in *Tercüme* (1943) and the translations of *Brave New World* (1945), *Republic* (1946), *New Atlantis* (1957) and *1984* (1958). With the gradual evolution of Turkish Humanism and the translation movement it put forth that was closely related to this new perspective supported by the state, *Utopia* was included in the translation lists of the Bureau first in 1943, then in 1947. However, like a number of other works in these lists, the plan was not realized and the translation of *Utopia* did not come out as a product of the 1940s, although it was done by agents that "carried the mission and activities of the Translation Bureau into the private sector" (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Presumed Innocent, 48).

The study concluded the analysis of the translational scene of the third period through proposing that in this period the "resistance" of the target literary polysystem towards the import of the texts of utopian nature became weaker, which brought about drastic transformations in the repertoires of the translated and non-translated utopias in the Turkish literary system (Even-Zohar, Making of Repertoire, 170-171). With the enrollment of the utopias of a more critical nature, the former was discharged of the semantic non-translational value it possessed, whereas the latter

repertoire got smaller to a remarkable extent. The study regarded this weakened resistance towards the translation of utopic works as the precursor of the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish, therefore the context analysis of the first translation embraced this last period portrayed by Chapter Three.

Chapter Four was based on an analysis of the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish within a framework that encompasses the "indicative" and "formative" roles of translation (Hermans) and the" implicit" and the "explicit ideologies" that mutually operate in a translation (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Presumed Innocent). As the macro-contextual background of the chapter was the formation of Turkish culture repertoire in the 1960s through a particular ideology, the study firstly embarked on the notion of agency and defined the agents of the first translation of *Utopia* as culture entrepreneurs who not only made the ideas and life models they introduced heard and accepted, but also aimed to convert them to a socio-cultural reality through directing the society towards a particular way of comprehending life (Even-Zohar, Papers, 195). Here, the study proposed that the repertoire these agents constructed via Çan Yayınları, in which the first translation of *Utopia* was posited, was a means of this implementation that aimed a particular way of social transformation. While accomplishing this self-assigned mission, these people, as the pursuers of the Turkish Humanist convention that was once introduced as a constituent of the identity construction procedures of the Republican ideology, benefited from their symbolic capital, which had already been developed to a remarkable extent via the culture planning initiatives of the Republican era, i.e. the Village Institues and the Translation Bureau. Likewise, the Çan Yayınları initiative paid its contributions to their symbolic capital, which might safely be regarded as "established" and "stable" today, in return (Gouanvic).

The rich background of the agents of the 1964 translation of *Utopia*, which reflected on the macro and micro levels of the translation, lead the study embrace the socio-political context initiated in the 1930s with Turkish Humanism on the one hand, and the social atmosphere triggered by the 1961 Constitution on the other, as the explicit ideology of the translation. Here the study introduced the fact that by being involved in a number of culture planning attempts of the Republican Era, these people once implemented life images that were "reinforcing socio-cultural control by promoting preferred interpretations of life circumstances"; whereas, in the 1960s, when drastic changes occured in the predominant state ideology and alternative ways of thought appeared in Turkish literary scene owing to the greater freedom of thought enabled through the 1961 Constitution, the life-image they implemented via Çan Yayınları repertoire "turned out to be at odds with the prevailing preferences" (Even-Zohar, Papers,199). Therefore, the study regarded the 1964 translation of *Utopia* as an "indicative" of both the transformation in the Turkish literary scene in the 1960s and the position of the Anatolianist standpoint in this historical context (Hermans). Heading from the text-selection policy adopted by Çan Yayınları throughout the 1960s, which clearly revealed the Anatolianist attitude of the translators that aimed to melt the authors from different eras and geographies, such as Rousseau, Montaigne, Rabelais, Campanella, Sartre, Russel, Babeuf, Kafka, Brecht, Beckett, Omer Khayyam and Yunus Emre, in the same pot of humanism, it set the position of the translators and Çan Yayınları apart from the vulgar-Marxist or the social realist attitudes displayed by other publishing houses that benefited from the enlivened atmosphere of the period and got involved in the translation of leftist works.

Anatolian Humanism as the explicit ideology of the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish was a movement through which the Turkish literary system acquired an

alternative culture repertoire to the one provided by Turkish Humanism in terms of embracing the East and West as the indispensable others of one another. Emphasizing the importance of Anatolia in human history, this movement aimed to "maintain a Mediterranean culture where different cultures and civilizations had been dissolved and spread to the rest of the world" (Berk 155-156) and it might be classified among the major populist events of Turkish history influenced by such populist-cooparatist initiatives of the Republican regime as the Village Institutes and People's Houses. The translators of *Utopia*, as the pioneers of Anatolianism, consciously reflected this particular stance to their translation process through defining their mutual work not as collaborative translation but as *imece*, which literally refers to the collective labor villagers carry out in the villages. On the blurb of their translation of *Utopia*, they introduce their collaborative work as a product of *imece*, which the present study regarded as an indicative of the mutual operation among the implicit and the explicit ideologies the first translation of *Utopia* bears.

Among the indications of this mutual operation, the study cited the domesticating attitude of the translators observed on both the paratextual and the textual level as well. It asserted that the translators employed domestication as a means of implementing the collectivist-humanist life-model presented by Anatolianism and triggering a "reader community" the members of which would develop "similar interpreting habits" around this ideology (Fish). Here, the applicability of the translational context Venuti draws for domestication, fluency and the (in)visibility of the translator to this particular case was questioned (Venuti, Invisibility). As Eyüboğlu, Günyol and Urgan were the self-assigned agents of the 1960s who were quite conscious of the fact that they possessed the parameters of "sense of self-confidence" and "access to enterprising options" brought by their

symbolic capital, they assigned the works they addressed to the Turkish reader a formative role with no hesitance (Even-Zohar, Culture Repertoire, 300). Bringing the foreign authors to the Turkish reader through fluent translations, they disseminated their humanist ideology which was based on the idea that Turkish culture possessed the Western values by nature. On the other hand, they became the pioneers of this humanist stance and sustained their teacher and bureucratic intellectual attitude they had adopted since the 1930s. Therefore, in this context, domestication enabled them "to engage a mass readership" and initiate "a significant canon reformation" as Venuti asserts; however, it by no means defined their position as invisible on their texts (Venuti, Scandals, 12). In contrast, when the fact that they were among the first ones that introduced the foreign authors to the Turkish reader is considered, it might even be asserted that these translators were more visible on their products than the authors of the texts they translated, which was the case in the 1964 translation of *Utopia*.

Chapter Five focused on the journey of *Utopia* in the Turkish literary system after its first translation and aimed to present how the retranslations of the work contributed to the great variety of contexts portrayed for *Utopia* since the Tanzimat Period. The study embraced the notion of retranslation in "a broader discussion of historical context, norms, ideology, the translator's agency and intertextuality" (Tahir-Gürçağlar, Retranslation, 233) and regarded each attempt of translating *Utopia* into Turkish as a different way of "filling in gaps" which bestowed each work with a unique position in the Turkish literary system (Toury, DTS, 27). In order to introduce the notion of rivalry among retranslations, which might exist in two different forms according to Anthony Pym as "active" and "passive", firstly some examples were given to display how some translations explicitly indicated their

difference from the other translations of the same work and promoted themselves as unique. Here, passivity was introduced as a nominal probability within the context of the rivalry among *Utopia* retranslations, because, as revealed by the relationship among the first translation of *Utopia* into Turkish and the proceeding translations, even there exist social and temporal gaps, which bring passivity to the scene according to Pym (82-83), rivalry might remain active owing to external factors.

The major concerns of Chapter Five were the indications of ideology and the formative role attributed to translation in retranslations, and in order to explore these, the study focused on two retranslations of the work, i.e. the one published by Dergah Yayınları and the one published by Ütopya Yayınları, which were published in the same year and which might be regarded as the representatives of two different ideologies. The fact that they were published in the same year exemplified how translation might synchronously introduce a single literary work to two different discourse worlds, therefore make it serve for different ideological purposes simultaneously.

As explored by the textual and paratextual analysis of the two retranslations, just as it was the case for the first translation, in both retranslations the explicit and the implicit ideologies operated mutually. Published in the Series of Western Thought among the works of Western philosophy on ethics such as Hume's *Ethics*, Montaigne's *Essays,* Plato's *Republic*, Machiavelli's *Prince*, August Comte's *Islam and Positivism* and Schopenhauer's *On the Basis of Morality*, the translation by Ayfer Cambier posited *Utopia* in a conservative context that aimed to introduce the ethical roots of the West to the Dergah reader. On the micro level, the text fulfilled the requirements of the publishing house as well; the religious tone of voice Camber bestowed her text with on both paratextual (i.e. preface, blurb) and textual level

brings about a consistent discourse and corresponds to the explicity ideology of the translation. Likewise, published in the Series of Political Culture, a series that includes canonical works of contemporary political thought, i.e. *From Colonization to Globalization* by Chomsky, *Cultural-National Autonomy* by Lenin, and an illustrated version of *Mein Kampf* by Clement Moreau on the one hand and indigenous works that possess the similar argumentative nature, i.e. *Marxism Tartışmaları/Manifesto'nun Güncelliği* (The Discussions of Marxism/The Topicality of the Manifesto) by Özgür Orhangazi, *Liberter Teori* (The Libertarian Theory) by İlhan Keser, *Küreselleşmeden Sonra* (After Globalization) by Ergin Yıldızoğlu and *12 Eylül ve Filistin Günlüğü* (September the 12th and the Palestine Journal) by Adil Okay, on the other, the translation by İbrahim Yıldız posited *Utopia* within a leftist context which corresponds to the publishing policy of Ütopya Publishing. The leftist discourse Yıldız consistently sustains on both textual and paratextual level again confirms the explicit ideology of the translation.

Rather than defining the equivalence relation between the source and the target texts, the study used the data explored by the textual and paratextual analysis of the retranslations in order to shed light on the notion of readership, and concluded that the major motive behind both retranslations was to fulfill the expectations of the reader communities of Dergah Yayınları and Ütopya Yayınları. By doing so, they reinforced the conservative and the leftist ideological stances their translators and the publishing houses represented. And recontextualizing *Utopia* according to different standpoints, these retranslations acquired unique positions within the receiving literary system.

The study introduced domestication in this grand context of ideology as a means of strenghtening the confirmity among the ideology of the reader community

and that of the translator and the publishing house. Therefore, one might once more discuss that it is not the invisibility but the visibility that domestication enables. However, in the case of these two retranslations, it is debatable whether it is the visibility of the translator or that of the discourse worlds s/he belongs to that exists in the target texts. In the case of the first translation, the translators possessed a remarkable symbolic capital which enabled them to introduce the receiving repetoire new options and become the pioneers of those new options. This surely reinforced their dominant presence in their translations and the study defined their positions as visible in their products without question. On the other hand, as for the case of two retranslations under focus, both translations serve for sustaining the options that already existed within Turkish literary repertoire. In other words, although the translators of all three translations act as producers on the level of the repertoire and the translational acts of all carry ideological motivations, the positions of İbrahim Yıldız and Ayfer Cambier are to be set apart from the translators of the first translation in terms of their visibilities on their products, because the specific target context and reader assigned for their translations are not determined by themselves, though they are confirmed by them, but by other agents and institutions that operate in the receiving literary repertoires. Therefore the visibility the translators acquire through domestication remains problematic and it might be safer to intoduce the leftist and the conservative ideologies of Ütopya Yayınları and Dergah Yayınları as visible in these two target texts rather than İbrahim Yıldız and Ayfer Cambier as their translators.

Final Remarks

This translational scheme drawn for the translations of *Utopia* into Turkish makes one question what is it in this text that sets it apart from other literary works that have not been translated or retranslated only two or three times. Individual translations have positioned *Utopia* in eighteen different contexts and addressed a number of reading communities that have different standpoints from one another. While introducing Wagner translations into French as a *fin de siècle* phenomenon of the nineteenth century France, Pym presents a similar case to the retranslations of *Utopia,* in that, at the time, there also existed both retranslations and re-editions of the previous translations, which Pym relates to the public demand towards Wagner in the nineteenth century France (79). Similarly, one might safely relate this case of abundance in *Utopia* translations in the Turkish literary system to the demand towards More's work. Especially, the increase in the number of retranslations after the year 2000 might be related to the invigoration of the publishing sector in Turkey and the establishment of new publishing houses that have been adopting different publishing policies since then. *Utopia*, as a text that bears ideas embraced by various ideological standpoints, must have seemed relevant to the target readers of most of these publishing houses and also expected to meet their various needs. That is why both the reeditions of the first translation and some of the retranslations, as well as some new retranslations continue being published today.

Focusing on over a hundred years of translational journey of Thomas More's Utopia in the Turkish literary system, this thesis demonstrated that translation, which has been used as a major tool for representation, culture formation and reformation for ages, brings about new contexts for texts not by extinguishing them, but by reproducing and propagating them. As explored, even if not translated, a work can

safely be posited in a translational context. Therefore, the lack of translational context is actually quite a nominal probability because, as the thesis aimed to introduce, translational perspective sheds light on not only the initial and further introductions of the texts to a particular receiving system, but also on the nonexistence of the texts in that system.

REFERENCES

Acaroğlu, Türker. *Edebi eserler sözlüğü : seçme 200 eser (1955-1965 yılları arasında radyoda ve basında tanıtılan edebi eserlerden seçmeler).* İstanbul: Ekim Basımevi, 1965.

Adıvar, Halide Edip. *İngiliz Edebiyatı Tarihi.* İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1940.

Akalın, Sami. *Edebiyat Terimleri Sözlüğü.* İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1966.

Akçay, Ahmet Sait. "Doğunun Ütopyası : Bireyin Ütopyası." *Parşömen* 2:3 (2001): 39-52.

Akyıldız, Kaya. "Mavi Anadoluculuk." *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık.* Ed. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu. 3 vols. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007. 465-481.
--- . "Sabahattin Eyüboğlu." *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık.* Ed. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu. 3 vols. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007. 468-471.

Andaç, Feridun. "Vedat Günyol ile Dünden Bugüne." *Aydınlanmanın Işığında Sanat İnsanlarımız.* Ed. Feridun Andaç. İstanbul: İde Yayınları, 1997. 9-31.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Thick Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader.* Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. 417-429.

Başar, Erdoğan. *Sosyalizm Sözlüğü.* Ankara: Toplum Yayınları, 1965.

Belge, Murat. "Ütopya." *Ütopya.* Ed. Ali Bülent Kuvan. İstanbul: İndex Yayınları, 2004. 39-45.
---. *Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi.* 5 vols. İstanbul : İletişim Yayınları, 1985.

Berk, Özlem. *Translation and Westernization in Turkey.* İstanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2004.

Berman, Antoine. "La Retraduction comme Espace de la Traduction." *Palimpsestes* 4, (1990): 1-8.

Bozkurt, Seyhan. *Tracing Discourse in Prefaces: Prefaces to Turkish Translations of Fiction Published by Remzi Publishing House in the 1930s and 1940s.* Saarbrücken-Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2007.

Bruce, Susan. "Introduction." *The Three Early Modern Utopias.* Ed. Susan Bruce. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. ix-xliii.

Buescu, Helena C., and João Ferreira Duarte. "Communicating Voices: Herberto Helder's Experiments in Cross-Cultural Poetry." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 43:2 (2007): 173-186.

Campanella, Tomasso. *Güneş Ülkesi.* Trans.Vedat Günyol, Haydar Kazgan. İstanbul: Çan Yayınları, 1965.

Campbell, Mildred. "The Utopia". *Utopia,* Trans. Ralph Robinson. Ed. Mildred Campbell. New York: Walter J. Black Inc, 1947. p. 3.

Cave, Terence. *Thomas More's Utopia in Early Modern Europe: Paratexts and Contexts.* Ed. Terence Cave. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Dijk, Teun Adrianus van. "Discourse as Interaction in Society." *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Ed. Adrianus van Dijk. 2 vols. London and Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1997. 1-37.

Dino, Güzin . "Sabahattin Eyüboğlu ve Türkiye'de Çeviri Hareketleri." *Türk Dili* 322 (1978): 104-111.

Duarte, João Ferreira."The Politics of Non-Translation: A Case Study in Anglo-Portuguese Relations." *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction* 13:1 (2000): 95- 112.

Dünder, Betül. "Dünyanın Sabahlarına Uyanmanın Vaktinde: Sabahattin Eyüboğlu." *Ç.N.* 1 (2007): 137-141.

Dürüşken, Çiğdem. "Sunuş." *Ütopya*. By Thomas More. Trans. Çiğdem Dürüşken. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınları, 2009. 7-23.

Eker-Roditakis, Arzu. "Thomas More's Utopia in Turkish: The Use of Footnotes in the Construction of Intertextuality and Contextuality in Translations." Unpublished paper submitted for doctoral studies at Boğaziçi University 2006.

Elliott, Robert C. "The Shape of Utopia." *The Shape of Utopia: Studies in a Literary Genre*. Ed. Robert C. Elliott. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1970. 25-49.

Eruz, Sakine. *Çokkültürlülük ve Çeviri: Osmanlı Devleti'nde Çeviri Etkinliği ve Çevirmenler.* İstanbul: Multilingual, 2010.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Papers in Culture Research.* Tel Aviv: Porter Chair of Semiotics, 2005. May 15, 2011 <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/EZ-CR-2005.pdf> .
---. "The Making of Repertoire and the Role of Transfer." *Translation and (re)shaping of Culture*. Ed. Saliha Paker. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 2002. 166-174.
---. "Culture Repertoire and the Wealth of Collective Entities." *Under Construction. Links for the Site of Literary Theory. Essays in Honour of Hendrik van Gorp.* Eds. Dirk de Geest, Ortwin de Graef, Dirk Delabastita, Koenraad Geldof, Rita Ghesquière and José Lambert. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000. 389-403

---. "Polysystem Theory." *Poetics Today* 11:1 (1990): 9-26.

Eyüboğlu, Sabahattin. *The Blue and the Black.* Trans. Hughette Eyüboğlu. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008.

Eyüboğlu, Sabahattin and Mehmet Ali Cimcöz. "Önsöz." *Devlet.* By Plato. Trans. Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Mehmet Ali Cimcöz. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1962. 5-22.

Eyüboğlu, Hughette. "Notes on the Translation." *The Blue and the Black.* By Sabahattin Eyüboğlu. Trans. Hughette Eyüboğlu. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008. xvii- xxii.

Fish, Stanley. "Interpreting the Variorum." *Modern Criticism and Theory.* Ed. David Lodge. London & New York: Longman, 1988. 310-329.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* Trans. A.M. SheridaSmith. London: Tavistock Publications, 1974.

Fox, Alistair. *Utopia: An Elusive Vision.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Tresholds of Interpretation.* Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gouanvic, Jean Marc. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances." Trans. Jessica Moore. *The Translator* 11:2 (2005): 147-166.

Göktürk, Akşit. *Edebiyatta Ada*. İstanbul: Sinan Yayınları, 1973.

Güney, Erol. "Introduction." *The Blue and the Black.* By Sabahattin Eyüboğlu. Trans. Hughette Eyüboğlu. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008. ix-xv.

Günyol, Vedat. *Uzak Yakın Bölük Pörçük Anılar.* İstanbul: Dünya Yayınları, 2004.

Gürsoy, Gencay. "Mina Urgan'la 'Ütopya' Üzerine." *Düşün* 13 (1985): 3-5.

Hermans, Theo. *Translation in Systems.* Manchester UK: St Jerome Publishing, 1999.

House, Juliana. "Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation." *Meta* 56: 2 (2001): 243-257.

Huyugüzel, Ömer Faruk. *Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın'ın Hayatı, Hikaye ve Romanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1982.

İnan, Banu. "Teaching the Humanistic Culture of Socrates, Erasmus and Thomas More Through Textual Analysis." MA Thesis Dokuz Eylül University Institute for Graduate Studies in Education, 2009.

Inghilleri, Moira. "Sociological Approaches." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* 2nd ed. Ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge, 2008. 279-282.

Karacasu, Barış. "Cevat Şakir Kabaağaçlı." *Modernleşme ve Batıcılık.* Ed. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu. 3 vols. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007. 472-477.

Karalıoğlu, Seyit Kemal. *Ansiklopedik Edebiyat Sözlüğü.* İstanbul: İnkılap ve Ata Kitabevi, 1969.

Karataş, Turan. *Ansiklopedik Edebiyat Terimleri Sözlüğü.* Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2004.

Katan, David. *Translating Cultures.* Manchester UK: St Jerome Publishing, 1999.

Kaynardağ, Arslan. "Türk Yazın ve Düşünce Tarihinde Ütopya." *Varlık* 1025 (1993): 12-13

Kıbrıs, İbrahim. *Başlangıcından Bugüne Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı.* Ankara: İnkansa Ofset, 2000.

Kılıç, Engin. "Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Edebi Ütopyalara Bir Bakış." *Kitaplık* 76 (2004): 73-87.
---. "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebi Ütopyalarında İdeal Toplum Tasavvurları." MA Thesis İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences, 2004.

Klasikler Bibliyografyası. Ankara: Milli Kütüphane, 1940-1966.

"Klasikler Listesi." *Tercüme* 7: 41-42 (1947): 438-504.

"Klasikler Listesi." *Tercüme* 4: 19 (1943): 89-115.

Koçak, Birgül. "Türk Düşüncesinde 'Ütopya': Bibliyografik bir Çalışma." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Dergisi* 3: 11 (2006): Separate Publication.

Kövenklioğlu, Jale. "The Two Utopias of 16th Century England." BA Thesis Robert College Deparment of Comparative Literature, 1968.

Küçük, Yalçın. "Aydın Sorumsuzluğu veya Sorumsuz Aydınlar." *Bilim ve Edebiyat.* By Yalçın Küçük. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 1985. 536-554.

Küçükcoşkun, Yasemin. "1980-2005 Dönemi Türk Edebiyatında Ütopik Romanlar ve Ütopyanın Kurgusu." MA Thesis Süleyman Demirel University Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences, 2006.

Lefevere, Andre. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Levend, Agah Sırrı. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973.

Liao, Min-Hsiu. "Influence of Translations on Non-translations: Popular Science as a New Genre in Taiwan." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 18:2 (2010): 127-140.

Mermutlu, Bedri. "Türkçe'de Yayınlamış ilk Felsefe Eseri." 15 May 2011. <http://dusundurensozler.blogspot.com/2008/04/trkede-yayimlanmi-ilk-felsefe- eseri.html>.

Milligan, Burton A. "Introduction." *Three Renaissance Classics: Machiavelli The Prince, More Utopia, Castiglione The Courtier.* Ed. Burton A. Milligan. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. iii-xix

More, Thomas. *Utopia.* Trans. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008.
---. *Utopia.* Trans. İbrahim Yıldız. İstanbul: Ütopya Yayınları, 2003a.
---. *Utopia.* Trans. Ayfer G. Cambier. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2003b.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Ralph Robinson. *Three Early Modern Utopias*. Ed. Susan Bruce. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. 1-149.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1999.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1998.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1981.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: Çan Yayınları, 1968.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Paul Turner. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Eng. ; Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: Çan Yayınları, 1964.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Ralph Robinson. *Three Renaissance Classics: Machiavelli The Prince, More Utopia, Castiglione The Courtier*. Ed. Burton A. Milligan. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. 105-239.
---. *Utopia*. Trans. Ralph Robinson. Ed. Mildred Campbell. New York: Walter J. Black Inc, 1947.
---. "Utopia'lıların Bilgileri, İşleri Güçleri". Trans. Adnan Balkış. *Tercüme* 3:17 (1943): 309-317.

Necatigil, Behçet. *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü.* İstanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1966.

Özege, M. Seyfettin. *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu.* İstanbul: Fatih Yayınevi, 1971.

Özkırımlı, Atilla. *Açıklamalı Edebiyat Terimleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar, 1991.
---. *Türk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi.* 4 vols. İstanbul: Cem Yayınları, 1982.

Özgül, Metin Kayahan. *Türk Edebiyatında Siyasi Rüyalar*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 1998.

Paker, Saliha. "Turkish Tradition." *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2nd ed. Ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routhledge, 1999. 571-582.

Popovic, Anton. *A Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1976.
--- (1970). "The Concept 'Shift of Expression' in Translation Analysis." *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. Ed. James S. Holmes. Mouton: Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1970. 78-87.

Pym, Anthony. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome, 1998.

Sellevold Kirsti. "The French Versions of Utopia: Christian and Cosmopolitan Models." *Thomas More's Utopia in Early Modern Europe: Paratexts and Contexts*. Ed. Terence Cave. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2008. 67-85.

Sevük, İsmail Habib. *Tanzimat Devri Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1951.
---. *Avrupa Edebiyatı ve Biz: Garptan Tercümeler*. 2 vols. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1940.

Sinanoğlu, Suat. *Türk Humanizmi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988.

Susam- Sarajeva, Şebnem. *Theories on the Move*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2006.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. "Translation, Presumed Innocent: Translation and Ideology in Turkey." *The Translator* 15:1 (2009): 37-64.
---. *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008.
---. "Retranslation." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, 2nd Edition*. Ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge, 2008. 233-236.
---. *Kapılar: Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar*. İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık, 2005.

Tanpınar, Ahmed Hamdi. *XIX. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1956.

Toury, Gideon. "Translation as a Means of Planning and the Planning of Translation: A Theoretical Framework and an Exemplary Case." *Translation and (re)shaping of Culture*. Ed. Saliha Paker. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 2002. 148-165.
---. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995.

Tuncor, Ferit Ragıp. *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları Bibliyografyası 1923-1993*. İstanbul: M.E.B, 1996.

Turan, Güven. "Utopia." *Yazko Çeviri* 1:2 (1981): 182-183.

Türkiye Bibliyografyası. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1928-1960.

Urgan, Mina. *İngiliz Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar, 1986.
---. *Edebiyatta Ütopya Kavramı ve Thomas More*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları, 1984.
---. "Önsöz." *Utopia*. By Thomas More. Trans. Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: Çan Yayınları, 1984. 5-48.
---. "Utopia." *Yeni Ufuklar* 13:146 (1964): 21-30.

Usta, Sadık . "Türkiye Devrimi'nin Ütopyaları." *Bilim ve Ütopya* 187 (2010): 7-16.
---. "Çeviri Üzerine Birkaç Not." *Ütopya*. By Thomas More. Trans. Sadık Usta. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2009. 9.

Uyar, Tomris. "Ortak Çeviri Deyince…" *Türk Dili* 38: 322 (1978): 58-59.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü*. İstanbul: Vakit Yayınları, 1935.

Ülser, Halil İbrahim. "Türk Romanında Siyasi ve Sosyal İçerikli Gelecek Kurguları." MA Thesis Istanbul University Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences, 2004.

Ünal, Erkal. "Invited Sojourners: A Survey of the Translations into Turkish of Non-Fiction Left Books Between 1960 and 1971." MA Thesis Boğaziçi University the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History, 2006.

Van Dijk, Teun A. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. 2 vols. London and Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1997.

Varlık Yıllığı. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1960-1964.

Venuti, Lawrence (2004). "Retranslations: The Creation of Value." *Translation and Culture*. Ed. Katherine M. Faull. Associated University Press. 25-39.
---. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London, New York: Routledge, 1998.
---. "Translator's Invisibility: The Evidence of Reviews." *In Other Words: Journal of the Translator's Association* 4 (1994): 16-22.

Yalçınkaya, Ayhan. *Eğer'den Meğer'e: Ütopya Karşısında Türk Romanı*. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi, 2004.

Yılmaz, İhsan. "Halide Edip Beni 13 Yıl Sömürdü". *Hürriyet Pazar*. 20 April 2002. May 15 2011 <http://webarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/2002/04/20/115249.asp>.

Yılmaz, Sevcan. "Absence/Silence of a Translation as a Borderline Issue: Şeytan Ayetleri (The Satanic Verses)." MA Thesis Boğaziçi University Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences, 2007.
Website of the National Library. 10 May 2011 <http://www.mkutup.gov.tr/> .

Website of the Turkish Language Association. 13 May 2011

<http://www.tdk.gov.tr> .

Website of Dergah Publishing House. 10 May 2011
<http://www.dergahyayinlari.com> .

Website of Ütopya Publishing House. 10 May 2011
<http://www.utopyayayinevi.com.tr/> .

Translators Cafe. 10 May 2011
<http://translatorscafe.com/cafe/member113662.htm> .

İdefix. 25 April 2011 <http://www.idefix.com> .

Pandora Bookstore. 25 April 2011. <http://www.pandora.com.tr> .