

THE POLITICS AND POETICS OF TRANSLATION IN TURKEY

1923-1960

ŞEHNAZ TAHİR GÜRÇAĞLAR

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2001

The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey

1923-1960

Dissertation submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Translation Studies

by

Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar

Bogazici University Library



39001101425174

14

Boğaziçi University

2001

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the kind help and encouragement of a number of people who enabled the development of the ideas in the following pages in numerous ways.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Prof. Dr. Saliha Paker, first of all, for sparking in me a passion for translation history and then, for the countless hours she spent commenting on, revising and editing the dissertation. I owe the vision, energy and enthusiasm required by this large project to her guidance and encouragement. I would also like to thank my committee members for their invaluable comments.

Prof. Gideon Toury, Prof. Theo Hermans and Prof. Daniel Simeoni, who commented on various parts of my dissertation deserve a special note of gratitude. I must also thank Erol Üyepazarcı for his patience in answering my never-ending inquiries and for his generosity in sharing his books with me. Many thanks to Burak Barutçu and Serdar Işın for their suggestions and for opening their book collections to me.

Special thanks to Dr. Ebru Diriker for her comradeship throughout the five years we spent at the PhD programme and to Pınar Besen for her support and friendship. I am indebted to both for being such wonderful travel companions and discussion partners.

I am grateful to my mother and father, whose unconditional love and support made me what I am today. Finally, many thanks to my husband Aykut for his academic and technical help, for not losing his good humour through the many sleepless nights and, above all, for his boundless affection.

Vita

- Place and Date of Birth:** Istanbul, 18.02.1967
- Secondary Education:** South Kitsap High School, Washington, USA, 1984
FMV Özel Işık Lisesi, 1978-1983
- Degrees Awarded:** M.A. in Media Studies, Oslo University, 1995
B.A. in Media Studies, Oslo University, 1993
B.A. in Translation and Interpreting, Boğaziçi University, 1989
- Professional Appointments:** Lecturer, Boğaziçi University, Department of Translation and Interpreting (1996-)
Professional Translator and Conference Interpreter (1989-)

Publications:

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz (2001) "On a Turkish Translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*: Adding Towards a Nationalist Text", *Target*, 13: 1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 127-150.

Tahir, Şehnaz (1999) "The Man from East-West: Reviews of Turkish Literature and Turkey's Image in Norway in the 1990s" (with Emel Türker) in Nedret Kuran Burçoğlu (ed.) *The Image of the Turk in Europe from the Declaration of the Republic in 1923 to the 1990s*, Istanbul: ISIS.

Tahir, Şehnaz (1998) “Sözlü Çevirinin Politikası”, *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları*, Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 177-184.

Tahir, Şehnaz (1998) “Kültür İthali ve Çeviri” *Toplumsal Tarih*, Nb. 55, July 1998, 54-58.

Tahir, Şehnaz (1997) “...Bu eser adi bir tercüme değildir. Başlangıçtan Tanzimata Kadar Türk Edebiyat Tarihi Çeviriye Bakıyor” in Hasan Anamur (ed.), *Hasan Ali Yücel’i Anma Kitabı. Ekinler ve Zamanlar Kavşağı Çeviri*, İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, 99-115.

Tahir, Şehnaz (1997) “Çeviri Eleştirisi Eğitiminde İki Kavram: ‘Yanlış’ ve ‘Varsayımsal Kurgu’”, in Turgay Kurultay and İlknur Birkandan (eds.): *Forum 1: Türkiye’de Çeviri Eğitimi, Nereden Nereye?* İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 107-113.

Tahir, Şehnaz (1995) *Getting Real: A Study on Genre, Characters and Themes in “The Real Life Series”*, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Oslo University.

Tahir, Şehnaz (1990) “Anında Film Çevirilerine Kuramsal Bir Yaklaşım” (with Eser Köksal), *Metis Çeviri*, Nb. 11, Spring 1990, 39-45.

Abstract

Contemporary research on translation history in early republican Turkey is marked by a focus on the activities of the Translation Bureau [Tercüme Bürosu] (1940-1966) at the expense of other publishers which operated in various fields of translated literature. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar's *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey 1923-1960* challenges this focus and sets out to reveal the complex and diversified nature of the system of translated literature in the first four decades of the Republic. The study is carried out on two levels. On the broad level, the dissertation investigates the implications of the political transformation experienced in Turkey after the proclamation of the Republic for the cultural and literary fields, including the field of translated literature. On a more specific level, it holds translation under special focus and explores the discourse formed on translation and translators in speeches, articles, prefaces or books concentrating on such issues as the functions and definitions of translation, translation strategies and the translator's visibility. This is complemented by a descriptive study of a series of translated texts from the fields of both canonical and popular literature which investigates the norms (not) observed by translators throughout the 1920s-1950s with special emphasis on paratextual elements, approaches towards textual integrity, and the treatment of proper names and foreign cultural elements. The findings of the study suggest that the concepts of translation both affected and were affected by cultural processes in the society, including ideological and poetological ones and that there was no uniform way of defining or carrying out translations during the period under study. The findings also point at the segmentation of readership in early republican Turkey and conclude that the political and poetological factors governing the production and reception of translations varied for different segments of readers.

Kısa Özet

Türkiye’de Cumhuriyet dönemi çeviri tarihi üzerine yapılan çalışmalar Tercüme Bürosu’nun (1940-1966) etkinlikleri üzerinde yoğunlaşarak edebiyatın farklı alanlarında faaliyet gösteren özel yayınevlerini göz ardı etmektedir. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar’ın *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey 1923-1960* başlıklı tezi bu yaklaşımı sorgulamakta ve 1923-1960 yılları arasında Türkiye’de çeviri edebiyat dizgesinin karmaşık ve zengin yapısını sergilemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma iki aşamada yürütülmüştür. Birinci aşamada cumhuriyetin ilânı ile birlikte Türkiye’de yaşanan siyasal dönüşümün kültür ve edebiyat alanında, özellikle de çeviri edebiyat dizgesi üzerindeki etkileri incelenmektedir. Tezin ikinci bölümünde araştırma alanı daraltılarak çeviri üzerinde yoğunlaşmış ve konuşma metinleri, makaleler, önsöz ve kitap gibi yazılı malzemeler taranarak bu dönemde çevirinin işlevleri ve tanımları, çeviri stratejileri ve çevirmenin konumu üzerine oluşan söylem ele alınmıştır. Bunu izleyen betimleyici çalışmada ise “saygın” ve “popüler” edebiyat alanlarından seçilen bir dizi çeviri metin incelenmiş, çevirmenlerin 1923-1960 döneminde izle(me)dikleri çeviri normları araştırılmıştır. Betimleyici çalışma sırasında özellikle çeviri kitapların ana metinlerini kuşatan kitap kapakları, resimler, önsöz, dipnot, reklâm gibi yan-metinler ayrıntılı olarak incelenmiş, bunun yanı sıra çevirmenlerin metnin bütünlüğüne, özel isimlerin ve yabancı kültürel unsurların çevirisine benimsedikleri yaklaşımlar ele alınmıştır. Ortaya çıkan sonuçlar çeviriye ilişkin kavramların toplumda kültürel ve ideolojik süreçlerden etkilendikleri kadar bu süreçleri etkilediklerini ve araştırmaya konu olan dönemde çevirinin farklı biçimlerde tanımlandığını ve yine farklı biçimlerde yapıldığını göstermiştir. Çalışma ayrıca söz konusu dönemde farklı okur kitlelerine seslenen çevirilerin üretim ve alımlama süreçlerini belirleyen etmenlerin farklı olduğunu da ortaya koymuştur.

The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey 1923-1960

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework and Methodology.....	8
1.1 Challenging Views on Modern Turkish Translation History.....	8
1.1.1 Translation, Westernization and Humanism.....	9
1.1.2 Translation Strategies.....	27
1.1.3 Case Studies – Smaller Scopes, Greater Results.....	34
1.1.4 Some Common Tendencies.....	37
1.2 Theoretical Framework	49
1.2.1 Nationalism, Literature and Translation.....	50
1.2.2 Culture Planning.....	53
1.2.2.1 Repertoire, Options and Resistance.....	56
1.2.3 Systems, Agents and Habitus.....	60
1.2.3.1 Translator’s Habitus and Norms.....	65
1.3 Methodology.....	67
1.4 Summary.....	71
Chapter 2:	
Planning and De-planning:	
The System of Culture in Turkey in 1923-1960.....	72
2.1 Planning: the Young Republic.....	73
2.1.1 Language Planning.....	75
2.1.1.1 The Alphabet Reform.....	78
2.1.1.2 Language and History as Instruments of Nation-Building.....	83
2.1.2 Westernism.....	93
2.1.2.1 Turkish Humanism.....	99

2.1.3 The Translation Bureau.....	105
2.1.4 Translation and Institutions of Planning.....	114
2.1.4.1 People's Houses.....	115
2.1.4.2 The Village Institutes.....	121
2.1.4.3 The State Radio.....	128
2.2 The Transition to the Multi-Party System: De-planning of Culture.....	132
2.2.1 The Village Institutes and the People's Houses under De-planning.....	134
2.2.2 Nationalism and Language as Instances of De-planning.....	136
2.2.3 Translation under Re-planning.....	141
2.3 Summary.....	148
Chapter 3: Aspects of Discourse on Translation.....	150
3.1 Functions of Translation.....	152
3.1.1 The Classics Debate.....	152
3.1.2 Translation as a Means of Canon Formation.....	153
3.1.2.1 Canon Making in Discourse.....	154
3.1.2.2 The First National Publishing Congress.....	164
3.1.3 Functions of Translation after 1940.....	169
3.1.4 The Effects of Translated Classics.....	175
3.2 The State as Patron and Planner.....	182
3.2.1 Calls for State Involvement.....	182
3.2.2 Terms of State Involvement.....	184
3.2.3 A Patron of the Classics.....	189
3.3 The Translator's Qualities and Visibility.....	196
3.3.1 The Translator's Visibility in the Extratextual Discourse.....	198
3.3.2 Partial Visibility in Paratextual Discourse.....	203
3.4 Concepts and Strategies of Translation.....	205
3.4.1 Definitions of Translation.....	206
3.4.2 Directness of Translation.....	209
3.4.3 Fidelity as a Multifaceted Concept.....	213
3.4.3.1 Fidelity to Textual Integrity.....	213

3.4.3.2 Fidelity to Content and Form.....	214
3.4.3.3 Fidelity to the Tone.....	217
3.4.4 Comments on Fluency and Literalism.....	221
3.5 The Shifting Discourse.....	226
3.6 Summary.....	228
Chapter 4: The Market for Translated Literature.....	230
4.1 The Publishing Market in 1923-1960.....	233
4.2 Trends in Turkish Literature in 1923-1960.....	237
4.2.1 The Canonization of Realism.....	237
4.2.2 Turkish Popular Literature in 1923-1960.....	242
4.3 Translated Literature in 1923-1940.....	250
4.3.1 Translations Published by the Ministry of Education.....	250
4.3.2 Private Publishing and Translation (1923-1940).....	256
4.3.2.1 Translated Popular Literature (1923-1940).....	261
4.4 Translated Literature in 1940-1960.....	265
4.4.1 Translations by the Translation Bureau (1940-1960).....	266
4.4.2 Private Publishing and Translation (1940-1960).....	274
4.4.2.1 Popular Literature and Translation (1940-1960).....	281
4.5 Summary.....	287
Chapter 5: Literature for the “People”.....	288
5.1 “People”, Populism and Public Edification.....	289
5.2 People’s Books.....	299
5.2.1 People’s Books as Folklore.....	300
5.2.2 Rewriting People’s Books.....	302
5.2.3 “People’s Books” and Other Popular Fiction for Urbanites.....	309
5.3 The Poetics of Translated Popular Literature.....	317
5.4 Summary.....	321

Chapter 6:

Case Study I: Translating on the Margin.....	322
6.1 Tools of Analysis	324
6.2 Selâmi Münir Yurdatap: A Literary Jack of All Trades.....	329
6.2.1 <i>Drakyola Kan İçen Adam</i>	330
6.2.1.1 Peritextual Elements.....	331
6.2.1.2 Matricial Norms in <i>Drakyola</i>	334
6.2.1.3 Treatment of Proper Names.....	338
6.2.1.4 Siting <i>Drakyola</i>	338
6.2.2. <i>Şerlok Holmes'in Arsen Lüpen ile Sergüzeşleri:</i>	
<i>Hindistan Ormanlarında</i>	342
6.2.2.1 Peritextual Elements	343
6.2.2.2 Narrative Structure and Characters	346
6.2.2.3 Treatment of Proper Names	349
6.2.2.4 The Status of <i>Hindistan Ormanlarında</i>	
as a Pseudotranslation	350
6.2.2.5 Siting <i>Hindistan Ormanlarında</i>	351
6.2.3 <i>Mehmetçik Çanakkalede</i>	354
6.2.3.1 Peritextual Elements	355
6.2.3.2 The Plot and Characters	357
6.2.3.3 Narrative Structure and Narrative Voice	359
6.2.3.4 Siting <i>Mehmetçik Çanakkalede</i>	362
6.2.4 Siting Selâmi Münir Yurdatap	366
6.3 Ali Rıza Seyfi: Nationalist at Heart	369
6.3.1 <i>Tarzanın Canavarları</i>	370
6.3.1.1 Peritextual Elements	371
6.3.1.2 Plot and Narrative Structure	374
6.3.1.3 Matricial Norms in <i>Tarzanın Canavarları</i>	375
6.3.1.4 Treatment of Proper Names	386
6.3.1.5 Siting <i>Tarzanın Canavarları</i>	386
6.3.2 <i>Kazıklı Voyvoda</i>	390
6.3.2.1 Paratextual Elements	393
6.3.2.2 Plot and Characters	395

6.3.2.3 Matricial Norms in <i>Kazıklı Voyvoda</i>	396
6.3.2.4 Siting <i>Kazıklı Voyvoda</i>	407
6.3.3 <i>Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir</i>	409
6.3.3.1. Peritextual Elements	411
6.3.3.2 Narrative Structure and Narrative Voice	413
6.3.3.3 Nationalism as Ideological Agenda	417
6.3.3.4 Siting <i>Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir</i>	420
6.3.4 Siting Ali Rıza Seyfi	422
6.4 Kemal Tahir: Torn Between Identities	424
6.4.1 <i>Kanun Benim</i>	426
6.4.1.1 Peritextual Elements	428
6.4.1.2 Plot and Characters	431
6.4.1.3 Matricial Norms and Treatment of Proper Names in <i>Kanun Benim</i>	432
6.4.1.4 Siting <i>Kanun Benim</i>	438
6.4.2 <i>Ecel Saati</i>	441
6.4.2.1 Peritextual Elements	442
6.4.2.2 Plot and Characters	444
6.4.2.3 Style and Ideology	446
6.4.2.4 <i>Ecel Saati</i> as a Pseudotranslation	449
6.4.2.5 Siting <i>Ecel Saati</i>	453
6.4.3 <i>Esir Şehrin İnsanları</i>	454
6.4.3.1 Peritextual Elements	455
6.4.3.2 Plot and Characters	458
6.4.3.3 Ideology and Style	459
6.4.3.4 Siting <i>Esir Şehrin İnsanları</i>	465
6.4.4 Siting Kemal Tahir	467
6.5 Writing/Translating on the Margin	471
6.6 Summary	475

Chapter 7:

Case Study II: Divergence and Convergence	476
7.1 Retranslation	478
7.2 Translations of <i>Gulliver's Travels</i>	480
7.2.1 <i>Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II and III-IV</i> (1943-1944)	481
7.2.1.1 Paratextual Elements	483
7.2.1.2 Matricial Norms in <i>Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II and III-IV</i>	489
7.2.1.3 Treatment of Proper Names	491
7.2.1.4 Treatment of Foreign Cultural Elements	492
7.2.1.5 Siting <i>Gulliver'in Seyahatleri</i>	492
7.2.2 <i>Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II</i> as a "School Classic" (1945).....	496
7.2.2.1 Peritextual Elements	496
7.2.2.2 Textual-Linguistic Alterations and Additions	498
7.2.3 <i>Cüceler Memleketinde</i> (In the Land of Dwarfs) (1927)	501
7.2.3.1 Peritextual Elements	502
7.2.3.2 Matricial Norms in <i>Cüceler Memleketinde</i>	504
7.2.3.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements.....	508
7.2.4 <i>Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri</i> (1935).....	509
7.2.4.1 Peritextual Elements	510
7.2.4.2 Matricial Norms	511
7.2.4.3 Treatment of Foreign Names and Foreign Cultural Elements....	512
7.2.4.4 <i>Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde</i> as a Retranslation	513
7.2.5 <i>Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde</i> (1941)	515
7.2.6 Subsequent Retranslations	517
7.2.6.1 Peritextual Elements	520
7.2.6.2 Matricial Norms	522
7.2.6.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements	524
7.2.6.4 The Decision to Retranslate	525
7.2.7 Siting Translations of <i>Gulliver's Travels</i>	527
7.3 Translations of <i>Alice's Adventures in Wonderland</i>	529
7.3.1 <i>Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde</i> (1946)	531
7.3.1.1 Peritextual Elements	532

7.3.1.2 Matricial Norms	533
7.3.1.3 Treatment of Proper Names	535
7.3.1.4 Treatment of Foreign Cultural Elements	535
7.3.1.5 <i>Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde</i> as a Retranslation	536
7.3.2 <i>Alis'in Sergüzeştləri</i> (1932)	537
7.3.2.1 Paratextual Elements	538
7.3.2.2 Matricial Norms	540
7.3.2.3 Treatment of Proper Names	542
7.3.2.4 Treatment of Foreign Cultural Elements	543
7.3.3 <i>Alis Harikalar Diyarında</i> (1944)	544
7.3.3.1 Peritextual Elements	545
7.3.3.2 Matricial Norms	547
7.3.3.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements	548
7.3.4 <i>Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde</i> (1953)	549
7.3.4.1 Peritextual Elements	550
7.3.4.2 Matricial Norms	552
7.3.4.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements	553
7.3.5 <i>Alis Harikalar Diyarında</i> (1956)	555
7.3.5.1 Peritextual Elements	555
7.3.5.2 Matricial Norms	556
7.3.5.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements	559
7.3.6 <i>Alice Harikalar Diyarında</i> (1960)	560
7.3.6.1 Peritextual Elements	560
7.3.6.2 Matricial Norms	561
7.3.6.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements	563
7.3.7 Siting Translations of <i>Alice's Adventures in Wonderland</i>	564
7.4 "Fuzzy Logic Rules"	567
7.5 Summary	573
Conclusion	574
Findings of the Study	575
Whose Centre, Whose Periphery?	585
Translation (as) Planning	588

	xvi
The Reception of Translations	592
The Acquisition of a New Habitus	594
References.....	597

Introduction

The focus on the marginality of translation is strategic. It assumes that a study of the periphery in any culture can illuminate and ultimately revise the center.

(Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation*: 4)

There can be no single history of a homogeneous field called “translation” in Turkey, and perhaps anywhere else for that matter. We should act on the assumption that there can only be histories of translation, histories of diversified concepts in numerous fragmented fields. At times there may be an overarching narrative, while at other times, all ends may remain loose.

The present thesis is an attempt to trace some concepts of translation operational in a specific place and period, i.e. in Turkey between 1923 and 1960. Through an analysis of these concepts I shall set out to capture certain phenomena overlooked by researchers who have previously described literary translation activity in republican Turkey. The ultimate aim of the thesis is to reveal the “politics” and “poetics” that shaped the field of literary translation activity and explore how translation contributed to cultural processes in early republican Turkey. The dates chosen as the beginning and the end of the period to be studied are significant, not only because they mark political transformations, respectively the proclamation of the Turkish Republic and the end of the Democrat Party regime. They have been chosen, because these political landmarks have also had implications for the field of culture, closely knit with the field of translation.

As a period characterized by dramatic social, political, economic and cultural transformation, early republican Turkey provides rich material to those who wish to

study the links between politics and culture. The series of reforms carried out within the first decade of the Republic indicates a conscious effort on the part of the state officials to introduce comprehensive changes to a wide range of fields covering both the public and the private spheres. Along with various cultural phenomena, such as education, language and the dressing code, translation was subject to state intervention as exemplified by the establishment of the Translation Bureau.

When I exposed myself to some of the cultural institutions in early republican Turkey I became intrigued by the Translation Bureau, both in terms of its structure and functioning. Moreover, I was intrigued by the question of how the activities of the Translation Bureau were received by different sections of the public, including among others, statesmen, academics, publishers, writers, translators and readers. My initial exploration of the field, in the form of a limited survey of works covering modern translation history in Turkey, statements by writers, publishers and state officials of the 1920s-1950s, bibliographies as well as translated texts, revealed that there were several concepts of translation in circulation. My preliminary study indicated that translations came in different shapes and forms and that it was difficult to locate a single and uniform definition of translation. Furthermore, the roles and functions attributed to translation were rather diversified. The concept and the intended function of translation seemed to vary, not only diachronically, but also synchronically.

These initial findings led me to a series of questions that defined the thematic scope and the theoretical and methodological framework of the thesis. The first set of questions pertain to the relation between translation and the changes introduced to the fields of culture and language in Turkey following the proclamation of the Republic: What were the motives behind the republican reforms? How did these

motives affect literature and translation? What was the function assigned to translation within the new repertoire of culture? What were the elements of the dominant discourse on translation? What was the response of publishers and translators to such discourse? Were there any shifts or breaks in translatorial behaviour in a period marked by dramatic socio-political change? The second set of questions regards different perceptions of translation: Why were there such diversified views of what translation was and how it was to serve the general readership? What was the place occupied by translation in the reading experience of the public? What affected the selection of titles by publishers and translators? How sharp was the demarcation between canonical and non-canonical works of literature? How did the translations of canonical and non-canonical works vary in terms of their production, marketing and reception? These questions guide me through the various arguments and enquiries I undertake in the coming chapters. They have also helped me to formulate the main hypothesis of the thesis which will be offered in Chapter 1. Before I set out to explore the questions mentioned above, I will offer a review and critique of the approaches adopted by some contemporary historical studies towards translation activity in republican Turkey.

Numerous writers, translators, journalists, researchers and translation scholars have set out to prepare historical analyses of translation activity in Turkey. Their work has been crucial for the present study, not only in terms of their documentary and analytical value, but also in terms of the perspectives they have adopted and the emphases they have placed on various phenomena. The “discourse” they have created on translation is significant, for most often, such discourse is an indication of their viewpoints on translation, rather than that of the actual course translation followed through the years. Current ideas on translation activity in republican Turkey

are very much formed by these studies, and their common stress on this or that point may to a large extent determine the topics that will be taken up by translation scholars in the future.

Most of these studies have a political focus. A review will reveal that the authors of these studies perceive of translation mainly as a political activity shaped by an ideological programme. They see translation, first and foremost, as a part of the attempts to westernize and modernize Turkey during the first few decades of the Republic. In the views of many researchers, translation was a vehicle for transferring certain ideas into Turkey and a tool for nation-building. Those researchers suggest that the true role and function of translation in the early republican period can only be understood within the general historical/political context. By emphasizing the ideological role attributed to translation by the state, researchers bring out the real reason behind the canonical status translated classics assumed in the 1930s and 1940s.

Regarding translation as a socio-political and cultural phenomenon is certainly a perspective that serves to broaden the view of historical translation studies. Nevertheless, the way researchers contextualize translation activity in Turkey remains partial, since they concentrate their attention on a small, albeit central part of the system of translated literature. They do not look at the periphery and the selection of translated books there. In the present thesis, I would like to argue that the studies focusing on the ideological function of translation have an overemphasis on the translation of classics at the expense of translated popular literature which made up the largest part of the market for translated literature in the first four decades of the Republic. Thus, popular literature, which has remained a marginalized subject in

academic studies of literature in Turkey, is also driven to the periphery of translation studies.

The common feature of studies on translation activity in republican Turkey is their focus on a specific translation institution, that is, the state-sponsored Translation Bureau. The idea of establishing a translation institution to work systematically on the translation of western classics was materialized when the Translation Bureau was set up in 1940. The Bureau worked under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and was active between 1940 and 1966 producing a total of 1120 translations. It also published *Tercüme* (Translation) a translation journal consisting of translations, translation criticism and theory.

The period between 1940 and 1946 has been viewed as the most productive phase of the Bureau. Indeed, the Bureau both re-oriented itself in terms of its selection of titles and reduced its rate of production after 1946. This development is associated with the resignation of Hasan Âli Yücel, Minister of Education, who had assumed the role of a visionary and a pioneer during the establishment and the early activities of the Translation Bureau. The Bureau is a milestone in Turkish translation history. It served as a role model to many private publishing houses who followed its path and became involved in the translation and publication of western classics. There is general agreement on the fact that the products of the Bureau were influential in setting the course of translation activity in Turkey in terms of the selection of source texts and the kinds of strategies to be employed by translators. The Bureau also served an ideological function and was regarded as a cultural instrument by those who attributed translation a major role in their efforts at creating a new Turkish identity. Nevertheless, the extent to which the Bureau fulfilled its intended function is unclear. As I will demonstrate in Chapter 1, researchers who

write about the role of the Translation Bureau within the history of translation in republican Turkey rely on secondary data and fail to provide us with case studies exploring how the Translation Bureau served this intended function.¹ In Chapter 1, I will challenge views on modern Turkish translation history in a number of ways and offer my approach to studying translations within a historical context.

Before I proceed with Chapter 1, let me provide an overview of the thesis. Chapter 1 offers a critical review of the existing works on translation history in republican Turkey. It also outlines the theoretical and methodological framework of the thesis formed on the basis of a critique of the current literature. Chapter 2 surveys the general social and political context of the period 1923-1960. It provides a brief introduction to the republican reforms and the socio-cultural transformation which took place in Turkey in the early republican era. This chapter contextualizes the state's view of translation and the activities of the Translation Bureau within a political framework and positions the Bureau within a network of republican cultural institutions. Chapter 3 carries out a critical analysis of discourse on translation until 1960. It studies statements by officials, scholars and literary figures and investigates the ways in which translation was regarded as an instrument of cultural enlightenment. This chapter also includes a survey of the various definitions and strategies of translation as expressed in speeches, newspaper and magazine articles and prefaces. Chapter 4 provides a survey of the market for translated literature in Turkey between 1923 and 1960 with special emphasis on the series launched by various publishers. It introduces major publishers, and provides information about their selection of titles, their marketing strategies and intended target audiences. It explores the different poetics that governed the field of canonical and popular

¹ The structure and activities of the Translation Bureau will be taken up in more detail in Chapters 2 and 4.

translated literature. Chapter 5 analyzes the concepts of “people” and “popular” and discusses the way in which these terms were used in early republican Turkey. It examines the ideology and the poetics of the system of translated popular literature in 1920s-1950s. Chapter 6 presents a case study of works by three writer-translators who operated in the field of translated popular literature. The chapter explores the norms governing the selection and translation of these works and delves into the different aspects of the poetics governing popular literature in early republican Turkey. Chapter 7 consists of another case study, this time concentrating on “canonical” literature. It analyses the translations of *Gulliver’s Travels* and *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* published in Turkey in 1923-1960 by the Ministry of Education and various private publishers. The chapter compares and contrasts the norms observed by the Translation Bureau and private publishers in their translations. It also discusses the concept of “retranslation” and its role within the Turkish system of translated literature.

Chapter 1

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

In the present chapter I will offer a critical review of some historical studies tackling translation activity in early republican Turkey and challenge some of their conclusions. In the second part of the chapter I will present my approach towards translation history in Turkey.

1.1 Challenging Views on Modern Turkish Translation History

The existing works on translation activity in Turkey create agendas of research, not only through what they have covered, but also through what they have not. This thesis takes its point of departure from what remain at best implicit in many of those studies. It poses questions regarding those areas of translation activity which have never found a voice in translation studies in Turkey. However, an overview of those areas that have been included in the studies tackling aspects of Turkish translation history is essential to be able to locate those which have been excluded. A review and critique of existing historical studies on translation will enable the thesis to reveal certain common areas of inquiry and explore alternative pathways into the past via these areas. These areas cover a number of views on translation-related phenomena, such as views on the function of translation, translation strategies, the structure of translation activity or the reception of translated books by different groups of readers. The areas of inquiry emerge where there are apparent contradictions among the different works on translation-related phenomena.

Alternatively, issues that attract an unquestioning consensus and approval may also be considered to pose significant question marks.

It is impossible to give an exhaustive survey of all works regarding translation activity in the period under study. Instead, I will dwell upon several selected contemporary studies and present their approach to translation. These studies represent a variety of viewpoints. Although the raw data they work from is roughly the same, their use of this data, and the emphases they place on different translation-related phenomena vary. I have grouped these studies under two headings, “translation, westernization and humanism” and “translation strategies”.

1.1.1 Translation, Westernization and Humanism

In the eyes of many contemporary writers, the most significant phase in terms of translation activity in republican Turkey has been the initial years of the Translation Bureau. This is valid for the majority of researchers whose works will be taken up in the following pages. According to these researchers, the function of the Translation Bureau, and therefore of its translation activity, has to be evaluated within the general project of westernization. They maintain that the function of the Translation Bureau was to create “humanism”¹ in Turkey which was expected to lead up to an “enlightenment”.

Let me first discuss some comments made by two of the former translators of the Translation Bureau in order to reveal some key concepts that define the relationship between translation and westernization. Vedat Günyol, who started translating for the Bureau during its initial years, has written a great deal about the

¹ The concept of humanism and its elaboration as an ideological basis for the republican reforms will be taken up in Chapter 2.

aim and the scope of the Translation Bureau. In his work, he emphasizes the humanist grounds behind the establishment of the Bureau and sees the activities of the Bureau as an integral part of the westernization movement. He writes, “The aim was to create the Turkish renaissance. And this depended on the adoption of the humanist spirit” [“Amaç Türk rönesansını yaratmaktı. Bu da hümanizma ruhunun benimsenmesine bağlıydı”] (Günyol 1983: 329). The term “Turkish renaissance” was used by the officials, academics and writers in the 1930s and 1940s to refer to a western-oriented cultural transformation in Turkey. This transformation would be enabled through better acquaintance with western culture, which would be realized through the translation of western classics (see for example Ülken 1938). Günyol is confident that this transformation was indeed achieved and that the activities of the Translation Bureau created “an unprecedented opportunity for cultural awakening for the Turkish youth who yearned for enlightenment” [“Bu, aydınlığa susamış Türk gençleri için bulunmaz bir kültür, bir uyanma olanağıydı”] (Günyol 1997: 4).

Nevertheless, Günyol suggests that the Bureau’s task of creating a “Turkish renaissance” was not completely fulfilled, mainly due to the political climate of the country which changed significantly after 1946. Günyol feels very strongly against the shift in the Bureau’s activities after Hasan Âli Yücel’s resignation. He argues that there was a change of emphasis from western classics to eastern classics which resulted in a decrease and the gradual demise of the activities of the Bureau (Karantay and Salman 1988: 13; Günyol 1997: 4; 1982: 30). At this point, one has to take the general political context into consideration. The year 1946, which marks the transition to a multi-party system from a single-party system led by the Republican People’s Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi), brought about significant changes to Turkish politics. Republican People’s Party started following a more populist line

and attempts at introducing a radical cultural transformation were suspended. Following Yücel's resignation, his work as the Minister of Education came under a great deal of attack by the members and supporters of the new Democrat Party. This also had an impact on the Translation Bureau. Vedat Günyol maintains that the activities of the Bureau were hampered by some members of the Turkish National Assembly after 1946. Those members of the assembly were involved in McCarthyism and called Hasan Âli Yücel a "communist" (Çıkar 1997: 125). Günyol comments on them as follows: "What was these people's problem? They did not want Turkish people to be enlightened. Because the enlightenment of the Turkish people would mean the end of their unfair order. Isn't this why they closed down the Village Institutes?" ["Neydi bu insanların derdi? Türk insanının aydınlanmasını istemiyorlardı. Çünkü Türk insanının aydınlanması, onların haksız düzeninin sonu olacaktı. Zaten bu yüzden değil mi ki, Köy Enstitülerini kapattılar"] (Günyol 1998: 1). This proves that the Translation Bureau was never conceived of as a mere literary institution. It was closely and explicitly associated with an ideological project, both by its founders and supporters and those in opposition.

Azra Erhat, one of the few classicist translators of the Bureau, is in agreement with Günyol in terms of the general aim of the Bureau as an instrument of westernization and enlightenment (Erhat 1974: 10). Erhat suggests that the activities of the Translation Bureau led to major developments in Turkish cultural life and comments, "THE TRANSLATION BUREAU, THE TRANSLATION journal and the translations of classics have opened up a new era in Turkey." ["TERCÜME

² The Village Institutes were unique educational establishments which aimed to raise teachers for rural areas. They remain one of the most controversial institutions of early republican Turkey. Launched during the Ministry of Hasan Âli Yücel in 1940, they were re-organized into a new and more conservative structure in 1954 when they lost their initial function of educating the rural population. Around 20,000 students graduated from the Village Institutes during the fourteen years of their operation (Katoğlu 1997: 405-408). The structure and function of the Village Institute and their role as

BÜROSU, TERCÜME dergisi ve klâsikler çevirileri Türkiye’de bir çığır açmıştır”] (Erhat 1974: 16). She suggests that this “new era” brought novelties to Turkish culture and literature, shaped the Turkish language, introduced a new order to publishing life, led to a new method in science based on textual evidence and put the Turkish intellectuals and artists in contact with international thought, literature and art (Erhat 1974: 16). There are several questions that emerge from the above statements. For instance, what were the literary and cultural novelties Erhat refers to? In what ways did the translation of classics shape the Turkish language? What kind of an order was introduced to publishing life by translations? How did translations help the emergence of a new method in science? So far no attempt has been made to delve further into these questions. These are questions that relate to the reception of the books published by the Translation Bureau which is a field truly untouched by academic research. The only data which is available about the reception of these books are comments and criticisms offered by writers and journalists of the time which do not speak for the full range of readership.

Contemporary researchers have also placed special emphasis on the role of the Translation Bureau within the general westernization movement through its promotion of the idea of humanism. A study by Zeki Arıkan, historian, discusses the creation of humanism as a specific function attributed to translation in early republican Turkey, more specifically, in the 1930s and 1940s.

Arıkan’s article “Cumhuriyet Döneminde Hümanizma Akımı” (The Humanist Movement in the Republican Period) (1999) associates the activities of the Translation Bureau with the aim of creating humanism in Turkey, which in turn, was expected to lead to an interesting phenomenon that can be termed as “self-

a part of the intended readership for the Translation Bureau products will be taken up in more detail in Chapter 3.

discovery”. Arıkan locates this idea in the discourse of the officials and writers of the day. Based on statements by Hasan Âli Yücel, Orhan Burian and sociologist and historian Hilmi Ziya Ülken, Arıkan suggests that humanism had the specific aim of triggering a national self-discovery process in Turkey. Translation of classics was to play a significant role in this process. Arıkan suggests that translation would serve as an important tool in terms of the creation of a “humanist spirit” [hümanizma ruhu] in Turkey, which would lead to “social enlightenment” [“toplumsal aydınlanmamız”] (Arıkan 1999: 89). He comments: “The Humanist movement of the republican period outlined here has contributed to the flourishing of a new perspective and the emergence of a new enlightenment movement, despite all attempts at crushing it” [“Çok genel çizgilerle verdiğimiz Cumhuriyet dönemindeki Hümanizma akımı Türkiye’de yeni bir anlayışın filizlenmesine ve yeni bir aydınlanma hareketinin, bütün baltalamalara karşın, doğmasına önemli bir katkıda bulunmuştur”] (Arıkan 1999: 93). What Arıkan means by the phrase “despite all attempts at crushing it” is not clear. However, based on the general context, one may assume that Arıkan is referring to the political developments after 1946 and the Democrat Party regime which started in 1950. Both Günyol and Arıkan seem to lament the change in the political climate after 1946 and regard the activities of the Translation Bureau as a part of a comprehensive, yet incomplete, project of modernization which came to a halt following the transition to a multi-party system.

Arıkan’s emphasis on the use of translation of classics as a means of “self-discovery” in the 1930s and 1940s is crucial in understanding the Translation Bureau’s establishment and operation. Arıkan bases his conception of “self-discovery” on earlier writings on this topic by Orhan Burian, professor of English, writer and a translator who extensively translated for the Translation Bureau. Burian

defined humanism as “one’s quest for self-discovery” [“insanın kendi kendini bulmaya çıkmasıdır”] (cited in Arıkan 1999: 86). What Burian meant was an exploration of Turkish national history and literature free from all dogmas, including religion (Arıkan 1999: 88). According to Burian, the western world had already gone through this process and found Greek classics at its cultural foundation. A study of European culture and its classics could guide us in our efforts at unearthing our past (Burian in Arıkan 1999: 86-87).

Questions such as how humanism was expected to bring about self-discovery, what exactly was going to be discovered, what the period included in the self-discovery process was, were not taken up in any detail by Burian or other writers of the day. Arıkan fails to introduce a critical angle to these questions, and does not elaborate on this significant concept of “self-discovery” shedding light upon that which distinguishes “Turkish humanism” from other humanist movements in the West.³

It should be borne in mind that Arıkan’s study relies on secondary sources. When Arıkan suggests that humanism contributed to an intellectual enlightenment in Turkey, he only bases his argument on the discourse of the statesmen and writers propagating humanism. He does not offer substantial evidence in the form of publications or public debates proving that humanism has indeed been influential in providing an intellectual and theoretical direction to Turkish social and cultural life.

Faceddin Kayaoğlu approaches translation’s role vis-à-vis the westernization attempts in the first two decades of the Republic from a different and slightly more critical perspective in his *Türkiye’de Tercüme Müesseseleri* (Translation Institutions in Turkey) where the last two chapters are allocated to republican translation activity

³ The concept of “self-discovery” and its significant role in shaping “Turkish humanism” as opposed to “classical humanism” will be taken up in more detail in Chapter 2.

(Kayaoğlu 1998). His study is confined to the state-sponsored translation activity, of which there have been two during the republican period.

Kayaoğlu starts his analysis of republican translation activity with the establishment of the “Telif ve Tercüme Heyeti” (The Committee for Original and Translated Works) in 1921 by the first Turkish Grand National Assembly which ran the country before the proclamation of the Republic in 1923 (Kayaoğlu 1998:199). Kayaoğlu offers an outline of the activities of the Committee which reported to the Ministry of Education, between 1921 and 1926, the year it was abolished. He provides lists of the members of the Committee under its four chairmen, along with the stated mission, activities, publications and decisions of the Committee (Kayaoğlu 1998: 195-249). He further includes a full list of the 68 books, translated or indigenous, published by the Ministry of Education between 1921 and 1926 (Kayaoğlu 1998:250-264).⁴

Kayaoğlu associates the abolishment of the Committee with some factors that indicate the dissent of the Committee members vis-à-vis the nation-building efforts of the young Republic. He suggests that the Committee was closed down due to the fact that its members disapproved of the dominant ideology, which was westernization. Furthermore, in Kayaoğlu’s view, the Committee members displayed a resistance against the adoption of the Latin alphabet which was considered a part and parcel of the desired transition to the western world (Kayaoğlu 1998: 248-249). This argument remains rather speculative since Kayaoğlu fails to provide any evidence. However, it can also be argued that Kayaoğlu introduces an alternative explanation for the dismissal of the Committee. So far, statements by officials or writers suggest that the Committee was dismissed because it was not efficient

⁴ 31 of the 68 books are translations of mainly western books on education, history, and sociology. Only two are works of fiction. These works will be taken up in more detail in Chapter 4.

enough (Kayaoğlu 1998: 248; Günyol 1983: 328). On the other hand, Kayaoğlu's broader view of the republican translation history is worthy of praise. He is one of the rare authors who offers an extensive review of the Committee for Original and Translated Works. His is probably the most detailed work on the activities of the Committee ever written.

In the fifth chapter of his study Kayaoğlu takes up the establishment and activities of the Translation Bureau. In line with many other authors, Kayaoğlu views the Translation Bureau as an instrument of westernization and humanism. He stresses the committed efforts of the state officials in creating a culture of humanism through translations. He comments: "Through this translation movement (the Translation Bureau) composed largely of Greek, Latin and western works, state administrators themselves tried to realize the culture of humanism in Turkey" ["Yunan, Latin ve Batılı eserlerin kahir ekseriyetini oluşturduğu bu tercüme hareketiyle hümanizma kültürü Türkiye'de bizzat devlet idarecileri vasıtasıyla gerçekleştirilmeye çalışılmıştır"] (Kayaoğlu 1998: 303-304). Unlike Arıkan, Günyol or Erhat, Kayaoğlu offers a critical assessment of the Translation Bureau's intellectual roots. Contrary to the opinion expressed by other authors, he regards humanism as a means to detach the Turkish society from its Islamic roots instead of perceiving it as an instrument of "enlightenment". He suggests:

During the Atatürk period, attempts were made to replace religion with nationalism. Religion was removed from social life and confined to the individual, private sphere through radical secular arrangements. In the İnönü period, even nationalism was relinquished and substituted by the Greek and Roman (humanist) culture. ... The real reason behind the priority attached to the translation of Greek and Latin classics was to quickly detach the society from the Turkish culture which had an Islamic content and to create a new culture of a Greek-Latin basis (Kayaoğlu 1998: 295-296).

[Atatürk döneminde radikal lâik düzenlemeler çerçevesinde toplum hayatından ferdi plana indirgenen dinin yeri milliyetçilik mefhumu ile doldurulmaya çalışılıyordu. İnönü döneminde ise milliyetçilikten de vazgeçilmiş, yerine Yunan ve Latin (hümanist) kültürü ikâme edilmeye başlanmıştır. ... Batı kültürüne kaynaklık eden Yunan ve Latin klasiklerinin tercümede öne alınmak istenmesindeki asıl maksat ise; toplumu süratli bir şekilde İslâmî muhteva taşıyan Türk kültüründen uzaklaştırarak, Greko-Latin temeline dayalı yeni bir kültür meydana getirmektir (Kayaoğlu 295-296).]

Kayaoğlu's statements on the emphasis on humanist culture to replace nationalism are debatable. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that nationalism was a topic widely discussed and problematized during İsmet İnönü's term of office as the President of the Republic, i.e. after 1938. Arıkan's analysis of humanism as a means towards national self-discovery is an example to this. Furthermore, the creation of a "national literature" has been a topical issue since "İkinci Meşrutiyet" (The Second Constitution) of 1908 and the role translations would play in that literature was taken up by many thinkers as will be demonstrated in the following chapters.⁵

Kayaoğlu's approach to translation is troubled by his exclusive use of secondary sources and his neglect of primary data, i.e. a look at the translated texts themselves. Kayaoğlu offers extensive lists on the members and the books of the Translation Bureau. However, he gives no information about how these books were translated. Neither does he comment on the reception of these books, their distribution, marketing or sales figures. Furthermore, he writes little about the critique of this translation movement, except its humanist basis. He does not look at the translated books individually and gives no information about the editing process or translation strategies of the translators. In a brief critical paragraph, Kayaoğlu writes: "Not all of these published translations are original. There are expressions

⁵ For a selection of these views see Coşkun (1938).

which are linguistically incorrect and lack in fidelity to the original. Mistakes have been made in the selection and prioritization of the titles. And some works have been published as classics, while it is difficult to say that they carry the qualities of classics” [“Neşredilen bu tercümelerin tümü orijinal değildir. Dil yönünden bozuk ve aslına sadık olmayan ifadeler söz konusudur. Eserlerin seçilmesinde ve öncelik verilme hususunda hatalar yapılmıştır. Bazı eserler de klasikler içinde yayınlanmıştır ki bunların klasik eser olma özelliğini taşıdıkları söylenemez.”] (Kayaoğlu 1998: 307-308). Kayaoğlu gives no information about how he arrived at these conclusions. Furthermore, some of the attributes he uses to describe the translations published by the Translation Bureau are rather vague. What is his definition of “original”? What does he mean when he says that the translations were not “original”? This statement can be interpreted in two ways. It may mean that the translations were not by the translators indicated on their cover pages, in other words, the translations were borrowed from other sources. On the other hand, the statement may be referring to indirect, i.e. second hand, translations. In other words, Kayaoğlu may be trying to suggest that they were not directly translated from the language in which they were originally written, but translated via an intermediary language. Likewise, Kayaoğlu does not elaborate on what he means by “linguistically incorrect” or “lack in fidelity to the original”. Neither does he go into the kinds of qualities he expects of “classics”. During this critical paragraph, the only work Kayaoğlu refers to is an article titled “Tercüme Faciaları” (Disasters of Translation) by Erol Güngör published in a column in a magazine in 1966 (Güngör 1998: 129-132). This is a short commentary which includes a critical view of the Bureau’s activities. While talking about the poor state of translated books in Turkey, Güngör refers to the works translated by the Translation Bureau. He argues that the general idea behind the

establishment of the Bureau was positive. He writes: "Therefore, a significant means of enriching intellectual life in Turkey would be to introduce the works created by the western culture to intellectuals. And this could be enabled by a comprehensive translation activity" ["Binaenaleyh, Türkiye'de fikir hayatını zenginleştirecek en mühim vasıtalarından biri Batı kültürünün yarattığı eserlerin münevverler tarafından tanınması olacaktı. Bu da geniş bir tercüme faaliyeti ile mümkün olabilirdi."] (Güngör 1998: 130). In that sense, Güngör is in agreement with the authors mentioned earlier. However, he is critical of the Bureau's activities due to the Bureau's emphasis on Greek sources, which he maintains, did not bring much benefit to Turkish intellectual life (Güngör 1998: 130).

Although, Günyol, Erhat, Arıkan and Kayaoğlu have adopted different perspectives to the issue of westernization and humanism, they make the relationship between westernization and translation clear. In that sense, they all arrive at the same conclusion regarding the function of translation in early republican Turkey: translation was used as a means of creating a humanist movement in Turkey, which was expected to facilitate and accelerate westernization in culture. However, along with their emphasis on this specific function of translation, they avoid problematizing how translation served (or failed to serve) this function. The authors mentioned above remain silent when it comes to naming, describing and analyzing actual translations. This may simply have to do with the fact that neither of the authors, including the two translators, are translation scholars and they are unaware of what primary sources, i.e. translated texts themselves, can offer about cultural and historical phenomena.

An article by a translation scholar, Turgay Kurultay titled "Cumhuriyet Türkiyesinde Çevirinin Ağır Yükü ve Türk Hümanizması" (The Heavy Burden of

Translation in Republican Turkey and Turkish Humanism) brings a more critical perspective to assessing the function of translation by posing question marks regarding several aspects of translation that have been largely overlooked in the past (Kurultay 1999). In this article, Kurultay problematizes the “idealization” of the Translation Bureau’s activities and tries to set the Bureau within a larger historical perspective. Kurultay stresses that the activities of the Translation Bureau should not be assessed in isolation from the rest of translation activity in Turkey, since the Bureau also encouraged private publishers to increase the number and improve the quality of their translations (Kurultay 1999: 17). He offers a statistical review of the number of translated books published in 1946 and 1958 by the Translation Bureau and other publishers, showing the changing roles of the state and private publishers. Through his emphasis on the importance of private translation activity, Kurultay challenges views that reduce republican translation history to a history of the Translation Bureau.

His perspective on the structure and activities of the Translation Bureau also varies from those of the authors mentioned earlier. Kurultay argues that the Translation Bureau was created by the state to fill a certain gap in the field of translation, rather than exercise direct intervention in translation. He defines the activities of the Translation Bureau as a “social translation movement” and writes,

This initiative needs to be evaluated as a social translation movement under state sponsorship (which I think is different from “patronage”) rather than direct involvement in translation by the state. Although a certain degree of hierarchy was inevitable, it is seen that the movement was to a large extent autonomous and that it achieved the enthusiastic involvement of the intellectuals (including the oppositional intellectuals) of the day (Kurultay 1999: 16).

[Bu girişimi devletin çeviri işlerini yürütmesi olarak değil, devletin bir tür sponsorluğunda (bunun “himaye” kavramından farklı olduğunu düşünüyorum) toplumsal bir çeviri hareketi olarak değerlendirmek yerinde olur. Her ne kadar

belli bir hiyerarşi ilişkisi kaçınılmaz olsa da, hareketin büyük bir ölçüde özerk olduğu ve dönemin aydınlarının (muhalif aydınlar dahil) coşkulu katılımını sağladığı görülüyor (Kurultay 1999: 16).]

As the above quote indicates, Kurultay perceives the Bureau as an autonomous “movement” initiated by the state, yet free of state intervention. However, he stresses that “hierarchy” was inevitable, although he does not quite specify what he means by “hierarchy”. Nevertheless, in a footnote, he argues that the translators involved in the “movement” were autonomous enough to have free discussions about the activities of the Bureau (Kurultay 1999:16). Kurultay stresses that he means not absolute but “relative autonomy” allowed by the “political authoritarian structure of the day” [“dönemin siyasal otoriter yapısı”] (Kurultay 1999: 16, 25). Kurultay’s claim emphasizing the involvement of the “oppositional intellectuals” in the activities of the Bureau remains ungrounded since it is not backed up by any evidence and he does not specify whom he means by “oppositional intellectuals”.

His unclear approach to a crucial concept like “patronage” blurs Kurultay’s general argument for a more objective and broader view of translation history. While he prefers “sponsorship” over “patronage”, he does not contrast the two concepts and his choice of “sponsorship” remains unexplained. The fact that the Bureau worked under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and that its translations were published by the Ministry makes one question his argument. Furthermore, the prefaces by İsmet İnönü, President of the Republic, and Hasan Âli Yücel, Minister of Education, introducing each translation appearing in the series “Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeleler” (Translations from World Literature) launched by the Translation Bureau is further evidence of intensive state involvement in the Translation Bureau.

Rather than provide new data, Kurultay's contribution to Turkish translation history lies in the questions he poses about the Translation Bureau. For instance, he problematizes the timing of the establishment of the Translation Bureau and asks why the Bureau was not set up sooner after the proclamation of the Republic (Kurultay 1999: 24-26). Although the argument he offers is not very detailed and based on his personal opinion rather than documentary evidence, his emphasis on this topic, which is altogether ignored by other researchers writing on the Translation Bureau, is to be appreciated.

Kurultay focuses on the role of the then Minister of Education, Hasan Âli Yücel's role in the activities of the Bureau. Kurultay's comments help us to set the Translation Bureau within the larger political and cultural context and turn a critical eye to the planning and setting up of the ideological infrastructure of the Bureau by Yücel. The Translation Bureau was set up soon after Hasan Âli Yücel became the Minister of Education. It is largely assumed that at that point in time, the Bureau owed its existence to Yücel's personal commitment and effort. That is why Yücel has come to be identified with the Translation Bureau as its main founder in the discourse of the majority of researchers who wrote on Yücel's role in the establishment and operation of the Bureau (e.g. Sönmez 2000: 55; Çıkar 1997: 83-84; Sinanoğlu 1980: 93). This may partly be due to the fact that the Translation Bureau lost its initial impetus after Yücel resigned in 1946.⁶ Kurultay identifies the Translation Bureau with Hasan Âli Yücel to such an extent that he calls the Translation Bureau, "the H.A. Yücel movement" ["H.A. Yücel hareketi"] (Kurultay

⁶ The Ministry of Education published 467 translations carried out by the Translation Bureau during the first six years of the Bureau's operation while Yücel was in power. Between 1946 and 1966, the number of translations published was 506. (The figures include only first-time publications and no subsequent reprints. The data is taken from *Klasikler Bibliyografyası* 1967: VI.) So the Bureau gave about half of its production during Yücel's time in power, while the other half was published during the 20 years which elapsed after Yücel's resignation until the Bureau's closure.

1999: 24, 33). However, while Kurultay stresses the personal importance of Yücel for the setting up of the Bureau, he also looks for larger social forces that may have facilitated the establishment of the Bureau at that specific point in time. He writes that the period immediately after the proclamation of the Republic was not favorable to a critical environment [“aydınların eleştirel konum alması”] since the government in power was trying to create a homogenous environment promoting a unitarian state structure (Kurultay 1999: 24). The period after 1940 provided a more (which does not mean totally) liberal atmosphere for intellectuals to work autonomously enabling the launch of the Translation Bureau (Kurultay 1999: 24). One should also bear in mind that the intellectual infrastructure of the Bureau was not created overnight. In Chapter 3, I will explore the discourse on translation before the establishment of the Translation Bureau and show that the 1930s witnessed an environment where officials, writers and publishers increasingly emphasized the importance of the translation of classics for westernization. Based on their discourse, I will argue that the centre of the literary system had already been reserved for the products of the Bureau before the Bureau started its operations and that a discursively induced “demand” came before “supply”.

Kurultay’s emphasis on the relationship between the state-sponsored movement and the activities of the private publishers can be considered a novel contribution to Turkish translation history. This is an aspect that has been missing in the studies reviewed so far. Kurultay rightfully concludes that the historical role played by the Translation Bureau can best be assessed by juxtaposing it to the activities of private publishers. He writes,

So far, studies on Turkish translation history have foregrounded state-sponsored initiatives and the developments in the field of translation have

usually been associated with these activities. However, the process of development is much more complex and different types of activities prepare or transform one another. ... Yet the real transformative developments should be sought first in works produced by personal initiative, deriving from an innovative spirit, displaying an irregularity and scattered over a time period (Kurultay 1999: 22).

[Bugüne kadar Türk çeviri tarihi incelenirken, devlet eliyle yapılan girişimler öne çıkarılmış ve gelişme çizgisi bu etkinlikler karşılaştırılarak bulunmaya çalışılmıştır çoğunlukla. Oysa gelişme süreci daha karmaşıktır ve farklı türden etkinlikler birbirlerini hazırlamakta veya dönüştürmektedir. ... Ancak değişim süreci açısından asıl gelişmeler, kişisel girişimlerle ortaya çıkan, yenilikçi ruhtan kaynaklanan, çok düzenli olmayan ve zamana yayılan çalışmalarda aranmalı öncelikle (Kurultay 1999: 22).]

Kurultay's focus on personal initiative free from state-sponsored movements can be analyzed in line with the "human translator" concept in Translation Studies.⁷ This perspective suggests that translators as people have their own interests and agendas. Even when their translation activity is not regulated by officials or institutions, they have a role to play in the course translation takes. This is a significant idea that underlies the perspective adopted by the present thesis to translation history. I act on the assumption that the periphery of the system of translated literature, i.e. translated popular literature in the case of republican Turkey, which is not regulated, except by market forces, can offer diverse ways of looking at translational phenomena. The periphery may offer an alternative narrative about translation activity and reception. It may even offer its own concept(s) and definition(s) of translation which do not always agree with those upheld by the canon occupying the centre, in this case the products of the Translation Bureau. The interaction between "state-sponsored" and private movements, or individual

⁷ Anthony Pym writes, "I believe human translators have had something to do with the history of translation, although I readily admit it is hard to say exactly what their general role, on an individual or collective level, is or might have been. Since I suspect translators might even have done something important in history, I am interested in elaborating the working hypothesis that they are active effective causes, with their own identity and agenda as a professional group" (Pym 1998: 160). In this

endeavour, is essential to explore the social dynamics that shape translation activity over time.

Özlem Berk's study "Bir Türk kimliği yaratmada Tercüme Bürosu ve kültür politikaları: Çevirilerin yerelleştirilmesi" (The Translation Bureau and cultural policies in the creation of a Turkish identity: domestication of translations) (Berk 2000) represents a reverse approach to translation history, like the majority of researchers mentioned in these pages and has emphasis on what I would like to call an "institutional approach" undermining the role of the translator as an independent agent.

Berk suggests that the activities of the Translation Bureau between 1940 and 1946 reflect the government policies of the single party era. She refers to statements by state officials, especially by Hasan Âli Yücel, to argue that translation was considered a means of importing western culture along with other forms of cultural production such as western classical music, ballet and opera (Berk 2000: 160). She identifies westernization with humanism which she defines as "an ideal concept of culture, i.e. a canon which was necessarily desirable for all" ["ideal bir kültür kavramı ...; yani herkesin arzulaması gereken bir kanon"] (Berk 2000: 168). Berk echoes Arıkan in attributing humanism a special function, that of domesticating and internalizing a universal culture and reflecting it on the Turkish culture ["evrensel kültürü yerelleştirmek ve içselleştirmek, öznel bir boyutta hissederek ve yaşayarak kendi kültürümüze aktarmak"] (Berk 2000: 169). She takes up the concept of humanism in some length and questions the ready adoption of this western concept by intellectuals while the people generally held a Muslim identity. She suggests that the kind of humanism propagated by Yücel and his associates was a universal

thesis. I intend to reveal certain aspects of the roles of the "human translator" both in and outside of the Translation Bureau.

concept freed from a cultural and social setting and dated back to Greek and Roman works which were identified with the pre-Christian pagan origins of the West. Therefore the Translation Bureau focused on the translation of Greek and Roman classics (Berk 2000: 161).

So far we have seen that researchers (and translators) who write on translation activity in republican Turkey have all dwelled upon the major role played by the activities of the Translation Bureau. They focus on the function attributed to the Translation Bureau, which they define as introducing a form of humanism/cultural enlightenment through the translation of western classics. The studies outlined above lead to certain question marks in my mind regarding the operation and the actual (rather than the intended) function of the Translation Bureau. These questions mainly have to do with the reception of the products of the Translation Bureau. While they emphasize the “new era” or “enlightenment” brought about through translations, none of the above authors, except for Kurultay, seem to be concerned about providing empirical data to back up their arguments. This is mainly due to the fact that they do not problematize the reception of the Translation Bureau products. If reception were to be problematized, we would be faced with several questions, such as how the actual effect of the Translation Bureau books on readers and Turkish culture, including literature, can be measured, how private publishers were influenced by the selection of titles and translation strategies of the Translation Bureau, what the response of private publishers of the time was to the discourse on translation’s function as a vehicle of humanism, and finally, if and how the concept of humanism/westernism was reflected on the strategies employed by translators. In my view, attributing a general intended function to translation creates a picture of translation activity as an area determined and governed by external social forces

leaving no room for the initiative and creativity of the individual translator or groups of translators or publishers. However, any study attempting to reveal aspects of translation history can only be complete by including the perspective of the translator as a human being who is involved in individual and collective strategies, accommodating or resisting potential cultural impositions which dictate what and how translation should be.

1.1.2 Translation Strategies

In this section I will take up the views of researchers on translation strategies used by translators in republican Turkey. A brief review of these views exposes a number of areas of inquiry that are closely related to the questions posed above. It will be observed that researchers who touch upon the subject of translation strategies do so within a polarized dichotomy. Furthermore, their perspective offers a view of the activity of translating as a process shaped by pre-determined norms rather than a process of individual decision-making. Let us have a look at some of the studies that deal with translation strategies.

Özlem Berk's article referred to above combines an analysis of the Translation Bureau's political function with a review of the translational norms offered by the Bureau (Berk 2000). Berk suggests that the norms to be observed by the translators who worked for the Bureau were determined even before the Translation Bureau started producing its publications and that the most significant norm to be followed was "domestication" (Berk 2000: 169). Her perspective on the strategies followed by the translators does not leave any room for the "relative autonomy" Kurultay mentions. Her argument provides a picture of the Translation Bureau as an

impersonal mechanism, where individual initiative was unwelcome, even when it came to actual translation strategies. Berk's view of the Translation Bureau makes it an "Ideological State Apparatus" as defined by Louis Althusser (Althusser 1971: 121-173)⁸. Seen in this light, the Bureau and its general context disempower the translator and leave little room for concepts of negotiation or agency which have been under extensive discussion in recent translation studies. However, Berk's statements about the strategies employed by the Translation Bureau translators need to be considered tentative. Her conclusions are based on secondary material and she does not provide any case studies on the translated texts. So although she presents her findings as "norms at work at the Translation Bureau", what she essentially offers the readers is an analysis of the norms promoted by the members of Translation Bureau (Berk 2000: 161-168). She refers to statements by critics and translators to corroborate what she proposes, i.e. the dominant norm observed in translation was that of "domestication" at the time. She suggests that critics regarded translation as indigenous writing with unique literary qualities and that they argued that translation should be read as fluently as an indigenous piece of writing. Berk also quotes Nurullah Ataç who wrote, "If it (the translation) forces the language it becomes unintelligible, and is, therefore, unfaithful to the text" ["Dili zorladığı takdirde söylediği anlaşılmaz; bu suretle metne sadakatsizlik etmiş olur"] (Ataç in Berk 2000: 162-163). So in a way, although it sounds paradoxical, fluency was identified with fidelity (Berk 2000: 163). Berk also explores the subject in her doctoral thesis where she writes: "Faithfulness was discussed only in terms of comprehensibility. A translation was faithful not when it showed a strong

⁸ Ideological State Apparatuses are social institutions such as education, organized religion, the family, organized politics, the media, the culture industries, etc. which reproduce the dominant ideologies.

resemblance to its source text, but when it was intelligible in the target culture” (Berk 1999: 185). Nevertheless, she does not dwell upon this interesting contradiction for long and throughout her analysis of the discourse formed by the intellectuals associated with the Translation Bureau she continues to suggest that fluency was the prevailing strategy in the 1940s while translators invariably domesticated the foreign text “by making it easily readable, producing the illusion of authorial presence whereby the translated text could be taken for an original” (Berk 1999: 162). She therefore presents translation strategies as consisting of two poles: domestication versus foreignization.⁹

Berk also shows how the principle of “domestication” was defended by two leading translators of the Bureau, Nurullah Ataç and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu (Berk 2000: 164-167). In her analysis, Berk suggests that the adoption of the “domestication” strategy was due to attempts at westernizing Turkey since the 19th century (Berk 2000: 168). For a detailed analysis of this connection between “domestication” and “westernism”, which remains largely unexplored in her 2000 article, we need to turn to her doctoral thesis. Berk writes in her thesis that domestication served,

“to create a cultural other, i.e. the West, which was experienced as a superior culture and which, in fact, did not seem so foreign to readers. The use of a vernacular language in translations was to serve towards the ‘naturalisation’ of the other culture. Using fluent language, translators wanted to present the West as something familiar to the target culture, something that could be learnt easily as it was read. This approach eventually would serve the final aim: the Westernisation of Turkish culture” (Berk 1999: 184).

This partially answers one of the above questions on how the concept of humanism/westernism reflected on the translation strategies employed by translators.

⁹ This artificial dichotomy between domestication/foreignization, or fluency/literalism will be taken up in Chapter 3. 3.4.4.

Nevertheless, her focus on extratextual material rather than actual translation strategies makes Berk's explanation hypothetical.

Berk's argument that the dominant strategy for translations was "domestication" is debatable on several levels. First of all, her methodology lacks the sufficient tools to be able to arrive at this conclusion. She is involved in a form of critical discourse analysis where she tackles the statements by critics and translators. This kind of an analysis can only give information about what the critics and translators say and how they say it, rather than evaluate the truth-value of their claims. Juxtaposed with the social context, this kind of an analysis can provide one with invaluable data about the kind of discourse emerging from statements on the products of the Translation Bureau. However, to be able to detect the kinds of norms in operation, one has to look at the texts themselves and complement/challenge Berk's study on secondary sources with primary data. Even when Berk's conclusions are limited to the area of discourse, it appears that she arrives at an over-generalization about the propagation of the idea of domestication. Ataç and Eyüboğlu were indeed known for their pro-fluency position, yet this cannot be generalized to all translators who worked for the Translation Bureau. For example, Orhan Burian, who translated extensively for the Bureau, was of a different opinion and argued that "the translators who deviate from the tone of the original may soon get carried away by their personal tone" ["aslın havasından çıkan mütercimim, kendi havasına kapılarak başı dönebilir"] (Burian 1944: 18).

While Özlem Berk suggests that "acceptability domestication" was the dominant norm adopted by the translators involved in the Translation Bureau activities, Suat Karantay argues for the opposite view and proposes that "adequacy" was the dominant norm. In his article "'Tercüme Bürosu': Normlar ve İşlevler" (The

Translation Bureau: Norms and Functions), Karantay summarizes the process through which the Translation Bureau was established and its operations with brief references to the kinds of norms at work. In the introduction to his study, he criticizes the pre-republican views and practices of translation using Toury's terminology to describe translation strategies. He emphasizes that pre-republican translations lacked coherent norms, and that omissions, summaries and adaptations were widespread (Karantay 1991: 97). He also comments on the translations produced in the "beginning of the republican period" and writes that they were of poor quality (Karantay 1991: 97). Karantay traces a shift in the norms observed after the establishment of the Translation Bureau: "Among the translational norms (Toury 1980: 51-62) the initial norm adopted required an emphasis on 'adequate' translation. The translators could no longer use source texts as liberally as they wished. 'Adequacy' had already established itself in the early period of the Republic, but in the 1940s it was going to become institutionalized" ["Çeviri normları arasında (Toury 1980: 51-62) benimsenen öncül norm (initial norm), 'yeterli' çeviri üzerinde ısrarla durulmasını gerektiriyordu. Çevirmenler artık, kaynak metinleri istedikleri gibi, serbestçe kullanamayacaklardı. 'Yeterlilik', cumhuriyetin ilk döneminde de kendini kabul ettirmişti ama şimdi, 1940'lı yıllarda kurumlaşacaktı artık."] (Karantay 1991: 98). The reader is not informed of the source of this argument and the shift from acceptability to adequacy, deriving largely from the author's personal judgment, creates a large question mark. Furthermore, Karantay does not elaborate on the possible causes and effects of this shift and treats translational norms as decisions taken in isolation from the general social context.

Although they argue for the existence of contradictory norms at the Translation Bureau, the approaches adopted by Berk and Karantay overlap in the way they assess translation strategies as a binary opposition.

Will this binarism be valid for all texts and time periods? Is it actually valid for the products of the Translation Bureau as suggested by Berk and Karantay? These questions will only find answers after a case study on the Translation Bureau, exploring the actual (rather than the hypothetical/discursive) norms at work in its products.

Another study that argues for the existence of a binarism in the translation strategies in circulation in the republican period is by Bülent Aksoy. Aksoy's study is on the discourse created by translators themselves to express their approach to translation. In the article "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Çeviri Anlayışları" (Conceptions of Translation in the Republican Period) Aksoy adopts a binary approach similar to the one mentioned above and explores the historical debate between those who propagate "fluent" ["zorlamasız, kılçıksız, akıcı" (1995: 76)] and "style-based" ["üslup karşılama" (1995: 88)] translation.¹⁹ He comments on the writings of several leading translators of the 1940-1970 period such as, Nurullah Ataç, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Orhan Burian, Nâzım Hikmet, Suut Kemal Yetkin, Memet Fuat and Sait Maden, and traces the canonization of "style-based translation" in the discourse of translators especially after 1950. Aksoy remains on the level of secondary discourse

¹⁹Aksoy does not have consistent use of terminology throughout the article. His use of the word "fluent" has nothing to do with Venuti's theoretical framework. Aksoy prefers to rephrase a binary opposition in translation strategies in different ways in various paragraphs. He seems to offer a dichotomy based on a rendering of "sense" and "style". For example, he talks about "sense for sense translation" ["anlamca aktarım"] versus "translation where the style is foregrounded over sense" ["üslubu verebilmek"] (Aksoy 1995: 86).

throughout the article and explores various translators' approach to translation as they express it in their written statements about translation.

Aksoy's study clarifies some of the ambiguity created by Berk's and Karantay's insistence on the dominance of opposite translation strategies in the 1940s. Aksoy explores how Ataç and Eyuboğlu, who both served as chairmen to the Translation Bureau, propagated "fluency" while some other translators such as Orhan Burian and Suut Kemal Yetkin criticized their approach and preferred "style-based" translation (Aksoy 1995: 75, 81-82). He does not suggest that "fluency" was the dominant norm in the operations of the Translation Bureau, instead, he demonstrates the existence of a plurality of initial norms in the discourse of the Bureau's translators. Aksoy also offers the readers a review of the strategies promoted by translators who were active in the 1950s and 1960s. He demonstrates that "style-based translation" came to be regarded more highly than "fluency" by literary circles in this period. This is a commendable aspect of the article. We see a clear attempt at building a continuum between the Translation Bureau and more recent translational phenomena, such as strategies employed by contemporary translators, which may have partially derived from it. This is a step towards assessing the impact of the Translation Bureau on translation strategies in Turkey.

The lack of a theoretical framework and insufficient contextualisation are the major weaknesses of Aksoy's study. Throughout his article, Aksoy makes it clear that he *does* perceive of translation strategies as existing on two poles. His categorization of translation strategies as "fluency" and "style-based" is vague. His terminology is rather eclectic and impressionistic and Aksoy is unable to specify what the two categories actually involve. He uses concepts such as "fluent" ["akıcı" (p. 74)], "fidelity" ["sadakat" (p. 79)], "freedom" ["serbestlik" (p. 76)] "sense-based"

["anlamca aktarmak" (p. 86)], "style-based" ["üslubu verebilmek" (p. 86)], "smell of translation" ["tercüme kokuyor" (p. 78)], "linguistic translation" ["lâfzî tercüme" (p.80)], "equivalent" ["eşdeğeri" (p. 74)] rather arbitrarily and leads to a great deal of confusion in the reader's mind as to what he actually means by either of them. This mainly derives from the fact that he does not make use of the academic terminology developed in translation studies. This distinguishes him from authors who follow Descriptive Translation Studies and have systematic use of descriptive terminology.

In terms of contextualisation, Aksoy does not comment on the socio-cultural or political processes surrounding translation throughout the period he discusses. In turn, he fails to establish connections between translation strategies and the larger context within which such strategies are developed. As a result, the impression left by his article is very much a picture of translation as an isolated activity and translators working in a socio-cultural vacuum engaged in arbitrary strategies. Nevertheless, his exploration of the debates among various translators contributes to a view of translators as visible agents.

1.1.3 Case Studies – Smaller Scopes, Greater Results

The majority of the works mentioned so far propose to contribute to an analysis of the general history of translation in republican Turkey. On the other hand, various authors have written micro-histories of translation in Turkey. These case studies do not attempt to describe or analyze all aspects of translation activity throughout the republican period. Instead, they limit themselves with certain corpora. Yet their contribution to Turkish translation historiography has been larger than their actual scope. In most cases they rely on translated texts along with their references to

secondary material and therefore are able to justify their claims within a more scholarly framework. Among these studies two articles by Saliha Paker represent a line of research that offers a successful analysis of primary material and constitutes examples in proper contextualisation. In “Changing Norms of the Target System: Turkish Translations of Greek Classics in Historical Perspective” Paker sets out to “describe some aspects of the Turkish translations of Greek classics in their historical and cultural context” (Paker 1986a: 412). She traces the changes in the translation strategies of translators involved with the Greek classics from 1866 to 1970 and reveals a shift of norms after the 1930s from acceptability towards adequacy. Her analysis differs from Aksoy’s analysis of a similar shift in norms in several respects. First of all, Paker bases her study on actual translations and not on secondary material about these translations. Furthermore, she does not represent the selection of these norms as individual and arbitrary choices. Paker connects changes in preferred norms to larger socio-cultural phenomena, such as the cultural transformation Turkey went through in the first few decades of the Republic. While she writes about different groups of translated texts, she also presents the social background against which their norms emerged. Along with an informed and multidimensional look at translational norms, Paker’s major contribution to modern Turkish translation history has been her assessment of the pre-republican and republican corpora as a whole. She avoids creating a historical break in translation activity with the proclamation of the Republic in 1923. Rather, she demonstrates that the change in translation strategies did not take place overnight and that “preliminary norms” of the 19th century survived until the 1930s when a gradual shift started taking place linked to the republican educational and cultural policies (Paker 1986a: 421). Paker’s “Hamlet in Turkey” follows the same framework for translations of *Hamlet* in Turkey (Paker

1986b). The fact that *Hamlet* is a dramatic play has also had an impact on Paker's analysis. She looks at the actual *Hamlet* translations and at the same time, takes their reception into consideration in a historical and cultural context. She not only looks at the norms in different translations, but also considers how well these translations fared with the audience and theatre circles mainly by looking at the number of times they were staged. She concludes that "there is a highly interesting correlation between this play in translation and/or production, and attempts or developments in the direction of cultural renovation on the one hand and major political changes on the other" (Paker 1986b: 100). She also reveals that *Hamlet* translations have actually served as a model for original drama in Turkish (Paker 1986b: 101).

Işın Bengi-Öner (1999) takes a close look at three translations of *La Dame aux Camélias* into Turkish by Ahmed Midhat (1880-1881), Midhat Cemal (1937), and Mustafa Nihad Özön (1937). Her focus is not so much on the socio-cultural background but rather on revealing the norms used by the translators of the three texts. In her approach, the emphasis on the initial norms of acceptability and adequacy are not questioned or linked to the historical/cultural processes surrounding them. However, her study is valuable in the sense that it performs an acid test about the reliability of secondary sources. She evaluates a variety of norms and arrives at a conclusion which is rather contradictory with the ideas of the highly-regarded literary critic Ismail Habib Sevük on these translations. Therefore Bengi-Öner shows the reader that extratextual material, regardless of their respectable and reputable status, may mislead researchers in terms of the information or judgments they offer about translated texts.

The list of micro-histories on translation in Turkey can certainly be extended (see for example, Pinar 1987, 1988; Karantay 1989). Although some of the concepts

utilized by the authors of these studies, such as the acceptability/adequacy dichotomy, are under critical scrutiny today, the contribution of these studies towards a larger Turkish translation history is undeniable. It should also be pointed out that case studies are free of certain troubling tendencies observed in general surveys of translation. Case studies appear emancipated from an “institutional approach” to translation history and place equal weight on the activities of different publishing bodies. Their view is not limited to the products of the Translation Bureau and they allocate space for the activities of private publishers and individual translators.

The conclusions reached by surveys on Turkish translation history and on the specific role of movements or institutions within it, such as the Translation Bureau, will remain tentative until enough evidence is obtained to justify or falsify their claims. This can only be possible through carrying out case studies on specific corpora spanning through time.

1.1.4 Some Common Tendencies

Based on the assessment of works covering republican translation history in Turkey, one can locate certain general tendencies. These tendencies are significant cursors of what is foregrounded and what goes unmentioned. The emphasis on certain phenomena and the indifference towards others is an inevitable part of historiography. In that sense, it is impossible to claim for the possibility of a totally comprehensive and impartial translation history. However, a relatively more comprehensive and multi-faceted view of history can be attained through revealing and supplying the missing aspects of each account. The exercise so far has been an

attempt to reveal the missing aspects of the studies mentioned above and as indicated before, this could only be possible through a study of what they include.

Let us now move on to analyzing what these studies do. First of all, all of the studies above, except for Kurultay's study, have a nearly exclusive emphasis on the activities of the Translation Bureau. The Translation Bureau was certainly a significant and important institution in Turkish translation history, but this does not justify the current lack of focus on the activities of private publishers in republican translation history. So the first and the most common trend in the surveys on the history of translation in republican Turkey can be summed up as reductionism: they reduce Turkish republican translation history to a history of the Translation Bureau.¹¹ This is an institutional approach to translation history, perhaps deriving from practical concerns. The lack of extensive public debate and a planned and systematic translation movement make works published by private publishers more difficult and less attractive to analyze. Shortage of data, the time-consuming effort of tracing old books in various libraries in different cities, lack of publication lists for private publishers are other factors that may add to the unpopularity of private publications in researchers' eyes. It is also true that private publishers did not have a strongly pronounced ideological agenda and this may be one of the reasons why their publications did not evoke much academic interest.

¹¹ In Özlem Berk's study this assumes its extreme form. She writes "The number of private publishing houses in Turkey started to increase in the 1960s. Translators and authors who worked for the Translation Bureau set up their own publishing houses in this period and transferred the experience they acquired at the Bureau to these private publishing houses. Yet throughout the period included in this study (1940s) almost all translation activity was carried out by the Translation Bureau" ["Türkiye'deki özel yayınevlerinin sayısının artması ise 1960'lı yıllarda başlar. Tercüme Bürosu'nda çalışan çevirmen ve yazarlar bu yıllarda kendi yayınevlerini kurarak Büro'da edindikleri deneyimleri bu özel yayınevlerine aktarırlar. Ancak incelediğimiz bu dönem boyunca (1940'lar) hemen hemen tüm çeviri etkinlikleri Tercüme Bürosu tarafından gerçekleştirilmiştir"] (Berk 2000: 157). Berk not only overlooks translations by other publishers, but also explains the (hypothetically) eventual evolution and flourishing of private translation activity as a consequence of the Translation Bureau.

The way surveys on translation activity approach the Translation Bureau is also problematic. Most of them focus on the intended function of the Bureau as an instrument of westernization, however none set out to offer an analysis of how well this function was served. One notices a constant neglect of the response of the readership or the book market towards the products of the Translation Bureau. Sales figures, prices, marketing and distribution mechanisms are altogether ignored.

This tendency is mainly due to the second common tendency I would like to underline: attempts at offering general surveys all suffer from a methodological problem. They exclusively rely on secondary material and are not able to ground their conclusions on empirical phenomena, i.e. translated texts. Although they bring interesting insights into the socio-cultural context surrounding translations, they fail to establish links between that context and individual translations.

Finally, those surveys referring to translation strategies often represent these strategies within a polarized structure and display an unrefined approach to translational norms. Those authors who mention translation strategies tackle them in terms of adequacy/acceptability, domestication/foreignization and fluent/style-based. They do not problematize these concepts which they offer as binary oppositions.

I have chosen these three areas as points of departure for my thesis. They have served as gateways into a field surrounded by ambiguities and questions. Among the three, the first tendency, that is an exclusive focus on the Translation Bureau, has proven to be especially thought-provoking. In that sense, it can be said to lie central to the main argument in this thesis: the representation of the modern Turkish translation history as an area governed and shaped by the activities of the Translation Bureau needs to be challenged.

Statistics may aid us to appreciate the significance of posing such a challenge. A brief example will suffice to reveal that the Translation Bureau was not the only “producer” of translated literature in the 1940s. According to data offered by *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* (Turkish Bibliography) covering the years between 1938 and 1948, the share of the translations commissioned by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education within the total number of translated books was considerably low: during the ten years between 1938 and 1948, 465 English and American works were translated and published in Turkey. This figure includes literary translations, covering drama, poetry, short stories and novels, “people’s books” [“halk kitapları”]¹² and children’s books. Out of the 465 titles, 74 were translated and published by the Ministry of Education¹³, which amounts to 16 per cent. Statistically, the Translation Bureau was an important player in the field of literary translations from English, but it was by no means the dominant player. The breakdown of these figures according to individual categories may give a better idea about the kinds of translations published by the Ministry of Education:

¹² This is a category introduced by the *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* and mainly covers adventure and detective stories. The term “people” which led to some interesting connotations in the way it was used within the general political context will be taken up later. The nature and constituents of this category will be discussed in Chapter 5.

¹³ The Ministry of Education had two forms of publishing activity included here. One was carried out by the Translation Bureau within the series of “Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeleer” (Translations from World Literature) and “Okul Klasikleri” (School Classics). The other translation activity covered plays which were published within the series “Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Devlet Konservatuari Yayınları” (Ministry of Education State Conservatory Publications). Translators who worked for the Translation Bureau translated books for all three series. The figures offered above are combined figures for the Translation Bureau and the State Conservatory. If the translations published by the State Conservatory are excluded from the statistics, the total number of translations from English carried out by the Translation Bureau is 47 and its percentage within the total is nearly 10 per cent.

Translations from English and American literatures between 1938-1948 (Source: *Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1939-1948*)

Category	Published by the Ministry of Education	Published by Others	Total
Poetry	1 (100 %)	-	1
Drama	50 (72.5 %) [27 by the State Conservatory 23 by the Translation Bureau]	19 (27.5 %)	69
Novels and short stories	22 (9 %)	223 (91 %)	245
People's books	-	86 (100 %)	86
Children's books	1 (1.5 %)	63 (98.5 %)	64

These figures are indicative of certain trends in terms of the translation of specific genres. The activities of the Translation Bureau were concentrated in the field of drama, and novels and short stories to a smaller extent. On the other hand, private publishers took the lead in the fields of popular literature (termed "people's books" by the bibliography) and children's literature where the Translation Bureau remained inactive. Private publishers had a strong presence in translated novels and short stories. 91 per cent of translations were published by private publishers in these two fields. Furthermore, private publishers appear rather systematic in their publications of translated literature. The translated novels and short stories from English into Turkish were often published within the scope of series indicating a conscious effort at putting the readership in touch with western literature. Among 223 titles published by private publishing houses 100 (45 per cent) were published within specific series with titles pointing at a serious step in this direction. All major publishing houses had series of translated literature. These series bore such titles as, "Dünya Muharrirlerinden Tercümeler Serisi" (Translations from World Authors) by Remzi, "Şarktan-Garptan Seçme Eserler" (Selected Works from the East and the West) by Ahmet Halit, "İnkılâp Kitabevinin Seçme Tercümeler Serisi" (İnkılâp Publishing Houses's Series of Selected Translations). Some of these series covered what can be regarded as "canonical literature" while others could be considered

modern classics or bestsellers of the day. The Translation Bureau carried out its activities mainly in the field of canonical literature, and as I will discuss in Chapters 2, 3, and 4, became a major institution in introducing a new canon of literature. As indicated earlier, the Bureau focused particularly on the translation of western classics in the 1940s. In the above table, the genre where the Translation Bureau was most active appears to be drama. At a closer look, the reason becomes clear. 19 of the 23 translations published by the Translation Bureau in the field of drama were by William Shakespeare, the most “canonical” author in the English language.

Canonization of certain genres or texts is both a cultural and a political process and can be an important part of nation-building efforts. Gregory Jusdanis in his *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture* (1991) explores how modern Greece “invented” itself a canon by including and excluding certain literary texts in its tradition. In the same vein, in the present thesis I will discuss how modern Turkey “imported” a literary canon and the role translation played in this process. The concept of “culture planning” offered by Itamar Even-Zohar is of key importance in the thesis (Even-Zohar 1994; 1997). It will be the major instrument for exploring the connections between culture and translation and to trace the developments in translation, both as text and cultural activity, within a cultural context. In this study I will concentrate on both translations of canonical and non-canonical texts. The statistics offered above illustrate that exclusive focus on the activities of the Translation Bureau can only offer us a partial view of translation history. A translation history tackling only 10 per cent of translation activity in a given period cannot claim to be a complete one. I will introduce a more balanced approach to translation activity undertaken by different publishers. This approach requires of me to formulate a working hypothesis that represents translation as a multi-faceted

concept and enables a simultaneous investigation into the translation activity of both the Translation Bureau and private publishers and their translators. The fundamental concepts of this hypothesis are planning, characterizing the activities of the Translation Bureau, and resistance, characterizing the activities of some private publishers and their translators:

I claim that in early republican Turkey there was official culture planning in language, publishing and translation, and that a significant number of private publishers and translators resisted the norms offered by the dominant discourse of the planners.

The field of translated popular literature has largely been exempt from discussions about translation. In retrospect, the field of popular literature between 1923 and 1960 appears rather chaotic. There is also evidence to suggest that it was considered a field marked by disorder by the canonical writers of the day who adopted a demeaning attitude towards popular literature. Compared with the seemingly carefully planned order of the Translation Bureau, the translation activity in the field of popular literature appears much more unsystematic and arbitrary. Research will show whether it contained its own logic. The lack of secondary material on this field which can be defined as a productive, yet “silent” one, demands of me to base my conclusions mainly on primary data. I will undertake this by presenting a case study on translations of popular literature.

This brings me to the second common tendency I criticize: the general inclination towards using secondary material and a systematic neglect of primary material, i.e. translated texts. The surveys on translation in modern Turkey suffer

from a major shortcoming. Not only do they foreground the activities of the Translation Bureau over the activities of other publishers, but they also fail to provide empirical evidence for the arguments they form on the Translation Bureau. This further reduces the completeness and reliability of their conclusions. Let us consider a study on translation history as a structure set up on a tripod. One leg of that tripod would be the general historical context within which translation activity takes place. The second leg would be the discourse formed around translations, i.e. theorizing on translation, translation criticism, and statements by translators. The third leg will have to consist of the translated texts themselves. The description and analysis of translational phenomena encountered in these texts will complement and test the data offered by the second leg. Needless to mention, these three legs will be in constant contact with each other, interacting at each stage of the study. I will make sure that my findings and analysis remain grounded in contextualised facts (Strauss and Corbin 1990). The surveys outlined above are based on only one or two legs of the tripod and therefore offer shaky conclusions. My aim is to produce a study with equal weight in all three of the legs. That is why I have included case studies in this thesis. I will describe and analyze two sets of translational corpora, one on translations of popular literature, the other on parallel translations by the Translation Bureau and private publishers. I will supplement the case studies with a critical analysis of discourse formed around translation.

I consider all language use, whether in the form of translated texts or comments on translation, as particular instances of discourse with a strong social dimension. After Fairclough and Wodak (1996), I regard all forms of discourse as social practice with ideological effects pointing at specific power relations. Therefore both translated texts and comments on translations will be regarded as potential sites for

visible or implicit debate with the established or intended socio-political order. Through a critical discourse analysis I aim to reveal the “opaque aspects” of translational discourse and make them visible (Wodak 1997: 173-174).

My criticism of the third common tendency, that of reducing translation strategies to a polarized dichotomy, follows from the two arguments mentioned above. First of all, critical analyses of translated texts demand an approach that explains translational phenomena through a socio-cultural framework. Studies that present translational norms as decisions taken by isolated translators working in a socio-cultural vacuum will contribute little to translation history. In that sense the attributes “adequate” and “acceptable” will only make sense if they are linked to the larger context shaping (or failing to shape) the translators’ decisions. Descriptive Translation Studies provides the necessary tools for this kind of a contextualization. While Gideon Toury elaborated the categories of translational norms, he also indicated how they can be investigated and generalized, *and* linked to larger social phenomena (Toury 1995). Major studies using the descriptive methodology in the world have carefully established connections between translational norms and the social and political contexts shaping them. The two studies by Saliha Paker mentioned previously make use of the terminology and methodology of Descriptive Translation Studies and form examples of proper contextualization.

On the other hand, the dichotomy “acceptability” versus “adequacy” is problematic. It will be clear to those who include empirical phenomena in their studies that the description and analysis of translated texts requires more elaborate and specific terminology than “acceptability” versus “adequacy”. Gideon Toury, who developed these two concepts as the two poles of the “initial norm”, himself suggests, “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” (Toury 1995: 57). Maria Tymoczko stresses the need for a richer spectrum of alternatives while assessing translational norms. In her *Translation in a Postcolonial Context* (1999) she writes,

Theories based on binarisms have become increasingly problematic in a poststructuralist intellectual climate. Middle grounds, alternative possibilities, positions of both/and have opened up in translation studies, as well as in other intellectual domains. The structuralists’ dichotomy of the raw and cooked no longer convinces: experience in our own kitchens shows other options. The raw, the cooked and the rotten. The raw, the cooked, and the burnt. The raw, the marinated, and the cooked. The raw, the fermented, the salted, the pickled, the dried, and the cooked. Or, when things are *à point*, the perfectly raw-and-cooked. In cultural matters, such as translation one cannot generalize from classical logic nor can one apply the law of excluded middle: fuzzy logic rules translation studies as it does most disciplines that analyze human culture (Tymoczko 1999: 140).

The polarization of translational norms proves unproductive in terms of several points. The first one has to do with the risk of over-generalizations. Any degree of adherence to the norms of the source text may run the risk of being classified as adequacy and the differences among texts displaying strategies of adequacy on varying degrees will be smoothed out. It is also true that unless they work on actual texts, researchers are insensitive to what the concepts of adequacy and acceptability actually involve. Therefore translators displaying different strategies in terms of preliminary, textual-linguistic or matricial norms may be labeled under the same norm for different reasons while they radically deviate from that norm in other respects.¹⁴ For instance, a translator may be labeled as ‘pro-adequacy’ because of her tendency to keep the syntax of the source text intact in translation, while she may be

¹⁴ According to Gideon Toury, the “preliminary norm” concerns the existence and nature of a translation policy and the directness of translation. “Matricial” and “textual-linguistic” norms are included in “operational norms”. Operational norms guide the decisions taken during the act of

considered as ‘pro-acceptability’ for using phonetic transcriptions of proper names. It is also true that the adequacy/acceptability dichotomy falls short of explaining the writing strategies of pseudotranslators who may have to produce an “adequate-looking” text to render that text “acceptable” to the target audience. Alternatively, calling an adaptation “extreme form of acceptability” yields little result in terms of analyzing the translator’s construction of the domestic universe within which she embeds the foreign text. Especially in periods and places where borders between indigenous writing and translation are blurred, there arises a need to expand the tools of analysis beyond “acceptability” and “adequacy”. I will return to this issue throughout my analysis of the selected corpus.

The first set of texts I have chosen to analyze, explores translation strategies in the field of popular literature. As the analysis will reveal, translation occupied a different place in the field of popular literature, often overlapping with indigenous literary production. Therefore the analysis of this corpus will also address the critical issue of “authorship in popular literature”.

Case Study I - A Study of Works of Popular Literature by Three Writer-Translators

Includes a descriptive study on the works by the following writer-translators:

Selâmi Münir Yurdatap	<i>Sherlock Holmes'in Arsène Lupin ile Sergüzeşleri - Hindistan Ormanları'nda</i> (1926)	Pseudotranslation
	<i>Mehmetçik Çanakkale'de</i> (1937)	Indigenous
	<i>Drakyola Kan İçen Adam</i> (1940)	Translation
Ali Rıza Seyfi	<i>Kazıklı Voyvoda</i> (1928/1946)	Concealed translation
	<i>Tarzan</i> (1935)	Translation

translation, while material norms affect the fullness and distribution of the translation, and textual-linguistic norms govern the selection of material to formulate the target text in (Toury 1995: 58-59).

	<i>Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir</i> (1940)	Indigenous
Kemal Tahir	<i>Kanun Benim</i> (1954)	Translation (“I, the Jury” by Mickey Spillane)
	<i>Ecel Saati</i> (1955)	Pseudotranslation
	<i>Esir Şehrin İnsanları</i> (1956)	Indigenous

The second case study includes parallel translations from English published by the Translation Bureau and other publishers. A comparison of the strategies used by Translation Bureau translators and others may yield interesting results about the translational norms at work in the Translation Bureau and private publishers.

Case Study II Some translations and retranslations by the Translation Bureau and Other Publishers

Translations of *Gulliver's Travels* by Jonathan Swift:

Cüceeler Memleketinde (1927) translator unknown. Istanbul: Resimli Ay Matbaası.

Cüceeler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri (1935) tr. Ercümend Ekrem Talû. Istanbul: Akşam Kitapevi.

Gulliver Cüceeler Ülkesinde (1941) Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi.

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II (1943) tr. İrfan Şahinbaş. Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri III-IV (1944) tr. İrfan Şahinbaş. Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II (1946) tr. İrfan Şahinbaş. Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.

Cüceeler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri (1946) tr. Ercümend Ekrem Talû. Istanbul: Kanaat Kitapevi.

Gulliver Cüceeler Ülkesinde (1960) tr. Arif Gelen. Köy ve Eğitim Yayınları.

Güliver'in Maceraları (undated), tr. M. Doğan Özbay, İyigün Yayınları.

Translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll:

Alisin Sergüzeştləri (1932) tr. Ahmet Cevat, Muhit Mecmuası.

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1944) tr. Muzaffer Beşli and Naime Halit Yaşar, Ahmet Halit Kitabevi.

Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde (1946) tr. Kısmet Burian, Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde (1953) tr. Azize Erten, Varlık Yayınları.

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1956) tr. Nurettin Ardıç, Rafet Zaimler Kitabevi.

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1960) tr. Leylâ Soydaş and Bige Atasagun, İyigün Yayınları.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

In the first part of this chapter, I offered a critical review of some historical studies tackling translation activity in early republican Turkey. I challenged these studies based on three points. My first criticism rested on the content of these studies. I concluded that most of them focus only on the activities of the Translation Bureau and therefore offer the reader a restricted and reductive view of republican translation history. My second criticism was about the methodology these studies follow pointing out that although they offer the reader conclusions about translational norms and strategies, they mainly derive their results from secondary material and do not deal directly with translated texts. My final criticism was about the binarist approach adopted by these studies towards translation strategies.

In the rest of Chapter 1, I will offer my approach towards translation history in Turkey in 1923-1960. In the beginning of the Introduction I mentioned some questions shaping my perspective of the field of translation in early republican Turkey. Those questions concerned the various functions and definitions of translation in the face of a socio-cultural environment in rapid transformation. The answers to these questions will not only have implications for the field of translation, but will also provide insight about other social and cultural forces that may, at first sight, appear to be irrelevant to translation. Translation is at the nexus of several sites such as politics, society, culture and literature and its study bears results that are beyond its limits as a textual process.

1.2.1 Nationalism, Literature and Translation

Scholars have drawn our attention to the role played by language and literature in politics, especially within the context of the rise of European nationalism in the 19th century (see for example Anderson 1991; Jusdanis 1991; Even-Zohar 1996). Vernacular, or re-standardized languages mediated through printed literature played an important role in creating what Even-Zohar (1996: 5) terms “socio-cultural cohesion” in processes of nation-building. Print-language, as a standardized form of the vernacular, served the creation of “imagined communities”, i.e. nations, and built particular solidarities among groups (Anderson 1991: 133). As I will illustrate in Chapter 2, the Turkish alphabet and language reforms, and to varying degrees all of the republican reforms, were realized in deep awareness of the “imagined” aspects of nations. and in that sense, the power-holders appear to have followed a model of nationalism which had already been created elsewhere. In other words, the Turkish “nation” seems to be the product of “pirating” (Anderson 1991: 81) like many other

nation-states formed by communities who became engaged in “belated modernity” (Jusdanis 1991: 40).

The formation of literary canons has been found to be of paramount importance in the making of nations. Literary canons serve as links between a nation’s past and present. Their basic role is to keep the past alive (as a common backdrop that unites the members of the nation) and to create values which continue to exert their authority on the works of the present day (Jusdanis 1991: 60). They also serve to reinforce a sense of nationhood as Gregory Jusdanis (1991: 59) writes: “The canon serves as a utopian site of continuous textuality in which a nation, a class, or an individual may find an undifferentiated identity.” Jusdanis also shows how the process of literary canonization takes place as a project of the revival of works by great authors, “founding geniuses ” (1991: 59) and as a means of creating “a hierarchy of prized texts transmitted through time” (1991: 60). As I will demonstrate in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 the project of literary canonization in early republican Turkey seems to diverge from this idea in one major way. For reasons that I will explore in the following chapters, officials, writers and publishers did not attempt to revive the works of Turkish writers or poets belonging to previous ages, neither did they envisage a canon composed of Turkish works. I suggest that they focused on the future, rather than on the past, in creating the literary canon. They foresaw and encouraged the emergence of a new Turkish literature, not as something that would derive its sources from the Turkish literary past but from western literature. In Chapter 3, I will argue that they “imported” a literary canon from the West in the expectation that this canon would give rise to a new literature that would be uniquely Turkish.

The role explicitly attributed to translation within this process of importation is beyond any dispute. The works on translation activity in early republican Turkey have almost exclusively focused on this aspect of translation, as I have illustrated in the previous section. These works have explained the reason behind direct reliance on translation for creating a corpus of canonical texts in terms of the westernization efforts of the young Republic, especially in the single-party era of 1923-1945. Based on the claims of these studies, westernization and translation become inseparable concepts within the republican context. To these I would like to add the concept of “canonization” and tackle “literary canonization” as part of the westernization project. In line with some of the studies I review in the Introduction, I will suggest that in some of its forms translation was put in the service of both westernization and literary canonization. This will enable me to contextualize the task of the Translation Bureau within the project of westernization in clearer terms as an institution of canon formation. Yet my initial survey on the field of translation in early republican Turkey has indicated that there was no uniform view of translation as a political tool. The data I offered in the previous section further reveals that, at least in the field of translated American and English literature, the Translation Bureau produced only 9 per cent of the titles in the market of translated literature from English. The intended function of translation activity in the remaining 91 per cent has not been explored and we have little reason to believe that westernization was the only idea that translation activity was uniformly associated with across the whole market of translated literature. It is certainly worth to carry out an investigation into other segments of the field of translation than those controlled by the Translation Bureau in order to find out whether there were other intended functions or other socio-cultural concepts associated with translation. As I indicated above, the main idea behind my

hypothesis is the lack of a singular and uniform view of translation in the system of translated literature in Turkey in 1923-1960 despite planning attempts aiming to create (and even to impose) such a view.

1.2.2 Culture Planning

I have decided to use the concept of “culture planning” while exploring the intervention of the state in both the public and the private spheres, including that of translation. There are several reasons for my choice. First of all, “planning” implies a deliberate act of intervention (Even-Zohar 1994: 5) which suggests an ideological agenda. Secondly, “planning” makes it possible to account for all acts of intervention by the state as parts of a larger programme. These acts can be as wide-ranging as the alphabet reform (1928), or as specific as the setting up of a state conservatory (1936). By introducing a relational view of culture, the concept of “planning” links numerous instances of intervention regardless of their range and scope into a meaningful structure. Finally, “planning” implies an endeavour, rather than a finished project, enabling one to question the success of the planning efforts (Even-Zohar 1997a: 3).

My use of “planning” distinguishes itself from the concept of “planned” or “centrally planned” culture which is strictly associated with government regulation of a specific field. Planning, whether conspicuous or implicit, can be undertaken not only by state institutions but also by free agents in the society. A conception of culture planning as an activity that is not confined to official institutions can be found in the work of Itamar Even-Zohar. His theory provides an outlook that can account for planning initiatives undertaken individually or collectively at diverse locations, both within and outside of the centre of political power. This is evident in

Even-Zohar's conception of culture planning: "as a deliberate act of intervention, either by power holders or by 'free agents,' into an extant or a crystallizing repertoire" (Even-Zohar 1997: 2). Regardless of the status of the planners, the ultimate aim of planning is to attain control over the field which is subject to planning. Such a view allows us to see the social and the cultural fields as sites of struggle among different groups of agents, rather than as sites controlled by unitary and homogenous collectivities. This view has direct implications for my perception of the field of translation in early republican Turkey. Historical studies on translation activity spanning through the 1920s-1950s present a picture of a centrally controlled and centrally defined field, operating in terms of the norms offered by the state officials, writers, translators and the Translation Bureau. Combining this idea with the idea of "peripheral planning" leads to a view of the field of translation as a site shaped by multiple planning efforts.

It is true that the planning efforts of those who have more symbolic capital¹⁵ (Bourdieu 1993: 7) are likely to succeed over the efforts of agents that are marginal(ized) and have less access to cultural, economic and political means. Nevertheless, it is assumed that any planning effort that succeeds or fails in overthrowing or transforming a given repertoire will end up generating socio-cultural energy (Even-Zohar 1997a: 3), introducing major or minor options to the existing repertoire. When analyzed in terms of "planning", the activities of the Translation Bureau appear both as "planned" and "planning" acts. In his "Translation as a Means of Planning and the Planning of Translation", Gideon Toury shows how translation has been used both as an object of planning, being subject to programmes which modified source languages and translation strategies selected and employed by

¹⁵ "Symbolic Capital refers to degree of accumulated prestige, celebrity, consecration or honour" (Bourdieu 1993: 7).

translators, *and* as an instrument of cultural change, affecting changes in other cultural and social fields in the Hebrew culture (Toury in press b). Therefore, while the Translation Bureau was a product of planning, in terms of the selection of works for translation and the translational norms to be observed, it was also an instrument of planning. Through the Bureau's activities new options for the Turkish repertoire of translated literature were created, which in turn, had significant reflections on the Turkish system of culture.

It is also a fact that the Translation Bureau as a state-sponsored institution had significant symbolic capital which deemed its planning efforts more likely to succeed, or at least more visible. How are we, then, to account for the translational and literary behaviour displayed by those people or groups of people located away from the literary centre largely defined by politics? What was the status of those people who became or remained peripheral mainly because they resisted the views advocated by the centre? How did the silent majority respond to the planning efforts of the Translation Bureau? This majority made up a group of considerable size whose very silence constrained its influence on the cultural and literary systems, therefore depriving it of symbolic power. I maintain that these groups were also engaged in culture planning, although not as conspicuously and systematically as those whose convictions lay in the strength of state authority. I argue that their planning was carried out through the options they offered for the repertoire of culture, rather than through their rhetoric, unlike the agents associated with the Translation Bureau, who offered their options inside a package wrapped up in well-articulated discourse.

1.2.2.1 Repertoire, Options and Resistance

Before I set out to explore the evidence in support of my arguments there are a number of concepts which need to be clarified. First of all, the concepts of “repertoire” and “option” which are so closely linked with the concept of culture planning, demand some explanation. Even-Zohar (1994:2) suggests that the planning of culture is creating new options for a repertoire. In his terms, the cultural repertoire is “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 1997b: 355). The use of the term “options” points at two significant aspects of Even-Zohar’s theory. First of all, it indicates that he perceives of cultural transformation as a process of decision-making, entailing choices to be made among different alternatives. Secondly, the broad scope of the term “option” helps us define culture in both material and intangible terms. In other words, we can think of culture both in terms of goods, such as books or works of art, and of more abstract tools for the organization of life, such as social skills or norms of behaviour (Even-Zohar 1997c: 2-4). As the system of translated literature is a part of the system of culture, the same view would be valid for the translation repertoire. In other words, I suggest that the repertoire of the system of translated literature not only includes translated texts, but more abstract aspects of translation activity such as ways of looking at and speaking about translation. Seen from this perspective, options in the translation repertoire are composed of translational norms and policies as well as translated texts.

Locating the repertoire of translated literature in relation to other repertoires available in the system of culture can reveal the points of contact among these repertoires, enabling one to map their interaction. In the following chapters I will

explore how new options for the translation repertoire correlate with other options for culture at large, such as the discussion and the gradual adoption of the Latin alphabet (Chapter 2) and the establishment and the closure of the Village Institutes (Chapter 2). I will also elaborate on how various options in the repertoire of literature developed, by tracing their trajectory within the system of translated literature. Even-Zohar (1997b: 358) maintains that the making of culture repertoires takes place via two routes, “invention” and “import” – hence my use of the term “import” to refer to the process whereby intellectuals¹⁶ and state officials resorted to western literature in order to create a new literary canon for Turkey. According to Even-Zohar, successful instances of import are translated into “transfer”, i.e. they become integrated in the home repertoire (1997b: 358.). By making use of the concepts of “invention”, “import” and “transfer”, I will analyze the genesis of certain options in the system of literature, such as the rise of “village” literature, detective fiction and the dime novel, and where possible, reveal their relationship to options in the system of translated literature. My discussion of the different aspects of the system of translated literature will draw on André Lefevere’s concept of “poetics”. Lefevere defines “poetics” as “an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols” combined with “a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be, in the social system as a whole” (Lefevere 1992: 26). I will argue that the system of translated literature in early republican Turkey was shaped by two different forms of poetics that resulted from the tension between two different literary and translatorial habituses. I suggest that the poetics introduced by the state.

¹⁶ Throughout the thesis I use the term “intellectuals” to refer to a group of educated people involved in intellectual pursuits, such as politics, teaching, writing, or the arts. My usage of this term derives from the way the term “münevverler” was widely used during the period under study. For instance, the Translation Bureau’s journal *Tercüme* included a cover note in its first issue that read, “We present the *Tercüme* journal to the Turkish intellectuals and ask those who consider themselves as

through its cultural network, was not able to overthrow the poetics that reigned in the field of popular literature, which had its roots in the pre-republican literary past. In my view, the themes and literary strategies codified by these two forms of poetics also created a duality in the field of translated literature.

The various options offered by writers, translators and publishers led to the formation of two different literary repertoires in early republican Turkey. One of these repertoires was regarded as “canonical” whereas the second one was considered “non-canonical” and was discredited to a large degree. Nevertheless, one should bear in mind that not all imported options are integrated into the home repertoire (Even-Zohar 1997b: 359). Some of the options offered as a part of culture planning efforts may not be met with general acceptance and fail to become instances of “transfer”. Such failures are caused by resistance shown by target groups addressed by the planners (Even-Zohar 1997a: 4). The concept of “resistance” which plays a key role in my hypothesis requires some elucidation. Even-Zohar (1997a: 4) defines resistance as “a form of unwillingness towards the advocated, or inculcated, repertoire”. He suggests that resistance may take place in “passive” or “active” modes. In passive resistance, people ignore the new options and avoid their usage. Active resistance involves an overt struggle against the planned repertoire (Even-Zohar 1997a: 4-5). In the following chapters, I will explore the response of publishers and translators towards the new translation repertoire offered by the agents in the “centre”. The evidence in the form of discourse on translation and the selection of titles to be translated suggests that some private publishers and translators responded to the new repertoire positively, accepting and confirming its options. Furthermore, they actively contributed to the planned repertoire with options

intellectuals to assist us” [“Tercüme mecmuasını Türk münevverlerine takdim ediyor ve kendilerini bu vasıfta sayanları bize yardıma davet ediyoruz”].

that conformed to the basic features of the new repertoire (Chapters 3 and 4). I will also provide evidence indicating that some publishers and translators who were active in the field of popular literature ignored the new repertoire. These groups continued to be engaged in specific forms of publishing and translating that did not comply with the principles and norms propagated by the planners (Chapters 3, 4 and 5). I will argue that these publishers and translators were involved in “active resistance” in that they not only ignored the options offered by the planners but also developed and maintained an alternative repertoire of translated literature, resulting in the preservation of a separate poetics.

So far, my argument has been based on a conception of culture as consisting of systems with central and peripheral positions occupied by various agents or groups of agents whose interactions lead to dynamism and change in the respective systems. The idea of culture planning which I borrow from Even-Zohar is also based on a systemic view of culture, which by and large, operates on an idea that regards cultural change as a phenomenon driven by the tension between the centre and the periphery (Even-Zohar 1990: 16). Nevertheless, my understanding of “system” and its “centre” and “periphery” positions is somewhat different from Even-Zohar’s. In the present thesis, I intend to offer a view of the cultural, literary and translation systems in Turkey in the 1920s-1950s, providing room for not only the positions occupied by texts, but also by agents. This will help me avoid the disadvantages of strict classifications created by various binarisms that are inherent in a formalist systems theory that uses its explanatory tools to explore cultural dynamics via texts, rather than subjects or collectivities of subjects.

1.2.3 Systems, Agents and Habitus

Even-Zohar's idea of culture planning is based on his polysystem theory whereby he offers a view of all cultural and social phenomena as parts of larger systems whose components are interdependent. Even-Zohar terms these larger systems "polysystem" which he defines as "a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent" (1990: 11). Such a view of culture enables one to see the interrelationships among different fields and account for changes in them. It becomes possible to associate changes in translation and literature with political developments, or alternatively, political events may be revealed to have been triggered by literary movements as exemplified by the role literature assumed in the making of a modern Greek national identity (Jusdanis 1991). It is also widely acknowledged that the polysystem theory contributed to a "cultural turn" in translation studies, making the study of translation synonymous with the study of culture (Hermans 1999: 118). However, when one takes a step beyond the polysystem theory's unproblematic claim to offer "relational thinking" (Even-Zohar 1997d: 1) and starts examining its fundamental properties, a series of questions emerge. These questions mainly have to do with the "dynamic stratification" principle which underlies the binary oppositions that polysystem theory uses to classify and explain cultural observables and their transformation over time. Let me offer Even-Zohar's own formulation of this principle and then focus on its problematic aspects:

These systems are not equal, but hierarchized within the polysystem. It is the permanent tension between the various strata which constitutes the (dynamic) *synchronic* state of the system. It is the prevalence of one set of systemic options over another which constitutes the change on the *diachronic* axis. In

this centrifugal vs. centripetal motion, systemic options may be driven from a central position to a marginal one while others may be pushed into the center and prevail. However, with a polysystem one must not think in terms of *one* center and *one* periphery, since several such positions are hypothesized. A move may take place, for instance, whereby a certain item (element, function) is transferred from the periphery of one system to the periphery of an adjacent system within the same polysystem, and then may or may not move on to the center of the latter (Even-Zohar 1997e: 9).

The above paragraph explains the major binary opposition that prevails in the polysystem theory, that of “centre” and “periphery”. The idea of shifting hierarchies indeed helps one to conceptualize historical cultural change within a clearly-defined model. Even-Zohar avoids a view of cultural systems as unitary and homogenous structures by providing the possibility for the co-existence of more than one system, and therefore more than one centre and periphery. However, how the hierarchization among the different systems takes place is unclear. Without cultural agents, i.e. people, it would be impossible to create the value-judgments that lead to the various hierarchies. Furthermore, Even-Zohar uses the passive form to describe functions that are in fact performed by people and not by self-generating systems as the above quote implies. Notice the following usages: “these systems are not equal, but **hierarchized** within the polysystem”, “systemic options **may be driven** from a central position to a marginal one while others **may be pushed** into the centre and prevail”, “a certain item **is transferred** from the periphery of one system to the periphery of an adjacent system within the same polysystem”. This depersonalized approach makes it difficult to inquire into who actually performs or leads to the performance of the movement of the different items. Moreover, it makes the polysystem theory a text-bound one (Hermans 1999: 118), conceptualizing cultural dynamics in terms of what texts do, rather than what people make texts do. This becomes even more evident in the pairs canonized/non-canonized (Even-Zohar 1990:

15) and primary/secondary (Even-Zohar 1990: 21) which strictly pertain to texts. The questions of who defines canonicity or primary value are untouched.

Although Even-Zohar's polysystem theory offers valuable insight into how the cultural and literary fields are structured and how they change over time, it falls short of explaining the human element behind these structures. Even-Zohar has abundantly made up for the absence of the human element in his later work, especially in the 1990s when he explicitly incorporated "people" into his paradigm (see for example 1997b and 1998). This is most evident in his use of the concept of "planning" which inevitably involves "planners". Nevertheless, in my view, a revision of the polysystem theory, this time including hypotheses on how people affect systems as well as how they are affected by them, is necessary. Although Even-Zohar (1998: 364) argues, "So the agents, the people, as in Halliday's and Bourdieu's approaches, have since long been integral part of any version of the Polysystem Theory ... have been fully explicit in 'polysystemic' studies of cultural dynamics", his own formulations of the polysystem theory suggest otherwise. He comes closest to the idea of agency in his use of the term "institutions of culture" (1997e: 5) and even then, does not take the step to acknowledge the people that create these institutions. In that sense the polysystem theory remains grounded on its structuralist roots as criticized by various authors (Gentzler 1993: 114-121; Hermans 1999: 118). Anthony Pym (1998: 115) refers to the systems theory as "a product of the *Aufklärung* projection of functional totalities, based on a belief in the meaningfulness of nature grasped as a whole" and adds, "I like to oppose it to the Humanist attention to detail and historical accuracy". What I aim to do is not to oppose the polysystem theory and replace it with exclusive focus on the concept of agency. I intend to expand the conceptual tools of the polysystem theory to include

the human element that actually creates the structures and the classifications the theory is based on. So while I explore how translated texts are positioned in the centre or the periphery of the various systems that make up the cultural polysystem I will consider the way people position them. When I deal with the role of translation in the making of a literary canon, I will consider the work of the agents that ultimately led to that process, or the agents that were affected by that process.

One question remains. If agents are, deliberately or inadvertently, the factors behind the emergence and the dynamism of the systems, what is the force that structures human behaviour? I suggest that we need to look at the interaction between the agent and the various systems to locate the forces that shape human action and perception.

In contrast to the principal polysystem theory, Even-Zohar turns an eye on how people drive the cultural machine by granting them an active role vis-à-vis cultural change as providers and users of various options in his work on repertoires. He does this by creating a new framework that incorporates agency and includes such terms as “planners” (1994: 16), “consumer” (1990b: 36), “producer” (1990b: 34), “innovator” (1994: 5), “resistance” (1997a: 4), “entrepreneurs” (1997a: 4) and “anonymous contributors” (1997b: 357). Even-Zohar’s idea of repertoires and the options making up the repertoire do not consist of disparate elements. He introduces the idea of “models”, i.e. pre-organized options, that people make use of in their production and consumption of repertoires (Even-Zohar 1990b: 41). This accounts for the structures that make people favour similar repertoric choices and that create regularities of behaviour. Yet where do these models come from? The answer needs to be sought in the interaction between the individuals and the systems they operate in.

Even-Zohar borrows Pierre Bourdieu's notion of "habitus" as "a mediating mechanism between social webs and the actual practices performed by individual actors" (Sheffy 1997: 37) to supplement his framework. He suggests that the habitus theory provides a "link between the socially generated repertoire and the procedures of individual inculcation and internalization" (Even-Zohar 1990b: 42). Bourdieu maintains that the source of individual action "resides neither in the consciousness nor in things but in the relationship between two stages of the social, that is, between the history objectified in things, in the form of institutions, and the history incarnated in bodies, in the form of that system of enduring dispositions which I call habitus" (Bourdieu 1990: 190). According to Bourdieu, habitus is a "second nature" formed by a series of dispositions that generate practices and perceptions. These dispositions are the result of a long process of inculcation, starting from childhood, incorporating the social conditions which generate them – thus they are "structured structures" (Bourdieu 1993: 5). In this sense of the concept, habitus can be regarded an element of the polysystem just as any other item, moved around by the (depersonalized) hierarchies that form the various strata within the systems. However, Bourdieu suggests that habituses are also "structuring structures", because they can generate practices that are adjusted to specific situations (Bourdieu 1993: 5). This is the idea that grants an active aspect to the concept of agency in Bourdieu's thought. Habitus is not a structure that moves along with the current, but is capable of being translated into alternative practices that can actually change the direction of the current. The specific dynamism of the habitus concept is based on the idea of "power". Bourdieu suggests that the motive of social life is to seek power over classifications, or distinction (Bourdieu 1996: 479). The resources people use during their pursuit of

distinction are the different forms of capital, mainly “economic”, “cultural” and “symbolic” capital (Bourdieu 1993 :7).

While the concept of culture planning and its various conceptual instruments enable the researcher to shed light upon the various struggles, i.e. pursuits for distinction, within the system of culture, the binary classifications offered by the polysystems theory (centre/periphery; canonized/non-canonized; primary/secondary) obscure the relations between the agents and the systems. I will make use of the habitus concept when I explore how individuals or groups of individuals relate to the changing structure of the polysystem.

The habitus concept can also be instrumental in revealing the structuring role of translators vis-à-vis the translational norms. In other words, the elaboration of a concept of “translatorial habitus” enables a view of the translator’s work not only as an activity governed by pre-determined patterns, but also as an activity that contributes to the making of norms (Simeoni 1998: 21-22).

1.2.3.1 Translator’s Habitus and Norms

Any attempt at explaining the dynamism of the translation system without losing sight of its relation to other systems, e.g. politics, culture, literature, begs for a methodology that can contextualise the way translations are done. This methodology is largely supplied by Gideon Toury’s descriptive approach which focuses on the role of norms in translation (Toury 1995). Within the context of Toury’s work, norms can be considered as regularities of behaviour which underlie the strategic decisions taken by translators during their process of translation. According to Toury, regularities of behaviour are the main source in any study of norms (Toury 1995: 55).

Like Bourdieu's concept of habitus, norms are also acquired during one's process of socialization (Toury 1995: 55), yet unlike the structuring aspect of habitus, norms imply conformity and the decisions governed by norms "tend to be highly *patterned*" (Toury 1995: 147). Daniel Simeoni suggests that the overwhelming majority of translators subject themselves to the valid norms of their professions – a tendency he names *servitude* after Marja Jänis (1996). Yet, he claims, this conformity is a voluntary one, because translators more or less consciously follow models they assimilate during their professional training and practice (Simeoni 1998: 23). In Simeoni's view, the translatorial habitus uses its structuring force to reinforce the current order. He suggests that translators use their agentive power to contribute to the perpetuation of translational norms, adding that "norms do prevail, but translators govern norms as much as their behaviour is governed by them" (Simeoni 1998: 23). I would like to take this idea one step further to suggest that translators in acquisition of different translatorial habituses may use their agentive power to resist norms, or may become engaged in a programme to perpetuate a different set of norms than those propagated by the holders of symbolic power, located at the centre of the system of translation. This is the main idea that underlies the resistance hypothesis of the present thesis. This view also leads to a questioning of "regularities of behaviour" as the main source of the study of norms, since different translatorial habituses will lead to different forms of translational behaviour, making "irregularities" just as worthy a study object as "regularities".

The case of the early republican Turkey provides an interesting example for how translatorial habituses are restructured or resist restructuring under translation planning by official bodies. It further offers rich material for a study of the links between the translatorial habitus of various practitioners and the concepts of

translation surfacing in individual works. In that sense it is imperative to inquire into the overlaps or gaps between the translator's discourse on translation and his/her translation practice. Just as translational norms need to be explored on two levels, i.e. the level of textual and extratextual material (Toury 1995: 65), translatorial habituses need to be explored not only in the available discourse of the translator in the form of prefaces, interviews or memoirs, but also in translation practice. Yet one should also introduce a caveat about the conclusions one will obtain as a result of studies on translatorial habituses: translatorial habituses are always in the making and therefore never final (Simeoni 1998: 31). So all conclusions about translatorial habitus, at an individual or collective level, will be tentative and time-dependent.

The habitus concept does not pose a threat for the Descriptive Translation Studies framework. The incorporation of habitus into a study on translational norms will only expand and enrich that study's scope by introducing a translator-based approach to what is largely a product or text-based methodology. This will enable the present thesis to introduce a mediating concept between the texts and the general cultural context which will lead to a stronger conceptual bridge between socio-cultural phenomena and the translational norms observed (or resisted) by different translators.

1.3 Methodology

The present thesis focuses on the uses, definitions and strategies of translation in a socio-cultural setting in rapid transformation. In what preceded this section, I elaborated on the theoretical concepts that shape my perspective to cultural and translational phenomena, namely "culture planning", "system" and "habitus". These

concepts will underlie my analysis of the forces that shaped the system of translation in Turkey in 1923-1960. As I pointed out in the Introduction, this analysis will consist of a tripartite approach made up of a study of the historical cultural context, of the discourse formed around translation and of translated texts.

Although it combines a variety of sources pertaining to the three fields referred to above, this thesis is fundamentally about the “discourses” of translation. It acts on the assumption that all texts, including translated texts and secondary texts on translation or on phenomena related to translation, are forms of “discourse”. The concept of “discourse” enables me to site linguistic action in relation to its socio-cultural determinants. As Norman Fairclough (1995: 73) suggests, discourse denotes language use that is “imbricated in social relations and processes which systematically determine variations in its properties”. A comprehensive study on discourse must be based on the integrated analysis of the intentionality and perspective of the speaking/writing agents, the interaction between them and their addressees, the context, the power relations and the ideological structures that impinge upon them (van Dijk 1997: 7-34). According to such a view of discourse, statements on translation *and* translations themselves become practices of social interaction. Thus translations, as well as discourse about translation, become instruments which agents use in their pursuit of distinction in their respective fields while the discourses they form will always originate from their respective habituses.

The historical data available for the purposes of this thesis are made up of two forms of discourse which can be classified as textual (translated texts) and extratextual (statements on translation) discourse (Toury 1995: 65). The analysis of both the textual and the extratextual material will be carried out in line with the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis which maintain that discursive practices

may have ideological effects and produce or reproduce power relations whose nature may not always be so clear to people. Critical discourse analysis aims to make these “opaque aspects of discourse” more visible (Wodak 1997: 173-174).

Critical discourse analysis enables the present thesis to view translation as social practice and to look at translated texts and translation activity in terms of their interaction with the larger structure of power relationships. Translated texts and discourse on translation may also be revealed to have an “opaque aspect” and this can only be explored through a critical perspective. The critical approach to translational discourse will require a review of a wide range of phenomena which may not always appear to be directly relevant to translation, in other words, it will require a proper contextualization of such discourse.

The textual material, i.e. translated texts, further requires a methodology that can account for its status as a mediated text originating from a (actual or hypothetical) source text. I will offer two case studies on textual discourse and carry out an analysis based on Descriptive Translation Studies (Toury 1995) which will involve a comparison of target texts with their sources in order to uncover the norms observed (or resisted) by translators. I will further elaborate on the issue of norms and the descriptive methodology in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 as I present my case studies. I will also engage myself in a discussion of how translatorial habituses can be explored in a historical context especially in relation to their structured and structuring positions vis-à-vis translational norms.

As mentioned in the Introduction, in Chapter 6, I will analyze some fictitious¹⁷ (pseudotranslations) and concealed translations¹⁸ which are somewhat problematic in terms of their relationship to a source text. I share Toury’s opinion

¹⁷ “... texts which have been presented as translations with no corresponding source texts in other languages ever having existed ...” (Toury 1995:40).

asserting the possibility of using pseudotranslations as legitimate objects of study in translation studies (Toury 1995: 46). The cultural circumstances which give rise to them as well as the textual strategies employed by the pseudotranslators can supply significant insight into a society's concept of translation, as well as its expectations from it. Based on this assumption I will carry out an investigation of the thematic and stylistic features of pseudotranslations selected for this study.

Between the two forms of discourse referred to above, i.e. textual and extratextual, there lies another form of discourse which is more difficult to classify and analyze: the paratext. Defined as "those liminal devices and conventions, both within the book (*peritext*) and outside it (*epitext*), that mediate the book to the reader: titles and subtitles, pseudonyms, forewords, dedications, epigraphs, prefaces, intertitles, notes, epilogues, and afterwords" (Macksey 1997: xviii), paratextual discourse will be subjected to the same treatment as other forms of discourse in this thesis and be analyzed in its capacity as social action. I will borrow Gerard Genette's terms and concepts in my classification of the data offered by the available paratexts. The framework he elaborates in his *Paratexts* (1997) will guide me through my exploration of the titles, subtitles, forewords, prefaces, notes, reviews and other paratextual elements I encounter in and about the books included in the case studies. This framework will also enable me to situate the concepts of anonymity and pseudonymity within a socio-historical context.

¹⁸ Translations which have been presented as indigenous texts in the target culture.

1.4 Summary

Chapter 1 offers a survey of current views on modern Turkish translation history and outlines the theoretical framework and the main hypothesis of the present thesis. It explains the culture planning approach selected to link the socio-cultural transformation Turkey underwent in the initial decades of the republican period with the system of translated literature. It offers a critical review of Even-Zohar's polysystem theory as the backbone of the culture planning approach and concludes that the lack of a concept of active agency in the polysystem theory has been largely overcome in Even-Zohar's more recent works. It is further suggested that Pierre Bourdieu's concept of habitus can be used in order to reinforce the human element in the polysystem theory and in Descriptive Translation Studies. Chapter 1 also describes the methodology of the thesis consisting of Critical Discourse Analysis and Descriptive Translation Studies.

Chapter 2 will offer the general historical background of Turkey in 1923-1960, exploring the republican reforms and the shift in cultural policies starting in 1946 in terms of the concept of culture planning.

Chapter 2

Planning and De-planning:

The System of Culture in Turkey in 1923-1960

The comprehensive and rapid changes that took place in the Turkish system of culture following the proclamation of the Republic point at the intricate relationship between the systems of politics and culture. In this chapter, I will argue that both systems influenced each other reciprocally and as major parts of a vast programme of planning, they generated concepts and practices which were reproduced by other systems, such as the systems of education, literature and translation. I will also offer a descriptive analysis of some of the significant political and cultural changes Turkey underwent within the first forty years of the republican period. The focus will be on events and concepts that had close correlation with the field of translation. After a brief introduction of republican reforms in general, and the language reform in specific, I will take up the concepts of westernization and “humanism” as the main ideological and philosophical infrastructure of the republican reforms. In the second part of the chapter I will present a brief review of the changing political climate in Turkey after the adoption of the multi-party system, suggesting that this meant a gradual withdrawal of the initial planners and their replacement with new planners who came to power with a new stock of political and cultural options.

2.1 Planning: the Young Republic

When the Republic was proclaimed in 1923, Turkey had just gone through a three-year war of liberation against occupying powers and was opening a new page in its history as a new country under a new name and a new political system which placed westernization at its crux. The Ottoman Empire had been pre-occupied with the question of modernization and westernization since the 18th century, but it was the republican era under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, which finally institutionalized this movement. The first twenty years of the republic were marked by intensive planning activity which aimed to westernize Turkey while building a nation equipped with a unique Turkish identity. Here I am using the word 'nation' in Benedict Anderson's sense as "an imagined political community – ... both inherently limited and sovereign" (1991: 6). Anderson connects the rise of nations to two preceding systems that they came to replace: the religious community and the dynastic realm (1991: 12). This argument holds true for the case of Turkey which attempted to create a sentiment of nationhood for its citizens to replace an identity based on religion, i.e. Islam. The young republic was trying to establish a new and secular Turkish identity which would ideally rise upon a common culture, language and history instead of religion (Güvenç 1997:225, 245; Yamaner 1998: 197, 201). This new national identity was constructed through a series of essentially secular reforms which have endured many a storm in Turkish politics until our day. As sociologist Emre Kongar writes,

Since Islam dominated all areas of social, political, cultural and economic spheres of the Empire, not only as a religion, but also as a way of living, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his friends attacked religious dogmatism in order to launch a new socio-cultural reform program. Such an act was quite

meaningful from the political point of view too, as the ousted Sultan-Caliph and the old regime took their legitimate political authority from Islamic institutions (Kongar 1986:27).

This reform programme has had strong implications on not only how the Turkish state was run but also on how people went about living their daily lives. The reforms include, among many others, unity in education (1924), adoption of Western time and calendar (1925), adoption of the international numeric system (1928), and the alphabet reform (1928). These reforms may also be considered the elements of an emerging repertoire in Turkey. The planners located in the centre of the political system, namely Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and officials and writers associated with the Republican People's Party, worked out all of these reforms as a series of options for the political and cultural repertoires in Turkey.

The idea of establishing this western-oriented repertoire was not a novel one. The Ottoman Empire had become receptive to western influences since the 18th century through military innovations, trade and diplomatic relations. These influences became more and more intense as Europe's military superiority over the Empire grew. In the 19th century some Ottoman subjects spoke western languages, studied in the West and started advocating for western political and cultural institutions. By the early 20th century, the military, educational and legal systems as well as the bureaucracy had undergone a number of western-inspired reforms.

The republican regime incorporated these reforms into a more planned programme which constituted various elements of an emerging cultural repertoire. The cultural repertoire which was being proposed, aimed to reinforce a sense of nationhood required to keep the citizens together who had, until not long ago, upheld a set of different and dispersed values. The making of this repertoire was not an easy task. It demanded laborious planning and execution, which would fail unless the

planners could manufacture some form of social consent. As Ernest Renan pointed out in a celebrated lecture he gave in 1882, "(A nation) presupposes a past; it is summarized however, in the present by a tangible fact, namely, consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life. A nation's existence is, if you will pardon the metaphor, a daily plebiscite, just as an individual's existence is a perpetual affirmation of life" (Renan 1991: 19). Itamar Even-Zohar terms this consent "socio-cultural cohesion". He writes: "By 'socio-cultural cohesion', I mean a state where a widely spread sense of solidarity, or togetherness, exists among a group of people, which consequently does not require conduct enforced by sheer physical power. It seems to me that the basic, key concept to such socio-cultural cohesion is *readiness*, or *proneness*" (Even-Zohar 1994:6). The way to achieve such socio-cultural cohesion is through planning of culture in a given entity, in other words, creating new options for its repertoire (Even-Zohar 1994: 4).

The reforms realized in the first fifteen years of the republic have all had a crucial role in creating and maintaining the new Turkish identity which was based on a new repertoire composed of a largely western inventory. Perhaps the most influential of all reforms was the alphabet reform which re-shaped the cultural configuration of the newly-founded Republic.

2.1.1 Language Planning

In the modernization and nation-building efforts of many societies, language has emerged as a significant instrument. It is no coincidence that nationalism flourished in Europe only after vernacular languages firmly established themselves (Jusdanis 1991: 41). Creation of a feeling of a community also entailed the necessity to create

a common language. In Europe, that language was mainly Latin until the 16th century which had given rise to an “imagined” Christian community. The rise of vernaculars shifted the focus of the “imagined community” towards a linguistic one from a religious basis. This led to “a larger process in which the sacred communities integrated by old sacred languages were gradually fragmented, pluralized and territorialized” (Anderson 1991: 19). People speaking shared languages that were asserted and standardized through the printing press, developed a distinct consciousness that was to result in nationalism (Anderson 1991:67-80). If we consider the Turkish nation as an imagined construct in Anderson’s sense, rather than a factual entity, then we can suggest that the making of modern Turkey partly owes to the drastic changes introduced in the linguistic field.

In Anderson’s scheme there is no place for a centrally planned language policy that underlay the rise of vernaculars in Europe. Rather, Anderson presents the development of vernaculars as a process spanning through several centuries, triggered by the rediscovery of the humanist works, Europe’s expansion through voyages of discovery and conquest, and finally the invention of the printing-press. However, not all linguistic changes come in the form of natural evolution. In their individual struggles for power, groups may resort to different methods in order to shape language in ways that best serve their planning programmes. For example, the diglossia in Greek, *katharevusa* and demotic, led to a controversy which lasted for over a century, deeply affecting the Greek process of modernization and resulting in the treatment of language as an explicit political tool (Jusdanis 1991: 41-46). In Israel, another country that borrowed its model of modernization from Europe, the late 19th and 20th centuries witnessed a deliberate revival of spoken Hebrew,

followed by phases of standardization and lexical modernization with the aim of creating a homogenized national culture (Landau 1990: 137-138).

Republican Turkey constituted no exception to a perspective that sees language as a major tool of nation-building. In fact, like the alphabet reform, the language reform dates back to the pre-republican period. A general discontent with the state of the Ottoman language emerged among writers and journalists after the “Tanzimat” (the Ottoman Reformation) of 1839. Systematic calls to simplify the language came from writers such as İbrahim Şinasi, Ziya Paşa, Namık Kemal and Ahmet Mithat in the 19th century (Lewis 1999: 12-16). In 1908, “Türk Derneği” (Turkish Association) was formed, which attracted language reformers from various flanks, including the simplifiers, purifiers and Turkicisers. Because of this fragmentation, the Association did not have a shared view of the future of the Turkish language, which prevented its ideas from disseminating to the broader society (Levend 1949: 310; Lewis 1999: 19). More effective was the “Yeni Lisan” (New Language) movement founded in 1911 and led by writers such as Ömer Seyfettin, Ali Cânip and Ziya Gökalp (Levend 1949: 326). This movement can be considered a significant act of culture planning with a clearly defined programme pressing for the creation of a new Turkish literature purged of words of foreign origin (Yücel 1989: 198-199). It also had a political base, since it was clearly supported by the “İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti” (Committee for Union and Progress) (Yücel 1989: 191). The movement was met with an active resistance from many literary figures who became engaged in a fervent linguistic debate (Lewis 1999: 25). Nevertheless, the impetus behind “Yeni Lisan” was strong enough to constitute the main origin of the republican language reform.

The language reform launched by the republican officials aimed to become a mass-planning project by offering options that not only influenced the system of literature, but also had far-reaching effects on other systems of culture, such as education and religion. The dimensions of the language reform can only be properly understood if it is placed within the general framework of other republican practices, such as the unity of education (1924), the Turkification of the Friday sermon (1928) and the Turkification of the call to prayer (1932). The language reform both reinforced and was reinforced by the secular policies of the republic within its first decade. The change in orthography realized in 1928 formed a significant step towards the language reform which started in the early 1930s.

2.1.1.1 The Alphabet Reform

A possible shift from the Ottoman script to a Latin-based alphabet had been on the agenda since the mid-19th century, debated within the larger question of grammar and purification of the Turkish language. The first official record of discourse on possible modifications to the Ottoman-Arabic script dates back to a talk given in 1862 by Münif Efendi, on the difficulty of the existing script. This was followed by a proposal to introduce changes to the script by Azerbaijani author Ahondzade Mirza Fethali in 1863. His proposal was declined on the grounds that it would send the older Islamic works to oblivion (T.D.K. 1962: 14). During the First World War, the Enver Paşa Minister of War proposed certain modifications to the Ottoman script, yet the modified form never became popular. On the other hand, writers such as Ali Suavi and later Hüseyin Cahit, Abdullah Cevdet and Celal Nuri were in favour of the adoption of a Latin-based alphabet. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is also

known to have supported the idea of a Latin-based alphabet as a young officer in the Ottoman army even before the Second Constitution of 1908 (Ertop 1963: 55; Korkmaz 1995: 937). The debates on a possible change in script heated up with the dawn of the Republic.

In the republican period, the first official proposal in favour of the adoption of the Latin alphabet was made during the first national Economics Congress (1923) by a worker representative by the name of Nazmi. The chairman of the congress, Kazım Karabekir, refused this proposal giving a response echoed by many others in the period to follow:

I wonder if this Latin can be adopted. The day it is adopted the country will be caught up in a turmoil. Above everything else, while our libraries are full of holy books, chronicles and thousands of volumes of works written in that language, the day we adopt this dramatically different alphabet we will be faced with a great disaster, having given the whole of Europe a fine weapon, to denounce us to the whole of the Islamic world that Turks have adopted the foreign script and become Christian. This is the evil idea our enemies are working on... Besides, there is no Latin alphabet which can express our language (Karabekir in Levend 1949:367, originally published in *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, March 5, 1923).

[Acaba bu Lâtince kabul edilebilir mi? Bu kabul edildiği gün memleket herc ü merce girer. Herşeyden sarf-ı nazar bizim kütüphanelerimizi dolduran mukaddes kitablarımız, tarihlerimiz ve binlerce cild âsarımız bu lisanla yazılmış iken büsbütün başka bir şekilde olan bu hilâfını kabul ettiğimiz gün, en büyük felâkette derhal bütün Avrupa'nın eline güzel bir silâh verilmiş olacak, bunlar âlem-i İslâma karşı diyeceklerdir ki, Türkler ecnebî yazısını kabul etmişler ve hıristiyan olmuşlardır. İşte düşmanlarımızın çalıştığı şeytankârane fikir budur... Sonra bizim dilimizi terennüm edecek hiç bir Lâtin harufu yoktur (Karabekir in Levend 1949:367, originally published in *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, March 5, 1923).]

The proposal and Karabekir's response gave rise to a public debate which was to last until 1928, the year the reform was realized (T.D.K. 1962: 14-15; Katoğlu 1997: 413). One should also note that this debate was exclusively carried out by

statesmen and literary figures, since literacy was a mainly urban and male skill present in less than 10 per cent of the population. A proposed change of script concerned only the educated minority (Dilmen 1983: 86; Dikici 1996: 67). Between 1923 and 1928 the Grand National Assembly as well as numerous publications including national newspapers, magazines and books allocated time and space to arguments on the pros and cons of a possible alphabet reform.

As Karabekir's above statement illustrates, there was a religious sentiment involved in the arguments put forth by those who were against the reform. They were reluctant to break away from the idea of "umma", a Muslim community kept intact by the use of a common Arabic alphabet which was recognized as the script of the holy book Koran. In other words, they were reluctant to take the step required to apply a European model of nationalism, by modifying the core construct of their "imagined community" and giving up the sacred community in favour of a territorial, cultural and linguistic idea of nation.

The debate was not limited to the religious aspect but also had linguistic, literary and historical dimensions. There was general agreement on the need for a change in script in order to facilitate the reading and writing of the language and to increase literacy. However, some suggested that making slight modifications to the Arabic alphabet by adding a few vowels would suffice. Others demanded a radical shift and advocated the adoption of the Latin alphabet (Levend 1949: 368). The latter group held that the Arabic script was difficult to learn and to practice, that it made the standardization of the Turkish grammar impossible and that it prevented foreigners from learning Turkish. The resistance against the adoption of the Latin alphabet had several grounds which were developed as a counter-argument against the above ideas. Historian Ali Seydi, writer and poet Cenap Şehabettin, historian

Avram Galanti, writer Abdullah Battal Taymas, writer Halil Halid, novelist Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil and literary critic and historian Fuat Köprülü were among those who maintained that the adoption of the Latin-based alphabet would not improve literacy and grammar, that the ultimate aim of penetrating the western civilization would not be facilitated by the use of Latin letters and that those foreigners who wished to learn Turkish would still be able to learn the language with the Arabic script if they were really interested (Ülkütaşır 1973: 55-56). Avram Galanti, a scholar of Jewish origin, wrote two books on the issue, the first appearing in 1925 (*Türkçede Arabî, Lâtin Harfleri ve İmlâ Meseleleri* – Arabic, Latin Letters in Turkish and Issues of Spelling and Punctuation), the second in 1927 (*Arabî Harfler Terakkimize Mâni Değildir* - Arabic Letters Are Not an Obstacle to Our Development) and heatedly argued for the retention of the Arabic script. His main concern was that Turkish was not a language suitable for developing scientific terminology and that the adoption of the Latin-based alphabet would make it impossible to develop new terminology from Arabic roots, which had been the accepted method for centuries. He also stated that the Latin alphabet would cause a break from the Ottoman literary and historical heritage. He added that the switch to the Latin alphabet would have negative political and commercial implications for Turkey's relations with the Arabic-speaking countries (Galanti 1996: 17-18).

Although Atatürk was known to be a supporter of the Latin alphabet, he was not among those who initially pressed for its adoption. He preferred to wait for some time before going ahead with the reform since he thought that it would be a premature step during the first few years of the Republic (Korkmaz 1995: 939). In fact, Atatürk, having abolished the Caliphate in 1924, was struggling with active resistance against his planning project, in the form of a series of rebellions of

especially religious origin as well as political opposition in the Grand National Assembly. It took some time before he firmly established his authority, and active resistance turned passive. By 1927 all opposition had been silenced and Atatürk's Republican People's Party was the only party to take part in the general elections, which could not be considered democratic by any means (Lewis 1961: 258-270). This was when Atatürk decided the time was ripe for the alphabet reform, which would prove to be the most radical of all reforms in terms of its consequences. Once Atatürk seriously started to plan the reform, the resistance lost its hold and some of those who started out as ardent opponents turned in favour of the reform. For instance, Kazım Karabekir, who was once totally against the idea, started supporting it as the reform approached and wrote in a newspaper that the Turkish people would quickly get used to the script and that a period of three years would be enough for the whole of the country to adopt the new script (Şimşir 1992: 166, originally published in *Journal d'Orient* on August 10, 1928). A "Dil Encümeni" (Language Committee), established to assess the feasibility of the Romanization of the script, suggested a five-year transition period. Atatürk did not intend to wait that long. He personally did not believe that a long transitory period would encourage people to learn the new script and stated that a period of three months would suffice (Ertop 1963: 60). On November 3, 1928 the National Assembly passed the law on the new Turkish script and the first book using the Latin alphabet was published on January 1, 1929. By the middle of 1929 all publications were using the new alphabet (Dikici 1996: 53).

2.1.1.2 Language and History as Instruments of Nation-Building

The alphabet reform played a significant role in reinforcing the secular and western orientation of the Republic and marked the beginning of the language reform. Once the new alphabet was in place, the Language Committee was enlarged and started working on a new Turkish dictionary and scientific terminology (Heyd 1954: 25; Korkmaz 1995: 924; Ertop 1963: 69). This committee was dissolved in 1931 and in 1932 “Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti” (the Turkish Linguistic Society) was formed. The Society constituted a step towards purging loan words from Turkish and developing a "pure" Turkish vocabulary (Ertop 1963: 75). Yet the words that the Society mainly concentrated on and tried to find replacements for proved to be words of Arabic and Persian origin. Lewis writes: “It is significant that the hue and cry after alien words affected only Arabic and Persian - the Islamic, Oriental languages. Words of European origin, equally alien, were exempt, and a number of new ones were even imported, to fill the gaps left by the departed” (Lewis 1961: 428). In certain cases, The Linguistic Society deliberately increased the European vocabulary and replaced Arabic and Persian loan-words with words of western origin (Heyd 1954: 77).

The reason why Atatürk insisted so much on the language reform had to do with the fact that he considered the Turkish language one of the founding blocks of the newly-formed nation. In a section he wrote for Afetinan’s *Medeni Bilgiler* (Aspects of Citizenship) originally published in 1931 as educational material, he defined the Turkish language as an important element of Turkish nationhood:

The language of the Turkish nation is Turkish. Turkish is the finest and the richest language in the world and it is also one which can be the easiest. Therefore all Turks love their language and work to enhance it. The Turkish nation sees that despite endless troubles it has had to go through, its morals,

customs, memories, interest, in short everything that makes it a nation is preserved through its language. The Turkish language is the heart and the mind of the Turkish nation (Atatürk in Afetinan 1969: 19).

[Türk milletinin dili, Türkçedir. Türk dili dünyada en güzel, en zengin ve en kolay olabilecek bir dildir. Onun için her Türk dilini çok sever ve onu yükseltmek için çalışır. Çünkü, Türk milleti geçirdiği nihayetsiz badireler içinde, ahlakının, an'anelerinin, hatıralarının, menfaatlerinin, elhasıl bugün kendi milliyetini yapan her şeyin dili sayesinde muhafaza olduğunu görüyor. Türk dili, Türk milletinin kalbidir; zihnidir (Atatürk in Afetinan 1969: 19).]

As indicated earlier, the use of language as a means of creating a sense of nationhood is not a new phenomenon. This process was the hallmark of European nationalism which regarded language as a major instrument for creating nations out of heterogeneous populations (Even-Zohar 1986: 127). Atatürk and the officials associated with the Republican People's Party did not only resort to language-planning during their nation-building efforts. Realizing the significance of a common history for nations, they also focused on the re-shaping of the past. In his contribution to Afetinan's work, Atatürk mentioned the importance of a sense of shared history ("Zengin bir hatıra mirası" [A rich heritage of memories]) for a nation (Atatürk in Afetinan 1969: 23). "History" became an important means of planning, where the rediscovery of the past would nurture a collective future for the Turkish nation. Again, the use of history as a means of creating a national identity was not unique to Turkey. 19th century European nationalisms had made great use of a specific historical "trope" to symbolize the emergence of their specific nations: "awakening from sleep", which meant a "guaranteed return to an aboriginal essence" (Anderson 1991 :195). Early republican Turkey followed this aspect of the European model too, and history became a significant tool for the planners.

Culture planning was carried out through several institutions among which the Turkish Linguistic Society and "Türk Tarih Kurumu" (the Turkish Historical

Society) assumed a leading role. The Turkish Historical Society was the counterpart of the Turkish Linguistic Society in the field of history. It was established in 1931, under the name “Türk Tarihi Tetkik Cemiyeti”, (Society for the Study of Turkish History) contributing to an account of a common past as another corner stone in developing the new Turkish identity. The Society assumed its current name in 1935. The main tasks of the Society was to carry out studies into Turkish history and to prove that it was not confined to the Ottoman past. In 1932, what has been termed as the “Turkish historical thesis” was presented in the First Turkish Historical Congress which convened in Ankara. The theory behind this thesis was the idea that Turks originated from Central Asia which was the cradle of all original civilization in the world. The thesis claimed that civilization spread to the world with the migration of Turks to various parts of Asia and Africa, and that older Anatolian civilizations, such as Sumerians and Hittites, were Turkic peoples. If proven, this thesis would make Anatolia a Turkish land since antiquity (Katoğlu 1997: 422-423; Lewis 1961: 353). It was needed to unite the peoples of Anatolia through a narrative proposing a common national genealogy. Bernard Lewis writes:

Though the encouragement of Turkish pride and self-respect was no doubt an essential part of Kemal’s purpose, it was probably not his primary objective. This was to teach the Turks that Anatolia – Turkey – was their true homeland, the centre of their nationhood from time immemorial, and thus to hasten the growth of that ancient, intimate relationship, at once mystical and practical, between nation and country that is the basis of patriotism in the sovereign nation-states of the West (Lewis 1961: 354).

Atatürk was so committed to the two instruments in his nation-building project, language and history, that before he died in 1938 he left a considerable part of his inheritance to the Turkish Linguistic Society and the Turkish Historical Society.

In fact language and history were inseparable from each other for European planners leading young nations. If nationality was a construct existing from time immemorial, language would be the ideal symbol of continuity, because nothing could be as historically deep-rooted as languages (Anderson 1991: 196). In Europe, the relationship between history and language lay in the use of vernaculars as national languages. “Awakening” metaphor enabled those nations to wake up to the reality of the national vernaculars which functioned politically and which were not all that familiar to people, and especially to the literate populations. The trope “awakening from sleep”, enabled those people to study their vernacular languages, folklores and musics as “rediscovering something deep-down always known” (Anderson 1991: 196).¹ In Turkey, the “awakening” metaphor functioned both on the level of history and of language, which were interdependent in many ways. The Turkish history thesis purported to offer a truth long-forgotten in history – that Anatolia had always been Turkish. On the linguistic side, “Güneş-Dil Teorisi” (The Sun Language Theory) maintaining that all languages originated from Turkish, was presented in 1936, and as a reflection of the historical thesis, aimed to prove the continuity of Turkish culture since the conception of the human civilization (Katoğlu 1997: 421; Brendemoen 1990: 456).

One can comfortably claim that Atatürk and his colleagues in the state administration were involved in what came to be termed “language planning” by scholars some forty years later (Weinstein 1990: 1). Language planning can be carried out on three different levels. Heinz Kloss mentions two levels: “Corpus Planning”, referring to choice of language form, and “status planning”, choice of

¹ This idea was familiar to the intellectuals of the early republican period, who contended that “national self-discovery” could only be possible via a better understanding of the western civilization. This is the idea behind a perception of translated classics as a means of self-discovery as mentioned in Chapter 1.

language function (Kloss in Weinstein 1990: 6). A third level can be added to these two: “Planning for Planning’s Sake” which involves the enhancement and dissemination of the language in question (Karam 1974 and Cooper 1989 in Toury in press a). The Turkish language planning movement can be tackled under “corpus planning” in terms of the adoption of the Latin-based alphabet and the initial purification efforts, as well as in terms of the neologisms introduced by the Turkish Linguistic Society. The third category, “Planning for Planning’s Sake” has also been carried out in the maintenance and propagation of the language reform. In this sense, it was not only the state officials or the members of the Turkish Language Society who took part in the planning process; teachers, authors, translators, journalists, in short, many men and women of letters became agents of planning through their works. This demonstrates that when planning attempts are successful and the new options become integrated into the cultural repertoire, the users of the repertoire also become planners since they serve to reinforce the newly introduced repertoire by naturalizing its options.

The language reform in Turkey had the aim of transforming the society, not only in terms of its language, but also in terms of its cultural dispositions as mentioned above. As Brian Weinstein writes:

Language policy and planning can assist efforts to change a state and society in radical ways: changing identities, replacing one elite by another in the state apparatus, and altering patterns of access to reflect the replacement of a dominant class or ethnic group. In short, language planning is an important instrument of revolutionary change (Weinstein 1990: 14).

The Turkish language planning project was not without its opponents and it would be naïve to think that the consensus needed to advance the reform was

granted unanimously. In his address to The First Turkish Language Congress held in 1932, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın expressed his concern about forced linguistic changes and argued in favour of the natural dynamics in a language. He said:

I must admit that I find complaints about foreign words mixed in our language somewhat exaggerated. The character of a language lies in its grammar and syntax. Loan-words do not spoil this character. It is impossible to have contact with foreign communities and not borrow words from them. Foreign words cannot artificially penetrate a language upon so and so's demand. They enter a language due to a necessity and need, in the form of an evolution. As in all other fields in the world, things that happen in languages happen because of necessity (Yalçın in *Birinci Türk Dili Kurultayı*: 274-275).

[İytiraf ederim ki dilimize karışmış yabancı kelimelerden dolayı edilen şikayetleri biraz mübalağalı buluyorum. Bir lisanın şahsiyeti sarfında ve nahvindedir. Yabancı dillerden alınan kelimeler bu şahsiyeti bozmaz. Ecnebi kavimlerle münasebette bulunup ta onlardan kelime almamak imkan haricindedir. Bir dile yabancı kelimeler filan veya filan şahsın arzusu ile sun'î olarak doldurulamaz. Onlar tarihi bir zaruret ve iycabın neticesinde, bir tekamül ameliyesi olarak dile girerler. Dünyada, her sahada olduğu gibi, dilde de bir şey olmuşsa onun öyle olması zaruri idi de onun için olmuş demektir (Yalçın in *Birinci Türk Dili Kurultayı*: 274-275).]

Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın was not alone in his concern, yet the opposition remained silent. It was only after the Second World War, which also marked Turkey's transition to a multi-party system, that those against purism started expressing their ideas publicly and in a systematic manner (Heyd 1954: 44). Major opponents such as "Muallimler Birliği" (Teachers' Association) and "Hür Fikirleri Yayma Cemiyeti" (Society for the Propagation of Free Thought) held their own language congresses respectively in 1948 and 1949 (Heyd 1954: 44; also Brendemoen 1990: 456). However, there was general agreement on the irrevocability of some elements of the language reform. A linguistic conscience was created among the people and even the opponents were forced to modify their usage of Ottoman by the new awareness sown in their readership (Brendemoen 1990: 456).

While 35 per cent of the vocabulary used by newspapers were of Turkish origin in 1931, this rate had risen to 57 per cent in 1946, demonstrating the success of the reform (İmer 1998: 86). Language planning was not challenged in a systematic way and a repertoire of vocabulary that could emerge as an alternative to both the Ottoman and the newly-formed Turkish repertoires did not exist. The opponents lacked a clear idea as to how they wanted to see the language develop in the future and this, in turn, prevented them from attempting to reverse many of the changes made in Turkish thus far (Heyd 1954: 48). In other words, the opponents were not able to engage themselves in active resistance and hence, they were not able to launch their own language planning project.

The alphabet reform and the ensuing purist movement spelled a new identity for the people of Turkey. This identity was distanced from the Ottoman/Arabic/Persian heritage and was brought closer to the intellectual foundations of the “western civilization”. In Bourdieu’s terms, all republican reforms may be considered part of a project that aimed to transform the habitus of the people. Nevertheless, by its very nature, habitus, as a set of acquired dispositions, cannot be transformed overnight. Bourdieu suggests that revolutionary change cannot mark a break with the habitus of those it affects, but that, such change must be based on the dispositions constituting the specific habitus in question. In other words, a revolution (and to a certain extent the republican reforms) can break the “structuredness” of the habitus, yet revolution will only take place if the structure of the habitus allows it. Bourdieu writes that the conjecture capable of creating revolutionary, collective action lies in the dialectic between a habitus and a stimulating event only on those who are already disposed to realizing the change in question (Bourdieu 1977: 82-83). Therefore when one questions the success of the

culture planning efforts carried out through the republican reforms, one needs to inquire the degree to which they agreed with the system of dispositions people held. If those dispositions did not agree with people's current habitus, i.e. their "present past" (Bourdieu 1993: 7), then a radical transformation foreseen by the republican reforms would be unlikely to succeed. The way to success would pass through the shaping of a new "past", in other words, a gradual transformation of the habitus through modifications of the dispositions.

The republican reforms offered the members of the nation a new identity, i.e. a new habitus, which was prepared with much care and painstaking effort. Yet, would this identity be readily accepted by the masses? Education was the key word and it turned out to be the major instrument in transforming the habitus. Within the early republican context, education appears to be the general framework within which the majority of the planning activities of the state can be placed. Education was not only associated with schooling; the true positions and functions of institutions such as the Translation Bureau and the "Halkevleri" (People's Houses) can only be understood when their interaction with the educational ideals of the Republic are brought to mind.

Education was one of the major tools in the hands of the planners, and the infrastructure of culture planning was largely set up through reforms and institutions introduced to the educational system. Education was to serve the dissemination of the new repertoire to the urban working class and to peasants who had not played a role in the creation of the repertoire and were therefore not familiar with it. As a first and significant step, the law on the unity of education closed down religious schools and established co-education and state control over all educational institutions private and public. Immediately after the alphabet reform was announced, "Millet

Mektepleri" (Nation's Schools) were established with the aim of teaching the Latin alphabet to the people. Within the first few years of the reform over two and a half million people attended these schools (İskit 1939: 188). Yet the rate of success was lower than 50 per cent. Within the first five years of the Nation's Schools 2,305,924 students attended the courses, and only 1,124,926 of them learned the Latin-based alphabet and received their certificates (Şimşir 1992: 244). In 1933, three million citizens were literate and about one thirds of this number had learned to read and write in the Nation's Schools. The 1935 census revealed that the population of Turkey was 16,188,767 ("Nüfus Sayımı" 1935: 209). The rate of literacy among the population over 7 years of age was 15 per cent (İmer 1998: 71). Yet this was a drastic increase compared to only 1,100,000 literates in 1927, when the population was 13,648,270 ("Nüfus Sayımı" 1935: 209) and the Ottoman script was still in use.² The Nation's Schools, which at their kickoff had a rather ambitious aim of making the rate of literacy 100 per cent in 15 years, gradually lost their impetus and were closed down eight years after their establishment (Şimşir 1992: 244-245). Nevertheless, especially during their first five years the Nation's Schools were the instruments of a massive literacy campaign standing as a proof to the state's commitment to educating the citizens of the Republic. Adult literacy courses continued within the scope of the People's Houses in the 1930s and 1940s.

The emphasis on education could be noticed in official speeches and documents since the initial phases of the Republic. At the end of the War of Liberation in 1922 Mustafa Kemal addressed a group of teachers saying, "Yes, science will be our guide in our nation's political and social life, as well as in its

² There is some ambiguity regarding literacy figures before the adoption of the Latin alphabet. In his 1992 book Şimşir gives the 1927 literacy figure as 1.1 million whereas *On Yülda Maarifimiz Rehberi* (Manual on Our Educational System within the Last Decade) published on the occasion of the tenth

intellectual education. The Turkish nation, Turkish art, Turkish poetry and literature will develop in all of its fine aspects thanks to schools, thanks to the sciences which will be taught by schools.” [“Evet, milletimizin siyasî, içtimaî hayatında, milletimizin fikrî terbiyesinde de rehberimiz ilim ve fen olacaktır. Mektep sayesinde, mektebin vereceği ilim ve fen sayesinde ki Türk milleti, Türk sanatı, Türk şiir ve edebiyatı, bütün bedayiiyle inkişaf eder”] (Atatürk in Parla 1995: 303).

The government programmes of the young Republic often stressed the need for improvement in the educational system of the country. Even before the Republic was officially proclaimed, the acting government in the Turkish Grand National Assembly envisaged in its programme significant developments in education. The National Assembly’s programme adopted the education of both children and adults as major goals. There would be mandatory primary education for both boys and girls, teacher training would be given an impetus while the educational infrastructure was improved. Adult education would be conducted through evening classes, apprentice schools and publishing activity, all geared towards meeting the educational needs of the public. The change in the habitus would come in the form of improved “cultural capital” (Bourdieu 1993: 7). However, this cultural capital would not be generated locally but would be “imported” from abroad, i.e. mainly from the West. Although Mustafa Kemal (in Parla 1995: 303-304) publicly expressed his concern that “imitation of the East or the West” would not serve to rescue people out of their “ignorance”, his rhetoric largely remained on paper. Paradoxically, immediately after the War of Liberation waged against western powers, the Turkish government started looking for guidance from the West in educational matters. The programme of the last acting government before the

anniversary of the Republic in 1933 indicated this figure as 685,040 excluding students in primary education (reprinted in *Varlık* Vol. 1, Nb. 8, 29.10.1933).

proclamation of the Republic stated that a delegation had been sent to Europe for the acquisition of educational materials and also pointed out that students of high merit would be sent to "scientific centres" in Europe for further education (*1920-1989 T.C. Hükümet Programlarında Kültür Politikası* 1990: 14). This official policy was also endorsed by many writers, scholars and publishers in the country. The source of knowledge and science, if not always of culture and morals, was seen as the West. In one of the popular magazines of the period, *Resimli Uyanış*, Kazım Nami (Duru), who was a writer, translator and politician, wrote the following:

Science is in the West. In Germany, in France, in England, in Russia, in Italy, in America, in short, it is everywhere in the West, but not here. ... Our ignorance is deep, very deep; ... What are we to do in this state, in this deplorable state of ours? We have entered Western life; we wish to catch up with the Western nations. This is a high and admirable aim. We must resemble only the West to be able to live in the world as a nation (Kâzım Nami 1929).

[İlim Garptedir. Almanya'dadır, Fransa'dadır, İngiltere'dedir. Rusya'dadır, İtalya'dadır, Amerika'dadır, hulasa garbın her yerindedir, fakat bizde değildir... Cehlimiz koyu, koyu; ... Biz bu halimizle, bu aczi halimizle ne yaparız? Garp hayatına girdik; Garp milletlerle at başı beraber yürümek istiyoruz. Maksudumuz yüksek ve takdire şayandır. Dünyada bir millet olarak yaşamak için ancak Garb'e temessül etmek mecburiyetindeyiz (Kâzım Nami 1929).]

This is only one example among many showing how the young Republic aspired to become a western nation. It tells as much about the self-conception of the Turks, as expressed by Kâzım Nami, as their conception of the West.

2.1.2 Westernism

Although the Republic of Turkey had risen from the remnants of an empire which represented the Orient for the West for many centuries and stood as a military

antagonist, the technical superiority of the West had long been acknowledged by the Empire and attempts had been made to catch up with it. Yet in terms of legal and social institutions, there remained a duality between western and Ottoman institutions which existed side by side throughout the 19th century without giving rise to any particular synthesis (Ülken 1994: 48). Even some westernizers regarded civilization in two different senses: technical and "real". They held that the West *did* have technical civilization but in terms of "real" civilization Islam was superior (Lewis 1961: 230). The different views on westernism have been summed up under two different groups by Tarık Zafer Tunaya in his *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri* (Westernization Movements in Turkey's Political Life) (1999). These two groups of views, called respectively "Bütüncü" (Wholist) and "Kısmici" (Partialist) by Tunaya, have existed in both late Ottoman and republican periods and in a way continue to do so today. In fact, it has been suggested that although westernization was one of the most topical items in the agenda of early republican Turkey, the differing opinions were not presented in a programmatic manner unlike the late Ottoman period of the Second Constitution starting in 1908 (Tunaya 1999: 118).

The partialist school of thought emphasised the need for adopting western science and technology while rejecting its cultural and moral basis (Tunaya 1999: 79). Renowned ideologue and founder of the Turkist movement, Ziya Gökalp, contributed to the partialist debate with an important distinction he made between "medeniyet" (civilization) and "hars" (culture). In his *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Principles of Turkism), originally published in 1923, he wrote: "So it is evident that what separates culture from civilization is the fact that culture is made up primarily of feelings and civilization is made up primarily of knowledge" ["Görülüyor ki hars

ile medeniyeti biri birinden ayıran, harsın bilhassa duygulardan, medeniyetin bilhassa bilgilerden mürekkep olmasıdır.”] (Gökalp 1986: 34). His idea of westernization was limited to the civilizational aspect while his vision was to preserve the elements of a Turkish culture within a westernised civilisation. In a way, this became the mission of what he called “Turkism”. In his words:

So the duty of Turkism is to search and find the Turkish culture that has only survived among the people and on the other hand to take Western civilization intact and as a whole and to implant it into national culture (Gökalp 1986: 40).

[İşte Türkçülüğün vazifesi, bir taraftan yalnız halk arasında kalmış olan Türk harsını arayıp bulmak, diğer cihetten garp medeniyetini tam ve canlı bir surette alarak milli harsa aşılmasıdır (Gökalp 1986: 40).]

Wholists, on the other hand, maintained that the western civilization was a whole and could only be adopted in its entirety (Tunaya 1999: 57). The republican institution in its early stages can be said to have adopted this latter approach which could be sensed in the body of social, cultural, legal, economic and political reforms it initiated. It was not willing to adopt only selected items of the western repertoire as had been the case in the 19th century (Arıkan 1999: 83). Yet, what was meant by the term “West” which was obviously more than a geographical designation? Starting from the 19th century, Ottoman and later republican subjects did not consider the West as only Europe. By then, United States and even Japan were also regarded as western countries. However, the concept of the West included much more than a physical map.

A study of the writings of philosophers and literary figures of late Ottoman/early republican periods reveals that the West was mainly an intellectual construct. It was the idea of a civilization into which the new Turkey wished to

transform itself. Author and publisher Yaşar Nabi wrote: “The West is a mentality, it is a spirit, a mind” [“Batı bir zihniyettir, bir ruhtur, bir kafadır.”] (Yaşar Nabi in Tunaya 1999: 59). Likewise, Hilmi Ziya Ülken held that the concept of the West had no absolute boundaries and that it referred to an open and universal civilization (Ülken 1948: 23). Hilmi Ziya Ülken who played a significant role in introducing the concept of humanism to the westernization debate in Turkey, held that in its geographical sense, the West hosted a plethora of trends including modern, positivist and realist (thus desirable) ideas but also the occult, Christian philosophies and the idea of attaining civilization through bloodshed (undesirable traits) (Ülken 1938a: 185; 1939: 690). Therefore he defined West not in a geographical but in a conceptual way: “The West is only to be found in the scientific, philosophical and artistic works produced by a constantly expanding technical and rational civilization” [“Garp, yalnız gittikçe genişleyen teknik ve rasyonel bir medeniyetin doğurduğu ilim, felsefe ve san’at eserindedir.”] (Ülken 1938a: 186).

According to the wholist position, the “West” was not only superior in science and technology, but also in culture and literature which it largely owed to the classical Greek and Roman traditions. Already in 1840, in his book titled *Avrupa Risalesi* (The European Treatise), Mustafa Sami was hinting towards this idea by mentioning “antika” (“antiquities - works by artists and scientists dating back to immemorial time”) [“başlangıcı bilinmeyecek kadar eski zamanlardan gelen sanatkarların ve bilginlerin eserleri”] as the source of all European inventions (Kaygı 1992: 51). Later on, the concept of “antiquities” became clearer and its Greek and Roman roots were emphasized. For instance, in 1919, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, known for his westernist and liberal views, wrote that Turkey was under the influence of oriental teachings which recommended submission and temperance whereas the

West drew inspiration from the Roman and Greek traditions which propagated freedom, justice and integrity (Ağaoğlu 1972: 75). In the same volume, he also stressed the need for a new understanding of morals in Turkey. This understanding had to free itself from a sexual foundation and would prioritize virtues such as loyalty, hard work, dignity and sacrifice. According to Ağaoğlu, the foundations of this new morality could be laid by adopting Greek, Roman and European literary works as educational material in schools (Ağaoğlu 1972: 77).

The interest in western classics only emerged in the second half of the 19th century. This interest became evident with the appearance of some prose translations which entered the Ottoman system of literature for the first time. Between 1866 and 1918, eight translations of Greek classics (four of Aesop's *Fables*, three of Homer's *Iliad* and one of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*) were published (Paker 1986: 412). The implications for domestic literature came around 1912, when writer Yakup Kadri, poet Yahya Kemal and Ömer Seyfettin, later prominent short story writer and one of the founders of the "Yeni Lisan" movement, started showing sympathy and inclination towards ancient Greek literary forms and subjects in their works (Yücel 1989: 251-299; Sinanoğlu 1980: 92). Yet there was considerable reaction from literary circles against this movement called "nev yunanilik" (neo-hellenism) and there was some confusion as to whether neo-hellenism referred to modern or ancient Greece. In an article he wrote, Yahya Kemal made it clear that his idea of Greek literature had nothing to do with "today's Greeks who are only able to build towers with baccarat cards and play with them" ["bugün ancak bakara kağıtlarından kule yapan ve bakara kağıtlarıyla oynıyabilen Yunanlılar"] (Yücel 1989: 258). Hasan Âli Yücel, a prominent literary and political figure of the single-party era, who quoted

Yahya Kemal's statement, confirmed this idea in his *Edebiyat Tarihimizden* (From Our Literary History) originally published in 1957:

It is a fact that Western thought and art, established according to the Greek model, are dependent on it but not slave to it. And this is why each nation can make use of that model without losing its own identity; it can be both original and remain national (Yücel 1989: 259).

[Gerçek şudur ki, Yunan modeline göre kurulmuş olan Garp fikir ve sanatı, ona bağlı olmakla beraber onun esiri değildir. Ve böyle olduğu için de her millet, kendi benliğini kaybetmeksizin o modelden istifa eder; hem orijinal olur, hem milli kalabilir (Yücel 1989: 259).]

The idea of making use of the Greek model while remaining Turkish at the same time became a major concern during second phase of the young Republic under the leadership of İsmet İnönü. The language reform and the planning activity carried out in the fields of history and language during the first fifteen years of the Republic were gradually replaced by an emphasis on western classical culture as a means of creating a common cultural basis for the nation. Nationalism was entering a new phase and the Turkish history thesis and the Sun Language Theory would no longer be discussed. The new conception of nation as a construct based on a common cultural heritage had taken over the idea of the religious community while secularism had established itself as a fact of life, although it continued to attract considerable opposition that mainly remained passive. Ninety-eight per cent of the population was Muslim and continued to practice their faith. The planners needed a base that would legitimize Turkey's adoption of western culture as a universal culture, rather than a Christian one. Such a base would also put an end to the debate between partialists and wholists and place Turkey firmly on the path of modernization. After all, republican westernism did not wish to imitate its image of

the West, but aimed to engender its own civilization which would no doubt be inspired by the West but not be a copy of it. The way out of this dilemma was found in the concept of "humanism".

2.1.2.1 Turkish Humanism

"Humanism" never became a mass-movement in Turkey. However, it occupied a central position in the discourse formed around translation and the Translation Bureau. Humanism, which was presented as a philosophical basis for the republican reforms, was used as a significant instrument in the planning of the educational and literary repertoire in Turkey. The intellectual framework of the humanist movement was built by certain groups who wrote for two journals, both launched to elaborate on how the concept of humanism could be instrumental in a nation's "discovery" of itself. These journals were *Yücel* (Rise) and *İnsan* (Human), launched in 1935 and in 1938 respectively (Arıkan 199: 85). An article titled "Maksad" (Purpose) which appeared in the first issue of *İnsan*, was about a "Turkish Renaissance": "Only a century later the Turkish revolution is bringing about the renaissance which it should have brought about during the Tanzimat ... Today, we are engaged in a Renaissance in the truest sense: We are joining the world anew. Western methods will guide us in re-discovering ourselves" ["Türk inkılabı Tanzimatta yapması lazım gelen rönesansı ancak bir asır sonra yapabiliyor ... Bugün hakiki manasıyla Rönesans yapıyoruz: Dünya kervanına yeniden katılıyoruz. Bu yolda kendimizi tekrar bulmak için garp metodları bize rehberlik edecektir."] (Ülken 1938c: 1-2). This phrase "re-discovering ourselves" is rather interesting, for it attempts to present westernization as a means towards getting closer to one's national identity, rather than as a form of detachment

from national roots. According to the proponents of the humanist movement, humanism was to be instrumental in unearthing Turkish national history and literature. Orhan Burian who wrote extensively on the subject in *Yücel*, presented the concept of humanism as "a quest to discover oneself" ["insanın kendi kendini bulmaya çıkmasıdır"]. He added, "When we talk about a quest, we do not mean discovering the individual. Our history has not been studied. Our social structure has not been analysed in terms of its organization and functioning. And we have a literature that has not been explored" ["Kendimizi arayalım derken ferdi kastetmiyoruz. Bir tarihimiz var ki tetkik edilmemiştir. Bir içtimai bünyemiz var ki nasıl kurulmuş ve nasıl işleyegelmiş olduğu araştırılmamıştır. Gene bir edebiyatımız vardır ki aranmamıştır."] (Burian in Arıkan 1999: 86). The above statements indicate that what appears as a paradox (discovery of the "national" through a study of western cultural sources) became a method for Turkish humanists. This is in line with what Bernard Lewis writes about the Turkish reforms: "Among the Turks, the two terms most frequently used to denote their revolution are nationalism and Westernization – and the two are not, as in other parts of the world, in contradiction with one another" (Lewis 1961: 478).

The use of the term "humanism" in this sense distanced the term from its classical Renaissance context and produced a domestic version. In English, the term humanism has many connotations. It may mean "the tendency to emphasize man and his status, importance, powers, achievements, interests, or authority" (in Honderich 1995: 375). A more scholarly meaning which emerged in Germany in 1809 associates humanism with "devotion to the literatures of ancient Greece and Rome, and the humane values that may be derived from them" (Mann 1996: 2). A more extended definition reads:

Humanism is that concern with the legacy of antiquity - and in particular, but not exclusively, with its literary legacy - which characterizes the work of scholars from at least the ninth century onwards. It involves above all the rediscovery and study of ancient Greek and Roman texts, the restoration and interpretation of them and the assimilation of the ideas and values that they contain (Mann 1996: 2).

The interest in Greek and Roman texts made up only one part of the attempted humanist movement in Turkey, for Turkish humanism was different from classical humanism in its function and scope. Classical humanism asserts that the function of classical humanities is to educate man and put him in a position to exercise his freedom (Edwards 1967: 70). "Turkish humanism", on the other hand, would be a national phenomenon, giving rise to a new and unique interpretation of the Turkish national culture based on a universal/western/classical intellectual infrastructure. In that sense Turkish humanism may be compared to German neo-humanism which made a re-assessment of classical thought and enabled it to spread outside of the Latin universe (Sinanoğlu 1980: 108). Neo-humanism embarked to reconcile the classical universe and the modern world and attempted to do that in a secular world with a new dogma-free conception of man (Sinanoğlu 1980: 108; Gökberk 1985: 188).

The term "neo-humanism" has been used in defining Turkish humanism. One of the earliest references to neo-humanism in Turkey was published in an article which appeared in *Yücel*. The article titled "Neo-humanisme ve Akıl" (Neo-humanism and Reason) emphasised the national aspect of neo-humanism and contrasted the latter with humanism. Fevzi Muhip, the author, wrote that both humanism and neo-humanism relied on reason, but were different in the sense that

the former was a universal idea whereas the latter was national. This made their versions of reason different too:

Since neo-humanism draws its strength from the overwhelming victories of Turkish national power, the kind of reason it recognizes, believes in and enhances can surely not be the linear and static reason of the old humanism.

Neo-humanism is to blend bare reason with sentient faith. (Fevzi Muhip 1935: 3).

[Neo-humanisme'in erg kaynağı, ulusal Türk gücünün akıllara durgunluk veren yengileri (zaferleri) olduğuna göre; onun tanıdığı, inandığı ve yükselttiği akıl, elbette eski (humanisme) de olduğu gibi öyle düz ve durgun bir akıl olamaz.

Neo-humanisme, kuru akla, yaş inancı (imanı) aşılacaktır. (Fevzi Muhip 1935: 3).]

This article is interesting in terms of both its style and content. Fevzi Muhip seems to be a proponent of the language reform and uses many neologisms derived from Turkish roots. In a footnote, he argues that “neo-humanism” is a word derived from Turkish roots. The whole article is shaped around the national essence of neo-humanism, which the author claims has surpassed classical humanism in terms of reason.

In a series of articles which appeared in *Yücel*, Orhan Burian wrote that reading and translating Greek and Roman classics would constitute the first step in humanism, but more important was the assimilation of the spirit in these works which would result in the birth of a free and systematic style of thinking. Burian called this style of thinking “neo-humanism” and added that neo-humanism would help mankind in fighting against totalitarian regimes (Burian 1940a,b,c).

Indeed, the Greek and Roman literary heritage, i.e. the core of classical humanism, was given a preliminary and partial role in Turkish humanism. According to Ülken, the study of Greek and Roman cultures would complement critical and objective introspection and retrospection which he believed, had as much weight in creating humanism as Greek and Roman classics (Ülken 1939: 693). In one of his articles in *İnsan* he wrote:

The time has come for us to take a look at ourselves ... The only means of looking at ourselves is to adjust our eye to the angle of the advanced world: to gain an in-depth knowledge of the West, to realise our intellectual and artistic Renaissance, to translate Greek - Roman and modern Western works into our language are all preparations for adopting that angle. In a single word, we have to agree to serve as an **apprentice** to the new civilization we have entered in order to become creative (Ülken 1938d: 377).

[Gözümüzü kendimize çevirmenin tam zamanıdır ... Kendimize bakmanın yegâne vasıtası, gözümüzü ileri dünya zaviyesinden ayarlamaktır: Garbi derinden derine tanımak, fikir ve sanat Rönesansımızı yapmak, Yunan-Roma ve yeni garb eserlerini dilimize çevirmek bu bakış zaviyesini kazanmanın hazırlıklarıdır. Yeni girdiğimiz medeniyette yaratıcı olabilmek için, bir kelime ile o medeniyetin **çıraklığını** geçirmeyi kabul etmeliyiz (Ülken 1938d: 377).]

In the rest of this article, Ülken stressed the importance of travelling and visiting the remote areas of Turkey with a new awareness based on western cultural sources. In this sense, the classical world became an instrument of a national re-discovery process. In fact, a look at the contents of Ülken's journal *İnsan* shows that the editorial board of the journal was doing what Ülken was preaching. The first issue of the journal included articles on humanism and westernism by Hilmi Ziya Ülken and Nurullah Ataç, an article on Stefan George's place in German poetry by Celalettin Ezine, but also an article on Turkish legal history by Ahmet Ağaoğlu and a study on the famous folkloric figure Nasreddin Hoca by Pertev Naili Boratav. This

profile was maintained in later issues. During the five years it was published, *İnsan* continued to offer a careful mix of articles based on both western and Turkish sources.

The creation of a humanist culture in Turkey became a significant part of the culture planning efforts. As demonstrated in Chapter 1, the translations of western classics have been considered to be at the forefront of these efforts. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to think of the role of translation vis-à-vis humanism as a task isolated from other instruments of planning. Rather, we have to conceptualize the function of translations of classics within a network that includes several interrelated ideas and institutions. The functions allocated to the translation of classics will be discussed in the next chapter where I will offer a critical analysis of the discourse on translation in the early republican period. In the present chapter I will dwell upon the structural ties between the Translation Bureau, as the locus of the translations of classics, and two crucial institutions set up by the Republican People's Party: the People's Houses and the Village Institutes. I will also discuss how the setting up of a state-sponsored translation institution may be related to a major principle of the early republican era, namely statism. During this initial exploration of the Translation Bureau, I will concentrate on the structure and operations of the Bureau, rather than offering a qualitative analysis of its output. The role of agents such as Hasan Âli Yücel, Nurullah Ataç and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu who appear as central figures in the setting up and functioning of the Bureau will be tackled in the next chapter.

2.1.3 The Translation Bureau

The translation of western classics into Turkish was not a new phenomenon in Turkey at the dawn of the Republic in 1923. Since the 19th century, Ottoman westernists had been extending calls for a programme which would include a systematic selection and translation of the major works constituting the basis of western thought. Already in 1897, Ahmet Mithat Efendi, a renowned writer and translator of the late Ottoman period, regarded translation as an important tool in the transfer of ideas. In an article he wrote in the daily *Tercüman-ı Hakikat*, he emphasized the importance of translating European classics into Turkish (in Kaplan 1998: 65-69).³ Following the proclamation of the Republic, a few scattered efforts were made by both the state and some private publishing houses to translate western classics into Turkish. Among these, the publications of the Ministry of Education in the form of vulgarizations of western classics in the 1920s, and the translated classics published by Remzi and Vakit Publishing Houses are worthy of mention.⁴ Yet Turkish writers and academics continued to complain that these translations were selected and translated in an arbitrary way, failing to fulfill the need for translated classics. As an example to this attitude, we can take a look at an article published in the daily *Cumhuriyet* in 1939. In this article Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, eminent writer, wrote:

A great number of works have indeed been translated into our language. Yet these translations, which were selected randomly and carried out without being subject to a specific programme, did not meet the need and what is more, they did not even create the need for translation. Our language has no knowledge of a

³ For a detailed presentation and discussion of the reaction shown to Ahmet Mithat and the ensuing debate on the translation of classics, see Kaplan 1998.

⁴ The translated books published by the Ministry of Education prior to the Translation Bureau and the activities of Remzi and Vakit Publishing Houses will be taken up in detail in Chapter 4.

vast literary past. A few novels, five or ten philosophy books, and a few elementary informative works. These are the gains made by our language in a time period approaching a century... (Tanpınar 1998: 77)

[Vâkıa dilimize şimdiye kadar birçok eserler tercüme oldu. Fakat rastgele seçilen ve hiç bir programa tâbi olmadan yapılan bu tercümeler ihtiyacı karşılamak şöyle dursun, bu işin zaruretini duyuracak miktarda değildir. Bütün bir edebiyat mazisinden dilimizin haberi yoktur. Tek tük birkaç roman, beş on felsefe kitabı ve birkaç elemanter bilgi eseri. İşte bir asra yaklaşan bir müddet zarfında dilimizin kazançları... (Tanpınar 1998: 77)]

The solution to this problem was shown as state involvement. It is therefore not surprising that the above article ends with a clear call for state intervention. Tanpınar maintained, “yet the question of translation is not only a question of good intentions. It is a question of money and programme. If we wish to create Turkish ‘learning’ we need to start it within a state programme and by mobilizing all of the facilities of our country” [“Fakat tercüme meselesi sadece bir iyi niyet meselesi değildir. Para ve program meselesidir. Eğer bir Türk irfanı yaratmak istiyorsak, bu işe bir devlet programıyla ve memleketin bütün imkânlarını seferber ederek girmemiz lâzımdır”] (Tanpınar 1998: 79). In Chapter 3, I will offer more examples from the discourse of various personalities in the early republican Turkey, demanding the state’s involvement in translation and publishing activity. I suggest that this demand must be analyzed in conjunction with the principle of statism adopted by the Republican People’s Party.

In the late 1930s the calls from intellectuals finally struck home, and the young Minister of Education, Hasan Âli Yücel, decided to take the issue in his hands (Çıkar 1997: 82). The First Turkish Publishing Congress held under the leadership of Yücel in 1939 was a milestone leading towards the establishment of a government-sponsored translation agency. Translation constituted a major part of

the agenda of the Congress.⁵ The Translation Committee, which was one of the most active of the seven committees established during the Congress, submitted a report to the Congress which included a list of modern and ancient classics. The committee recommended these works as a priority for translation and stated that those related to humanist culture should be prioritized (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:125). The extensive deliberations on translation at the Congress provided the impetus for the establishment of the Translation Bureau in 1940 under the auspices of the Ministry of Education.

The involvement of the Ministry of Education in publishing and translation is an indication of the fact that education and publishing activity as well as literature were seen as integral and indispensable components of the process of nation-building and of placing Turkey on a westward path. Translation would serve as the channel through which the foundations of a new Turkish literature would be established. In other words, the new Turkish literature would depend upon "import". This import was envisaged as a planned and systematic flow of the translations of major works belonging to the western civilization. Much of the discourse on translation and literature throughout the 1930s set the translation of canonized western works as a priority. Yet, this undertaking was expected from the state. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, editor of the literary magazine *Varlık*, wrote that the "regulating hand" of the state had to be there for a systematic translation movement (Nayır 1937: 163). The Translation Committee of the Publishing Congress, also stressed the need for state involvement and suggested that an institution be established under the Ministry of Education to start up a planned translation movement (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 125). This expectation might have originated from past experience,

⁵ The deliberations of the Congress will be taken up in more detail in Chapter 3.

as the Ministry of Education had been involved in planned translation and publishing activity since its conception within the first Grand National Assembly in 1921, first through “Telif ve Tercüme Encümeni” (the Committee on Original and Translated Works) (Kayaoğlu 1998: 200), then through the series of translated literature it launched after the proclamation of the Republic, which was discontinued in 1928 (Sevük 1940b: 38). However, the call for state involvement can be better explained in terms of the political context of the day. One of the principles of the governing Republican People’s Party and the republican reforms was the idea and practice of statism in a wide variety of fields. On April 20, 1931, Mustafa Kemal expressed this principle in a manifesto in which he set forth the six principles of the Republican People's Party, as follows :

Although considering private work and activity a basic idea, it is one of our main principles to interest the State actively in matters where the general and vital interests of the nation are in question, especially in the economic field, in order to lead the nation and the country to prosperity in as short a time as possible (Official English version printed in Lewis 1961: 280).

Statism went beyond the economic field and also permeated the cultural field where the state led in setting up and maintaining cultural institutions such as the State Theatre, The State Opera, and The State Fine Arts Museum. Publishing was another field where the state made its presence felt. The state gave support to publishing through two channels: state-published books and the support offered to private publishing houses in the 1930s (Yücel 1998: 107 [originally published in 1936]; İskit 1939: 251). The Ministry of Education also published literary translations, which I will discuss in Chapter 4. However, their literary publishing activity was minimal until 1940. The bulk of indigenous and translated books was brought out by private publishers (*Türkiye Bibliyografyası* 1939; Sevük 1940a, 1940b) which also

depended on the state for their livelihood, but only partially. The state purchased a certain number⁶ of copies of books from private publishers (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 145, 153). However, this was not deemed sufficient by the publishing industry. In an interview appearing in the daily *Son Posta* in 1936, İlyas Bayar, publisher, said that the Ministry of Education purchased only about fifty or a hundred copies of each publication, and added that this figure had to be at least five hundred since sales were low and the publishing industry needed state support to survive (İskit 1939: 298). Indeed, although the readership had increased with the rising rate of literacy, circulation figures were still very low and books hardly sold over a thousand or fifteen hundred copies (İskit 1939: 298; *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 58). Publishers were more willing to produce popular literature which had a market, but in the case of "serious" works which would lay the grounds for "Turkish humanism", they regarded this as the state's responsibility (İskit 1939: 299). Publishers were thus making a clear call for state patronage.

The initial structure and activities of the Translation Bureau largely owes to the work of the Translation Committee set up by the Publishing Congress on May 2, 1939. The committee consisted of 27 members⁷ and convened at the Ankara People's House in the afternoon on the first day of the Congress. Their work

⁶ This number is specified as 150-300 copies by Hasan Âli Yücel (1998: 105).

⁷ Following were the members of the Committee: Etem Menemencioglu (Chairman of the Committee - Professor at the School of Political Science), Mustafa Nihat Özön (Reporter- Literature teacher at Gazi Teacher Training Institute), Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar (Secretary of the Balkan Union), Ali Kâmi Akyüz (Istanbul MP), Bedrettin Tuncel (Associate Professor at the Faculty of History, Languages and Geography), Bürhan Belge (Advisor-in-chief at the General Directorate of Press), Cemil Bilsel (University Rector), Fazıl Ahmet Aykaç (Elazığ MP), Fikret Âdil (writer), Galip Bahtiyar Göker (Istanbul MP), Halil Nihat Boztepe (Trabzon MP), Halit Fahri Ozansoy (Director of *Uyanış* magazine), İzzet Melih Devrim (writer), Nasuhi Baydar (Malatya MP), Nurettin Artam (teacher and writer), Nurullah Ataç (French teacher at Pertevniyal High School), Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Literature teacher at Bursa High School), Rıdvan Nafiz Edgüer (Manisa MP), Sabahattin Rahmi Eyüpoğlu (Inspector at the Ministry of Education), Sabahattin Ali (Instructor at the Conservatory), Sabri Esat Siyavuşgil (Associate professor at the Literature Faculty), Selâmi İzzet Sedes (writer), Suut Kemal Yetkin (Director General of Fine Arts), Şinasi Boran (Director of State Railroads Magazine), Yusuf Şerif Kılıçer (French teacher at the Military School), Yaşar Nabi (writer), Zühtü Uray (translator at the President's Office) (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:35).

continued for two and a half days and the report they prepared was presented at the congress on the fourth day, May 5, 1939. There were writers, editors, teachers, academics and members of parliament in the committee which was formed by the congress “based on the areas of specialization” [“ihtisaslarına göre”] of their members (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:20). There are two significant aspects of the way this committee was formed and presented. First of all, out of the 27 members, only one was presented as a translator. The others, although there were prominent translators among them, were presented by their other occupations. This offers interesting clues about the status and prestige of the job of a translator in the 1930s as will be taken up in the next chapter. Secondly, there were six members of parliament who participated in the meetings of the committee, which is an indication of the importance attached by the state to translation activity. We may conclude that the planners, who seemed to have resolved to take up translation as a tool for their culture planning project, intended to attend the process of planning personally.

The report prepared by the committee extended a call for the setting up of an official translation bureau under the auspices of the Ministry of Education to oversee the translation of classics into Turkish (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:20). This recommendation led to the setting up of a “Tercüme Heyeti” (Translation Board) which met in February 1940 for the first time (“Haberler” 1940a: 112). This board was chaired by Adnan Adıvar and met four times with the participation of 14 members.⁸ The Board prepared a list of books to be translated, including works by Sophocles, Erasmus, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Molière, Rousseau, Goethe, Stendhal,

⁸ The members were Halide Edip Adıvar, Saffet Pala, Bedri Tahir Şaman, Avni Başman, Nurettin Artman, Ragıp Hulûsi Erdem, Sabattin Eyüboğlu, Nurullah Ataç, Bedrettin Tuncel, Enver Ziya Karal, Sabahattin Ali, Cemal Köprülü, Abdülkadir İnan, Kadri Yürükoğlu (“Haberler” 1940: 112).

Balzac, Aeschylus, Plato, Julius Caesar, Machievelli, Swift, Voltaire, Lessing, Tolstoy and Sadi. Sadi was the only non-western writer in this list.

In its last meeting, the board decided to set up a permanent translation bureau. This bureau would “send the translations to editors to be examined and prepare the bi-monthly magazine *Tercüme Mecmuası*” [“Bu büronun vazifesi gelecek tercümeleri, tetkik edecek kimselere göndermek ve iki ayda bir çıkacak olan *Tercüme Mecmuasını* hazırlamaktır.”] (“Haberler” 1940a: 113).

The initial Translation Bureau was made up of seven members: Nurullah Ataç (chairman), Saffet Pala (secretary general), Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Sabahattin Ali, Bedrettin Tuncel, Enver Ziya Karal and Nusret Hızır. Its magazine *Tercüme* started to be published in May 1940. The members of the Translation Bureau were translators themselves and personally translated for the Bureau. Some books were commissioned to other translators who were asked to translate a sample of twenty five to thirty pages which would be checked by experts. If their samples were found to be adequate, they would continue their translation (“Haberler” 1940a: 113).

The Translation Bureau prepared translations for several series which were published by the Ministry of Education. Among these “*Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeler*” (Translations from World Literature) is the best known. “*Okul Klâsikleri*” (School Classics) and the publications of the State Conservatory also occupied a considerable part of the Bureau’s time. The Bureau started working rather intensively and translated 10 plays for the State Conservatory in its first year. 13 works were translated in 1941. Thereafter, the number of books translated and commissioned by the Bureau rose steadily. 27 books came out in 1942, 68 in 1943, 97 in 1944, 110 in 1945 and 143 in 1946 (*Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* 1967: VI). During this time, the Bureau had focused on western classics. Greek and Latin

works were largely prioritized, while eastern works were neglected to a significant degree. Only 23 out of the 467 titles translated between 1940-1946 were eastern classics (5 per cent) and these mainly consisted of Arabic and Persian works (based on Tuncor 1989: 26-65). After 1946, a decline was observed in the number of books published, as well as a revision of the general policy of the Translation Bureau. While the period leading up to 1947 had a pronounced focus on literature, the titles after 1947 also included scholarly and philosophical works. More will be said about this in the coming sections. When the Bureau was closed down in 1966, it had produced a total of 1247 works, including reprints. 973 of these were first-time editions. *Tercüme*, too, continued to be published until 1966, but especially in the 1950s it became rather irregular, failing to appear for long periods. *Tercüme* included translations, reviews, criticism, bibliographies and news about the activities of the Translation Bureau. One of its major functions was to provide a free platform where translators and writers could raise their views on translation. In that sense, the pieces published in *Tercüme* offer clues about the concepts of translation held by the translators and the writers, and their views on translation strategies. It could be considered as the mouthpiece of the Translation Bureau, keeping abreast with the latest developments in the world of “canonical” translations.

Through the Translation Bureau, the state set out to fulfill a function that was both expected of it, and was necessary to complement its nation-building efforts in the field of literature. While the rate of literacy was soaring due to intensive literacy campaigns and the level of education was on the rise on account of new schools and teacher training institutions, there was a shortage of literary works which would aid the state in the creation of a national sentiment. These works had to be in line with the principles of the new Republic and supplement the reforms by creating a

philosophical and literary background for them. The themes or styles of popular literature in circulation could not deliver these functions, while indigenous writing was too slow in responding to the needs of the state, striving to assume its place in the creation of a “national” literature, as I will demonstrate in Chapters 3 and 4. The Translation Bureau was set up as one of the pillars of the culture planning project and was a significant step towards the planning of literature and translation. It bridged the political and the literary fields by serving as a channel through which the concept of humanism, as the ideological basis for a Turkish renaissance, would be transferred to the field of literature and evoke a response in the readership, as well as in writers.

The Translation Bureau also assumed a pivotal role in the canon formation process in early republican Turkey. By defining canonicity in terms of the lists it prepared and its translations, the Bureau distinguished high literature from low, or popular literature. The making of the republican literary canon diverged from canon formation processes elsewhere. In the West, texts within a canon are classified according to genres which may develop a hierarchical relationship with each other varying over time (Jusdanis 1991: 61). In Turkey, the classificatory criterion was not a work’s genre, but its theme and provenance. Works originating from a “humanist” background were clearly prioritized regardless of the genre they belonged to, especially during the initial six years of the Bureau’s operation.

It would be misleading to think of translation planning only in terms of the Translation Bureau. The state also became involved in private publishing throughout the 1930s and 1940s, albeit indirectly. It set the course of translation activity for some private publishers by offering them assistance as well as guidance in their selection of titles to be translated. Therefore the phenomenon of “translation

planning” had far-reaching effects on the book market, as I will explain in Chapters 3 and 4. As for the market for the books published by the Ministry of Education, this issue will also be taken up in Chapter 4. Suffice it to say that the Ministry partly created its own market through its own distribution mechanism. The advertisements published in *Tercüme* indicate that the books by the Translation Bureau were sold in the state bookstores, as well as in regular bookstores for relatively cheap prices. However, there were some other channels through which these books found their readership: mainly libraries and schools. The planning of translation can only be properly contextualized by taking these channels into consideration. Below I will discuss the relationship between translated literature and two institutions which have closely been associated with the politics of the Republican People’s Party in the single-party era. These two institutions are also major pillars of the nation-building efforts.

2.1.4 Translation and Institutions of Planning

Around 1930, the legislative and political framework required by the culture planning project of the young Republic was more or less complete. Realizing the importance of popular consent for the success of their planning efforts, republican officials started working on the mechanisms necessary to create that consent. As mentioned earlier, education was considered to be the major tool and the planners introduced several new institutions that would serve towards the edification of the general public. The establishment of the Istanbul University (1933) and the Ankara State Conservatory (1936), the reform in the Fine Arts School (1936), and the setting up of the Village Institutes (1940) were significant steps towards expanding the

reach and quality of formal education for the Turkish youth. Adult education was not neglected, and a series of institutions that would increase the general educational and cultural level of the public were devised. The Nation's Schools (1929) were the first and most significant institutions of informal training for adults. Public libraries were another instrument for shaping the cultural landscape of the population. The libraries grew partly in conjunction with the People's Houses (Halk Evleri) and People's Rooms (Halk Odaları).

2.1.4.1 People's Houses

The People's Houses were set up in 1932 in fourteen towns. They had their origins in the "Türk Ocakları" (Turkish Hearths) a similar structure launched in 1912 and revived in 1924 (Lewis 1961: 376; Karpat 1959: 380; Öztürkmen 1994: 162). The People's Houses were supplemented by "Halk Odaları" (People's Rooms) in 1940 which opened up in smaller towns and villages. These institutions were regarded as cultural centres which would provide ground for inculcating the principles of the republican reforms in the general population (Lewis 1961: 376). The People's Houses were conceived of as 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 (*Halkevleri İdare ve Teşkilat Talimnamesi*, 1940, reprinted in *Halkevleri* 1963: 10). In a public address he gave on the occasion of the first anniversary of the People's Houses in 1933, İsmet İnönü, then Prime Minister, confirmed this function by saying, "Friends, The People's Houses are centres which can daily convey the principles and practices of the Republican People's Party to the people" ["Arkadaşlar; Halkevleri. Cümhuriyet

Halk Fırkası'nın kendi prensipleri ne olduğunu ve bu prensiplerin memlekette nasıl tatbik edildiğini her gün halkımıza söylemek için de başlı başına bir merkezdir.”] (İnönü in *Söylevler 1932-1941*).

The People's Houses had nine branches of activity: language and literature, fine arts, drama, sports, social assistance, adult education, library and publications, village welfare, history and museums (*Halkevleri* 1963: 11). Each People's House was expected to have a library (*Halkevleri* 1963: 10) and reading was encouraged on every occasion. The guidebook published for the libraries to be set up in the People's Houses instructed the librarians and the administrators of the Houses to create an environment amenable to reading by extending the working hours to enable readers to come to the library after work or during weekends (İğdemir 1939: 59). The guide formulated the objectives and principles of the libraries in the People's Houses as follows:

The libraries in the People's Houses are institutions which have been set up with the aim of encouraging the public to read and of enlightening their ideas. Therefore there is no reason to prefer scientific works over literary ones in the People's Houses libraries and the value of the library should not be judged based on that. The libraries in the People's Houses have been set up to serve everyone who would like to have their reading needs fulfilled. However, vulgar books and books pursuing political purposes as well as books of low character and morals should have no place in the library (İğdemir 1939: 60).

[Halkevleri kütüphaneleri halkı okumaya teşvik ve fikirleri tenvir maksadile tesis edilmiş müesseselerdir. Buna binaen Halkevleri kütüphanelerinde ilmî eserleri edebî eserlere bir tercih sebep olmadığı gibi, kütüphanenin kıymeti de bu noktai nazardan ölçülmemelidir. Halkevleri kütüphaneleri mütalâa ihtiyacını tatmin etmek isteyen herkes için kurulmuştur. Ancak âmiyane eserler ile siyasi hedef takip eden eserlerin, karakter ve ahlâk noktai nazarından zayıf eserlerin kütüphanede yeri olmamalıdır (İğdemir 1939: 60).]

Libraries constituted one of the most active branches of the People's Houses. The number of libraries in People's Houses rose from 22 in 1935 to 395 in 1945,

including those in the People's Rooms, and the number of readers soared from 45,789 to 648,408 within the same period (Ersoy 1966: 9). The activity reports of the People's Houses attach special importance to their library services and indicate that they kept regular records of their books and readers (*Halkevlerinin 1934 Senesi Faaliyet Raporları Hülâsası* 1935; *Halkevlerinin 1935 Senesi Faaliyet Raporları Hülâsası* 1936). Some larger People's Houses were also engaged in publishing activity (see Afyon People's Houses report in *Halkevlerinin 1934 Senesi Faaliyet Raporları Hülâsası* 1935: 7).

The People's Houses placed an emphasis on the reading of translated classics. This becomes clear through the "summary" competitions ("kitap hülâsa etme müsabakası") of the Ankara People's House for high school and university students. These competitions aimed to make students better understand the works they read and to absorb what they read (İğdemir 1945: 22). In 1945, the People's House offered the contestants four options they could choose from to prepare their summaries. One of them was a classic published by the Ministry of Education: *Le Rouge et le Noir* by Stendhal for university students and *Julius Ceasar* by Shakespeare for high school students. Three university students and two high school students won the competition and the summaries they prepared were published in a volume by the Ministry of Education.

A personal interview held with a former visitor of the Şehremini People's House in the 1930s and 1940s revealed that the library served both as a reference centre for students doing their homework and assignments and a place visited for leisure reading after school hours and during holidays. The respondent also indicated that the most recent publications would be available through the library and his first

contact with Turkish novels and translated classics took place through the library of the Şehremini People's House (Interview with Hasan Sezai Gürçağlar on 8.4.2001).

Based on the above information it can be assumed that the People's Houses occupied a significant place in the reading experiences of people, and that their libraries were one of the major "customers" for both indigenous and translated literature. In 1943, alone, the libraries of the People's Houses acquired 55,000 books (Çeçen 2000: 170). In 1945, the total collection of books written in the Latin alphabet held by the People's Houses amounted to 564,122 (Ersoy 1966: 10). These libraries were much more popular among the reading public when compared with other public libraries which largely held collections in Ottoman script. In 1944, public libraries outside the People's Houses held 234, 688 books in the new script, i.e. only one third of the People's Houses (Ersoy 1966: 10). The collections in the People's Houses were formed either through the books supplied by the state, through donations by private individuals or through purchases (Çeçen 2000: 147-148). The translated classics published by the Ministry of Education were among the books purchased by the People's Houses, especially by those located in the urban areas (Taner 1948: 12-13). Based on the instructions printed in the guidebook for libraries, it appears as though all of these libraries were expected to receive or purchase books of a certain kind, i.e. books that were not "vulgar or of low character and morals". It is difficult to guess the exact titles or the genres of the books referred to in this statement. Nevertheless, it will become clear in Chapter 3, that such phrases were often used to denote popular literature.

Apart from their libraries, People's Houses put the local communities in contact with indigenous and translated literature through their drama branches. Drama was one of the most popular branches of activity in the Houses. In 1944, 329

People's Houses out of 405 held theatre performances (Karadağ 1998: 101). By 1947, a total of 400 Turkish and translated plays had been performed by members of People's Houses (Karadağ 1998: 102). Turkish plays proved to be more popular than translations. There were no translations among the 24 most frequently performed plays of the People's Houses (Karadağ 1998: 114). Nevertheless, 82 out of the 290 plays (28 per cent) so far identified to have been staged by People's Houses were translations or adaptations. Furthermore, 18 plays translated by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education were performed by the houses (Karadağ 1998: 217-234). As we analyze these figures, we should also bear in mind that the Translation Bureau was set up only eight years after the establishment of the Houses.

The drive to educate the people appears as the main motive behind the activities of the drama branches. This motive was underlined by the state officials as well as by the intellectuals of the country. In his address on the occasion of the first anniversary of the People's Houses Prime Minister İsmet İnönü stated that the People's Houses had to make use of their artistic activities as a means of edifying the people and encouraging them to work harder for the benefit of their country (İnönü in *Söylevler* 1942: 18). In an article on the drama activities of the People's Houses, an eminent novelist, translator and playwright of the early republican period, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, maintained that theatre performances would enable the youth to receive intellectual, educational and linguistic training. He also added that this could only be enabled by performing works which have "a literary and intellectual value" ["*edebi ve fikri değeri olan*"] (1940: 133-134).

A main concern for the selection of the plays was their message. The state wished to see works that would help instill the principles of the Republic in the

public. The basic problem was a shortage of indigenous plays that had the literary and intellectual value Güntekin was referring to, as well as the ideological content the officials required. The Republican People's Party encouraged the writing of indigenous plays and commissioned new plays to Turkish playwrights (Karadağ 1998: 103). It published both translations and indigenous plays within a series it launched for this purpose under the title "CHP Halkevleri Temsil Yayınları Serisi" (Republican People's Party People's Houses Drama Publications Series). The Party also launched four competitions to select plays which would be included in the repertoires of the People's Houses (Karadağ 1998: 109). According to the terms of the first competition opened in 1938, the competing playwrights could write on any subject they wished to, provided that they remained within the basic principles of the Turkish "revolution". The plays had to enhance the public's literary taste and rhetorical skills. Moreover they had to address the modern, cultural and national feelings of the new Turkish society. They also had to be edifying (Karadağ 1998: 104). These requirements echo the general expectations from literature as a means of education and nation-building in the early republican era.

Translated plays published by the Ministry of Education started to be performed after 1940, yet they were mainly popular in the People's Houses located in urban centres. Only 8 out of 116 People's Houses which had active drama branches after 1940 staged plays translated by the Translation Bureau. The Adana People's House staged two of these plays in 1945, the Ankara People's House performed four between 1945 and 1947, the Bakırköy People's House performed three between 1940 and 1946 and the Eminönü People's House performed three between 1941 and 1947 (based on lists offered by Karadağ 1998: 247-267). Nevertheless, these were large People's Houses with a relatively high number of

members when compared to Houses located in the countryside. For instance the Eminönü People's House, one of the most active Houses in all of the branches, held 80 performances and attracted over fourteen thousand viewers in 1935. Its performances were broadcast nationwide by the state radio (*Halkevlerinin 1935 Senesi Faaliyet Raporları Hülâsası* 1936: 47). In the same year, Ünye People's House held five, while Trabzon People's House held only three theatre performances (*Halkevlerinin 1935 Senesi Faaliyet Raporları Hülâsası* 1936: 112-113). We can safely conclude that although only a few People's Houses performed classics translated by the Translation Bureau, their reach was higher than those which did not perform these classics. Furthermore, urban People's Houses seemed more receptive to the works of the Translation Bureau, while rural Houses concentrated mainly on local plays.

The Translation Bureau's penetration to the countryside may have been insignificant in terms of the activities of the People's Houses. Nevertheless, another crucial instrument of culture planning that aimed to provide a platform for the education of the rural population, the Village Institutes, became a channel for the distribution of the classics to the rural areas.

2.1.4.2 The Village Institutes

Unlike the People's Houses, the Village Institutes were a part of the formal educational system and put students in contact with literature within a more planned and systematic structure. The institutes remain as one of the most controversial instruments of planning of the early republican era. They have had a transformative role on the rural population and on Turkish literature during their short period of

activity.⁹ The Institutes were set up with the idea of educating the rural population, who would, in turn, educate their fellow-villagers and help combat illiteracy and general backwardness. Young village children would be trained at the expense of the state and upon graduation would be sent back to their own villages as teachers to teach villagers agricultural methods and hygiene (Lewis 1961: 471; Karpat 1959: 377).

The Village Institutes have been extensively criticized since their conception in 1940. There is little doubt that the Institutes not only taught children about rural matters such as agricultural methods or animal husbandry, but they also intended to transfer the general principles and ideology of the new Republic. First and foremost, they aimed to implant a sense of equality (Apaydın 1967: 54) and brought about practices that ran against religious conservatism which dominated the majority of the countryside. Furthermore, their incorporation of girls into the educational system and their adoption of co-education as well as their emphasis on positivism were some of the elements that reinforced the principle of secularism. A graduate of the Village Institutes, Talip Apaydın, suggested that the teachers in those Institutes strove to inject a unique spirit and personality to their students based on democracy, critical debate and practical training (Apaydın 1967: 54). The ideological orientation of the Republic made itself felt in the Institutes. Kemal Karpat writes,

Given the practical training in the field and in the classroom in a spirit of self-sacrifice, the graduates of the Institutes considered themselves the standard-bearers and representatives of the new regime in its fight against ignorance, poverty, religious fanaticism, and archaic traditions in the villages” (Karpat 1959: 378).

⁹ The institutes were set up in 1940 with 20 schools scattered around the countryside. In 1947, with the transition to the multi-party system the Institutes were re-structured and lost their initial function of offering practical training to the rural population. In 1951 they were converted to “Teachers’ Schools”.

Reading played a very important role in the daily activities of the Village Institutes as a means of creating cultural and social awareness. Apart from technical courses, the training programme included subjects such as sociology, psychology and economics where translated textbooks were used (Demircan 2000: 160; Apaydın 1967: 108). There were daily “free reading” hours where students were encouraged to read translated works as well as contemporary Turkish fiction (Demircan 2000: 161). Vedat Günyol, who taught French at Hasanoğlan Village Institute in the early 1940s maintains that literature teachers made a special effort to assign the reading of translated classics to the students. He also remembers students coming to him and asking specific questions about French classics and French writers (Interview with Vedat Günyol, 30.10.2001).

The graduates of these Institutes gained not only practical skills but also an intellectual background in literature and social sciences. Some students, and later, teachers of the Institutes took up a career in literature and found the opportunity to have their works published in the magazine *Köy Enstitüleri Dergisi* (The Village Institutes Magazine) which had a circulation of 16,500 (Demircan 2000: 165). This generation of writers¹⁰ launched the movement called “village literature” (“köy edebiyatı”) in the late 1940s and early 1950s and brought new life to Turkish literature which had thus far taken up urban themes (Karpas 1962: 38-40). The hallmark of their novels was realism and an emphasis on lived experience, which significantly altered the image of village life in the readers (Ahmad 1993: 84).

¹⁰ This generation was led by Mahmut Makal who published his impressions of Turkish village life in serialized form in the popular literary magazine *Varlık* and had a ground-breaking impact on the contemporary literature of the time. This series was published under the name *Bizim Köy* in 1950. Makal was shortly joined by writers like Talip Apaydın, Fakir Baykurt and Mehmet Başaran, all educated at Village Institutes.

The curriculum of the Village Institutes had special focus on literature. Teachers instructed the students to read regularly during the daily “free reading” hours and students were asked to write down summaries of the books they read and have discussions among themselves (Demircan 2000: 161). A Village Institute graduate reports that within one year, an average third-year¹¹ student in the Institute read between 23 and 64 books (Tekben in Demircan 2000: 161). Another graduate, who later became a writer, wrote that the teachers worked hard to instill the habit of reading in the students:

Judging for myself, initially there were books which I understood nothing of, yet read with determination, with persistence. The impression our teachers gave us was that we had to read just as we ate bread or drank water, we had to read continuously, and then we would benefit and learn many things without even being aware of it. Our knowledge, our culture would develop (Apaydın 1967: 56).

[Kendimden biçiyorum, ilk günler ısrarla, inatla okuyup da hiç birşey anlamadığım kitaplar oldu. Ama bize öyle bir kanı vermişlerdi ki, okuyalım. ekmek yer, su içer gibi boyuna okuyalım, farkında bile olmadan pek çok şeyler öğreneceğiz, faydalanacağız. Bilgimiz, kültürümüz gelişecek (Apaydın 1967: 56).]

This indicates that the use of literature as a planning tool did not remain in rhetoric; it permeated even the remotest parts of the country through the educational system. The above statement coming from a writer, who was once a peasant boy, and would have probably remained a peasant if it hadn't been for the Village Institutes, testifies that the reading of literature, as an option in the new cultural and educational repertoire, was adopted by at least one of the target groups. Nevertheless, the reach of the Village Institutes was limited¹², and the majority of rural children and youth

¹¹ Corresponding to 8th grade in primary education.

¹² There were twenty-one institutes around the country in 1948 and the number of graduates and students reached 25,000 in 1950 (Karpaz 1959: 377-378). This was a relatively low figure when we

who did not attend school, remained exempt from this aspect of the culture planning project. In fact, there is evidence showing that not all Village Institute students agreed to reading. Apaydın wrote that some of his class-mates scolded him for reading and that there were two groups of students, those who read and studied quietly, and those who were socially more outgoing, yet unable to develop a habit of reading. He remarks that it was the members of the former group who turned out to be more successful in life, although he does not elaborate on what he means by “success” (Apaydın 1967: 57).

Statements by former students of the Village Institutes indicate that translated classics were the most popular reading material at those schools. Apaydın wrote that as students, they read Turkish and foreign novels, short stories, books published by Remzi Publishing House and “classics”.¹³ Another graduate of the Village Institutes, Ömer Demircan, wrote that they received the classics published by the Ministry of Education as soon as they came out and devoured them (Demircan 2000: 161). Pakize Türkoğlu, also a graduate, wrote,

The selected Turkish and world classics published by the Ministry of Education have truly had a significant role in implanting a reading habit in the students as well as in encouraging an interest in domestic and international affairs and in the way they developed a sound perspective. These outstanding works found their most eager readers in the Village Institutes (Türkoğlu 2000: 269).

[Köy Enstitülerinde okuma alışkanlığının bunca derin kazanılmasında öğrencilerin yurt ve dünya sorunlarına olan ilgisinde, sağlıklı bir bakış açısı

consider that there were around 35,000 villages in the country during the same period (Lewis 1961: 471). According to Feroz Ahmad (1993: 84) this figure was 44,000, making the number of graduates seem even smaller. Ahmad also suggests that “the number may be small enough but the influence of these teachers was totally out of proportion to it” (1993: 84).

¹³ Remzi Publishing House launched a series of translated literature in 1937 under the title “Translations from World Authors” (“Dünya Muharrirlerinden Tercümeleler”). 100 books, mainly consisting of translated western classics, were published in this series by 1948 (see Chapter 4). The term “classics” is often used to refer to the classics translated by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education.

geliştirmelerinde, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nca yayımlanan Türk ve dünya klasiklerinden seçme yapıtların büyük etkisi olduğu doğrudur. Bu nitelikli yapıtlar en istekli okurlarını Köy Enstitülerinde buldu (Türkoğlu 2000: 269).]

Kemal Karpat, who visited the famous Hasanoğlan Village Institute near Ankara, a teacher training college and the only Village Institute of higher education, studied the library records and concluded that books borrowed most frequently from the library were classics, works on Turkish history and books related to the general state of the country. Records revealed that romantic novels and stories were not that popular among the students (Karpat 1962: 68).

The encounter between İnönü and a female student at the Savaştepe Village Institute has been taken up by a number of writers to exemplify the interest the students felt in the classics (originally published in M. Asaf Aktan's *Canlandırıcı Eğitim Yolunda* in 1991, reprinted in Makal 1992:85; Baykurt 1997: 130; Türkoğlu 2000: 269; Demircan 2000: 161). On a visit to the Institute, İnönü saw a young girl with her lunch bag and asked what she had in it. She showed him the modest lunch along with a copy of *Antigone* by Sophocles in Turkish translation, published by the Ministry of Education. Touched by what he saw, İnönü turned to his company and told them that the students at the Institutes were reading the most recent publications which were not even read in Ankara. Upon hearing this, the girl said: "Sir, it's not only me, the whole institute is reading this book." ["Efendim ben değil, tüm enstitü okuyor bu kitabı."]

The intensive reading programme introduced in the Village Institutes were backed up by teachers and intellectuals who taught at these institutes. Some of these intellectuals were also associated with the Translation Bureau, pointing at a close connection between these two institutions of planning. Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, one of the chairmen of the Translation Bureau and a prolific translator who translated 18

books for the Translation Bureau, taught western literature at Hasanođlan Village Institute, which was a teacher training college. Professor İrfan Şahinbaş who translated 9 books for the Bureau taught English, while Vedat Günyol, translator of 3 books published by the Ministry of Education, taught French at the same Institute (Apaydın 1967: 159-160). An obituary published in *Tercüme* for Saffet Korkut (Pala), translator and associate professor of English, announced that she taught both at the university and at Hasanođlan Village Institute and that some of her students at both schools became translators for the Bureau (“Saffet Korkut” 1946: 97). The translators teaching at the Institutes made extensive use of translated classics by the Translation Bureau as teaching material. Apaydın recalls having read and analyzed books by Socrates, Plato, Epiktetus, Montaigne, Voltaire and Rousseau in Eyübođlu’s western literature courses (Apaydın 1967: 163).

Eyübođlu, who also served as chairman of the Translation Bureau after Nurullah Ataç, was an ardent supporter of the Village Institutes. He not only taught at the Hasanođlan Village Institute, but was also involved in preparing the curriculum of the Institute. Moreover, he encouraged his immediate family and friends to work for the Village Institutes. His sister Mualla worked at the Hasanođlan Institute, while Eyübođlu continuously urged his brother, Bedri Rahmi, a prominent writer and artist of the time, to join the same Institute (see Eyübođlu’s letters to his sister and brother in Başaran 2001: 57-68). A letter to the headmaster of Arifiye Village Institute written by Eyübođlu illustrates how his several identities, as a translator, as a member of the Translation Bureau and as a teacher at the Village Institutes are inseparably connected. Having heard that the headmaster was looking for plays to be staged in Arifiye, Eyübođlu wrote him a letter recommending translations. He wrote,

It would be in vain to look for an indigenous play that would suit the institutes. Our playwrights are only novices and what is more, they only address a limited audience around them ... Europeans are better in this business. We will borrow plays from them just as we borrow physics or chemistry books. But we will not do this as snobbishly as the Darülbedayi¹⁴ or the Conservatory does. We will only borrow the texts. We will perform the play with our own colour, with our own means and own understanding (Başaran 2001: 68-69).

[Telif piyesler arasında enstitülerin işine yarayacak eser aramak beyhudedir. Muharrirlerimiz bu işte pek acemi olduktan maada bir türlü kendi etraflarındaki mahdut zümreye hitap etmekten kurtulamıyorlar ... Bu işte Avrupalılar bizden usta. Fizik kimya kitapları gibi tiyatro örneklerimizi de onlardan alacağız. Fakat Darülbedayi gibi, konservatuvar gibi züppece değil. Yalnız metni alacağız. Oyunu kendi rengimizle, kendi imkânlarımızla, kendi anlayışımızla oynayacağız (Başaran 2001: 68-69).]

Eyüboğlu recommended the classics published by the Ministry of Education, mainly works by Molière and Shakespeare. He also added that these works should be distributed to the students to be read, discussed and memorized. He remarked: “They must not say that they do not understand these works. They will have to manage” [“Biz bu eserleri anlamıyoruz demek yok. Anladıkları kadar.”] (Başaran 2001: 69-70). This statement, together with Apaydın’s above account of how he developed the habit of reading, make it clear that the students did not always understand what they read, but they continued, mainly because they were encouraged and instructed to do so by their teachers.

2.1.4.3 The State Radio

The State Radio was another institution that deserves to be mentioned in terms of the socio-political context within which the Translation Bureau and other publishers

¹⁴ The Istanbul municipal theatre.

active in the field of translated classics were situated. The Radio broadcast performances of the State Conservatory, as well as theatre performances by some People's Houses. In the 1940s, some of these performances consisted of translated classics. For example the magazine of the People's Houses, *Ülkü* (1.3.1942) reported that *Antigone*, which was the first Greek classic performed by the students of the State Conservatory held its premiere in February 1942 and that this performance was broadcast nationwide.

The general focus on education and reading could also be noted in the Radio programmes. Regular contact between the listeners and translated classics took place via "The Book Hour" ["Kitap Saati"], a programme aired twice weekly starting from 1942. The programme prepared and presented by Adnan Ötügen informed the listeners of new books in the market. These books were not only literary, but covered a wide range of subjects such as the fine arts, medicine, aviation and agriculture (Ötügen 1946: 4-10). Ötügen introduced the subject matter and the format of new books. The programme only ran for about 15 minutes, so there was no time to go into a review or a critique of the books. Instead, Ötügen concentrated on introducing the publishers, the price, illustrations and cover details of the books (Ötügen 1946: V, XIII). Ötügen allocated one of his programmes to introducing the classics published by the Ministry of Education in 1942 (Ötügen 1946: 22-29). He introduced 27 works in a rather detailed way, mentioning the author and translator of each one. He also commented that all works were translated with utmost care by competent scholars and carefully edited before they were published (Ötügen 1946: 22). He invariably praised all of the 27 books and concluded his programme by commenting, "I see no need to recommend my intellectual listeners to acquire the whole collection of these extraordinary works for their own libraries, or at least to

read them” [“Aydın dinleyicilerime bu eşsiz eserlerin bir koleksiyonunu kendi hususi kütüphanelerine mal etmelerini veya hiç olmazsa bunları okumalarını tavsiyeye bile lüzum görmüyorum”] (Ötüken 1946: 29). Ötüken allocated time for the introduction of other translated classics, published both by the Ministry and Education and private publishers in his programmes (Ötüken 1946: 29-38).

Although Ötüken claimed to address “intellectuals”, the Radio’s reach was far beyond that. By the 1940s, it had become a major means of information and entertainment in the remotest parts of the country and often constituted the only means through which the public was informed of cultural affairs. An article published in *Son Posta* on November 28, 1945, expressed the importance of the “Book Hour” for the rural population as follows:

Some have claimed that the Book Hour on the radio was not beneficial for those who had the opportunity to follow the daily press. It will be sufficient for these friends, who have not left Istanbul in all their lives, to take a small trip to the east to appreciate the value of the Book Hour. Radio is the only means of communication with the world in these regions, where no book reaches and where newspapers arrive only once in two months, especially in the winter (in Ötüken 1946: XVI).

[Bazıları günü gününe, gazetelerden neşriyatı takip imkânlarına mâlik bulunan bizler için, radyodaki kitap saatinin pek te faydalı olmadığını iddia ettiler... İstanbul’dan bir karış ayrılmamış bulunan bu arkadaşların radyodaki kitap saatinin kıymetini anlamaları için, küçük bir doğu seyahati yapmaları kâfidir. Kitabın hiç uğramadığı, gazetelerin, hele kışın, iki ayda bir geldiği bu yerlerde, nurları dünyaya bağlayan biricik vasıta radyodur (in Ötüken 1946: XVI).]

As it is clear from the above lines, the Ötüken presented the Radio as a significant instrument for maintaining contact between the rural population and cultural events and developments in Istanbul and Ankara. The Radio provided an instrument for the planners who wanted to reach the villages. By being incorporated into the official network of communication, the Translation Bureau, and translated

classics in general, had a chance to get in contact with the rural population, albeit in a limited way.¹⁵

The Radio, Village Institutes and the People's Houses constituted a significant part of the network within which the Translation Bureau classics were located. The common thread that ran through all of these institutions was the educational mission which lay exclusive emphasis on reading and literature. Within this network, the socio-cultural, as well as the political role of indigenous and translated literature was clearly defined. As Karpat wrote, "In this process of general transformation in Turkey, literature itself evolved from a means of amusement and self-expression into an effective weapon of social and cultural change" (Karpat 1959: 328). Karpat also mentions the contribution of the translation of world classics through the Ministry of Education to the development of Turkish literature (Karpat 1959: 328). Within the general project of culture planning, reading, but reading certain kinds of books, was regarded as a national duty. The people were mobilized to transform their own habituses, so to say, by reading books that would open up new horizons before them and change their mind-set in favour of a westernized, modernized and secular "nation". The romanization of the alphabet, literacy campaigns, setting up libraries and the establishment of the Translation Bureau are all steps that mark various stages on the same road expected to lead towards the "Turkish renaissance" in the form of a unique national culture that would be both western and Turkish.

This intensive period of culture planning, spanning over twenty three years from the proclamation of the Republic, entered a phase of stagnation in 1946. The

¹⁵ While discussing the importance of the State Radio for the modernization project, one should bear in mind that the reach of the Radio was limited throughout the 1930s and 1940s. The transmitters in Ankara and Istanbul were not strong enough to cover the whole country; many areas in the North, East and Southeast could not receive radio signals (Ersan Gözübüyük 1999: 6). Istanbul and Ankara had the largest number of radio receivers. In 1938, the two cities accounted for 70 per cent of all radio sets

reasons for this stagnation were both political and cultural. The transition to a multi-party regime required the Republican People's Party to adopt a populist approach and modify some of its radical cultural practices. The Democrat Party government between 1950-1960 brought about a downturn in terms of some of the cultural policies adopted and implemented during the single-party regime.

2.2 The Transition to the Multi-Party System: De-planning of Culture

While the culture planning project continued with significant steps such as the setting up of the Village Institutes and the Translation Bureau in the 1940s, the country was suffering from considerable social turmoil. The desired socio-cultural cohesion seemed far away mainly due to political and economic problems. Although Turkey remained neutral during World War II, its economy was deeply scarred. The decreasing purchasing power of the citizens created social unrest. This was coupled by repressive measures taken by the government, such as martial law and strict control of the press, against foreign espionage and infiltration (Lewis 1961: 298). Turkey adopted the United Nation's Declaration in 1945 as it became clear that its interests lay in the West. The UN Charter required Turkey to liberalize its political regime and under the pressure of these external and internal developments, the Republican People's Party was forced to make fundamental changes in its philosophy and policies (Karpaz 1959: 143). The most significant change was the permission for the formation of an opposition party which was set up in January 1946 under the name Democrat Party. The Democrat Party became the spokesmen of private enterprise and individual initiative and attracted popular support in a short

in Turkey. Although the share of the provinces displayed a steady increase in the 1940s, Istanbul and Ankara still had 53 per cent of all radio sets in 1946 (Kocabaşoğlu 1980: 207).

period of time (Karpat 1959: 153). Republican People's Party soon became aware of the rise of the Democrats and held a party convention in May 1946 to revise its policies in a number of fields. I take this as marking the beginning of a period of "de-planning" in the field of culture.

The principle of statism was abolished to a large degree and government control over the economy started to loosen. Yet this would not be sufficient to win seats in the elections as it was not only the economic measures which troubled the people. The social and cultural policies of the early republican era had also created discomfort among the public. The growing resistance, which largely remained passive during the war years, was starting to become more and more vocal with the transition to a multi-party system. Secularism was the focal point of a number of social and cultural problems. The rural population did not understand the benefits of secularism, as the principle of secularism had never been properly explained to them (Ahmad 1993: 105). Following the discussions in the 1947 Republican People's Party Convention, the principle of secularism was amended and a gradual liberalization was carried out in the field of religion. Religious instruction was re-introduced under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, while permission was extended to private schools for the training of "imams" (Karpat 1959: 279). The Republican People's Party seemed to introduce a halt to its culture planning project. This became most evident with the changes made to the Village Institutes.

2.2.1 The Village Institutes and the People's Houses under De-planning

While the Institutes 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 until

1946, the liberalization policies of the government revised and restricted their activities after 1946. After Hasan Âli 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 (Karpaz 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. This part of the planning project seemed to have lost the support of the majority in the National Assembly. A return to religious concerns and fear of communism dominated the resolutions adopted by the National Assembly. Co-education in the Institutes, which was found to be detrimental to youth's morality by certain politicians (Karpaz 1959: 38), was abolished. The free reading hours were restricted and students were only allowed to read books that "suited their level" ["öğrencilerin düzeyine uygun"]; this has largely been interpreted as a regulation against the reading of classics by the students (Türkoğlu 2000: 556). New reading lists were issued and the books supplied during Yücel's Ministry started to be destroyed. The curriculum was amended and practical training was reduced (Türkoğlu 2000: 556). The Democrat Party, which took over the government in 1950, merged the Village Institutes with teacher training schools in 1954, putting a definitive end to a unique, yet effective, experiment in culture planning for the rural population.

The People's Houses also underwent a re-structuring during the transition to a multi-party regime. The Houses were being criticized as institutions directly attached to the Republican People's Party which then saw a need to revise its ties with the Houses. In 1947, it was concluded that the Houses would be converted into

cultural foundations for the general use of the public. This decision was not carried out, although the Houses no longer had any political responsibility after 1947 (Karpas 1959: 381). By 1950, there were around 500 People's Houses and 4,000 People's Rooms in the country. In 1951, their buildings were confiscated by the Democrat Party as the property of the Republican People's Party and the Houses were closed down. Arzu Öztürkmen raises an interesting question regarding the closure of the People's Houses. She suggests that although there is fairly detailed information about the structure and functioning of the People's Houses and the reaction of the Democrat Party against these institutions, no detailed study exists about why that reaction may have come about (Öztürkmen 1994: 175). She further maintains that there is no information on the members of the public who did not participate in the activities of the Houses during their time of operation. According to Öztürkmen, neither is there any insight on the way the public criticized or opposed the modernization efforts of the People's Houses. Öztürkmen evokes the possibility that the Houses might have fulfilled their original function in the 1940s and that they would not have been able to fit in with the multi-party system anyway (Öztürkmen 1994: 175). Whatever the case, the People's Houses filled a large gap in terms of increasing the cultural capital of the urban and rural communities. Their dissolution meant the loss of a valuable instrument of culture planning.

The de-planning phase, which had started with the transition to a multi-party system in 1946, gained momentum after the Democrat Party won the 1950 elections and took over the government. The general policy of the Democrat Party was economic liberalism. Nevertheless, conservatism ruled in the field of culture. This conservatism made itself felt both in politics and in the cultural practices of the new government.

2.2.2 Nationalism and Language as Instances of De-planning

The cultural de-planning process can best be explained in terms of the changes introduced in two major fields that constituted the foundations of the culture planning process in the single-party era: nationalism and language. Nationalism, which constituted one of the ideological pillars of the Republican People's Party's practices was subject to reinterpretation in 1947. It was the principle of nationalism which had guided the majority of reforms in the period leading up to the multi-party era. The language reform, the Linguistic and Historical Societies, the People's Houses, the Village Institutes had all served towards the creation of a national identity based on a common culture, language and history. The Republican People's Party had regarded nationalism as a political principle during the single-party era, while, later, the general liberalization policies of the party led to a re-interpretation of this principle. The new interpretation was propagated by Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, who proposed to "fill a gap created in the past twenty-five years in the ideals of nationalism and to fulfill the demands of people" (Karpat 1959: 256). Tanrıöver's blend of nationalism contained a strong element of religion. According to Tanrıöver, religion combined with history, would provide the common ground for this new nationalism, because "the source of national strength lay in history, particularly in the history of the Ottoman Empire, and because Islam lived in the spirit of the Turkish communities" (Karpat 1959: 255). This was in complete opposition to the former version of nationalism which strongly denounced the uniting spirit of religion. Religion was seen as a force that prevented the forming of a national community based on "language", "culture", and "ideal" ["dil", "kültür" ve

“mefkûre”] (Republican People’s Party Programme, Article 5). During the single-party era, efforts were constantly made to replace the sense of religious community which lay at the heart of the Ottoman Empire, with that of a linguistic and cultural community. In 1933, an article published in *Ülkü* expressed this as follows: “The Turkish nation failed to display true national development or to develop a clear awareness of its nationality as long as it adopted the caliphate or the idea of religious community” [“Türk milleti; halifecilik ve ümmetçilik içinde ne hakikî bir millî inkişaf görmüş, ne de milliyeti hakkında sarîh bir şuur edinebilmiştir”] (Aydoslu 1933: 281). The new version of nationalism proved to be the legitimate one for the period after 1946 and brought the concept closer to Ziya Gökalp’s traditionalist view of nationalism which took its “sap” from Islam (Karpas 1959: 455).

Indeed, Gökalp’s cultural framework made itself strongly felt in the practices of the Democrat Party. This could be considered a return to the “partialist” position present in the pre-republican era: Turkey would look up to the West in terms of science and technology, but would preserve its own values when it came to culture. In Gökalp’s words “Our spiritual needs stemming from religion and nation cannot be borrowed from the West. That is the place to borrow technique and science. Our ideal is a modern Islamic Turkishness” [“Dinden ve milliyetten doğan manevî ihtiyaçlarımız Batı’dan alınamaz. Oradan teknik ve ilim alınacaktır. Ülkümüz modern bir İslam Türklüğüdür”] (Gökalp in Ülken 1994: 321). The revival of the partialist view was a major blow to one of the tenets of the culture planning project of the single-party era. The Republican People’s Party had worked hard to put an end to dualism in westernization by adopting western principles in both science and culture. The kind of nationalism propagated by the Republican People’s Party was

based on re-discovering the pre-Islamic roots of the Turkish civilization by using western concepts.

Nothing expresses the “partialist” approach of the Democrat Party better than its own government programme accepted on May 22, 1950. The programme read:

Regardless of how materially advanced a country is, a society which does not provide room for spiritual values in its soul and which is not based on nationally and morally strong principles, will surely face a terrible end under the current complex conditions of the world. The dissemination of science and technical knowledge in a country does not guarantee the survival of a free and independent nation, unless this principle is adopted by the training and education system and unless that country equips its youth with spiritual and humane values in line with its national character and customs (*1920-1989 T.C. Hükümet Programlarında Kültür Politikası* 1990: 74).

[Maddi bakımdan ne kadar ilerlemiş olursa olsun, millî ahlâkî sarsılmaz esaslara dayanmayan, ruhunda manevî kıymetlere yer vermeyen bir cemiyetin, bugünkü karışık dünya şartları içinde kötü akibetlere sürükleneceği tabiidir. Tâlim ve terbiye sisteminde bu gayeyi göz önünde bulundurmeyen, gençliğini millî karakterine ve ananelerine göre manevî ve insanî kıymetlerle teçhizat edemeyen bir memlekette ilmîn ve teknik bilginin yayılmış olması, hür müstakil bir millet olarak yaşamanın teminatı sayılamaz (*1920-1989 T.C. Hükümet Programlarında Kültür Politikası* 1990: 74).]

This new version of nationalism accommodated religion as a uniting principle and soon enough, the hard-line attitude against the use of Ottoman words, as symbols of the religious community, was modified. Words of Arabic and Persian origin started to be re-introduced into Turkish vocabulary, a process which became rather visible after the Democrat Party came into power. One of the earliest and decisive moves of the Democrat government in 1950 was to lift the ban on the call to prayer in Arabic. The Democrat Party also permitted Koran recitation over the radio (Heyd 1954: 52; İmer 1998: 73). This decision had religious consequences, as well as linguistic ones. It was clearly announcing that the new national identity based on the Turkish language was being modified to give way to the older order of religion.

Another significant act of linguistic de-planning by the Democrat government was the replacement of the 1945 constitution with the former one promulgated in 1924 (“Teşkilat-ı Esasiye). The 1945 constitution was a Turkified version of the former constitution. The 1924 constitution had been translated into “pure” Turkish and promulgated in 1945 (Lewis 1961: 429). In December 1952, after considerable debate in the National Assembly, the “pure Turkish” constitution was withdrawn and the text of the 1924 constitution was re-promulgated (Heyd 1954: 51; Lewis 1961: 429; İmer 1998: 73).

With the dawn of the multi-party era, and especially during the Democrat rule, the Turkish Linguistic Society adopted a moderate approach to linguistic issues and brought its scholarly role to the foreground, while it consistently abstained from representing language as a political issue (Heyd 1954: 49; Lewis 1961: 429). Although it continued its activities in the field of “simplifying” the language and standardizing the orthography, its mission of purification had come to an end and the Society assumed a much more passive role compared to its energetic profile during the 1930s and early 1940s. This also had some implications on the way words of Turkish origin were used in the society. When such words were deprived of official support, the use of words of Turkish origin by daily newspapers fell to 51 per cent in the 1950s from 57 per cent in 1946 (İmer 1998: 86, 88). Nevertheless, when we consider the fact that the rate of such vocabulary was only 35 per cent in 1931 at the start of the language reform, the success of linguistic planning becomes clear (İmer 1998: 86). Therefore, linguistic de-planning can be said to be only partially successful.

The Democrat government put an end to mass literacy campaigns and adult education came to a halt. This had significant repercussions for literacy figures in the

country. The rate of literacy had shown a steady increase during the single-party era starting with the alphabet reform. This mainly had to do with the Nation's Schools and later, adult education courses held by the People's Houses. The Democrat rule reversed this trend. While the literacy rate rose from 17.5 per cent in 1935 to 40 per cent in 1949, this rate stagnated during the next decade and, even fell to 39 per cent in 1960 at the end of the Democrat rule (İnan in İmer 1998: 71).

It would be misleading to claim that the Democrat Party reversed all of the cultural reforms introduced during Republican People's Party's time in government. While language reform, and adult education went through a process of de-planning, the Democrats continued the planning efforts in the field of formal education and libraries. Although the Village Institutes were abolished, the number of schools, teachers and students increased in the country. In fact, this number was doubled during the ten years of the Democrat rule (Tunçay 1997: 178). Public libraries also increased both in terms of number and the size of their collections. Between 1950 and 1960, 72 new libraries were opened, and the number of public libraries rose from 88 to 160 in 1960. The collections rose from a total of 876,701 books in 1950 to 1,776,508 books in 1960 (Ersoy 1966: 59). Nevertheless, such statistics give little impression about the qualitative properties of the libraries, and one will have to investigate the new books acquired by libraries during this decade to be able to arrive at firmer conclusions on this issue.

In the meantime, the changes introduced to the fields of language and religion provide enough evidence to enable one to view the cultural policies of the multi-party era as acts of de-planning. Some of the former planners, i.e. members of the Republican People's Party, joined the ranks of the opposition and were as active in

de-planning as much as had been in the initial planning process. About the period leading up to the Democrat government, Karpat wrote:

The most interesting approach of all these changes is that the criticism causing them came chiefly from the ranks of the Republican Party which had created these institutions. People who had helped, or had thought it advantageous to side with those creating the institutions, later did not hesitate to attack and tear them down in their efforts to adjust to the new political situation. That which one Republican Minister had done previously another tried to undo, as though they no longer belonged to the same party but to two rival parties bent upon destroying each other. The new Minister of Education, Şemseddin Sirer, undid what Hasan Âli Yücel and other Ministers tried to achieve, although both were Republicans. The party of reforms had become its own prosecutor (Karpat 1959: 382).

The attitude towards the translation of classics published by the Ministry of Education provides a striking example of how the transition to a multi-party system affected the behaviour of some politicians towards culture and literature.

2.2.3 Translation under Re-planning

The translations carried out by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education appeared to attract full consensus from the National Assembly between 1940-1946. Its selection of titles, its focus on works constituting the “humanist culture”, its working methods met with general acceptance. One cannot locate any form of negative criticism in terms of the use and function of translated classics during this time. There was no active resistance against the activities of the Translation Bureau. The criticism raised against certain classics published by the Ministry of Education remained at the level of the individual work and was largely composed of a critique of the translation strategies, rather than a criticism of the content or the value of these works.

As mentioned earlier, during the initial six years of its operation, the Translation Bureau gave weight to the translation of Greek and Latin classics. This was also accompanied by translations from European languages such as French, German, English and Russian. Classics from oriental and minor European languages were also translated, although these translations were much fewer in number.

Hasan Âli Yücel, whom many consider to be the main founder of the Translation Bureau, resigned from his post as Minister of Education in August 1946, shortly after the general elections held in July. He was replaced by Şemseddin Sirer, who became involved in the efforts that targeted leftist influences in schools in December 1946. He suspended four professors (Nail Pertev Boratav, Niyazi Berkes, Behice Boran and Adnan Cemgil) from Ankara University for alleged communist activity, before a court decision was issued. The evidence used against the professors was the articles they wrote for publications known for their leftist tendencies (Çetik 1998: 16-29). The fear of communism was one of the main reasons for a number of de-planning acts after the mid-1940s, such as the modifications made to the Village Institutes and the People's Houses. The publications of the Ministry of Education also became a target for those who wished to purge leftist influences from socio-cultural institutions. In July 1947, Lermontov's *Demon* which had been translated into Turkish in 1945 under the title *Vadim*¹⁶ was harshly criticized in the National Assembly for containing passages unfavorable to Turks. Fahri Kurtuluş, Republican People's Party's Rize MP, even introduced a proposal to delete those passages from the book (Karpas 1959: 377). While the budget of the Ministry of Education was discussed in the National Assembly, another MP condemned the translation of

¹⁶ The work was translated by Servet Lunel, who translated a total of 12 Russian classics for the Translation Bureau until 1966, and published by the Ministry of Education. *Demon* had been translated into Turkish for the first time in 1937 by Avni İnel and Vecihi Gök under the title *İblis*, and published by Hilmi Kitabevi.

Encomium Moriae by Erasmus¹⁷ and said “we cannot hand our culture over to madmen” [“kültürümüzü delilere teslim edemeyiz”] (in Günyol 1997: 4).

However, Sirer decided to continue his predecessor Yücel’s initiative and maintain the Ministry’s support for the translation of classics. This was met with appreciation by the intellectuals and press. An article published in the daily *Son Saat* wrote,

The current minister has decided to continue the foreign classics series translated and published with the initiative of the former Minister of Education. It is only fair to appreciate and praise this exceptional act by Reşat Şemseddin Sirer, since in our country it has become a custom for officials not to complete, but even to destroy the work started by their predecessors (“Yelkovan” 1948: 154).

[Eski Milli Eğitim Bakanının teşebbüsü ile tercüme ve neşredilen yabancı klâsikler serisine şimdiki Bakan da devam etmeği uygun görmüştür. Her yeni makam sahibinin, kendisinden öncekiler tarafından kurulan herhangi bir eseri tamamlamayıp bilâks yıkması bizde âdet hükmüne girdiği için Reşat Şemseddin Sirer’in, bu istisnai hareketini beğenmek ve övmek hakka riayet etmektir (“Yelkovan” 1948: 154).]

The author of the above article was also pleased to announce that while classics were previously released each year on October 29, the anniversary of the Republic, they would be released throughout the year. He further commented that releasing them on the anniversary of the Republic seemed like acts of “charity” (“cemilekârlık”), which was rather “unseemly” (“münasebetsiz”) (“Yelkovan” in *Tercüme* Vol. 8, Nb. 43-44: 154).

Sirer was indeed determined to continue the publication of classics, but on different terms. On January 29, 1947, Sirer convened a meeting of the Translation Bureau to revise its structure and operations. During this meeting it was decided that

¹⁷ *Deliliğe Methiye* (In Praise of Madness) translated by Nusret Hızır and published by the Ministry of Education as number one in the Latin Classics series.

the Bureau, which had thus far focused on literature, would also translate philosophy, history and science books. It was further resolved that those literary works which would convey “patriotism” (“yurt sevgisi”) to the youth would be prioritized. The publication of a new series on biographies of famous authors, as well as analyses of their works was among the decisions taken in this meeting. The participants of the meeting also decided that the series “Essays on the Art of Theatre” (“Tiyatro Sanatı Üzerine Denemeler”) would be enriched by new translations and that an editing board would be set up to oversee the publication of *Tercüme*, the journal (“Haberler” 1947: 434). The real change was presented in the second decision which consisted of giving a new orientation to the activities of the Translation Bureau. Within the first six years of the Bureau’s operation, works of humanist origin were explicitly prioritized, but now the focus had shifted towards works with patriotic overtones.

This was not an act of de-planning, but of re-planning, since the previous plans were being replaced by new ones. In the field of translation, 1947 marks the beginning of a new planning process, which I have termed re-planning. In this new process, some of the Bureau’s former principles were maintained. The idea of the use of translation as an instrument of culture planning and education was still valid. Furthermore, the new government was still adhering to the principle of statism in translation and declaring that it would focus on the translation and publication of those works that were not commercially viable for private publishers to produce (“Haberler” 1947: 436). As a result of the meeting held in January 1947, several commissions were set up to prepare a new list of suggested titles for translation. This list was published in *Tercüme* and diverged significantly from the lists published by the Translation Bureau in 1940 (“Haberler” 1940a: 113-114) and 1943 (“Haberler” 1943: 441-444). The biggest difference was the emphasis on eastern works. The

1940 list only included one such work: Sadi's *Gülistan*. In the 1943 list, there were four "Oriental Classics" ("Şark Klasikleri") which consisted of Arabic, Persian, Indian, and Chinese works.¹⁸ The 1947 list was a combined one, covering both suggested titles and translations already published by the Ministry of Education ("Klâsikler Listesi" 1947: 438-504). The list featured 47 Persian works (15 of them already translated), 77 Arabic classics (only 2 previously translated), 11 Indian works (2 previously translated) and 21 Chinese classics (4 previously translated). These figures should not mislead us to thinking that the Bureau would have exclusive focus on eastern classics. The list which featured a total of 1980 titles was more comprehensive when compared to the previous ones. It also included a high number of western classics, including 191 Greek and 115 Latin works. French works topped the list with 370 titles. So the share of eastern classics within the total number of titles had not risen dramatically. This rate was 8 per cent in the 1947 list, 3 per cent in 1940 and 7 per cent in 1943.

Nevertheless, theory and execution did not overlap. The activities of the Translation Bureau declined considerably after 1946. Until the end of 1946, the output of the Bureau had increased steadily, reaching a total of 467 titles, with 143 titles in 1946, excluding reprints. This number dropped to 57 in 1947, and continued to decrease especially after 1950. While the Bureau annually translated an average of 66.7 titles within its first six years, it produced an average of 32.6 new titles annually between 1947-1966 (based on *Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* 1967: VI).

The shift towards eastern classics becomes more visible in the list of actual publications by the Ministry of Education than in its list of intended translations.

¹⁸ These lists covered suggested titles for translation. Some titles were translated and published during the years that followed. Some were never translated. On the other hand, some of the works translated by the Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education were not included in these lists.

While Arabic and Persian works made up 3 per cent of the Translation Bureau's output between 1940-1946 (15 works), this rate more than doubled and increased to 7 per cent between 1947-1966 (52 works) within the total number of translations published, including the reprints. Furthermore, the translations of Greek classics lost considerable impetus after 1947. While until 1946, 63 Greek classics were published by the Ministry of Education which constituted 13.5 per cent of the Translation Bureau's output, 31 Greek classics were published after 1947, constituting 4.7 per cent of the total number of translated titles. It cannot be claimed that the Bureau had exhausted the Greek classics, since 97 out of 191 titles included in the list of suggested titles were never translated. Furthermore, Russian classics lost favour to a large degree. 60 Russian classics had been translated and published until 1946 (12.8 per cent), while the number of translations remained at 31 (4.7 per cent) during the following 20 years.¹⁹

The shift of focus in the activities of the Translation Bureau is indicative of a new process of translation planning. Translations and lists published after 1947 point at a new literary canon for Turkey. The former canon-making efforts aimed to place works with a "humanist" background in the centre of the literary polysystem in Turkey. After 1947, the state officials dropped "humanism", "Turkish humanism" and "Turkish Renaissance" from their discourse. The prefaces by President İnönü and Hasan Âli Yücel to the translations published by the Ministry of Education until 1946, disappeared with the transition to the multi-party system. İnönü and Yücel had also written pieces for *Tercüme* on the anniversaries of the establishment of the journal and carefully delineated the purpose of the government's emphasis on

¹⁹ The statistics offered in this section are based on the lists published in "Klâsikler Listesi" (1947) and *Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* (1967).

translation.²⁰ After 1946, such attempts to contextualise translations vis-à-vis the aims of the government also disappeared; for example, no attempt was made to replace the prefaces to the classics with new ones.

I would like to argue that the shift and decline in the activities of the Translation Bureau have to do with the new definition of nationalism in Turkey. Translation of western classics was placed at the heart of literary canonization and translation was attached a major role in terms of creating and reinforcing a national identity during the first six years of the Translation Bureau. The version of nationalism generated and disseminated during the Republican People's Party rule carefully emphasized a common language, history and culture as the founding blocks of the new nation. The element of culture did not include religion which was identified with the Ottoman past and continuously downplayed by the state. Instead, the government was looking to the western literary and cultural traditions to create a unique blend of Turkish national culture. In the early stages, the Sun language theory and the Turkish History Thesis claimed that Turkish language and history were the origin of western language and culture. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, the attempts at finding common roots for Turkish and western cultures were abandoned and western humanist culture, which was represented as a universal culture rather than a strictly western one, was brought to the foreground, mainly through translations. After 1947, as nationalism was re-interpreted within a partialist paradigm, the culture planning project also changed direction. Since the West would be considered as the source of science and technology, and Turkey, now embracing its religious past, would be the source of national culture, foreign works were no longer needed for the making of a new Turkish culture. Imports of foreign classical

²⁰ The discourse of the state officials on translation, as well as the discourse of the journal *Tercüme* will be taken up in more detail in Chapter 3.

works via translation started losing their central position and political function, at least in the discourse of the state. A striking example to this shift is the publication of translations of Turkish literature into western languages in *Tercüme*. A preface to the 52nd issue of *Tercüme* wrote, “it’s only natural that we try to acquaint other nations with our thoughts and tastes” [“bizim de kendi düşünce ve zevklerimizi ... başka milletlere tanıtmaya çalışmamızdan daha tabii bir şey olamaz”] (“Önsöz” 1951). This was a novel approach that started to compensate for the previous views of Turkish intellectuals on republican Turkish literature which they regarded as inferior to western works (see Nayır 1937: 162 and my Chapter 3). It is further interesting that this preface referred to a “literary renaissance” [“edebî rönesans”], instead of a “Turkish Renaissance” that would be brought about by translations. The impact of translation was now confined to the field of literature.

2.3 Summary

Chapter 2 offers an overview of the cultural practices of the republican governments in 1923-1960. It introduces the republican reforms, the westernism principle underlying these reforms, as well as some of the republican institutions founded to reinforce and disseminate the reforms. The chapter also provides information about the establishment, structure and operations of the Translation Bureau as an instrument of culture planning and nation-building. It sets out to construct a network of republican institutions within which the Bureau’s activities can be contextualized. The cultural implications of the transition to the multi-party system and the Democrat rule are also tackled in order to reveal the ways translation, and cultural institutions at large, can be affected by political dynamics.

Chapter 3 will present an analysis of the various stages of discourse on translation. The changing functions attributed to translation and the role to be played by translation within the literary canonization processes in Turkey will be traced across statements by state officials, intellectuals, publishers and translators throughout the period under study.

Chapter 3

Aspects of Discourse on Translation

The culture planning efforts of the Republican People's Party government, followed by the de-planning phase launched by the Democrat Party as discussed in Chapter 2, revolved around the principle of westernization. While the single-party era adopted westernization as a significant tool for modernization in both science and culture, the multi-party era witnessed a reversal of this trend and brought about a return to the pre-republican "partialist" understanding of westernization. In Chapter 2, I explored how this change of direction in culture planning may have affected the state's view of translation. In Chapter 3, I will focus on the changing conceptions of translation as articulated in the extratextual discourse by government officials, academics, publishers, writers and translators. As I indicated in Chapter 1, extratextual discourse is secondary on translation expressed in oral or written statements, as opposed to textual discourse, i.e. translated texts themselves. The present chapter will not limit its perspective with the Translation Bureau and will present a review of articles, oral statements and book chapters by all parties involved, both representing the government and the private publishing sector between 1923-1960.

It will become evident that the various elements of extratextual discourse on translation crystallized mainly in *Tercüme*, the Translation Bureau's journal, and in several dailies and literary magazines where writers, publishers and translators associated with the translation of canonical literature raised their views. Translators, writers or publishers active in the field of popular translated literature remained absent from the extratextual discourse and did not offer their views on the functions or definitions of translation. Therefore, much of the discourse tackled in this chapter

expresses the views of the planners located within the center of the cultural and literary systems. This should not be judged as a selective approach in data collection. Rather, the apparent focus on the statements by central planners and translated canonical literature originated from the available material in this field. The agents and institutions involved with popular translated literature simply remained absent from the public discussions on translation.

In the following sections the utterances by various persons and groups are evaluated within a framework that regards discourse as social practice, revealing ideas, tensions, hierarchical relations and power struggles among different agents and collectivities. In this sense, the discourse formulated by agents should not be taken as representing the actual state of translation. Rather, such discourse reflects their views, their experiences and perceptions, in short, their habituses.

The material used in this chapter comes from several sources. The proceedings of the First Turkish Publishing Congress (1939), articles published in a number of dailies and literary magazines such as *Ulus*, *Cumhuriyet*, *Ülkü*, *Varlık*, *Resimli Ay*, *Ufuklar* and *Yeni Adam*, articles appearing in the *Tercüme* journal in 1940-1960, a number of books written by writers closely involved with translation (Nayır 1937; Ülken 1997 [1935]; Özdenoğlu 1949; Sevük 1940) make up the major sources. All material used in this chapter was produced during the period under study, i.e. 1923-1960.

Translation was a topic that was widely discussed by different agents such as state officials, writers and translators in the early republican period. It may be suggested that translation has never again become the topical subject that it was in the 1940s. The debate around translation covered various aspects of the phenomenon, ranging from general topics such as the cultural functions of

translation to critiques of specific translations. In this chapter, I have classified extratextual discourse on translation under main headings: the expected and actualized functions of translation, state involvement in translation, the qualities and visibility of the translator and translation strategies.

3.1 Functions of Translation

Throughout the early republican period, and especially before and during the few initial years of the Translation Bureau, people who aired their ideas on translation were pre-occupied with a specific question: what is the aim of translation? This was not a new topic. Since literary translations from western languages started to be carried out in the 19th century, translation and its cultural role remained a topical subject. Translation even became the topic of a heated literary discussion in 1897.

3.1.1 The Classics Debate

The discussion known as the “Classics Debate” (“Klâsikler Tartışması”) was voiced in articles published in several dailies and magazines and lasted for about three months in late 1897. Famous literary figures like Ahmet Cevdet, Ahmet Râsim, Cenap Şehâbettin, Hüseyin Dâniş, Hüseyin Sabri, İsmail Avni, Necip Asım and Sait Bey (also known as “Lâstik” [“elastic”] Sait) took part in this discussion launched by Ahmet Mithat Efendi with an article he published in *Tercümân-ı Hakikat* in September 1897 (Kaplan 1998). The series of articles written in response to this original article, as well as Ahmet Mithat Efendi’s responses to them, offer rich information about the kinds of functions translation was expected to serve. The ideas

formulated by the participants of this debate suggested that translation of western classics was an important need for the Ottoman culture, since this culture had not gone through a “classical period” in the western sense. According to these writers, translation could enrich Turkish culture and literature, while it would also enable the Ottoman Empire to catch up with European nations. Furthermore, translation of classics was expected to lead to original creation and generate “Turkish classics”. What was meant by the term “classics” was mainly Greek and Latin works (Kaplan 1998: 61-63).

This debate draws attention to two main points regarding the republican conception of translation. First of all, it illustrates that the emphasis on the translation of classics was not a new phenomenon introduced by the republican regime. Secondly, it demonstrates that the function attributed to translation remained the same since the 19th century, although the republican view of translation had a more pronounced focus on Greek and Latin classics through the introduction of the concept of “humanism” as I will explore in the next section.

3.1.2 Translation as a Means of Canon Formation

A survey of oral and written statements about translation in the 1923-1960 period reveals that Turkish politicians, publishers, writers and translators, had certain expectations from translation. They were largely dissatisfied with the quality and quantity of translations carried out in Turkey, yet they sounded hopeful that translation of certain kinds of works, i.e. international classics, would help Turkish literary and intellectual life to develop in a number of ways. Several functions were attributed to translation, and most of them remained as “expected” or “intended”

functions rather than actualized ones. The discourse on the expected functions of translation activity was marked by somewhat different elements prior to the establishment of the Translation Bureau in 1940. This discourse was characterized by a negative and critical tone expressing the frustration intellectuals felt in seeing an unsystematic and highly commercialized translation market. During this period open calls were extended to the state to intervene in translation activity.

3.1.2.1 Canon Making in Discourse

Throughout the late 1920s and 1930s, translation was a topic under intensive discussion. Statesmen, academics and writers who raised their views on this subject concentrated on the importance of translating western literature into Turkish and suggested that such translations would be instrumental in the cultural development of the nation in a number of ways. Nothing expresses this idea better than the words of Mustafa Kemal who told the Grand National Assembly that “writing and translation are the most significant instruments of development for national sovereignty and national culture” [“Telif ve Tercüme işleri hakimiyet-i milliyenin ve millî harsın en mühim vasıta-ı intişarıdır.”] (*Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri* 1952: 289). Mustafa Kemal made this statement soon after the end of the War of Liberation, on March 1, 1923, which demonstrates the importance attached to books and reading in the early phases of the Republic.

The most significant idea underlying the discourse of this period before 1940 seems to be the creation of a “need” for the translation of classics. Writers argued that the Turkish culture and literature suffered from a lack of literary works to be read by younger generations. In their view, that meant that the cultural life of the

country and national literary production would come to a standstill. They offered the western literary system as a possible source for importing a new literary corpus into the Turkish system.

Hasan Âli Ediz, who later translated for the Translation Bureau, wrote in 1939 that a modern country was founded to replace the Turkey of the past which had a backward and feudal system and that a new kind of language and literature were needed to express the new subjects brought about by this modernization. He argued:

In this day and age, the “language issue” and the “literature issue” are both issues pertaining to translation. If we cannot present the literary works of nations who are more advanced than us in terms of literature to our youth, who do not speak foreign languages, as a model, it will be impossible for us to inject a literary culture to the next generation and awaken the literary potential that lies dormant in them (Ediz 1939: 280).

[Halbuki bugünkü devirde gerek ‘dil işi’ gerekse ‘edebiyat işi’, herşeyden önce biraz da tercüme işidir. Edebiyatları bizden ileride olan milletlerin her sahadaki edebiyatlarını ecnebi dili bilmiyen genç neslimize bir örnek olarak veremezsek, bu nesle modern bir edebî kültür aşılamamıza, bunlara gizli bir halde bulunan edebî cevherleri uyandırmamıza katiyen imkân yoktur (Ediz 1939: 280).]

In the same vein, in his *Edebiyatımızın Bugünkü Meseleleri* in 1937, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, translator, writer and publisher, wrote that the translation of seminal works of western literature into Turkish was vital for the development of a contemporary Turkish literature because Turkish culture needed to create a new foundation for itself. Nayır wrote:

The great civilization and language reforms we have undergone have broken our ties with our former literature and culture, which was of a different aspect and language. Since there can be no culture without a basis and since today we do not have the possibility of making use of the literature of yesterday, it is a must for us to base our new literary and cultural works on the artistic and

intellectual corpus originating in Ancient Greece which underlies contemporary European literature (Nayır 1937: 162).

[Geçirdiğimiz büyük medeniyet ve dil devrimleri, veçhesi ve dili pek başka olan eski edebiyat ve kültürümüzle aramızdaki bağları koparıp atmıştır. Temelsiz bir kültür olmayacağı ve dünkü edebiyatımızdan bugün için faydalanma imkanı da bulunmadığı için, yeni edebi ve kültürel çalışmalarımızı eski Yunandan başlayarak çağdaş Avrupa edebiyatına varan ve bir kül teşkil eden sanat ve fikir varlığına dayamamız bir zarurettir (Nayır 1937: 162).]

Nayır, who was an ardent proponent of the translation of western classics, maintained a similar view throughout his literary career, which expanded well into the 1970s. Already in 1935, he wrote in *Varlık*: “I think every one of us believes in the need to enrich our weak, and even poor, national library by translating the great scientific and literary works of foreign languages, and we all hope that this undertaking will be successfully carried out at once [“Yabancı dillerin ilmî ve edebî büyük eserlerini dilimize çevirerek çok zaif ve hattâ zavallı olan millî kütüphanemizi zenginleştirmek lüzumuna inanmıyan ve böyle bir işin, bir an önce başarılmasını dilemeyen. sanırım ki, aramızda kimse yoktur.”] (Nayır 1935: 305). This statement reflects the view Nayır held of the weak state of Turkish intellectual life in the early republican period, which was largely shared by other writers in the 1930s as I will illustrate in the following paragraphs.

Why was the source of a new literary foundation sought in western works? Many regarded the question of increasing the quality and quantity of translations a part of the westernization project. For instance, Fuat Köprülü, writer, literary historian and politician, suggested that the translation of scientific and literary works from European languages was only natural since, “the first thing a nation entering a new civilization does is to translate the works belonging to that civilization into its own language” [“yeni bir medeniyet dairesine giren bir milletin ilk işi o medeniyete

ait eserleri kendi lisanına tercüme etmektir”¹] (Köprülü 1928: 405). Likewise, Hilmi Ziya Ülken wrote in 1935 that he expected translation activity to lead to “westernization” (“garphlaşma”) (1997: 347).

İsmail Habib Sevük, in his seminal two-volume anthology on European literature and Turkey, stressed the importance of providing access to western works for monolingual Turks. He suggested that the way to become “fully European” went not through learning foreign languages, but through translation. He wrote:

... the secret for making Turkey fully European lies in reflecting Europeanness in Turkish. The issue of translation is not one of our secondary tasks, it stands before us as a great ideal, as the mission of all missions, as our greatest flag. It is only through “true translations” that we will arrive at “true Europe” (Sevük 1940a: VII).

[... Türkiyeyi tam Avrupalı yapmanın esas sırrını türkçeye tam Avrupalılığı aksettirmek görelim. Tercüme meselesi ta’lî işlerimizden değil o, en büyük bir bayrak gibi davaların baş davası olarak azametli bir ideâl heybetiyle duruyor. “Tam tercüme”yledir ki “tam Avrupa”ya varacağız (Sevük 1940a: VII).]

As it becomes evident from the above statements, the context set for translation activity was a political and ideological one, where translation was given the significant mission of creating the necessary intellectual and literary background for cultural westernization. This context also involved a rather inferior view of Turkish culture and literature, which needed to be inspired and guided by western literature. Turkish literature was found to be deficient vis-à-vis its European counterparts. European or western literatures, two terms which were used interchangeably, were perceived to be more advanced than Turkish literature and were seen as models that could serve to improve the level of Turkish literature,

¹ Transliteration into the Latin alphabet mine.

especially in terms of the themes they tackled. Baha Dürder's article published in *Kalem* in 1939 constitutes an example to this attitude. Dürder wrote that Turkish writers were not at the same caliber with European writers. He also added that if we wanted to catch up with European literature we needed to rely on translations (1939: 269).

In the views of many intellectuals, adopting western literature as a model for creating domestic literature did not entail an imitation of such works. Indeed, the tendency to imitate either the East or the West was considered to be the major reason behind the literary stagnation the country suffered from (see Şükûfe Nihâl in Coşkun 1938: 53). Turkish literature, and especially the novel, was regarded as a weak copy of French literature, which it had attempted to imitate since the 19th century (Fuat Köprülü in Coşkun 1938: 10). According to many writers, familiarity with western classics, mainly through translations, would enable a better assessment of Turkish literature and bring about a better understanding of national literary sources. For instance, Kâzım Nami wrote in *Ülkü* in 1934 that although Turks knew the past and the present of their own literature, i.e. folk literature, they failed to capture its true spirit because "we do not know its historical background since we do not understand what it has absorbed from classical literatures" ["bunun mazisindeki yönelmeleri bilmemekliğimiz klasik edebiyatlardan ne almış olduklarını anlayamamaklığımızdandır."] (Kâzım Nami 1934: 333). In 1933, in a book titled *Bizim İstedığımız Edebiyat* Refik Ahmet Sevengil wrote, "I take national literature to be one which upholds and preserves the local flavour using a Western technique" ["Ulus edebiyatını batı tekniği içinde yerli tadı üstün tutan ve yaşatan bir edebiyat olarak anlıyorum."] (Sevengil 1933: 23). The concept of "national literature", which was topical since the turn of the century, revolved around this question of how one

could make use of foreign literary ideas and models and remain original at the same time (see interviews in Coşkun 1938).

The reliance on translations as literary models and sources of inspiration was not a new phenomenon. Translation had occupied a significant place in the Ottoman literary polysystem in the 19th century. Saliha Paker writes the following on the position occupied by translation in the Tanzimat period:

... translated European literature assumed a twofold 'central' function, or a function that was manifested on two levels in the *Tanzimat* period: while translation of European works of canonized status (such as Şinasi's *Translations of Verse*, Münif Paşa's *Philosophical Dialogues*, Şemsettin Sami's translation of *Les Misérables*, Ahmed Vefik Paşa's translations from Molière) functioned as a shaping force on the level of 'high literature', non-canonized/popular translated literature and adaptations for the theatre were active on a lower level. It was the dynamic interaction between these two levels (or strata) that contributed to such linguistic and literary innovations as the simplification of prose style and the introduction of the drama, the novel and the short story as the new *genres* into Ottoman literature (Paker 1991: 30).

The discourse throughout the 1930s shows that the pivotal role attributed to translation for the development of the Turkish literature continued. However, this time the translation's role concerned the import of new ideas rather than the development of new genres. In other words, the innovative force of translation was expected to display itself in the content, not in the form.

Translation was attributed another, this time, a more practical role in the 1930s. Apart from serving as a tool for cultural westernization and contributing to the development of a national literature, translation would also serve as a means to provide reading material to the public. This was a function translation had assumed during the 19th century, compensating for the lack of indigenous popular literature that would address the urban population (Paker 1991: 41). In the 1930s translation assumed this function once more, which became an emergency due to the alphabet

reform. The 1928 alphabet reform had cut off the younger generation from literature written in Ottoman script and there had emerged a need for new literary texts. Although the traditional works of Ottoman literature were not rejected by some intellectuals such as Hasan Âli Yücel, Falih Rıfkı Atay and İsmail Habib Sevük who stressed the need for the transliteration of these works into the new Turkish alphabet, the majority of the intellectuals and statesmen called for the creation of a completely new literature detached from the older works (See *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939). Zekeriya Sertel, a journalist, publisher and translator wrote in daily *Tan* in 1939:

Statistics show that the number of books published and sold in Turkey increases each year. The members of the new generation that have cut off their ties with the old script are in need of a new and rich library. They look for books to read, but most of the time fail to find what they are looking for. Book sales rise but are not sufficient to satisfy our cultural needs.

This situation obliges us to have a programme and a plan in publishing and to provide the new generation with the books they need as soon as possible (originally published in *Tan* on 2.5.1939 reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:190).

[Yapılan istatistikler gösteriyor ki Türkiyede kitap basım ve satışı seneden seneye artıyor. Eski harflerle alakasını kesmiş yeni nesil, yepyeni ve zengin bir kütüpane ihtiyacı karşısındadır. Okuyacak kitap arıyor, fakat çok defa aradığını bulamıyor. Kitap satışı artıyor, fakat kültür ihtiyacımızı tatmine kafi gelmiyor.

Bu vaziyet de bizi neşriyatta programlı ve planlı bir tarzda çalışmak ve yeni nesle en kısa zamanda muhtaç olduğu kütüpaneyi vermek mecburiyeti karşısında bırakıyor (originally published in *Tan* on 2.5.1939 reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:190).]

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar saw the solution to this problem in translation. He suggested that there was a shortage of books that would be useful for youth between the ages of fifteen and twenty in Turkey and recommended translations from European

languages as the means to improve the cultural and intellectual capabilities of the younger population (Tanpınar 1998 [1939]: 78-79).

There seemed to lie a general motive behind all of the statements mentioned above: the making of a new literary canon for Turkey. The old canon, i.e. the corpus of works that were written in the Ottoman alphabet, was pushed to the periphery of the literary system after the alphabet reform. This was partly the result of deliberate attempts to break people's ties with their Ottoman heritage, largely associated with Islam and the "East" ("Şark"²). This was an ideological move. Throughout the 1930s older works, which belonged to the Ottoman literary system were not transliterated into the new alphabet and remained unavailable. Therefore it became virtually impossible for the young generation, who entered schooling after the alphabet reform, to read these works. This provides an interesting example of how change may take place in a literary system. Even-Zohar (1990a) explains systemic change as a function of texts within the system. According to Even-Zohar, change is triggered by the tension among the various strata in a system, such as the tension between canonized/non-canonized or primary/secondary elements. The case of early republican Turkey shows that this may not always be the case. The change which took place in the Turkish literary system (mainly in transition from the Ottoman literary system) proves that groups of texts within a system may also change positions through intentional manipulation by agents. In early republican Turkey, change was affected by culture planners who evacuated the center of the literary system by making the works once located at the center unavailable due to the change of script. The discourse formed around the translation of western classics in the

² Although the term "East" was sometimes used to refer to the "Orient" in general, covering both the Middle and the Far East, as well as India, it generally implied the Persian and Arabic-speaking Muslim countries.

1930s indicates that intellectuals attempted to offer a new center for the literary system. It was proposed that this center be filled with a new canon, mainly consisting of western classics. In fact, this new canon had been on the cultural agenda since the 19th century and translation had long been regarded as the main route through which this canon would be imported to Turkey (Kaplan 1998).

In the views of many officials and literary figures, the attempts at creating the repertoire, which would constitute that canon, had largely failed. Literary and scholarly translation activity from the *Tanzimat* period until the 1930s was frequently criticized on the grounds of the selection of the works and the translation strategies employed.

Translations from western languages since the *Tanzimat* were found to be “sporadic and arbitrary” [“dağınık ve tesadüf”] (Ülken 1997 [1935]: 347). These translations were regarded as unsystematic and not forming a consistent corpus, therefore it was suggested that they had little positive impact on Turkish culture (Ülken 1997 [1935]: 347; Tanpınar 1998 [1939]; Dürder 1938: 6; Nahit Sırrı 1934). It was also argued that translation became a commercial activity rather than a cultural one (R.P. Yücer “Neşriyat Kongresi”, originally published in *Bursa Gazetesi* on 2-14.4.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 176). Ali Kemali, translator and administrator, wrote in 1933 that publishers and translators acted out of commercial concerns in their literary translation activity and that they prioritized the commercial value of books over their literary and intellectual value (Ali Kemali 1933: 20).

According to the general opinion, the commercialization of translation had several consequences. First of all, it reduced the quality of translations, since translators had to translate fast to be able to make enough money as they were paid

rather low fees on the private publishing market (Ediz 1939: 280). Secondly, translation fell at the hands of incompetent translators, again due to the low fees (R.P. Yücer in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 176; Ediz 1939: 280). And finally, the commercialization had an impact on the choice of titles to be translated. Classics were neglected since their sales were low and did not bring much profit to the publishers (“Klâsiklerin Tercümesi” 1933).

Writers also criticized translations in terms of their quality. Translations were often judged as “wrong and bad” [“yanlış ve kötü”] (Ediz 1939: 279). They were criticized for either being too “free” (Nayır 1935: 305), or too “literal” (Ülken 1998 [1935]: 346). Indirect translations carried out via an intermediary language were found to be unacceptable (Nayır 1937: 163; Ediz 1939: 280; Ahmet Ağaoğlu in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 171). Furthermore, writers drew attention to retranslations as a sign of disorder in the publishing market for translated literature. Retranslations were considered to be a waste of time and effort (Köprülü 1928: 445; “Tercümeler” 1938: 566). It was suggested that publishing activity was not subject to any form of coordination which often resulted in several publishers commissioning the translation of the same work around the same time (Dürder 1938: 270). It was also indicated that some publishers who noticed the popular success of certain translated works published retranslations, or simply the same translations with a few modifications in order to exploit that success (Dürder 1938: 270; “Tercümeler” 1938: 566). In brief, there was general dissatisfaction with the way translations were selected and carried out. The solution to this problem was seen in state involvement in translation, as I will explore in the next section.

The organization of the National Publishing Congress in 1939, and the emphasis on translation in the proceedings of that congress, indicate that the state

was ready to assume a larger role in translation and publishing in general. The deliberations of the Congress include statements that reflect the views of the state, as articulated by the Prime Minister Refik Saydam and the Minister of Education, Hasan Âli Yücel, as to the importance attached to translation by the planners. The discussions during the Congress, as well as the reports and comments published in conjunction with it, created a platform where expectations from translation activity, expectations from the state in creating the desired kind of translation activity and views on translation strategies crystallized. The deliberations at the Congress and the ensuing responses in the press, constitute a moment where all debates on translation until that date culminated in the materialization of the canon that had thus far largely remained rhetorical. The Congress was a defining moment in terms of translation activity in Turkey and a significant point of contact between the discursive and actual canonization of translated western literature in the Turkish literary system.

3.1.2.2 The First National Publishing Congress

The Publishing Congress was organized in order to define the future course of publishing activity and to identify the ways in which the state might assist in improving the quality and quantity of books published in Turkey. In his keynote address, Prime Minister Saydam addressed the participants of the Congress as follows:

We have convened the Publishing Congress in order to benefit from your expertise and know-how in our analyses and programming of this subject [publishing] which is a very important issue in terms of the Turkish mission of culture...Your experience and knowledge will give us this programme... I

personally do not like noisy and arbitrary things anyway (*Participants cheer "bravo"*) (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 9).

[Türk kültür davasını mühim bir meselesi olan bu meseleyi mütalea etmek için ve onu programlandırmak için sizin yüksek ihtisasınızdan, görgünüzden istifade için Neşriyat Kongresini topluyoruz... Sizin geçirdiğiniz tecrübeniz ve ilminiz bize bu programı verecektir... Ben şahsan gürültülü, programsız işten zaten hoşlanmam (*Bravo sesleri*) (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 9).]

The “programme” to be designed by the state involved several aspects of publishing which were tackled by separate committees. The issues which would be taken up by the Congress were announced to the participants prior to the event. These included printing and broadcasting matters, copyrights, youth and children’s literature, awards and assistance for indigenous writing and translation, state aid for private publishing companies, promotion of reading among the people, the preparation of encyclopedias and reference material in Turkish (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 3). Among these issues, translation was given a special place. Translation came second in a list consisting of fourteen items defining the goals of the Congress. The aim of the Congress regarding translation was, “to determine the most necessary works to be translated into our language, including the classics, within a yearly plan and to assign the publication of these works to parties concerned” [“Dilimize terceme ettirilecek eserlerin, klâsikler dahil olarak, en lüzumlularının senelere ayrılmış bir plânda tesbit edilmesi ve bunların neşri için alâkadarlar arasında iş bölümü yapılması”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 3).

As explained in the previous chapter, The Translation Committee was one of the seven committees set up to discuss the above topics and to introduce proposals regarding the planning of publishing. The committee attributed a two-fold role to translation in the report it submitted to the Congress where it wrote: “Translation will serve both to transmit the ideas and the sensibility of the civilized world to our

country and to enrich our language" ["Tercüme, hem memlekete medeniyet aleminin fikirlerini ve hassasiyetini getirmek, hem de dilimizi zenginleştirmek hususunda hizmet edecektir"] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:125). These two functions, the former cultural and the latter linguistic, are also observed in the discourse of the contributors to *Tercüme* and other journals throughout the 1940s and 1950s. In the same report, the committee added that a certain "method and order" ["usul ve nizam"] had to be introduced for improving translation activity which was in a "deplorable state" ["perişan halde"] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 125). In the meantime, the committee continued to hold a conception of the Turkish culture as inferior to western culture by drawing a border between Turkey and the "civilized world".

The political function of introducing western culture and literature, which was attributed to translation throughout the 1930s, was also voiced in the Congress. In fact, it was the Hasan Âli Yücel, Minister of Education, who set the tone by making the following remark in his inaugural speech:

Republican Turkey, which aims and is determined to become a distinguished member of the western cultural and intellectual community must translate the classical and modern works of the civilized world into its language and **strengthen its identity** through feelings and thoughts expressed in those works. This obligation invites us to mobilize for translations on a wide scale (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:12). (emphasis mine)

[Garp kültür ve tefekkür camiasının seçkin bir uzvu olmak dileğinde ve azminde bulunan Cumhuriyetçi Türkiye, medeni dünyanın eski ve yeni fikir mahsullerini kendi diline çevirmek ve alemin duyuş ve düşünüşü ile **benliğini kuvvetlendirmek** mecburiyetindedir. Bu mecburiyet bizi geniş bir tercüme seferberliğine davet ediyor (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939:12).]

Yücel's words prove that translation was regarded as an official instrument of culture planning by the state. The ideological dimensions become evident in the minister's

identification of western culture with the “civilized world” and the kind of role he foresaw for translation within this context: translation was expected to convey western modes of thinking to Turkey, which would, in turn, result in a stronger Turkish identity. ,

The meetings of the Translation Committee resulted in the drafting of several recommendations which were expected to lead to “method and order” in translation activity. The recommendations included the setting up of an official translation bureau, extending state aid to private publishers for their translation activity and the launch of a translation journal. The committee also prepared a list of recommended titles for translation (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 125-127). The report of the committee was met with general approval and led to no significant discussion or opposition while it was read out for the participants of the Congress. The proposal to set up a translation bureau and the selection of titles for translation meant that the state was taking over the field of canonical translations and was entering into a phase of translation planning. This step was received well by writers and journalists who commented on the proceedings of the Publishing Congress in dailies and magazines.

The Congress in general, and specifically the inclusion of translation in its agenda, was largely appreciated by writers, publishers and journalists. It was suggested that the First National Publishing Congress would pave the way for a “Turkish Renaissance” (Fıratlı and Aka Gündüz in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 131, 241). Ahmet Ağaoğlu wrote that the state was performing an “auspicious” [“hayırlı”] act by taking up the translation of classics. He was happy to see the interest in European classic literatures as well as Ancient Greek and Latin works which, he announced, would strengthen Turkish culture (originally published in *İkdam* on 21.4.1939 reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 171). An

article which appeared in the daily *Tan* praised the congress for taking serious steps towards organizing translation activity in the country. The article also suggested that Turkish readers needed new publications to be able to follow international artistic and intellectual movements since the Turkish language lacked the books they needed (“Neşriyatımızı Organize Etmek İhtiyacı” originally published in *Tan* on 30.3.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 140).

The report submitted by the Translation Committee to the Congress defined a significant priority for the future translation activity of the Translation Bureau and wrote: “It is recommended that among the works included in the list, those relating to humanist culture should be attached significance” [“Listedeki eserler arasında, ümanist kültüre taallûku olanlara bilhassa ehemmiyet verilmesi ... tavsiye olunur”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 126). This statement heralded the attribution of a new function to translation activity: leading to a Turkish humanism. Indeed, until the mid-1940s, humanism was a term increasingly associated with the translation of western classics and it became one of the hallmarks of the discourse created in *Tercüme*. During the first few years of its activity, the Translation Bureau identified itself closely with creating the spirit of humanism in Turkey. In his preface to the translations carried out by the Bureau which was published in all translations until his resignation in 1946, Yücel made the connection between translation and humanism explicit and wrote:

The first understanding and feeling of the spirit of humanism starts with the adoption of works of art which are the most concrete expression of human existence. Among art forms, literature is the richest in terms of the intellectual elements of this expression. Therefore when a nation repeats the literatures of other nations in its own tongue, or rather in its own conception, it increases, revives and re-creates its intellect and power of understanding. This is why we consider translation activity so important and influential for our mission (Yücel 1961: 12).

[Hümanizma ruhunun ilk anlayış ve duyuş merhalesi, insan varlığının en müşahhas şekilde ifadesi olan sanat eserlerinin benimsenmesiyle başlar. Sanat şubeleri içinde edebiyat, bu ifadenin zihin unsurları en zengin olanıdır. Bunun içindir ki bir milletin, diğer milletler edebiyatını kendi dilinde, daha doğrusu kendi idrakinde tekrar etmesi, zeka ve anlama kudretini o eserler nispetinde artırması, canlandırması ve yeniden yaratmasıdır. İşte tercüme faaliyetini, biz bu bakımdan ehemmiyetli ve medeniyet davamız için müessir bellemekteyiz (Yücel 1961: 12).]

3.1.3 Functions of Translation after 1940

The early 1940s was a period when translation was under intensive discussion. *Tercüme* played a significant role in setting the agenda for much of this discourse. The articles it published found considerable response in other journals. Translators whose works were criticized in *Tercüme* went on to write responses in defense of their translations, making their translational norms explicit. Indeed, the discourse on translation throughout the 1940s offers an interesting case where translation became a public issue and a great deal of energy went into outlining the expected roles and strategies of translation.

The period after 1940 marked a new phase in the literary canonization project of the culture planners. The canon which had remained rhetorical during the 1930s started to materialize after 1940 with the increasing output of the Translation Bureau. While the intended functions of the translation of classics still covered the improvement of cultural and linguistic levels of the country, they became more elaborate and detailed. The creation of Turkish humanism, improving the status of qualified translators, providing criteria for discerning high literature from “lesser” works, development of new literary and scientific terminology were some of the functions expected from translation during this time.

I argue that humanism was seen as an intellectual goal and an ideal Turkey had to strive to attain. Translation was regarded as one of the ways in which a “Turkish Humanism” would be triggered in the country. In the first issue of *Tercüme*, Bedrettin Tuncel, who remained associated with the Bureau for a long period of time and served as the editor of the journal, wrote that the time was ripe for introducing the best examples of the “Greco-Latin civilization” [“Greko-lâtin medeniyetinin”] in Turkey because “this is where we must start if we want to launch a comprehensive humanist movement” [“Eğer bizde esaslı bir ümanizma hareketinin doğması isteniliyorsa, işe buradan başlamak icap eder”] (Tuncel 1940: 81). In his critique of the translation of *Protagoras* by Plato, Suat Sinanoğlu, classicist and translator of a number of Greek classics for the Translation Bureau, regarded the Turkish translation of *Protagoras* a significant contribution to the “mission of humanist culture” [“humanist kültür davamız”] (Sinanoğlu 1941: 485). In *Ülkü*, the magazine of the People’s Houses, Kemal Edip Ünsel wrote that the translated classics published by the Ministry of Education were welcome as significant steps towards engendering “true humanism” that Turkey had been longing for (Ünsel 1947: 9). In his preface to a series of interviews with famous literary figures in 1943, Şinasi Özdenoğlu wrote that the classics published by the ministry helped to put Turkish intellectuals in touch with the humanist culture (Özdenoğlu 1949: 32). İbrahim Hoyi called the translation of classics “a substantial and auspicious act for Turkish Humanism” [“Türk hümanizması için özlü, hayırlı bir iş”] (Hoyi 1948: 158). Humanism was almost invariably associated with the translation of Greek and Latin classics. In his preface to the special Greek issue of *Tercüme*, Hasan Âli Yücel expressed this in strong terms. He maintained that humanism required familiarity with Greek works and that the “civilized world” was rooted in Ancient Greece. He

then went on to argue that the Islamic civilization had established its “intellectual front” [“fikir cephesi”] by making use of Ancient Greek sources. He also suggested that the Islamic civilization had been selective in its use of Greek writers and philosophers, which brought about its failure (Yücel 1945: II). As explained earlier, the ideological backdrop of the discourse developed around translation as an instrument of humanism is closely related with the ideal of westernization. By publishing translations of works belonging to the western cultural heritage, and especially Ancient Greece and Rome, the Ministry of Education appeared to fulfill a political mission. The stress on the word “civilization” [“medeniyet”] in many of these statements further points at a conception of the western world as superior to Turkey. Within this context, the translation of classics appeared as vessels which would transfer the main features of that civilization into Turkey, and create the Turkish version of that civilization rising upon the idea of Turkish humanism.

Nevertheless, the introduction of western ideas and literature into Turkey was not seen as a simple act of transfer. Rather than simply westernizing Turkish intellectual and literary production, writers commenting on the importance of translation for establishing Turkish humanism, concentrated on the power of western classical literature to stimulate original thinking and production. This point was strongly underlined in the discourse of those who wrote about the role of translation in Turkey’s cultural development. A part of this argument was carried out through case studies exemplifying the role translation had assumed for different cultures in the past centuries.

Tercüme published a series of articles demonstrating the role translation played for other nations and how it was instrumental in creating a form of “renaissance” in each country. İhsan Sungu wrote an article on how translation brought about the

European Renaissance, and pointed out that exposure to Greek and Latin works expanded the intellectual horizons of the Europeans and made Renaissance inevitable (Sungu 1940: 119). He also pointed out that this marked the birth of the “modern” man. Although Sungu did not make it explicit, the undertext of his article seemed to build an analogy between the Renaissance man and the Turks who were also mobilized towards a form of renaissance. If Greek and Latin works had brought about the European Renaissance, surely Turks could also achieve a similar transformation through their exposure to Greek and Latin works. Sungu’s article, and similar articles on the impact of translation on other nations, can be evaluated as attempts at creating a form of consent in the readers about the importance of Greek and Latin literature, making the reading of classics belonging to these literatures an imperative for the intellectual and literary development of Turkey. Nevertheless, it was emphasized that these works would only serve as sources of inspiration and not of imitation. In an article she wrote for the first issue of *Tercüme*, Azra Erhat drew a clear parallel between other countries, especially Germany, which went through a process of translation from Greek and Latin, and Turkey. She suggested that translations from Greek literature would expand our general knowledge, make the Turkish readers experience the aesthetic pleasure to be invoked by these works and let Turkey “be inspired by the sources which have been feeding the west for the past two thousand years” [“Bu tercümeler ... iki bin seneden beri bitmez tükenmez varlığı ile garbi besleyen ilham kaynaklarından bizim de bir nasip almamızı temin edecektir.”] (Erhat 1940a: 82).

In another article, Azra Erhat introduced the impact of translation on Latin literature and pointed out that Latin literature emerged as a result of translations from Greek literature. Her real point, however, seemed to be to demonstrate that

translation could be instrumental in a nation's self-discovery, especially in the way she argued that the Romans were able to translate and learn from Greek literature without falling prey to simple imitation. She wrote: "Studying Greek works which are perfect examples, and analyzing them without losing none of their national qualities; that is the main quality of Latin literature" ["Mükemmel bir örnek olan Yunan eserleri üzerine çalışmakla, millî vasıflarının hiçbirini kaybetmeksizin tettebbü etmek, işte Lâtin edebiyatının ana vasfı."] (Erhat 1940b: 274). In 1944, she referred to the role of western classics in stimulating indigenous production and wrote, "Our aim is not to bring the intellectual products of western civilization into our country like import goods, but rather to reach their intellectual level and give products that are of the same value, isn't it?" ["Bizim amacımız da batı medeniyetlerinin fikir mahsullerini ithalât malı gibi memleketimize sokmak değil, onların düşünme seviyesine yükselip kendimiz aynı değerde mahsul vermek değil midir?"] (Erhat 1944: 319).

The stimulation of domestic literary production was a function expected from translation since first contacts with European literatures in the 19th century. This continued to be one of the central roles associated with translation after the establishment of the Translation Bureau. As an example, let me quote author and translator Reşat Nuri Güntekin who, in an interview with the *Varlık* magazine in 1943, said: "A rich library of translated works is a must for the emergence of an advanced Turkish literature. Both the writer and the reader can develop only within such a library. The source of what we call literary culture is nothing but fine products of world literature" ["İleri bir Türk edebiyatının kurulması için mümkün olduğu kadar zengin bir tercüme kütüphanesi şarttır. Yazıcı da okuyucu da ancak böyle bir kütüphane içinde gelişebilir. Edebiyat kültürü dediğimiz şeyin kaynağı

dünyanın güzel eserlerinden başka ne olabilir?"] (Güntekin in Özdenoğlu 1949: 109). In the same collection of interviews, there were many writers who were of the same opinion (e.g. Çağlar pp.54, Belge pp. 58, Koryürek pp. 61, Talu pp. 65, Atay pp. 66, Yücel pp. 67, Onan pp. 92, Uşaklı pp. 103 in Özdenoğlu 1949). Familiarity with classical and modern western literature was regarded as a prerequisite for young writers and poets (Akan 1946: 85). Orhan Burian claimed that the translated classics published by the Ministry of Education had brought about a literary renaissance into Turkey (1944: 17). Nurullah Ataç wrote that a literature would always be in need of foreign inspiration to be able to renew itself (Ataç 1948: 3).

In the meantime, the westernization function of translation had not changed and writers continued to associate translation activity with the imports of western ideas and literature into Turkey. Translation was regarded as a means which could facilitate the establishment of cultural and intellectual proximity with the western world. The "channel" metaphor may enable one to better conceive of this aspect of the discourse on functions of translation. Writers viewed translation activity as a "channel" through which foreign ideas would freely flow into Turkey. Some wrote that translation was an instrument for familiarizing oneself with foreign knowledge (Rohde 1941: 476), some argued that one of the main missions of translation was to disseminate the major works of the West in Turkey (N.S. 1942: 298; Ozansoy 1944: 4), still some others indicated that unless we went through western classics we would never be able to understand the European mentality and penetrate western culture.

Another major function associated with translation was to enrich the Turkish language. Falih Rıfki Atay wrote that the classics published by the Ministry of Education were translated by competent translators and that these books would serve

to strengthen Turkish to such an extent that those who spoke no other language than Turkish would be able to learn everything through it [“Türkçeyi, Türkçeden başka hiçbir dil bilmiyenlerin herşeyi öğrenebilecekleri bir kudrete çıkarmak”] (Atay 1944: 229). It was suggested that the efforts of translators to find equivalents for western words in the texts they translated would result in the introduction of new words and terminology into Turkish, and enrich the Turkish language (Yeşim 1948: 160).

Above everything else, if one had to mention a single salient feature of all statements written on the functions of translation, that would have to be its edifying role. “To expand the knowledge of the future generations through the shortest way possible” [“gelecek nesillerin bilgilerini en kısa bir yoldan arttırmak”] (N.S. 1942: 299), “to enlighten people’s ideas” [“fikirlerimizi aydınlatmak”] (Talu 1944: 238), “to improve the intellectual level of the youth” [“Gençlerin bu tercümeleleri okuyarak, okuyucu olma bakımından kendi fikir değerlerini yükselttikleri muhakkaktır”] (Yücel in Özdenoğlu 1949: 76) and “to enlighten the masses” [“geniş halk yığınlarını aydınlatmak”] (Ediz 1955: 3) were some of the phrases used to refer to the edification function expected from the translation of classics.

3.1.4 The Effects of Translated Classics

All of the different functions attributed to translation mentioned so far remained at the level of discourse, in other words, these were rhetorical functions that reflected the expectations of the writers rather than “actual” or “experienced” functions of translation. No attempt was made to check to see whether these functions were fulfilled by the translation of classics after 1940. Nevertheless, the negative discourse on the current state of translation changed markedly after the Translation Bureau was

established. Although there were significant complaints about the way the private market for translated literature functioned, there was a common sense of satisfaction with canonical translations and the Translation Bureau and the Ministry of Education were regarded as transformative forces in terms of the course of translation activity in Turkey. Some writers referred to the changes that took place in the system of translated literature after the Bureau started to function, and touched upon a few actualized functions of translated classics.

In 1944, four years after the Bureau gave its first products, writers started to observe the effects of its translations. Suut Kemal Yetkin, chairman of the Bureau in 1947-1950, wrote in the daily *Ulus* that the classics published by the Ministry of Education had high sales figures, which proved their popularity among the readership. He further suggested that the operation of the Translation Bureau led to an increase in the number of translators in the country. Yetkin further added that private publishers followed the ministry's example and started paying much more attention to the "artistic value" of the books they published ["kitapçıların bastığı kitapların bile bir sanat titizliği taşımaları"] (Yetkin 1944: 239). Another article published in *Ulus* by Neşet Halil Atay commented that the works sent by amateur writers started to display the effects of classics. Atay argued that these effects were very different and difficult to discern, but that they were very strong. He added, "For the time being, we are only able to observe the emerging bright world of stars behind a fog and patches of clouds" ["Bulutların arkasında yeni kurulmaya başlayan parlak yıldızlar âlemini şimdi yalnız sıyrıntılar ve sisler arkasında görebiliyoruz."] (Atay 1944: 230). An article published in *Varlık* magazine in 1946 noted, "We do not need to say that the positive impact of these translations of classics on culture will become evident in the future, we believe that that impact is already evident now and the

popularity of serious and high-brow works has extensively increased among the readership”[“Bu klâsik tercümelerin kültürümüz üzerinde yapacağı müsbet tesirleri zaman gösterecektir demeye de hacet yok, zannımızca o tesir daha bugünden görülmeye başlamış, okurların ciddî ve ağır başlı eserlere rağbeti geniş ölçüde artmıştır.”] (Klâsiklerin Tercümesi 1946: 2). İbrahim Hoyi suggested in 1948 that the Ministry of Education had introduced a considerable number of competent translators to the world of translation [“tercüme dünyamıza kalbur üstü bir hayli mütercim kazandırmıştır.”] (Hoyi 1948: 158).

While intellectuals in general were convinced that translations would be a source of inspiration for Turkish writers and generate indigenous works, some raised the concern that translated literature reduced the sales of indigenous literature by stealing its readership. Halit Fahri Ozansoy wrote in *Son Posta*, “This translation activity which merits much appreciation started to be harmful in one respect. First of all, it deters national literature and publishers are reluctant to publish one indigenous work for twenty translations they publish” [“Öyle ki, gitgide, bu çok takdire lâyık olan tercüme faaliyeti, bir cepheden zararlı bile olmağa başlıyor. Her şeyden evvel, millî edebiyatı körletiyor, kitabcılar yirmi tercümeğe karşı bir telifi basmaya bile nazlanıyorlar.”] (Ozansoy 1943: 4). In 1943, Nahit Sırrı Örik, writer and translator, maintained that translations caused readers to neglect indigenous works. As evidence, he claimed that his translations were in high demand while his indigenous books remained unpopular (Örik in Özdenoğlu 1949: 88). Nevertheless, the majority believed that high quality translations made the readers more selective towards literature, which also benefited domestic works by forcing Turkish authors to raise their standards. Writers suggested that translations raised the level of the readers

(Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar in Özdenoğlu 1949: 47) and helped refine indigenous literature [“telifi tasfiye etmek”] (Özdenoğlu 1949: 27).

Intended, or actualized, the positive functions attributed to translation were strictly associated with the translations of classics, and especially the activities of the Translation Bureau. Translations of “popular” literature were set apart from the classics and criticized to a large extent. Companies which published these translations were accused of commercializing translation activity and neglecting the issues of accuracy and quality of translations. Furthermore, publishers which commissioned such translations were condemned for their choice of works. In his contribution to the first issue of *Tercüme*, Bedrettin Tuncel touched upon the shortage of translated classics in Turkey and pointed out that past translation activity covered “worthless works which had commercial, rather than literary value” [“edebî kıymetlerinden ziyade, ticarî kıymetleri göz önünde tutulan değersiz eserler”] (Tuncel 1940: 79). In a magazine interview in 1943, Fuat Köprülü made a distinction between two types of translation: translation of classics as opposed to translation of “works in fashion” [“moda eserler”] (Fuat Köprülü in Özdenoğlu 1949: 69). He suggested that only the translation of classics would be useful. Behçet Kemal Çağlar wrote that translations of “no national value” [“millî kıymet taşımayan”] carried out with commercial concerns would be harmful (Behçet Kemal Çağlar in Özdenoğlu 1949). Writers did not really specify what kind of harm would be involved in those translations, neither did they offer a description of the kinds of works they referred to.

Although there is no specific data about what those works were, there is data about what they were not. Writers and translators did describe what they meant by “classics” which were often presented as the antitheses of “commercialized

translations”. Suut Kemal Yetkin defined the classics published by the Ministry of Education “not only Ancient Greek and Latin literatures or the literatures which follow their model but also works which have a superior value and have been proven immortal by generations” [“eski Grek ve Lâtin edebiyatını veya bu edebiyatı örnek alan edebiyatlar[1] değil, üstün bir değer taşıyan ve ölmezlikleri hakkında nesillerden not alan eserler”] (Yetkin 1944: 239). Lütfi Ay stressed the humanist sentiment involved with the Translation Bureau’s understanding of the term “classic”:

...we use classics in a broader and more universal, and at the same time in a humanist meaning. In that sense, we do not hesitate to provide room in our list of classics for all great works tackling and explaining the subject of the human with his strengths and weaknesses, and to all great minds which have given rise to nice ideas and have guided humanity under the light of these ideas (Ay 1944: 322).

[... biz klâsiği daha geniş daha evrensel, aynı zamanda da humanist bir mânada kullanıyoruz. Bu bakımdan insanı ele alan, onu iyi ve kötü taraflarıyla inceleyen, açıklıyan her büyük esere, dünyanın neresinde olursa olsun güzel fikirler doğurmuş, bu fikirlerin ışığında insanlığa yol göstermiş her büyük zekâyâ klâsikler listemizde yer vermeye çekinmiyoruz (Ay 1944: 322).]

Both of these definitions concentrate on the literary and intellectual “value” of the classics, as well as their universal and timeless appeal. Therefore we can deduce that the works denounced by writers did not include these qualities and were governed by fads in the market for translated literature, which was commercialized to a large degree. While publishers were criticized for publishing these popular works of low literary quality, there was general agreement on the fact that publishing was a commercial activity and that publishers were reluctant to produce works that had a limited readership. An article published in *Varlık* in 1933 commented, “... publishers refrain from publishing these kinds of works which have few customers, newspapers will not even once serialize these kinds of works” [“... tabiler, müşterisi az olan bu

neviden eserleri basmıya yanaşmazlar, gazeteler bu tarz eserleri kazara bir defa olsun tefrika etmezler.”] (“Klâsiklerin Tercümesi” 1933). According to the discourse of some writers, harsh competition in the publishing market kept publishers away from long translation projects due to fears that the translation of the same work would be published by somebody else. Furthermore, the low fees in the private translation market would also mean low-quality translations (Nurullah Ataç “Lüzumlu Bir Karar”, originally published in *Haber* on 20.3.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 137). Intellectuals recognized the need for the state to mobilize its resources and interfere in the publishing market by offering a new selection of translated titles to the readers and controlling existing translation activity in the market.

While academics, publishers and writers acknowledged the importance of translated classics and carefully emphasized the need for state involvement in the translation and publication of classics, those publishers whose products were condemned for being “commercialized” or downright “harmful”³ remained rather silent. Literary magazines or major dailies did not feature any statements by these publishers in defense of their activities. While publishers publishing canonical books, such as Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Sabiha-Zekeriya Sertel, Ahmet Halit Yaşaroğlu, İlyas Bayar and İbrahim Hilmi Çığıracan were rather vocal and raised their views on a number of publishing-related issues, including translation, owners of publishing

³ Certain publications were criticized for having harmful effects on the readers, and especially on children and the youth. For instance, Ahmet Ağaoğlu complained that the youth of the day lacked quality reading material and stated, “Today’s youth may come across all sorts of books. All sorts, from police and crime stories to erotic fiction. How will these kinds of works enlighten the youth?” [“Bugün gençliğin eline gelişi güzel herşey geçebilir. Polis ve cürüm romanlarından fuhuş ve şehvet hikâyelerine kadar herşey! Bu gibi eserlerden gençlik ne feyzi alsın?”] (originally published in *İkdam* on 21.4.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 171). Elsewhere, it was stated that certain magazines and books available in the market exploited the children’s fondness of mystery and excitement through using themes such as fear, horror, romance and adventure (originally published in *Vakit*, reprinted in *Ülkü* 1943: 7).

houses involved mainly with popular literature were absent from such discussions. The prefaces they published to their books did not include statements on why they were involved in publishing, or the purpose of their translations. An exception came from Türkiye Yayınevi which was the publisher of a number of popular books, as well as books by canonical contemporary writers such as Ernest Hemingway and Somerset Maugham. The editors of the publishing company wrote an introductory note to the first book of a series of crime fiction they launched under the title “Türkiye Yayınevinin Polis Romanları Serisi”. This introduction is rather interesting, since it can also be considered a defense of crime novel. The note read, “Crime novels are not simple novels that have a negative effect on people as some suggest. A well-chosen selection of such books can help develop the intellect and provide opportunities for taming one’s willpower and nerves. This is a fact acknowledged by the greatest psychologists and educators of the West” [“Polis romanları bazılarının düşündüğü gibi basit ve menfi tesirler yapan romanlar değildir. Bu tarz neşriyatın iyi, seçkin ve özlü olmak şartıyla, muhayyileyi işlettiği, zekâyı inkişaf ettirdiği, insanda irade ve sinir terbiyesi imkânları hazırladığı garbin en büyük psikolog ve terbiyecilerince Kabul edilmiş bir hakikattir.”] (Introduction to Christie 1946). This explanatory (and even apologetic note) illustrates the negative ideas and functions attached to crime fiction, which made up a large portion of the market for translated popular literature. This note is one of those rare instances where a positive statement was made about a genre located away from the canon proposed and later formed by the state officials and intellectuals. The presence and strength of private publishers of popular literature was not visible in the discourse on translation. They did not participate in the public debates that defined the function and strategies of translation on a rhetorical level. Their efforts become most visible when one studies the actual

situation of the publishing sector and the kinds of translated books that found a readership in the market for translated literature.

3.2 The State as Patron and Planner

3.2.1 Calls for State Involvement

The discourse of writers, publishers and academics prior to the setting up of the Translation Bureau invariably called for state involvement in publishing and translation activity. A similar discourse was used by publishers themselves, which may seem paradoxical at first sight. Sabiha Zekeriya Sertel, writer, translator and publisher, argued that it would not be possible for private publishers alone to increase the general level of culture and reading in the country and wrote: “It is not possible for private companies to set their competitive concerns aside and to undertake this initiative. Private companies can cooperate provided that the state play the role of a supervisor and organize this cooperation. This is where the interest of private companies lies” [“Yalnız hususî sermayedarların aralarında birleşerek, bütün rekabet kaygularını bir kenare atarak bu teşebbüsü başarmalarına imkân yoktur. Devlet nâzım rolü oynamak, teşkilâtçı rolü devlet yapmak şartile bütün hususî teşebbüsler elbirliği edebilirler. Çünkü kendi menfaatleri de bunu âmiridir.”] (originally published in *Tan* on 25.4.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 172-173). Moreover, publishers demanded state aid for their publishing in the form of financial support, a reduction in duties for book paper, reduction in postage fees for books, literature and translation prizes (Çığıracan, Bayar and Açikel in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 375-390).

Calls for state involvement in translation activity could be observed as early as in 1933. An anonymous article published in *Varlık* argued, “It is only through the efforts and selection of the Ministry of Education that we can have a well-structured library of classics. Expecting this from private initiative would mean expecting sacrifices which will never be delivered” [“Ancak doğrudan doğruya Maarif Vekâletinin teşebbüsü ve intihabıdır ki mutazam bir klâsikler kütüphanesine sahip olmamıza imkân verebilir. Aksi takdirde ferdî teşebbüslerden gayret istemek, gelmiyecek fedakârlıklar beklemek demek olur] (“Klasiklerin Tercümesi” 1933). In 1934, Yaşar Nabi Nayır wrote that state patronage over arts and literature was a well-established practice around the world and he outlined the terms of this patronage by suggesting that the state should open up its own publication and printing companies, theatres, workshops and studios apart from giving out prizes in all branches of the arts (Nayır 1934). Elsewhere Nayır commented that the “regulating hand” of the state had to be there for a systematic translation movement (Nayır 1937: 163). Author Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, in a newspaper article he wrote in 1939, emphasised that translations required money and programme and that this could only be provided by the state (Tanpınar 1998: 79). The Translation Committee of the Publishing Congress also stressed the need for state involvement and suggested that an institution be established under the Ministry of Education to start up a planned translation movement (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 125). In his article published in the magazine *Yeni Adam* immediately after the establishment of the Translation Bureau, Yunus Kazım Köni referred to the establishment of the Bureau as a “great event” and made some suggestions about the structure of the newly founded institution. He called for even more intensive state involvement than the planned structure of the Bureau and wrote that translation activity should become

a scientific and official state body just like the Offices of Statistics and Meteorology [“Tercüme işi böylece devlet bünyesine dahil, ve tıpkı İstatistik ve Meteoroloji işleri gibi hem ilmî, hem resmî bir uzuv hâline girer.”] (Köni 1940: 19).

Perhaps the only critical voice raised against state involvement in translation was Ahmet Ağaoğlu’s, often referred to as “the First Turkish Liberal”. He commented on the proceedings of the First Turkish Publishing Congress by saying that culture is made up of the feelings and thoughts of individuals, which cannot be planned within a structured programme. In his opinion, such planning attempts would result in a “standardisation” of cultural products (originally published in *İkdam* on 1.5.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 187). Nevertheless, the general opinion was that state’s support and planning of translation would serve the development of culture and literature in the country.

3.2.2 Terms of State Involvement

Hasan Âli Yücel, the Minister of Education, defined the state’s main mission in the field of translation as “introducing a programme for translation activity” [“tercüme işini de bir programa bağlamak”] (Yücel 1940: 2). Yücel saw the state’s role in the system of translated literature as a trigger for private activity and wrote, “The reason behind the Ministry of Education’s serious engagement in translation is to initiate the development of this movement outside of the state bodies” [“Maarif Vekilliğinin tercüme işi ile ciddî surette meşgul oluşu, bu hareketin devlet kadrosu dışında inkişafına bir başlangıç olmak içindir.”] (Yücel 1940: 2).

The state, via the Translation Bureau, would take charge of translation activity in two senses. On the one hand it would commission translations to be published by

the Ministry of Education and on the other, it would set the course of private translation activity by recommending titles for translation and editing the translations carried out by private publishers. This editing was not compulsory. Only those publishers who wished to have their translations checked would apply to the bureau (“Haberler” 1940a: 112). In turn, they would be allowed to bear a paragraph in their books indicating that the book was recommended by the Ministry of Education and that the translation was examined and approved by the Translation Bureau” (“Tercümesi Tavsiye Edilen Eserler” 1942: 12). The guideline published by the Ministry of Education regarding the procedures of the commissioning and editing of works by the Translation Bureau indicated that the Ministry would dictate the note that would accompany the books approved by the Bureau. The same guideline noted that the editing fee would be borne by the publishers themselves (*Maarif Vekilliğince Bastırılacak veya Basılması Teşvik Edilecek Tercüme Eserlerin Ne Suretle İnceleneceği Hakkında Talimatname* 1944: 8). The editing fee for both books commissioned by the Translation Bureau and works recommended to private publishers by the Bureau would be 13 per cent of the translation fee (*Maarif Vekilliğince Bastırılacak veya Basılması Teşvik Edilecek Tercüme Eserlerin Ne Suretle İnceleneceği Hakkında Talimatname* 1944: 7). Translations approved by the Translation Bureau would also receive state aid in the form of book purchases. The Ministry of Education announced that it would purchase 250 copies more than the number it would normally purchase [“Vekilliğin satın alacağı miktar aynı mevzudaki eserlerin mutad olarak alındığı miktardan 250 fazla olacaktır”] (“Haberler” 1940b: 209). Furthermore, the Ministry promised a monetary prize for translators whose translations were found exceptionally successful (“Haberler” 1940b: 209). The Bureau did deliver the first part of its intended support for private translations. In the

discourse on translated works, and on translations themselves, there is indication of the Bureau's editing process and Ministry of Education approval.⁴ As for the second part of this support, i.e. awarding translators, I have not been able to find any documentary evidence proving that these prizes were actually given out.

In his critique of the Turkish translation of *Germinal* in *Tercüme*, Lûtfi Ay referred to the support rendered by the ministry to private publishers approvingly. He wrote, "This way, the publishers are prevented from acting only upon their own ideas and tastes and the translators are encouraged to work with much more care and attention. A book whose translation is approved [by the ministry] is thus officially recommended to the readers" ["Bu suretle hem tâbiler yalnız kendi görüşlerine ve zevklerine göre hareket etmekten konulmuş oluyorlar, hem de mütercimler, her zamandan daha ziyade, dikkat ve itina ile çalışmaya sevkediliyorlar. Bu şartlar içinde tercümesi beğenilen kitap okuyucuya karşı da resmî bir tavsiye kazanmış oluyor."] (Ay 1941a: 354). It appears as though this "official recommendation" enhanced the credibility of the translations and the state's opinion mattered greatly for the readers. The state was considered to set an example of how translation activity needed to be carried out. The joint editing of translations commissioned to competent translators, relatively high fees paid to the translators and the high printing quality of the books were principles introduced by the Bureau (Burian 1944: 18). Furthermore, private publishers started to follow the practices of the Translation Bureau in the mid-1940s, which proved that the goal defined by Yücel for the Bureau as one of triggering

⁴ There is even evidence to suggest that the Bureau was not very successful in fulfilling its task of editing translations. The translations, which appeared with the approval of the bureau failed to meet the expected standards. For instance in his criticism of the translation of *Assommoire* by Hamdi Varoğlu, Cemil Meriç disclosed that the translation was edited by the Bureau and listed a number of shifts in the translation which he called "mistakes". He concluded that the Bureau had not properly examined and corrected the translation (Meriç 1942: 19, 22). One of the translators personally involved in the editing process admitted that there were too few people in the Translation Bureau to be able to edit everything submitted to the Bureau thoroughly (Burian 1974 [1947]: 4).

private translation activity had started to be attained. Burian wrote that new publishing houses flourished in the country. The majority of those started their activity by publishing translations and followed the example set by the Ministry of Education (Burian 1944: 17-18).

We may safely argue that the Ministry of Education and its Translation Bureau acted as a patron and a planner for the translation of classics in Turkey in the 1940s. This idea was in conformity with the principle of statism implemented by the Republican People's Party in a number of fields as explained in Chapter 2. As in other fields of activity such as economics and fine arts, the state had the aim of giving a new direction and order to translation activity and filling a gap in the literary system. As defined by Yücel, its role would be limited to setting an example for private publishing houses in terms of the selection of their works and the quality of their translations. Nevertheless, in the case of translation, we cannot conceive of the Ministry of Education as a neutral agent whose only goal was to help private publishers. With the launch of the Translation Bureau following the First National Publishing Congress, the state expanded its culture planning project into the field of translation. Rather than an antagonist of private publishing which had a largely commercial agenda, the state's image during the initial years of the Bureau was that of a generous patron and mentor, who would extend both financial help to the needy publishers (and they were all needy as I will explain in the next chapter) and provide intellectual guidance through its recommendations and editing.

The state, as represented by the Translation Bureau⁵, interfered in the shaping of the literary system by offering new options for the repertoire of translated

⁵ It would be wrong to conceive of the Translation Bureau as an institution that was completely governed and controlled by the state, since many of its members and translators also translated for private publishers or even ran their own publishing establishment. Nevertheless, the structure of the Translation Bureau as an official body attached with the Ministry of Education and the fact that it was

literature and by offering certain criteria against which translations would be judged. The canon defined by the discourse of the intellectuals of the country was adopted by the state and was turned into an actual canon, from a hypothetical one, through the planning of translation. The state appeared as the primary agent of translation planning in the extratextual discourse on translation.⁶ The guideline published by the Ministry of Education illustrates this in clear terms. The first and second articles of the guideline positioned the Ministry of Education and its Translation Bureau as the main decision-makers in terms of the source languages, the selection of titles to be translated and the translators who would translate them. The guideline left no room for private initiative in the form of contributions or proposals from private publishers and translators. The two articles read:

1 – The Translation Bureau of the Ministry of Education shall decide on the list of works to be published by the Ministry, the source languages and the translators who will carry out the translations whenever there is need. This list will be submitted for the approval of the Ministry by the Directorate General of Training and Education.

2- The translation of the works indicated in the list approved by the Ministry shall be commissioned to the translators indicated in the same list with a letter (*Maarif Vekilliğince Bastırılacak veya Basılması Teşvik Edilecek Tercüme Eserlerin Ne Suretle İnceleneceği Hakkında Talimatname* 1944: 5).

[1 – Maarif Vekilliğince basılmak üzere hangi dillerden, hangi eserlerin kimlere tercüme ettirileceği Vekillik Tercüme Bürosu tarafından, icabettikçe, bir liste halinde tesbit edilir ve bu liste Talim ve Terbiye Dairesi Reisliğince Vekillik makamının tasvibine arz olunur.

completely funded by the state forces me to view the Bureau as the embodiment of state's involvement in translation.

⁶ I will argue in Chapters 4 and 5 that the state was not the only agent of planning and that private publishers who drifted along with the “market” for translated literature also had a significant role in defining the kinds of translations read by the public. This more obscure side of translation planning will be taken up in the next chapter where I will carry out an expedition into the actual publishing market, offering information on the books published in the period under study. The common feature of private publishers was their silence and their lack of self-reflection. So they expressed themselves in the works they published and the way they published their works, rather than in articles or prefaces conveying their ideas.

2 – Vekillik makamınca tasvibedilecek listelerdeki eserlerin tercümesi yine o listelerde belirtilmiş olan mütercimlerden birer mektupla istenir (*Maarif Vekilliğince Bastırılacak veya Basılması Teşvik Edilecek Tercüme Eserlerin Ne Suretle İnceleneceği Hakkında Talimatname* 1944: 5).]

Despite Article 1 in this guideline, translators who wished to translate works included in the list by the Translation Bureau could translate a sample and send it to the Bureau. The Bureau, upon examining this sample, could commission the work to this translator. However, in January 1947 the Translation Bureau convened under the leadership of the new Minister of Education Sirer and reinstated the state's sole sovereignty over the choice of translator by expressing the following: "Translations by those who translate works, although they have not been commissioned by the Bureau, shall not be accepted even if those works are included in the lists" ["Kendilerine Büroca havale edilmemiş eserleri, listelerde olsa dahi, kendiliklerinden tercüme edip gönderenlerin tercümeleri kabul edilmeyecektir."] ("Haberler" 1947: 437).

3.2.3 A Patron of the Classics

The role assumed by the state vis-à-vis translation activity, and the various aspects of its translation planning project can also be explained within a patronage structure. Here I use the concept of "patronage" as introduced and elaborated by André Lefevere in his *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992). Lefevere argues that the system of literature has always been subject to two main kinds of control. The first kind of control originates from the system itself, exercised by the agents involved in the production of literature, while the second kind of control is carried out from outside of the system. This second type of control

is carried out in the form of patronage (Lefevere 1992: 14-15). According to Lefevere, patronage is “the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature” (1992: 15). Patronage covers three elements which are often found in interaction with each other: ideology, economics and status (Lefevere 1992: 16). In Lefevere’s view, the patron imposes its vision of what the society should be, in short, its ideology, onto the literary system. This is strongly valid for the Translation Bureau. Through its selection of works in the form of western classics, the Bureau openly expressed its preference for classics and “humanist” works during its first phase until 1946. The westernist ideology of the state was rather evident in this selection. The economic element of patronage was also present in the practices of the Translation Bureau. The state paid translators to act as members of the Bureau, it introduced new standards in the remuneration of translators by paying high fees to the translators it engaged and furthermore, used its financial resources to affect the selection and translation strategies used by private publishers. As for the status component, Lefevere writes that “acceptance of patronage implies integration into a certain support group and its lifestyle” (Lefevere 1992: 16). The application by private publishers to the Bureau to seek its approval and recommendation proved that being associated with the Bureau and the Ministry of Education offered publishers a special status, which positively changed their standing in the eyes of their readership. The Translation Bureau not only provided an ideology for translation activity, but also formed its “poetics” (Lefevere 1992: 26), i.e. the concept of what translated literature should be in the social system as a whole, and the inventory of literary devices, genres and symbols, which also included criteria for selecting works for translation and translation strategies.

The case of the Translation Bureau challenges Lefevere's claim that "patronage is usually more interested in the ideology of literature than in its poetics, and it could be said that the patron 'delegates authority' to the professional where poetics is concerned" (Lefevere 1992: 15). The Translation Bureau can be considered an institution that functioned both as an internal and external source of control over the system of translated literature. Being a part of the Ministry of Education, it held political and symbolic power and was able to set up the necessary mechanism to further its control on the system of translated literature. On the other hand, the Translation Bureau was a committee made up of professionals who also operated in the private book market. Their willingness to cooperate with the state in translation matters helped the Ministry of Education to control the system from within and to be able to define the poetics of this field. As I will demonstrate in the following sections, the members of the Translation Bureau, and the free-lance translators who were commissioned translations by the Translation Bureau, governed the discourse on translation strategies in the 1940s. Through their writings in *Tercüme* and other magazines and dailies, they raised their views on what translation was, and how it could best be carried out. Therefore they were able to define the terms through which translation came to be discussed.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to view the Translation Bureau as a patron that had absolute control over the system of translated literature. It was indeed a trendsetter and canon-maker in the field of canonical literature, yet the extent to which it could control the poetics of popular translated literature merits a long discussion. To be able to define the kind of patronage held by the Translation Bureau, we also need to explore the other force which shaped parts of the system for translated literature, i.e. the market. Perhaps it would be sounder to view the state's

involvement in translation within a differentiated system of patronage (Lefevre 1992: 17), since the state was not the only economic provider in the system. The patronage exercised over publishing and translation needs to be analyzed within a dual structure where the state was partially able to control and define the system of translated literature. Its control over popular literature remained limited to the rewrites of folk stories it commissioned (Güloğul 1937: 56-57). The market forces, in short, the marketing, distribution and sales mechanisms and the response they triggered in the readership, also exercised control over the literary system as I will demonstrate in Chapters 4 and 5. However, the market varied from state patronage in one important aspect: it lacked “status”. Being governed by market demands did not bring with it a special status for translators, writers and publishers. If anything, acting openly out of commercial concerns meant a loss of status among the intellectuals. Nevertheless, as Lefevre suggests, differentiated patronage may lead to a fragmentation of the reading public into subgroups (Lefevre 1992: 23). I would like to argue that this was also the case for the Turkish readership in the 1940s and 1950s. While a group of readers, mainly students and the educated population, were consumers for translated literature produced according to the canon and poetics offered by the patron, another group remained within the poetics offered by the private market. This is not to say that these two groups were completely fragmented. The same individuals could become a consumer for both canonical translated literature and popular translated literature. Nevertheless, the state had more power to impose its poetics on the reading public through its educational network, including schools, the Village Institutes and the People’s Houses. On the other hand, the market lacked such institutional and central power. While one of the reasons for reading the classics was to accrue “status”, there appeared no obvious reason for

reading popular literature other than the sheer reading pleasure. Furthermore, although the classics published by the Ministry of Education occupied considerable space in the literary agenda of the 1940s and 1950s, statistics indicate that the space it occupied in the reading experience of the people was limited. The number of copies printed per edition for the classics published by the Ministry of Education was 3,000 until 1958.⁷ The results of the 1935, 1940 and 1945 censuses indicate that the population of Turkey was 16,188,767 in 1935, 17,820,949 in 1940 and 18,871,202 in 1945 (“Nüfus Sayımı” 1935: 209; Banguoğlu 1945: 11). This meant that in 1945, 6,290 people would have to share a single copy of a classic published by the Ministry of Education. Furthermore, the rate of literacy among population above 7 years of age was 15 per cent in 1935 and 40 per cent in 1949 (İmer 1998: 71). These figures force one to question the actual reach and function of the products of the Translation Bureau, while they also draw attention to the weak hold of the state’s patronage over the general population in terms of defining their reception of translated literature. The degree to which the rural communities and the urban working classes could enjoy and internalize the complicated concepts and language of some of the classics is further debatable.

The classics translated by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education were not met with unquestioning approval. Although they were few in number, several writers and translators criticized the poetics offered by the Translation Bureau both in terms of its selection of titles and translation strategies. Among these, the strongest criticism came from Refi Cevad Ulunay.⁸ In

⁷ Alpay Kabacalı maintains that according to figures published in the daily *Cumhuriyet*, the number of copies per edition was 3,000 in 1940-1958, 4,000 in 1958-1964, 5,000 and in 1964-1966. He adds that these are not official figures (Kabacalı 2000: 204).

⁸ Ulunay’s criticism once more points at the intricate relationship between translation, culture and politics. Ulunay’s political past and his general ideological stance seems to reflect through his criticism of the Translation Bureau rather strongly. He was in opposition to the national struggle

an article published in the daily *Yeni Sabah*, Ulunay criticized the classics published by the Ministry of Education on several accounts (Ulunay, originally published in *Yeni Sabah* on 17.7.1946, reprinted in *Tercüme* 1946: 190-192). First and foremost, he was critical of the selection of the titles translated by the Translation Bureau, suggesting that the Bureau concentrated on western classics at the expense of eastern classics. Furthermore, he argued that these classics were translated badly in the hands of novice translators and that they were not subject to proper editing or proofreading. Ulunay also complained that the language used in the translations varied greatly and that they were full of mistakes. He expressed his disappointment with the translated classics as follows: “So far, this initiative has not yielded the expected result. Family men who know what they are reading were irritated by the mistakes they came across in these books and left the shelves they had reserved for them in their libraries empty” [“Bugün bu teşebbüsten beklenen netice elde edilememiştir. Okuduğunu anlar aile babaları kitaplarda rastladıkları hatalardan tedirgin olmuşlar ve kütüphanelerinde onlar için hazırladıkları rafları boş bırakmışlardır.”] (Ulunay 1946: 191).

Ulunay’s biggest concern was the Ministry of Education’s neglect of the Ottoman classics. He pointed out that the private publishers have had to take over the job of transliterating and publishing older works written in the Ottoman script, since the state showed no interest in them. He wrote:

The Ministry of Education published the western classics. What about our oriental classics? A few samples were published, as a form of variety, but these classics do not include the *divan* by Füzûlî ... Today’s children will not get to know this great Turkish poet who had realized the biggest linguistic revolution.

against the occupying powers during the War of Liberation. He was exiled in 1922 due to his writings against Mustafa Kemal and his supporters. He could only return to Turkey in 1938 after a general pardon. His criticism of the Translation Bureau may well be considered a criticism of the general culture planning efforts of the single-party era.

Because we have not been able to give the divan by Füzûli to the generation who has grown up after the adoption of the new alphabet!!! (Ulunay 1946: 191).

[Maarif Vekâleti garp klâsiklerini bastı. Ya bizim şark klâsikleri ne oldu? Bunlardan da çeşni bulunsun kabilinden beş on numune verildi, fakat bugün bu klâsikler içinde bir Füzûli divânı yoktur... Bugünün çocukları dilde en büyük inkılâbı yapan bu büyük Türk şairini tanımayacaklardır. Çünkü memleketimizde yeni harflerinden kabulünden beri yetişen nesle biz bir Füzûli divânı veremedik!!! (Ulunay 1946: 191).]

Unlike Ulunay's critique, the major part of criticism directed at the Translation Bureau's activities remained at the level of the selection and translation of individual works in the 1940s. Some translations published by the Ministry of Education were criticized in terms of their language use, or some translational shifts regarded as "mistakes". For instance in a review of the translation of Balzac's *Le Lys Dans La Vallé*, Cemil Meriç criticized the target text by commenting that the translation contained many mistakes and omissions, that the language used in the translation was against the principle of "pure Turkish" the Ministry had been propagating for years and that there were grammatical mistakes, neglects and lack of fluency in Turkish (Meriç 1942: 14). In another review, Meriç criticized the selection of Balzac's *Le Médecin de Campagne* by the Translation Bureau and the translator's preface to the book. He also argued that the only quality of the translation was the fact that it confirmed the aphorism "traduttore traditore" (Meriç 1942: 24).

Following the transition to the multi-party system, and the re-structuring of the Translation Bureau, some of the translators who were closely involved with the Bureau during the Republican People's Party government started to criticize its activities.

In an article he wrote in 1944, Orhan Burian (1944: 17) praised the humanist inclination of the Bureau, its editing mechanism, the high fees paid to translators as

well as the high print quality of the books. His positive tone appeared to have changed in 1947 when Burian (1974: 1-5) criticised the selection criteria of the Translation Bureau and wrote that the editing system of the Bureau was failing and that the printing and binding of the books were not up to desired quality. His discourse turned completely hostile to the Translation Bureau in another article published in 1953 where he wrote that the Translation Bureau was no longer competent to deal with its task and was causing large expense. He made a call for the closure of the Bureau and added that the selection and translation of classics could be performed by universities (Burian 1953: 131-131)

Nurullah Ataç, the first chairman of the Translation Bureau wrote in a critical article in 1952:

Why aren't these books [books published by the Translation Bureau] sold? First of all they are expensive. There are other reasons as well. People of this country are not used to reading, it is difficult for people to get used to books telling about things and situations which are not similar to the traditions of the society they live in (Ataç 1952: 231).

[Neye satılmıyor o kitaplar? Bir kere pahalı satılıyor. Bundan başka sebepler de var. Bu ülke kişileri kitap okumağa alışık değil, bir ulusun kişileri de kendi yaşadıkları toplumun törelerine pek benzemiyen işleri, durumları anlatan kitaplarla okumağa kolay kolay alışamaz, yadırgar onları (Ataç 1952: 231).

3.3 The Translator's Qualities and Visibility

Especially during the 1940s, the extratextual discourse on translation made mention of the translator a great deal. The special focus on the translator around this time was probably due to the launch of the Translation Bureau and the discourse developed by the *Tercüme*. Some of this discourse centered around the qualities of an "ideal"

translator, while a number of writers complained about the lack of such qualities in the translators of the time. Writers and translators who commented on various aspects of translation often referred to translators as independent decision-makers and held them directly responsible for the success or poor quality of their translations. In that sense it can be safely assumed that translators were rather visible during the period under study. I borrow the concept of “visibility” from Lawrence Venuti who has used the term “invisibility” while exploring the situation and activity of translators in current Anglo-American culture (Venuti 1995: 1). Venuti suggests that critics and reviewers hardly refer to the fact that the books they review are translations, and when they do address the translation, they neglect questions such as the translation’s accuracy, its intended audience or its place in the translator’s career (Venuti 1995: 2). I would like to argue that the reviews of specific translations or general comments on translation in early republican Turkey offer the scholar a different picture. That is why I have chosen to use “visibility”, rather than Venuti’s “invisibility” in the title to this section.

Below I will refer to two different sources which offer us clues about the translator’s status and situation in the period under study. The first source is extratextual discourse consisting of articles and reviews published in a number of magazines and dailies. The second source belongs to the translated texts themselves, and the way they present (or fail to present) their translators. I make use of paratextual elements of these texts to look for signs of the translator’s (in)visibility.

3.3.1 The Translator's Visibility in the Extratextual Discourse

The “visibility” attained by the translators in the period under study was not monolithic. There were two different façades of this visibility. One entailed an idealization of a specific type of a translator, the writer-translator. Underlying this ideal notion of the translator was an inferior view of the profession that included a perspective that regarded the activity of translation as a derivative and secondary activity. The second façade of visibility involved comments on the actual state and status of translators. One striking aspect common to both kinds of visibility was that they could both be encountered in statements by translators themselves; so this discourse may be said to reflect the self-perceptions of the translators.

In many statements on translation, the ideal quality for any translator was offered as that of “being an author”. A number of writers, and even translators, argued that only writers could produce successful translations. The issue of literary copyrights raised during the Publishing Congress offered an opportunity for a discussion of whether the translators deserved to be paid copyright fees. One of the participants of the Congress, İzzet Melih Devrim, novelist, playwright and translator, suggested that copyright fees be paid for translators. The reason behind this proposal was the conviction that a good translator of literary texts also had to be an author. Devrim argued, “It is a prerequisite for translators to be authors and writers to be able to carry out these literary translations successfully. They must be paid the same copyrights for their translations” [“Bu edebî tercümelerin lâıyıkı ile yapılabilmesi için mütercimlerin edip ve muharrir olmaları şarttır. Bunlara yapacakları tercemede aynıyle telif hakkının verilmesi lâzımdır.”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 74). Nevertheless, this proposal was not accepted because the Literary Copyrights

Committee (“Edebî Mülkiyet Encümeni”) decided to introduce a distinction between translation and indigenous writing and concluded, “We decided that translation and indigenous writing are different. Indigenous writing is to create a work directly through hard work. On the other hand, translation is to transfer⁹ an existent work by making use of one’s foreign language skills” [“Tercümenin telif ile bir olmadığına kanaat ettik. Telif bir adamın doğrudan doğruya birçok emek sarfederek bir eser vücade getirmesidir. Terceme ise hazır bir eseri ecebi dili bilmekten istifade ederek nakletmek demektir.”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 77). The above discussion illustrates that the translator was only regarded as worthy of copyright when s/he was an author her/himself. Moreover, the distinction drawn between translation and indigenous writing indicates that translation was seen as a derivative activity, lacking in creativity. The demarcation between translation and indigenous writing, always in favour of the latter, was evident in the discourse of a number of writers. In his review of Salâhattin Batu’s translation of *Iphigenia aus Tauris*, Suut Kemal Yetkin contended, “... a writer, an artist should not take pride in the great success he achieves in translation, but rather in the creativity he displays in his own work” [“... bir yazarın, bir sanatçının yüzünü ağartacak olan, tercümede göstereceği büyük başarı değil, öz eserinde göstereceği yaratıcılıktır”] (Yetkin 1942: 6). In 1943, writer Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar argued that a translator could never be a good author, because a successful author would prefer to write his own works rather than to translate others’ (Hisar in Özdenoğlu 1949: 46-47). In the meantime, there were also writers who argued for the creative aspect of translation and held it equal to indigenous writing. Hilmi Ziya Ülken referred to translation as “the creation of a new

⁹ “To transfer” is used to translate the verb “nakletmek”. For a discussion of the use of terms “nakil”, “nâkil” and “nakletmek” to refer to “translation”, “translator” and “to translate” see Section 3.4.

work” [“yeni bir eser yaratmak”] and maintained that a translator who translated an artist into a new language became a new artist in that language [“Artisti bir dile tanıtan, o dilde yeni bir artist olduğunu unutmamalıdır.”] (Ülken 1938: 78). The most prolific proponent of this latter view was Nurullah Ataç, who ardently argued for the artistic independence of the translator and the creative side of translation in his writings. The discourse he developed around translation during his career as a renowned translator consistently rejected an inferior view of translation and translator vis-à-vis indigenous writing and indigenous writer. In several of his articles he suggested that the translator was akin to an indigenous writer and wrote, “The translator, too, is a poet, a writer” [“Mütercim de bir şairdir, bir muharrirdir”] (Ataç 1941: 505). Elsewhere he commented that translators had to be as creative as indigenous authors (Ataç 1940: 404). Nevertheless, even Ataç’s view was tinted with dismay when it came to assessing the quality and status of the translators in Turkey in the 1930s and 1940s. In one of his later writings, he extended a call to writers to become engaged in translation. He maintained that writers should take over the job of translating and asked “Who is to blame if the majority of current translators are not competent? Not those who undertake translations without being writers themselves; we should rather blame our writers who deride the activity of translating” [“Bugünkü çevirmenlerin çoğu iyi değilse suç kimdedir? Kendilerini birer yazar olmadan bu işe atılanlarda değil, çeviri ile uğraşmağı küçümseyen yazarlarımızdadır.”] (Ataç 1948: 4).

Turkish intellectuals often attempted to mobilize authors to become involved in translation activity. In his article in the first issue of *Tercüme*, Bedrettin Tuncel extended a call for writers to take up translation, because, he claimed, translation was a kind of indigenous writing (Tuncel 1940: 81). İzzettin Melih Devrim recommended

that competent writers of Turkish should be forced to allocate some of their time to translation. He accused writers with preferring indigenous writing over translation and therefore leaving translation to “second- and third-grade writers” [“ikinci, üçüncü derecede yazıcılar”] (Devrim 1940: 275). As for poetry translation, poets were regarded as the only possible translators for poetry, because “poetry can only be written by poets” [“şiiri ancak şairler yazar”] (Teoman 1946: 93). The underlying idea behind the above statements was that translators would not be able to become writers no matter how much they aspired to, while writers, who spoke a foreign language, could easily become translators if they wished to. Nevertheless, these statements also made it evident that writers were normally not willing to become translators.¹⁰ This offers some indication about the status of the profession of translating.

As an ideal construct, the writer-translator was present in the discourse around translation in the 1930s-1950s. Statements by some writers and translators were laden with prescriptive judgments and these provided visibility to a model translator rather than assessing the current status and situation of the translators. Another form of visibility granted to the translators was in the form of criticism and complaints. Such statements condemned the activities of translators who either were incompetent, or let themselves be driven by market demands. For instance in an article he wrote, writer and translator Nahid Sırrı wrote that there were two types of translators in Turkey (Nahid Sırrı 1941: 374). According to him, the first type, including himself and some of his colleagues, dedicated themselves completely to

¹⁰ Despite the claims of these statements a number of eminent fiction writers became involved with translating in the early republican period. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Cevat Şakir Kabaağaçlı, Orhan Veli Kanık, Melih Cevdet Anday, Sabahattin Ali all translated foreign fiction at various times. Nevertheless, they are mainly known as writers and poets and their translation activity remained secondary to their original writing.

translation. The second type of translators regarded translation as a purely commercial activity and paid little attention to anything else than the fees they would receive. Nahid Sırrı added that the latter type of translators were in majority worldwide, which resulted in “bad” [“fenâ”] translations full of omissions and inaccuracies (Nahid Sırrı 1941: 374). Halit Fahri Ozansoy referred to translators who were only driven by their ambition to make money as “ruthless translators” [“insafsız mütercim”] (Ozansoy 1944: 4). In an article he wrote on the occasion of the Publishing Congress, Vâlâ Nurettin, writer, journalist and translator, with a considerable number of popular (and therefore “commercial”) translations to his credit, proposed the setting up of a disciplinary board to punish incompetent translators. He added in a rather ironical tone that football players who played foul were disqualified by the football federation while a translator who made many mistakes while rendering a classical work into Turkish was not held accountable (originally published in *Akşam* on 2.4.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 149).

Reviews of translated works in *Tercüme*, as well as in various other magazines, always referred to the translator of the work as a rule. These reviews included praise, as well as criticisms of the translator’s performance. Some of these reviews, especially the more negative ones, found responses in the translators, who often felt the need to defend their choices. I will refer to a number of these reviews in the next section on translation criticism and translation strategies.

3.3.2 Partial Visibility in Paratextual Discourse

When the extratextual discourse on translation is extended to include paratextual elements (Genette 1997: 1) of translated books such as covers and title pages, the translator's visibility assumes a partial status. The names of translators did not appear in the covers of the classics published by the Ministry of Education. This was the case across most types of publishers, involved both with canonical and popular translated literature. In the classics by the Ministry of Education, the name of the translator appeared in the second title page and it was always subordinated to the original author in terms of the position and size of the typeset. On the other hand, translators were allowed to submit prefaces where they could present and inform the readers about the text and its author in a manner that they chose. This indicated that the translator was given the status of an expert who was capable of commenting on the source work and its writer.

On the other hand, in the title pages of the classics, the translator was occasionally introduced with a professional attribute, such as "teacher of English at the Ankara Second Junior High School" (Stevenson 1944), "instructor at the School of Political Science" (Mann 1945), "associate professor at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography" (Swift 1946) etc. The frequency with which the translators were introduced with their "other", and probably more "legitimate" professions, indicate that translation was not considered a proper occupation and was regarded as a secondary or part-time activity. It is also interesting to note that an overwhelming number of translators were engaged in some form of academic activity, teaching at the university or a high school. This indicates how closely the translation of classics was related to education.

When paratexts of non-canonical translations are considered, the translator's visibility disappears altogether. While the translators' names were indicated on some popular translated books, some, especially those belonging to the "people's book" format did not feature their translators' names.¹¹ This is not to say that they were introduced as indigenous books either, there was simply no author's or translator's name on the cover. Nevertheless, it is not feasible to suggest that these works were received as works written originally in Turkish since their titles would lead to some question marks regarding their origins. For instance in 1944-1945 Güven_Yayınevi, a publishing company active mainly in the field of popular literature, published a series called "Meşhur İngiliz Polis Hafiyesi Şerlok Holmes Serisi" ["The Series of the Famous English Police Detective Sherlock Holmes"] which consisted of 83 dime novels offering a mixture of translations and Sherlock Holmes pastiches written originally in Turkish. Sherlock Holmes was a well-established name among readers of popular literature, one of the best-selling heroes of detective fiction since its first translation into Turkish in 1909. There was little doubt that the books published by Güven would be received as translations. There was no mention of the writer or the translator on any of the stories and they all appeared as anonymous works.¹² One could not even speak of an authorial visibility, let alone the translator's visibility. This was a strategy that reflected an indiscriminating attitude towards translation and indigenous writing, and for that matter, towards writers and translators. This is rather different from the attitude of the Ministry of Education or publishers like Remzi who were involved with translated canonical literature. These publishers carefully underscored the status of the books they published as translations by

¹¹ The concepts of "popular literature" and the "people's books" will be explored in Chapter 5.

¹² The reasons for the use of anonymity as a literary strategy by Güven publishing company, as well as by some other publishers will be discussed in Chapter 5.

indicating the foreign writer's name in the cover and the title pages, and this often resulted in the granting of a secondary position to the translators, whose names seldom appeared on the covers. Indeed, preserving the style and content of the indigenous work in translation appeared as a major concern in the discourse of the writers and translators who commented on translation strategies or offered reviews of translated works.

3.4 Concepts and Strategies of Translation

Writers, academics, publishers and translators who raised their views on the nature and strategies of translation expressed their ideas in terms of a number of concepts which will be tackled under separate headings in this section. The most important concept was translation itself, which was referred to under different terms and definitions. The various definitions formulated by writers and translators offer clues about their concepts of translation and serve as precursors of the strategies they recommend for translators. The definitions and recommended strategies of translation, which circulated in the public discourse in the period under study, are further valuable in terms of discovering the translational habituses of the different parties involved. I would like to view the debates on defining the concepts and strategies of translation as parts of a power struggle carried out in the system of translated literature towards defining the center of this system. This section will demonstrate that the canon-formation attempts were not limited to offering new options for the repertoire of translated literature in the form of a new set of titles. The making of the literary canon by the Translation Bureau and by some writers and translators associated with it, included guidelines on ways of reading and writing

literature, and also translated literature. The new canon would involve a re-consideration of the concept of translation accompanied by the introduction of certain definitions and norms.

In this section, I will review some of these definitions and norms as parts of an emerging center in the system of translated literature. As was the case in the efforts to define the functions of translation, publishers involved in popular literature remained silent about their concepts of translation. Their translational habituses can only be traced through their publishing activities, rather than their rhetoric, which was largely absent from *Tercüme*, literary magazines or dailies. Their concepts of translation can only be found in the way they used translation, and translation-related concepts in the covers of their publications, or on their promotional material.

3.4.1 Definitions of Translation

During the 1923-1960 period, a number of terms were used to refer to “translation”, what we call “tercüme” or “çeviri” in Turkish today. The term “translation” I make use of in the present thesis does not represent interlingual translation in its restricted sense. I use the term translation in a wider sense to cover cases such as adaptations, abridgements or vulgarizations in addition to translation *proper*. In other words, the way I use “translation” covers the whole range of the phenomenon that can be located anywhere in the continuum between the historical demarcations of “literal” and “free” translation (see Robinson 1998a and 1998b).¹³ There is plenty of evidence to suggest that adaptations, abridgements and vulgarizations, not to mention

¹³ I would also like to distinguish my use of “translation” from Lefevere’s concept of “rewriting” which includes translation and classifies it under the same heading with a range of literary activities such as compilation of anthologies, reader’s guides or histories of literature (Lefevere 1992: 2).

borderline cases such as pseudotranslations, were considered to be concepts belonging with the umbrella term “translation” during the period under study. Catalogues featuring these various types of translation placed them under the general heading of “translation” (see various editions of *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*) and the mainly negative views on such works were tackled under the subject of translation (see for instance Hulusi 1941; Garan 1949).

The most common terms used in order to refer to translations were “tercüme” and “çevirme”. The latter term was a neologism coined in the 1930s based on the verb “çevirmek” (“to turn around”, “to turn inside out” conventionally used in order to refer to “to translate”) and it was gradually replaced by “çeviri” in the late 1940s. “Adaptasyon”, a term imported from French, was used to refer to adaptation, mainly in drama translation, but also in fiction translations (see Hulusi 1941; Hızır 1941: 489). “İktibas” which was a word of Arabic origin, meaning “quoted after” or “borrowed from”, was a term with some ambiguous connotations. It was used to refer to translation of poetry by İzzet Melih Devrim (1940: 276) in an article titled “Literary Translation” [“Edebî Tercüme”]. On the other hand, “iktibas” was also used to refer to an abridgement of Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* published by Güven publishing company (Stoker 1940).¹⁴ “Nakil” is even more problematic than “iktibas” in terms of identifying its exact significance and position among the various concepts of translation. This term which literally means “transfer” in Turkish, was operational in Ottoman and early republican periods and could refer to both indigenous fiction and translations (see Vâlâ Nureddin’s *Mazinin Yükü Altında*, İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1942). The phrase “Türkçe’ye nakletmek” – “To transfer

¹⁴ This translation is included in the case study on translated popular literature which will be offered in Chapter 6.

into Turkish” was used in the sense of “to translate into Turkish” (Tuncel 1940: 79). Hilmi Ziya Ülken was among those who used “nakil” in the sense of translation proper. He used “nakleden” (“one who transfers”) synonymous with “çeviren” (“one who translates”) (Ülken 1997 [1935]: 350). On the other hand, “nakil” was also used to refer to indigenous writing on certain occasions. The works referred to under “nakil” generally belonged to the realm of popular literature and the provenance of these works were unclear as they often had characters with foreign names (see Sertelli 1941; Varoğlu 1947). Certain authors used “nakil” to refer to “free translation” and introduced “nakil” and “faithful translation” as binary oppositions (Burian 1936: 24). This latter meaning, i.e. “nakil” as “free translation” seems to have gained weight over time. Later writings, especially those written in the 1950s, started to regard “nakil” exclusively as free translation. One writer maintained that “adaptation” in drama translation and “nakil” in novel translation could be referred to as “impressionist translation” [“izlenimci çeviricilik”] (Cöntürk 1956: 462-464). “Impressionist translation” denoted a type of translation where the translator read the source text and wrote down his impressions of the text, rather than exerting any effort to reflect the style or the content of the source (Cöntürk 1956: 462).

Some writers and translators attempted to offer definitions of translation. The common thread that ran across all of these definitions was the insistence on the creative aspects of translation. Nurullah Ataç maintained that translation was to express a thought or a feeling in a language that was different from the original language it was expressed in (Ataç 1940: 404). In one of his articles in *Tercüme* he wrote: “To translate means to re-think something in a language that was originally thought in another language” [“Tercüme etmek, bir dilde düşünülmüş bir şeyi bir dilde tekrar düşünmek demektir.”] (Ataç 1941: 505). An anonymous piece in

Tercüme pointed out, “Translation is an activity characterized by personality, taste and perseverance rather than a simple knowledge of two languages. Therefore it would be more correct to call translation an original creation rather than a transfer” [“Tercüme, her iki lisanı da bilmekten ziyade, bir şahsiyet, zevk ve sebat işidir. Bu itibarla, tercüme yi bir nakilden ziyade, bir ibda addetmek doğru olur.”] (“Chateaubriand’dan İki Tercüme” 1941: 492). Likewise, Şinasi Özdenoğlu commented that translation was a re-creation of a work in another language (Özdenoğlu 1949: 25). This emphasis on translation as creative work led to a view that associated the activity of translating with indigenous writing. Nevertheless, this did not result in an upgrading of the translator’s status. Rather than urging the society to view translators on a par with writers, those who commented on the creative side of translating, urged writers to take up translation. Therefore, consciously or inadvertently, they downplayed the translator and created the writer-translator model. In the meantime, while creativity was underscored by those who attempted to define the act of translation, the “original” work was not left aside. The need to render the source text as closely as possible was tackled in a number of ways. This was a recurrent theme in statements on translation strategies, and was expressed through two concepts: “directness of translation” and “fidelity”.

3.4.2 Directness of Translation

Statements on translation strategies, including recommendations for the selection of titles to be translated, dwelled upon the importance of translating directly from the source language. Works translated before the 1940s were largely criticized for being second-hand translations, mainly carried out through French. For instance, Ahmet

Ağaoğlu complained that works translated into Turkish via French were a “jumble” [“altüst edilmiş vaziyettedir”] and stated that such mediated translations were bound to reflect the mistakes of the intermediary translation (originally published in *İkdam* on 21.4.1939 reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 171). In its report submitted to the Publishing Congress, the Translation Committee carefully emphasized the importance of direct translation and stipulated that as much as possible, translations should be carried out directly from the source language [“umumiyetle eserlerin tam olarak ve mümkün oldukça aslından tercüme ettirilmesi tavsiye olunur”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 126). The statement “as much as possible” was an indication of a problem hindering direct translations from Greek and Latin: there were few competent translators who could translate Greek and Latin classics into Turkish.

Halide Edip Adıvar, who acknowledged the importance of direct translation, wrote that it would be better for these classics to be translated via modern western languages, because “even if we assume that we have writers who are fluent in Ancient Greek and Latin, they lack the tone, tradition and culture reflected by the western classics” [“eski yunancayı ve lâtinçeyi su gibi bilen yazıcılarımız olduğunu farzetsek dahi garp klâsiklerinin yarattığı hava, an’ane ve harsa varis değildirler”] (originally published in *Akşam* on 4.5.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 205).

There was general consensus on the need to translate works written in modern languages such as English, German, Italian and Russian directly into Turkish (see Nayır 1937: 163; Tuncel 1940: 80; Köni 1940: 19; Ali 1941: 581-585). Translations from Greek and Latin were often held as an exception to this rule (Nayır 1937: 163; Tuncel 1940: 81). As Greek and Latin classics, and the attainment of a “humanist”

culture through them, became more topical with the establishment of the Translation Bureau and the launch of *Tercüme*, different views started to be heard. Classicists who advocated the need for direct translations from Greek and Latin, were the leading names in this debate. In his critique of the Turkish translation of Plato's *Protagoras*, Suat Sinanoğlu, classicist, writer and translator, wrote that a translation done via an intermediary language would run the risk of being "unfaithful" to the original (Sinanoğlu 1941: 485). While commenting on a translation of *Herodotus*, Azra Erhat, another classicist, criticized the work on the grounds that it was carried out via its English translation and stated: "We can only translate the works of a world we know well. In order to know a period, a civilization, a person well, we must first of all learn their language... Is it fitting for a person to translate a book if he does not know the world within which the work was written, or has not exerted sufficient effort to familiarize himself with that world?" ["Ancak iyi tanıdığımız bir âlemin eserlerini tercüme edebiliriz. Bir zamanın, bir medeniyetin, bir insanın iyi tanınması için de her şeyden önce onların kendi dillerini öğrenmek lâzımdır... Bir kitabın yazıldığı âlemi iyice tanımayan, onu öğrenmek için gerektiği kadar çalışmamış olan bir kimsenin o kitabı tercümesi doğru mudur?"] (Erhat 1942: 525-526). Likewise, Hilmi Ziya Ülken stressed the need to translate Greek classics directly from the original language, and moreover suggested the commissioning of such translations to philologues and philosophers (Ülken 1942: 17).

Nevertheless, the scarcity of translators who could translate directly from Greek or Latin made it imperative for the Translation Bureau to commission these translations to translators competent in modern European languages. The Bureau set up a committee to oversee the translations of works by Plato. This committee acknowledged a shortage of Greek and Latin translators and agreed on the need to

translate Plato's works via French, English and German. It also authorized the German O. Apel, the English Jowett and the French "Les Belles-Lettres" and "Garnier" series as source texts for translators (Hızır 1943: 345). Indeed, although the importance of using the "original" ("asil") text for translation was emphasized in theory, practical concerns led to an exception in the case of Greek and Latin, as well as minor European languages, such as Scandinavian languages, Finnish or Hungarian. In the case of the Greek classics, Paker observes:

Among those responsible for translations of Greek and Roman classics, seven are known to have translated from Greek or Latin, while the majority relied on French as the principal intermediate language. Hence, of the 66 translations of Greek classics published within the period 1940-1966, (some with 3 reprints) only 17, i.e. less than one-third, were from the original source-texts (Paker 1986a: 418).

The increasing emphasis on direct translations can be regarded as an emphasis on the source text as an "original" that had to be rendered into Turkish as closely as possible. Those who commented on the importance of direct translation also pointed out that a translator who translated a text via an intermediary language would not be able to permeate the "spirit" of the original work and therefore could be "unfaithful" to it (Sinanoğlu 1941: 484). This proves that the shift towards direct translations, which materialized with English, German and Russian works, but remained largely rhetorical for Greek, Latin and minor languages after 1940, also meant a shift towards granting a higher status to the original text. This shift in favour of the original work and the original writer was also visible in the use of the concept "faithfulness" or "fidelity".

3.4.3 Fidelity as a Multifaceted Concept

The term “sadakāt”, which I will translate as “fidelity”¹⁵ in the rest of this chapter, was used by writers and translators to denote several concepts. I would like to tackle these concepts under three main headings: fidelity to textual integrity, fidelity to content and form and fidelity to the “tone”. In all three of these concepts, fidelity had positive connotations as opposed to “free translation” that appeared as an antagonist of fidelity.

3.4.3.1 Fidelity to Textual Integrity

Some of the writers who wrote about the importance of fidelity to the original referred to the importance of rendering the text into Turkish in its entirety, without any omissions. For instance, in his review of the Turkish translation of *Le Lys Rouge*, Nahit Sırrı Örik maintained that a translation which omitted parts of the original text would be “unfaithful” to it and added that this was an indication of the fact that the translator did not consider the original author’s work worthy of translating fully (Örik 1940: 205). Likewise, Erol Güneş referred to fullness in translation as “the first prerequisite of fidelity” [“sadağatın ilk şartı olan eksiksiz tercüme”] (Güneş 1942: 530). Preserving the textual integrity of the source text was regarded as important for fidelity as reflecting the ideas of the source text (İlgün 1942: 147) or reflecting the “tone” [“aslın havasını”] of the original work (Ay 1942a: 152).

¹⁵ I will translate “sadağat” as “fidelity”, “sadağık” as “faithful” and “sadağatsız” as “unfaithful”.

3.4.3.2 Fidelity to Content and Form

A second concept that was associated with fidelity was that of reflecting the content and the form of the original in translation. Writers all stressed the importance of rendering the content and the form of the source text accurately, yet they all warned against the use of a defective language in the target text that might result from literal translations. İsmail Habib Sevük stated that “the first and fundamental prerequisite of good translations is fidelity to the original, in other words, accuracy in translation” [“İyi tercümeçiliğin ilk esas şartı asla sadakat, yani tercümede doğruluktur.”]. And then he added: “Accuracy may be the fundamental prerequisite of translation, but it is not enough. Beauty must also be attained along with accuracy. We shall also add delight to our translation. We are obliged to preserve the same literary value in the translation of a literary work” [“Doğruluk tercümenin esas şartı ama kâfi şartı değil. Doğruluktan başka bir de güzellik temin edilecek. Tercümemize zevk de vereceğiz. Edebî kıymeti olan bir eserin tercümesinde de aynı edebî kıymeti muhafazayla mükellefiz.”] (Sevük 1940b: 608).

The report by Istanbul University submitted to the Publishing Congress described the ideal translation as one that would be fully faithful to the original both in terms of content and style and would take into the Turkish language and culture into consideration (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 350). Nevertheless, the majority of writers and translators acknowledged the difficulty of attaining fidelity to both content and form and stressed the need to reflect the content of the original at the expense of the form.

Certain writers recommended a rendering of content at the expense of stylistic elements such as syntax. Lûtfi Ay’s review of three translated plays published by the

Ministry of Education is representative of this approach. Ay praised Sabahattin Eyüboğlu's Turkish translation of *Intérieur* by Maurice Materlinck for "remaining faithful to the content" ["muhtevaya tamamen sadık kalarak"] and using a colloquial Turkish (Ay 1941b: 86). Ay's review of Sabahattin Eyüboğlu's translation placed fidelity and fluency in Turkish ["konuşma dili"] as two concepts that were difficult to reconcile. Ay appreciated Eyüboğlu's success because he was able to combine the two (Ay 1941b: 86-87). In the meantime, Ay considered Eyüboğlu's manipulation of syntax and addition of some words as necessary choices required by his use of fluent Turkish. Ay's review of Nurullah Ataç's translation of *Le Pélerin* by Charles Vildrac drew attention to the same aspect of fluency and stressed the impossibility of remaining faithful to both content and form at the same time. Ay wrote that Ataç "expressed the features of the conversational language of the original in beautiful contemporary Turkish by remaining faithful to the original, but not becoming enslaved to form" ["Asıldaki konuşma dilinin hususiyetlerini muhtevaya sadık kalarak, fakla şekle esir olmadan bu günkü güzel Türkçe ile ifade etmiş".] (Ay 1941b: 89). In the same article Ay criticized a translation by İzzet Melih Devrim because the translator had remained largely faithful to the original, but had not paid enough attention to fluency (Ay 1941b: 88). In an article on translation of fiction, Yaşar Nabi Nayır wrote that fidelity did not consist of literal translation and that "Turkification" ["türkçeleştirme"] was an important element for fidelity. Throughout this article he gave examples of translated phrases that sounded strange in Turkish and concluded that such translations were a result of a misperception of the principle of fidelity (Nayır 1941: 91-95).¹⁶ Elsewhere, Nayır commented that fidelity to the

¹⁶ It is interesting to note that a review of one of Nayır's own translations appeared in the same issue of *Tercüme*. Suut Kemal Yetkin who wrote the commentary on Nayır's translation of *La Confessions d'un Enfant du Siècle* pointed out that his translation read fluently and easily ["tercümesi zevkle ve kolaylıkla okunabiliyor"] (Yetkin 1941: 83). Yet Yetkin also criticized Nayır for omitting large

form inevitably involved a betrayal of the “sense” [“mâna”] and that deviating from the form of the original stemmed from the will to come closer to the sense of the text (Nayır 1943: 425). Poetry translation was considered a genre where fidelity to form had to be put aside in order to achieve fidelity of “sense” or “content” (Nüzhet Haşım Sinanoğlu in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 390). The emphasis on form, i.e. meter and rhyme, was said to lead to “free translation”, which was generally regarded as an undesirable trait (Ozansoy 1946: 95).

Certain writers argued for the importance of establishing a balance between sense and form. Georg Rohde warned against a simplification of form and style for rendering the sense of the source text (Rohde 1941: 478). Nurullah Ataç criticized translators who attached importance to sense and ideas at the expense of form. He wrote:

Fidelity is of course necessary in translation, erroneous translation cannot be defended. Nevertheless, fidelity is not the major prerequisite of translation. Because a work of art’s real value lies in its form of expression, rather than its subject matter. A truly faithful translation is the translation that is faithful to form. It is wrong to think that we perceive of the meaning in the books we read or the conversation we listen, in terms of words: it is *manner* that gives us the sense, the purpose (Ataç 1940: 404).

[Tercümede sadakat elbette lâzımdır; yanlış tercüme müdafaa edilemez. Fakat sadakat tercümenin başlıca şartı değildir. Çünkü hiçbir sanat eserinin asıl kıymeti söylediği şeylerde değildir; onları söyleyiş tarzında, şeklidir. Gerçekten sadık olan tercüme, şekle sadık olan tercümedir. Okuduğumuz kitaplarda veya karşımızdakinin sözlerinde manayı kelimeler vasıtasıyla kavradığımızı zannetmek daima yanlıştır: bize manayı, maksadı bahşeden *eda*’dır (Ataç 1940: 404).]

portions of the novel and producing “sentences that are defective and incompatible with the nature of the Turkish language” [“aksak ve Türkçenin bünyesine uymıyan cümleler”] (Yetkin 1941: 82). This small example illustrates the gap that may exist between a translator’s rhetoric and actual performance and warns us against accepting extratextual comments at face value during a study of norms in translated texts.

Nevertheless, this “manner”, which Ataç italicized in his article, was beyond form. It was also expressed differently than “style” which was referred to as “üslûp”. Along with several other terms, “eda” became a near-metaphysical attribute that depicted an effect translators had to create in Turkish.

In fact, Ataç was not mainly concerned with devising ways of realizing fidelity to the original. He was a fervent opponent of “blind fidelity” [“körü körüne bağılılık”] in translation and advocated the use of fluent Turkish in translated texts. According to Ataç, a translation which violated the target language would be unfaithful to the original text (Ataç 1941: 505). For Ataç, translation was a creative process and had no strict rules to be observed and “a good translation is a *miracle* like all works of art” [“Her sanat eseri gibi güzel tercüme de bir *mucize*’dir”] (Ataç 1940: 404).

3.4.3.3 Fidelity to the Tone

Apart from fidelity to the content, the sense, the form and the style of the source text, remaining faithful to the “tone” of the original was a significant concern as expressed in a number articles that appeared in *Tercüme*. What I summed up as “tone” [“hava”] in the title to this section was a rather elusive concept that was sometimes expressed as “manner” [“eda”], “spirit” [“ruh”], “life” [“hayat”] or “çeşni” [“flavour”]. The reason why I have placed these concepts under the same heading has to do with the fact that they can all be associated with the creation of a certain effect in a translation.

As discussed in the previous section, some writers remained largely on the level of form and content while problematizing the subject of fidelity in translation. In the meantime, some went beyond form and content and stressed the importance of

re-creating the effect created by the source text on the source readers, on readers of Turkish. Nusret Hızır defined this effect, he termed “tone” [“hava”] as follows: “In our opinion, rendering the ‘tone’ faithfully means to create the thoughts and the images that will be invoked by the original in the same order and the same rhythm” [“Fikrimizce ‘hava’yı aynen vermek, tercüme okunduğu vakit, aslı okununca uyanacak olan tasavvur ve hayallerin aynı sırada ve aynı ritm’de uyanmasını temin etmek demektir”] (Hızır 1941a: 488). Suat Sinanoğlu referred to the importance of remaining faithful to what he called the “spirit” of the original author (Sinanoğlu 1941: 485). According to Sinanoğlu, an author’s “spirit” consisted of the unity of his ideas and his ways of expressing them and “spirit” was the single most important element in the original that the translator needed to be faithful to (Sinanoğlu 1941: 485). Sabahattin Ali maintained that a literary work was a “living being” [“canlı bir mevcudiyet”] and that the translator had to feel the “life” in the work to be able to translate it successfully. Ali also argued that the life in the original would enable the translator to find new phrases, new forms and new expressions in the target language (Ali 1941: 581). Lûtfi Ay praised a successful translation for enabling the readers to sample the “flavour” of the original (Ay 1942b: 541).

There was no general agreement on the use of the above set of terms. Some of them were used interchangeably, some were used to denote “style” in some articles and “effect” in some others. For instance Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar used “spirit” and “style” synonymously (Hisar in Özdenoğlu 1949: 46). Nusret Hızır used “manner” and “tone” interchangeably in one of his articles in *Tercüme* and he used them both to refer to “style” (Hızır 1943: 434). Furthermore, he argued that the best way to capture the style of the original would be through making the authors “speak in Turkish” (Hızır 1943: 434). On the other hand, Nurettin Artam made a distinction

between style and “manner” and wrote: “In my opinion, translation is to re-write a work in another language with a manner that approaches the force and the style it has in the original language” [“Kanaatimce, tercüme, bir eseri esas dilindeki kudret ve üslûba yakın bir eda ile ikinci dilde yeniden yazmak demektir”] (Artam in Özdenoğlu 1949: 95). Some writers stressed the importance of reflecting the “spirit” of the original work in the translation. Erol Güney argued that there were two types of fidelity “fidelity to the method” [“yol sadakati”] and “fidelity to the target” [“gaye sadakati”] (Güney 1942: 144). He urged all translators to opt for the latter type of fidelity that could only be possible through creating the author’s “mood” [“ruh haleti”] in the translation and reflecting this mood onto the readers (Güney 1942: 144).

The different terms used by writers and translators to refer to the “tone” of the original work created some confusion on the readers of the time. Nusret Hızır, who himself later used the terms “manner” and “tone” to refer to “style” in a rather ambiguous manner, commented on the use of these terms by various writers as follows:

We come across the following concepts in the articles: *Sense, spirit, form, manner, tone, living the language, fidelity, life*. These have not been described or explained... Moreover, there is no consensus neither in the definitions nor in the way they are used, in other words, when one of the authors use *spirit*, we are not sure that he uses it in the way another author understands or feels it (Hızır 1941b: 268).

[Yazılarda şu mefhumlara rastlıyoruz: *Mana, ruh, şekil, eda, hava, lisani yaşama, sadakat, hayat*. Bunlar ne izah ne de tarif edilmiştir... Üstelik, tariflerle olmasa bile sözün gelişinden anlaşılabilir bir ittifaka da şahit olmuyoruz, daha doğrusu, muharrirlerden biri meselâ *ruhu* kullandığı vakit, onu, diğer bir muharririn anladığı, yahut sezdiği manada kullandığından emin değiliz (Hızır 1941b: 268).]

This idea of fidelity that varied from writer to writer remained rather vague and no method was shown as to how fidelity could be attained. What *did* remain constant was the fact that fidelity was regarded as a positive concept in general. Most writers tackled it in contradistinction to “free translation” [“serbest tercüme”] which was associated with undesirable traits, such as omissions and neglect of the original work’s style. This behaviour was often associated with the translation activity of the past, and therefore of a translational habitus that many wished to see become obsolete.

Free translation was regarded as “apathy” [“laubalilik”] that consisted of a translator’s rendering of his impressions and ideas of a source text rather than translation proper. Such translations were characterized by omissions or unsuitable additions. “Free translation” was defined as “the writing of a new work by the translator who borrows the subject matter and leaves the spirit of the work aside in order to provide for a translation of sweet style” [“tatlı bir üslupla tercüme temini için, mevzuu ele alıp, eserin ruhunu bir tarafa bırakarak, mütercimim kendi kalemile yeniden bir eser yazması”] (from the preface to the 1937 Turkish translation of *The Inspector* by Avni İnel and Vecihi Görk, cited in Taluy 1943: 69). Nihal Yalaza Taluy condemned the use of free translation for the translation of classics in a critique of the Turkish translation of *The Inspector* by Gogol. Taluy pointed out that the translation, which was termed “free” by its own translators, was full of omissions and mistakes and was a hasty translation carried out in response to market demands [“piyasa hatırına ve çala kalem tercüme edilme”] (Taluy 1943: 69). “Free translation” was held synonymous with adaptations, “translations full of mistakes” [“yalan yanlış yapılmış tercümeler”], “imitations” [“kopye”] and pseudotranslations (Garan 1949). In that sense, “free translation” was seen as an impediment before the

literary development of Turkey, triggering the growth of a commercialized translation market and driving the readers away from literature (Garan 1949). The duality between the concepts “faithful” and “free translation” offers us little clue as to the desired method of translation. These two concepts largely remained as rhetorical categories and little was written about how a translator could attain fidelity. The comments by certain writers and translators on “fluency” [“akıcı dil”] and “literal” [“kelimesi kelimesine”] translation can offer us some evidence as to how they envisaged a “good” translation.

3.4.4 Comments on Fluency and Literalism

The discourse on translation strategies largely agreed on the need to render translations using a fluent Turkish that sounded natural rather than bookish. Nurullah Ataç and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu argued for the importance of using fluent Turkish in translation and suggested that fluency was a prerequisite of being faithful to the original text (for an extensive discussion of Ataç’s and Eyüboğlu’s views on fluency see Berk 1999: 173-185; Aksoy 1995: 74-80). They were joined by a number of writers who agreed with them and placed emphasis on observing the rules and fluency of Turkish in translations.

In a review published in *Tercüme*, Lûtfi Ay praised a translation for its “fluency and conversational naturalness” (Ay 1943: 77). In the meantime, he criticized another translation of the same work for having to sacrifice from fluency due to its over-emphasis on fidelity and for creating a “dry” language (Ay 1943: 75). Kemal Edip Ünsel wrote in *Ülkü* that one of the major principles of translation had to be fluency: “An important point that needs to be pointed out is that the works must be

translated with a fluent and natural Turkish and peculiar usages should be avoided” [“Bu arada hatıra gelen bir nokta, eserlerin, söz götürmez ve yadırganmaz bir Türkçe ile çevrilmesi, şivesizliğe düşülmemesidir.”] (Ünsel 1947: 10). He also maintained that translators had to find Turkish equivalents for foreign phrases rather than opting for literalism [“kelimesi kelimesine tercüme”] (Ünsel 1947: 10). In the meantime, Ünsel recommended domestication as a possible strategy in the translation of fiction works and stated: “As much as possible, stories must be translated in the familiar and established manner of old folk stories” [“Hikâyeler, mümkün olduğu kadar eskî halk hikâyelerinin alışılmış ve tutunmuş edası verilmek suretiyle çevrilmelidir.”] (Ünsel 1947: 10). Nevertheless, fluency had its limits and in general extreme domestication was not favoured by writers and translators. In his review of Orhan Burian’s *Othello* translation, Nusret Hızır criticized Burian for rendering the text literally in many sections and violating the fluency of Turkish (Hızır 1941a: 488). In the meantime, he also criticized Burian for the few phrases he domesticated into Turkish by using local phraseology. He concluded that Burian had failed to create the “tone” of the source text because he had failed to combine fidelity and freedom (Hızır 1941c: 79-80). Bedrettin Tuncel, in his review of *Antigone* in *Ülkü* criticized Sabahattin Ali for having used local expressions in his translation and pointed out: “We do enjoy these colorful and fresh folk phrases but they lose their inherent value in *Antigone*” [“Bu renkli ve diri halk tabirlerini sevmiyor değiliz fakat bunlar *Antigone*’de kendi kıymetlerini bile kaybediyorlar”] (Tuncel 1942: 21). Likewise, a translation which made wide use of local Turkish words and slang was corrected by the Translation Bureau where it was sent for editing. On behalf of the Translation Bureau, Ali Süha Delilbaşı defended their editing process by suggesting that such local usages could only be used in the adaptations of the past (Delilbaşı 1944: 467).

Two of the established practices of the Translation Bureau, namely, the inclusion of prefaces introducing the source author and his work, and the additions of footnotes explaining words or phrases unfamiliar to Turkish language and culture, can be considered parts of a domestication strategy. These literary devices made the elements of the source text more accessible to target readers, enabling them to capture and internalize the significance of the work and its author, as well as the main bits of information offered in the text. On the other hand, they can also be considered strategies that drew attention to the work's status as a foreign text that could only be properly understood and contextualized through expert help, therefore working against a possible domestication strategy. Another strategy observed in the books translated and edited by the Translation Bureau was the spelling of foreign names.¹⁷ The Translation Bureau caused a major transformation in this field and abandoned the phonetic transcription of proper names which had become a common practice among translators and publishers since the adoption of the Latin alphabet. This strategy, which was adopted in the first meeting of the Translation Board in February 1940 ("Haberler" 1940: 112), served a "foreignizing"¹⁸ function on the readers, constantly reminding them of the fact that what they were reading was a foreign text.

Although the majority of commentators emphasized the importance of attaining fluency, while at the same time remaining faithful to the original, there were also translators who argued for the benefits literalism could provide. Yusuf Kâzım Köni

¹⁷ Sometimes this strategy could go to rather extreme points. In one case, a translator who translated a book for the Bureau was harshly criticized for calling "Jesus" as "Yesu" instead of its Turkish equivalent "İsa" (see Meriç 1942: 26).

¹⁸ "a close adherence to the foreign text, a literalism that resulted in the importation of foreign cultural forms and the development of heterogeneous dialects and discourses" (Venuti 1998: 242). Lawrence Venuti sets "foreignizing" translation against "domestication" which he defines as "an adherence to domestic literary canons both in choosing a foreign text and in developing a translation method" (Venuti 1998: 241).

pointed out that translations which “smell of translation and have a raw taste” [“tercüme kokusu taşan, ham lezzetli tercümeler”] would help expand the capacity of the target language and suggested that “literal translations would enable the language gain new opportunities for expression” [“kelimesi kelimesine yapılan tercümeler dile yeni ifade imkânları kazandırır.”] (Köni originally published in *Vakit*, 19.8.1944, reprinted in *Tercüme* 1944: 158). In the same article, Köni argued against some of Ataç’s views on translation and suggested that in translations, the style of the original had to outweigh fluency in Turkish. Nâzım Hikmet, celebrated poet, writer and playwright, was also critical of the principle of fluency in translations. In his letters to Kemal Tahir he wrote while in prison in 1940-41, he dealt with the issue of translation in some length and raised his views on the topic. He pointed out that he did not wish to read a translated novel as if it were originally written in Turkish, but rather wanted to feel the period and the nationality the author belonged to through the translation (Nâzım Hikmet 1975: 259-260). Furthermore, he defended literalism in the translation of foreign phrases (Nâzım Hikmet 1975: 264).

Based on these statements it can be concluded that there was no one uniform view of how translations had to be carried out in the 1930-1950s. Although the views of Ataç and Eyüboğlu have reflected onto our day more intensively through the historical prism, there is no evidence illustrating that “domestication” was the most widespread strategy used and propagated by the translators until the 1960s. I would like to argue that the political stances of Ataç and Eyüboğlu played an important role in making their favourite translation norm more visible in the eyes of the contemporary writers and researchers. Both writers served as chairmen to the Translation Bureau, were productive and celebrated translators and were closely associated with the cultural policies of the single-party era. Ataç’s commitment to

linguistic purism and his prolific work as an art and literature critic¹⁹, as well as his much-debated elitist approach to culture, no doubt helped his views on translation to become more widespread. Likewise, Eyüboğlu's association with the Village Institutes, his pro-humanist views and his writings forming the basis of "Anatolian humanism" made his views on translation to be perceived as part of a larger cultural agenda. The political dimensions of their work made Ataç's and Eyüboğlu's views survive until our day, while the views of other writers and translators who were less programmatic in terms of expressing their views on language and culture became less interesting and, therefore, less accessible to subsequent generations of researchers.

Özlem Berk presents Ataç and Eyüboğlu as significant figures in defining translation strategies for some decades to come, attracting both followers and opponents and therefore remaining on the agenda until our day (Berk 1999 Chapters 6-7). Berk's study is interesting in that it combines an institutional view of the Translation Bureau with a study of the two individuals who were strong agents of change in the field of translational norms. Nevertheless, her stress on the two writers downplays the views of other writers and translators, and represents a uniform view of norms adopted by translators in the 1940s. This approach obscures some of the debates that marked the discourse on translation throughout this period. The debate on "fidelity" and the ensuing stress on the "original" are not to be missed, because the perspective adopted towards concepts of "fidelity" and "original" marked the

¹⁹ Nurullah Ataç was selected as the most popular essayist in Turkey in a survey conducted by *Varlık* 1956. In the survey readers were asked to vote for their favourite novelist, poet, story writer, and essayist. In the first three categories votes were distributed more or less evenly among three or four names. In the fourth category Nurullah Ataç received the highest number of votes by the 1220 participants of the survey. *Varlık* published the votes of individual participants in every issue and in one issue (Number 438 published on 15.9.1956) where the votes of 91 readers were published, Ataç received 87 votes ("Okuyucuların Beyendikleri" 1956: 18).

cutting line between two habituses, respectively active in the field of translations of canonical works and translations of popular literature.

3.5 The Shifting Discourse

Tercüme, the journal of the Translation Bureau, was a platform for translation criticism during the 26 years of its publication. The journal consisted of two sections. The first section featured translated works, which were sometimes accompanied by the original texts. The second section included translation criticism and general commentaries on translation. The critiques and comments published in *Tercüme* offer extensive information about the concepts of translation the contributors to the journal held. These comments included prescriptive statements, as well as assessments of “good” and “bad” translations. These can be regarded as attempts at shaping the poetics of the system of translated literature and the norms expected to prevail in the translations.

The initial years of *Tercüme*, and thus the Translation Bureau, featured the most productive issues in terms of a discussion of translational norms. During 1940-1945, which was the most regular and productive period of *Tercüme*, a total of 53 reviews and commentaries were published and criticism occupied significant space in the journal. The number decreased dramatically in 1945-1951 to a total of 10 critiques. In 1953-1959, this number fell to 2, soaring slightly to 6 in 1960-1961. Translation criticism disappeared from the journal altogether after 1963 (Berk 1999: 165). This was not only the case for *Tercüme*. Translation as a subject in debates on culture and literature reached the height of its popularity in the first half of the 1940s. No doubt, the Publishing Congress, the Translation Bureau and

Tercüme played a significant role in bringing translation on to the literary and cultural agenda. Following the demise in the activities of the Translation Bureau and the growing irregularity of *Tercüme*, the intensity of the discourse on translation dwindled.

A bibliography of publications on translation in the republican period compiled in 1985, demonstrates this trend in clear terms (Keseroğlu and Gökalp 1985: 228). The list published by *Dün ve Bugün Çeviri*, a short-lived translation journal published in the 1980s, includes articles on translation history in Turkey and in the world. The list also features publications of translation criticism and general translation problems and includes a total of 412 articles.²⁰ According to the list, 167 articles, i.e. 40.5 per cent, were published during 1940-1946. In 1947-1960, the period starting with the transition to the multi-party system until the end of the Democrat regime, 89 articles were published, corresponding to 21.5 per cent. When the two periods are compared in terms of the annual average of publications on translation, the difference between them becomes clearer. In 1940-1946, an average of 24 articles were published annually. This figure dropped to an average of 6 articles per year in 1947-1960.

The shift in the intensity of the discourse on translation is indicative of the importance attached to translation by the culture planners, especially during the last seven years of the single-party era. The state, acting upon calls by the intellectuals, not only became involved in the publishing of translated classics, but also defined the poetics of this field to a large extent with the activities of the Translation Bureau and its journal *Tercüme*. The decreasing frequency of articles on translation after

²⁰ Translated articles are excluded from this number. The bibliography has a considerable number of missing items. Instead of complementing the list with the data I have available, I based my assessment on the bibliography, as the list would still not have become exhaustive with my additions.

1946 ran parallel to a re-planning process in the field of translated classics carried out during the transition to a multi-party system. When the state's culture planning attempts stagnated and changed direction and when the function foreseen for translation as an instrument of cultural change started to lose its hold, translation exited the cultural agenda.

3.6 Summary

Chapter 3 offers a survey of extratextual discourse on translation in 1923-1960 and conducts a critical analysis of oral statements, commentaries and critiques on translation. It discusses the functions attributed to translation by the intellectuals and state officials of the day, exploring how translation was used as a tool for the literary canonization process of western classics in Turkey. The state's role as a planner of translation activity and its patronage structure within which it defined the ideology and poetics of the system of translated literature are also analysed in this chapter. The expected qualities of a translator and the concept of the translator's visibility are discussed and the differences between canonical and popular translated literature are highlighted. The chapter also explores the translation strategies offered by writers and translators and draws attention to the different meanings assumed by the term "fidelity". It suggests that different norms dominated the discourse on translation and that there was no uniform view of how translations should look like, or how they should be carried out. The chapter further examines the first half of the 1940s as the period when extratextual discourse on translation was most intensive and correlates this intensity with state involvement in translation.

Chapter 4 will offer a survey of the publishing market in 1923-1960. It will explore the publishing activity of the state and private publishing companies in the field of translated literature. Its goal will be to check the basic elements of the extratextual discourse against "facts" by describing the actual state of publishing. The chapter will also offer a review of indigenous literature which competed with translations within the same book market.

Chapter 4

The Market for Translated Literature

Chapter 3 explored the extratextual discourse on translation in 1923-1960, tracing the functions attributed to translation, translation definitions and translation strategies in the statements made by intellectuals, writers, publishers and translators. In Chapter 3, I discussed the way translation was used as a tool for canon making, affecting the selection of works to be placed in the “centre” of the literary polysystem. In Chapter 4, I will offer a review of the actual state of the market for translated literature during the period under study. This will enable the reader to develop a clearer picture of the shifts in publishing and translation patterns during such moments of cultural and political significance as the alphabet reform and the transition to the multi-party system. This chapter will also offer information on the activities of publishers that operated in the field of popular literature. These publishers, who did not raise their views in dailies or literary magazines, appear to be rather strong when one takes a look at the actual market in terms of the number of published titles. I will argue that these publishers were also involved in a form of translation planning through their selection of titles, publishing, marketing and translation strategies. Their publications hint at a different set of concerns than those valid for canonical works, which resulted in the creation of a different poetics that governed popular literature.

I will offer an investigation of the market for translated literature in two periods: 1923-1940 and 1940-1960. This division is suggested in view of the activities of the Translation Bureau, which need to be set apart from the translation activity that preceded the establishment of the Bureau. The Translation Bureau has

had implications for the field of private publishing in terms of a number of aspects, like the selection of titles for translation and the changes observed in the attitudes towards the source text and the source author. Therefore the market supply by private publishers in the 1940-1960 period has a series of different features than the previous one, which, in turn, forces us to use different criteria while studying the two periods.

Before I set out to explore the publishing market in 1923-1960, let me explain what I mean by the term “market” and the reason for the special emphasis I place on analyzing the specific repertoires that were in supply in the market. After Even-Zohar, I define the market as “the aggregate of factors involved with the selling and buying of products and with the promotion of types of consumption” (Even-Zohar 1994: 22). In my interpretation of the “market”, these factors include not only goods, sales and marketing strategies, but also producers, suppliers and consumers of goods. I would also like to point out that my perspective of the market is not limited to the “selling and buying” of products, but also includes the “production and consumption” of goods in the wider sense of this process. In many instances, the provision and receipt of goods is not a matter of commercial transaction. For instance, the visitors of libraries and of the People’s Houses or students in the Village Institutes did not necessarily buy the classics published by the Ministry of Education. They had access to these books through the purchases of the libraries or the state’s donations. Furthermore, it can be safely assumed that not all buyers of books purchased them with the aim of reading. “Consumers” might have received the books published by the Ministry of Education out of obligation or for prestige, but not necessarily for consumption purposes. In terms of culture planning, this broader view of the market is vital, especially in order to understand the importance

of the advertising and the wide availability of the classics commissioned by the Translation Bureau. In my view, the Bureau and the Ministry were not concerned with attaining high sales figures, but attached importance for creating a demand for the repertoire the planned for the system of translated literature. Higher demand for translated classics would also bring a higher likelihood of success in defining the ideology and poetics of the literary polysystem. On the other hand, a survey of the translation market in Turkey in 1920s-1950s reveals the diversity and quantity of popular fiction available in the market, suggesting that such books had a high demand. In this chapter, I will argue that these non-canonical books, which did not conform to the qualities defined and expected by writers and critics operating in the field of canonical literature, indicate resistance and preference for a different ideology and poetics than those affecting the system of canonical literature.

When we consider the translated book market in early republican Turkey, we need to distinguish between two main fields: the market created and maintained by the state, and the commercial private market. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the former field operated within a patronage structure that carried out both internal and external control over the system of translated literature. The Ministry of Education created a repertoire for translated literature and made it available to the readers, not only by means of the commercial network of bookstores, but also through the government's network of schools, Village Institutes and the People's Houses. Certain sections of the private market were also dependent on state aid, which suggested that they became a part of the ideology and poetics defined by the Ministry of Education. I argue that popular translated literature, which made up a considerable part of the private market, remained devoid of state support, and thus, its poetics was defined by publishers, based on a set of different criteria.

In what follows, I embark on “translation archeology” (Pym 1998: 5). Nevertheless, my intention is to be able to discover and untangle the rich network of relationships that existed among various publishers, translators, literary genres and readerships. Therefore, the chapter will not consist of a mere list of titles, publishers and translators, but will set out to develop a fresh way of looking at them. My survey and analysis in this chapter is based on several catalogues and books that offer information about the translated and indigenous titles published during the period under study.¹

4.1 The Publishing Market in 1923-1960

The first five years of the Republic were not productive in terms of publishing activity. The total number of books published during this period has been estimated as around 5,000 (Özerdim 1974: 15). The lack of official statistics for this period makes it difficult to judge the truth value of this estimation. Nevertheless, it is widely known that a large proportion of the publishing activity during this time was carried out by the state in the form of technical and educational books (Kaynaradağ

¹ This section has made use of the following catalogues and bibliographies: *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Katalogu* (The Catalogue of Turkish Works Published in Ottoman Script) (Özege 1971); Various volumes of the Bibliography of Turkey (*Türkiye Bibliyografyası* 1928-38; 1938-1948; 1949; 1950; 1951; 1952; 1953; 1954; 1955; 1956; 1957; 1958; 1959; 1960); *Milli Eğitim Yayınları Bibliyografyası* (The Bibliography of National Education Publications) (Tuncor 1989); *Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* (The Bibliography of Classics) (1967); *Avrupa Edebiyatı ve Biz* (European Literature and Us), Volumes I and II (Sevük 1940a, 1940b); *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları Kataloğu* (The Catalogue of the Ministry of National Education Publications) 1948; *Türkiye’de Tercüme Müesseseleri* (Translation Institutions in Turkey) (Kayaoğlu 1998); *Korkmayınız Mr. Sherlock Holmes. Türkiye’de yayınlanmış çeviri ve telif polisiye romanlar üzerine bir inceleme. 1881-1928* (Have no fear Mr. Sherlock Holmes. A study on translated and indigenous detective novels published in Turkey. 1881-1928) (Üyepazarcı 1997), *Tanzimattan Günümüze Eski Yunan-Latin Dil ve Edebiyatlarına İlişkin Türkçe Yayınlar Bibliyografyası* (The Bibliography of Turkish Publications on Ancient Greek-Latin Language and Literatures from the Tanzimat until the Present Day) (Çelgin 1986). None of these catalogues are complete. Especially *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*, which constituted the main source for my survey of the activities of private publishers, has many missing publications. In the remainder of this chapter I will refer to *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* as TB.

1983: 2824; Baysal 1991: 69). During this period, private publishing companies offered the reader books with patriotic themes and published works like memoirs from the War of Liberation and biographies of military commanders (Kaynardağ 1983: 2825). The technical facilities of publishers were rather limited during this time and the shortage of foreign currency made it difficult to import new machinery (Kabacalı 2000: 163).

A major source of income for publishers was the printing of school textbooks delegated by the state. The alphabet reform of 1928 had significant repercussions for private publishers. With the adoption of the Latin alphabet, the book stock of the publishers lost their value overnight as they were no longer allowed to sell books in the Ottoman script. An article published in 1933 in the magazine *Resimli Şark* (The Illustrated Orient) informed the reader that with the alphabet reform, the private publishers lost half a million Turkish Lira. Half of this amount was lost due to school textbooks published in Ottoman script which were withdrawn from the market with the transition to the new alphabet (“Harf İnkılâbından Sonra Bizde Kitapçılığın Bugünkü Hali ve İstikbali” 1933: 17). Furthermore, publishers and printing presses had to equip themselves with new type-sets and train the type-setters who would start working with the new alphabet (“Harf İnkılâbından Sonra Bizde Kitapçılığın Bugünkü Hali ve İstikbali” 1933: 18; Kaynardağ 1983: 2825). School textbooks continued to be the main source of revenue for a number of private publishers.² These were the books that had the highest sales and the revenue they generated was a significant source for companies to continue their publishing activity in other fields. Books, other than textbooks, sold only about three or four

² Ahmet Halit, İbrahim Hilmi, Tefeyyüz, Resimli Ay, Kanaat, Remzi and İnkılap were some of the major publishers involved in the publishing of textbooks (“Harf İnkılâbından Sonra Bizde Kitapçılığın Bugünkü Hali ve İstikbali” 1933: 17; Kabacalı 2000: 177).

hundred copies each and the revenue they generated could only cover one third of their printing costs (“Harf İnkılâbından Sonra Bizde Kitapçılığın Bugünkü Hali ve İstikbali” 1933: 19).

In the mid-1930s, the government decided to standardize the textbooks and delegated the printing of textbooks to the state’s printing house. This was a heavy blow to private publishers (Kaynardağ 1983: 2826). Deprived of their major source of income, they became dependent on state aid, which was provided in the form of book purchases. Between 1935-1939, the state paid 100,000 Turkish Lira to private publishers and writers.³ It distributed 96,430 books to schools and public libraries, which it purchased from private publishers (İskit 1939: 251). Nevertheless, private publishers did not deem this assistance sufficient and made several demands on the state to increase its support for private publishing. The desired support included more book purchases with higher prices, book awards and discounts in postage fees for publishers (see İskit 1939: 297; *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi 1939*: 362-370, 375-390). It should also be noted that some of these publishers, like Tefeyyüz, were also involved with the publishing of popular literature. Books purchased by the state did not include such works and state support went directly to the newly emerging literary canon.

The 1940s witnessed an increase in the number of private publishing companies and increasing cooperation between the state and private publishers, especially through the Translation Bureau’s scheme to recommend titles to be translated to these publishers. Mobilized by the publications of the Ministry of Education, new companies entered the publishing scene and concentrated on the

³ This amount can be compared to the average monthly salary of a civil servant, which was 156 TL in the same period (Kabacalı 1981: 166).

publication of translated classics and popular fiction. Book sales rose and publishing started to become a lucrative business. In 1946, private publishers were once more delegated the publication of school textbooks, which increased their commercial viability (Kaynardağ 1983: 2828).

The biggest problem of publishers throughout the period under study, i.e. 1923-1960, was low sales figures. Although their sales increased with the rising literacy, it never exceeded five thousand copies, and even that was an exception (Kabacalı 2000: 227). Before 1940, the average sales figure was between one thousand and fifteen hundred copies (İskit 1939: 298; *Proceedings of the First Turkish Publishing Congress* 1939: 58). Some popular novels became an exception to this, yet, the sales of canonical works were never high either. In the 1950s, there was general dissatisfaction with the market for canonical literature. Writers suggested that the market was teeming with popular novels, mainly romances and crime fiction, and expressed their concern that this would cause deterioration in the literary taste of the readers (Özdarendeli 1956: 628; Nayır 1971: 20, originally published in 1951 in *Varlık* No. 368). Nevertheless, new names and a new type of realism brought some dynamism to the publishing market in the 1950s and led to an increase in sales figures. Perhaps the real locomotive force behind the rise in the sales figures was the new pocket books, as I will explain in the following section. Some translated classics such as *War and Peace* and *Faust* broke sales records during the 1950s. Arslan Kaynardağ wrote in 1960 that the maximum number of copies printed per book increased to 10,000 in the late 1950s while this figure was only 2,000 in the beginning of the decade (Kaynardağ 1960: 310).

Ways of instilling the habit of reading in the public were discussed over and over again by both state officials and publishers. Reading was regarded as an

educational tool by the state, while publishers considered it the only means of increasing their sales figures (see various interventions in the Publishing Congress, *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939; *Resimli Şark* 1933: 1; Nayır 1971: 28-35, originally published in 1951 in *Varlık*, No. 374).

4.2 Trends in Turkish Literature in 1923-1960

4.2.1 The Canonization of Realism in Fiction

In the first two decades of the Republic, debates were marked by a longing for and anticipation of a new literature. As I illustrated in Chapters 2 and 3, translated literature was attributed the function of generating this new literature. Although intellectuals were dissatisfied with the general state of literary activity in Turkey, the system of indigenous literature was, by no means, static. New literary debates emerged and new names started to appear on book covers. Literary activity gained a new impetus especially after 1928. In the field of poetry, “Yedi Meşaleciler” (Seven Torchbearers) emerged in 1928 as a reaction against traditional forms of poetry (Karpat 1962: 35). In the meantime, the group formed around the literary magazine *Resimli Ay* launched an aggressive campaign led by Nazım Hikmet against the traditionalist views of literature and called themselves “iconoclasts” [“putları yıkıyoruz”] (Oktay 1986: 356-367). During the 1920s, Halide Edip, Yakup Kadri and Reşat Nuri, who had already become renowned figures in Turkish literature in the pre-republican period, continued to write novels. A concurrent theme in their fiction was Anatolia under the “National Struggle” for liberation. Especially after the 1930s, the scope of the novel expanded thematically to cover the sufferings of

the individual as a product of his/her immediate social environment. Yakup Kadri's *Ankara*, Sadri Ertem's *Çıkrıklar Durunca*, Peyami Safa's *Fatih-Harbiye* and *Dokuzuncu Hariciye Koşuşu*, Sabahattin Ali's *Kuyucaklı Yusuf* were works which created a new form of realism that made itself strongly felt in fiction (Özçelebi 1998a: 9). The use of social themes in literature was encouraged by the state. *Kadro*, a journal sponsored by the state and published between 1932-1935, propagated realism and the treatment of social issues in literature.⁴

The creation of a "national literature", a subject which was topical since the turn of the century, continued to be the most widely-discussed issue by writers and intellectuals. Numerous essays were written and interviews were carried out in the 1920s-1940s in order to reveal what "national literature" was and how it could be created. There was a diversity of opinions on the subject and writers expressed their idea of "national literature" in different terms. While some felt that it was necessary to create a pure Turkish language by eliminating words of Arabic and Persian origin to trigger the emergence a truly national literature (İsmail Hakkı in Coşkun 1938: 15), some suggested that national literature was the conveyor of a nation's unique characteristics (Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu in Coşkun 1938: 20). By contrast, literary historian Ağâh Sırrı Levend claimed that all literature was national, since it inevitably reflected the spirit and taste of the nation by and for which it was created (Levend in Coşkun 1938: 34). Kâzım Nami suggested that national literature had to originate from folkloric sources (Kâzım Nami 1934: 122). Authors carefully emphasized that a distinction had to be drawn between "national" and "nationalist" literature (Kâzım Nami 1934: 121; Tuncel 1943: 1). Despite these different opinions,

⁴ The writers associated with *Kadro*, including Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Vedat Nedim Tör, İsmail Hüsrev Tökin, Burhan Asaf Belge, Şevki Yazman and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, embarked on "forming an ideology for the Kemalist revolution" (Toprak 1998: 35).

there was general agreement on one element: a literature would become “national” when it reflected the spirit and problems of a country in an artistic manner (Karpap 1962: 32). This definition of national literature tied it back to realism and the social mission of literature. The debates formed in the literary journal *Yeni Edebiyat* (New Literature) drew attention to the question of the author’s responsibility to the society and issues in socialist writing (see articles reprinted in İleri 1998).

Social themes continued to be popular in novels and short stories until the 1960s. Novelists like Sabahattin Ali, Faik Baysal, Oktay Akbal and Orhan Kemal who addressed such social issues as labour relations, the hardships of rural life, problems of the urban working class were joined by a new generation of writers in the 1950s who specifically tackled village life. These young writers were graduates of the Village Institutes and conveyed their first-hand experiences of rural life in Turkey in their books. The pioneering name in “village literature” was Mahmut Makal, who published his notes of village life in serialized form in *Varlık* in 1948-1949. The notes, which immediately attracted public and literary attention, were published in book format under the title *Bizim Köy* (Our Village) in 1950. Talip Apaydın, Fakir Baykurt and Mehmet Başaran started publishing their works in the early 1950s and left their imprint on this specific literary genre, marked by a heavy dose of realism. Novelists and short story writers such as Orhan Kemal, Aziz Nesin and Yaşar Kemal, who adopted a realist view of literature, were also popular names in the 1950s and were largely appreciated by the reading public. Kemal Karpap wrote that these authors were read by students, teachers and intellectuals. He added that some groups of readers in rural areas also showed an interest in these works, perhaps mainly due to their realism (Karpap 1962: 62). During the 1950s novels and short stories, especially by the young and celebrated generation of new writers

started to be printed in large quantities. Karpat, who held interviews with publishers around this time, reported that first editions of books by renowned authors were printed around 3,000-6,000 copies, while books by less famous writers were printed around 2,000-4,000 copies (Karpat 1962: 72). Number of reprints per book also increased in this period. *Bizim Köy* had ten reprints in ten years and Yaşar Kemal's *İnce Memed* had four in seven years. Novels by Halide Edip Adıvar (*Sinekli Bakkal*), Reşat Nuri Güntekin (*Çalıkuşu*), poetry collections by Orhan Veli and Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı also had repeated impressions in the 1950s (Kaynaradağ 1960: 311).

Literary criticism in Turkey in the first fifty years of the Republic elaborated on realism as an ideal literary genre. The attribute "realist" was perceived and used as a compliment. Works by poet Orhan Veli and novelist Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar, were criticized for avoiding realism and refraining from expressing larger social problems, concentrating on the inner world of the individual (Hasan İzzetin Dinamo in Seyda 1970: 184; Özçelebi 1998b: 176). The aesthetization of Turkish literature only started to take place in the 1970s (Ecevit 1999: 316).

Literary criticism in Turkey, although it was not practiced in a scholarly and systematic fashion during the period under study, helped to canonize realist literature which it placed at the centre of the literary polysystem. Writers who commented on literature and criticized their colleagues' works in the literary magazines concentrated on the importance of creating an indigenous Turkish literature with a social agenda. The joint approval of works with social themes, such as labour relations, the pains of transition from a traditional society to a modern one, approval or critique of westernization or sufferings of the rural population, served to create a certain image of literature in the minds of the readers and writers. This image was defined by the expected and intended function of literature, which was to

reflect national life and domestic experiences (Moran 2001a: 16). I would like to argue that the realist tendency to depict the living conditions and social problems in Turkey, first within an urban, and then a rural context, complemented the nation-building efforts of the republican institutions. Realism served to reinforce a sense of shared experience and co-existence by offering readers references to common events and situations. The realist trend lasted well into the 1970s, and was finally replaced by what Berna Moran has termed the “innovative novel” [“yenilikçi roman”] (Moran 2001b: 49) which focused on the life of the individual extracted from the socio-political context.

In the Turkish context, the pre-1970 period represents the period preceding literary aesthetization. Gregory Jusdanis writes that when a literature ceases to be a tool for nation building, it becomes naturalized and turns into a means for orchestrating an ideological consensus (Jusdanis 1991: 163). Jusdanis maintains:

Although culture constitutes both an arena and an instrument in the nation-building process, it begins to disappear behind the scenes once the major conflicts are resolved. No longer fought over, it is taken for granted, becoming a part of everyday common sense, invisibly linking people in an intimate cohesion and guiding them through the differentiated spaces of modernity (Jusdanis 1991: 163).

Jusdanis further argues that this taken-for-grantedness of culture and literature, as fields governed by their own logic rather than judged by their relationship to external conditions, leads to an aesthetization in art (Jusdanis 1991: 163). Artistic aesthetization takes place in parallel to a country’s process of political and cultural modernization (Jusdanis 1991: 82). I argue that Turkish domestic literature in the 1920s-1950s was in its pre-modern stage, largely dominated by a social realist agenda. This agenda, as part of the project of literary canonization, was created by

the state and endorsed and maintained by the intellectuals of the country, i.e. the co-planners of culture.

The canonization of realism did not start after 1923. Like many other options offered for the cultural repertoire, realism had its roots in the pre-republican past. The proponents of the “New Language” movement who had launched a significant linguistic purification programme in the 1910s⁵, also defended the need to treat local themes and social issues in fiction (Moran 2001a: 16). The leading novelists of the early republican period such as Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, Halide Edip Adıvar, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu and Peyami Safa have been regarded as “extensions” of the early roots of realism in literature (Moran 2001a: 15).

The canonization of realism in fiction was largely valid for canonical Turkish literature, created by writers who wrote for the educated urban population. On the other hand, the field of popular literature was governed by a different poetics.

4.2.2 Turkish Popular Literature in 1923-1960

When one embarks on a study of the literary polysystem in Turkey in 1923-1960, the major problem one is faced with concerns the different groups of readership and the kinds of material they read. Based on a survey of statements by writers and scholars I was able to construct three different types of readerships. I identified the first group as the educated urban classes, teachers and students in secondary and higher education who read translated and indigenous canonical books, as well as some popular literature that could be considered as semi-canonical.⁶ The second

⁵ For information on “New Language” see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1.

⁶ What I term “semi-canonical” books consist of some bestsellers that were popular among the readership, although they were not regarded highly by the literary “institution”. These works can be positioned on a middle ground between canonical literature and non-canonical short narratives with

group consisted of the rural population who read rewrites of folk tales. The third group read popular novels consisting mainly of detective and adventure fiction (Özön 1985 [1936]: 110; Kaynaradağ 1960: 311; Karpaz 1962: 62). Literary criticism covered canonical reading material addressing the first group while little has been said or written about the non-canonical and semi-canonical literature, save for some general (and often derogatory) comments. Therefore, a survey of book catalogues is essential to offer some information about the publishing and reception of these two types of literature.

At this point, I would like to offer my definition of “popular literature” valid for the period under study. I have conceptualized “popular literature” in early republican Turkey as a collectivity of literary genres, themes and styles characterized by three features: popular demand, deviation from the poetics of canonical literature, and lack of attention from persons and groups that formed literature as an “institution”.⁷ In the 1923-1960 period, there were numerous works which were completely ignored by writers and critics. The poetics governing these works did not appear to comply with the poetics of the “canon” discursively and actually created and maintained by editors, publishers, writers and translators of high “symbolic power” (Bourdieu 1993: 7). The themes, styles, publishing and marketing strategies of these books display a number of features which distinguish them from the works positioned in the canon of the literary polysystem. The “popularity” of such books can mainly be understood by looking at their market availability. Without popular demand, these works, which did not receive state support, would

uncomplicated plots that have been referred to as “people’s books”. Chapter 5 will discuss “people’s books” and “semi-canonical” literature in more detail.

⁷ I am using the term “institution” as defined by Even-Zohar as “the aggregate of factors involved with the maintenance of literature as a socio-cultural activity” (Even-Zohar 1990b: 37).

not be on sale. Numerous reprints are another indicator that points at the popular success of these works.

A review of the books covered by the *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* makes it clear that the Turkish novel and short story did not only consist of canonical works in the early republican period. The period immediately following the adoption of the Latin alphabet offers interesting evidence about the thematically and stylistically diversified nature of the novel and the short story. Between 1928 and 1938, writers of canonical fiction such as Reşat Nuri Güntekin (1889-1956), Halide Edip Adıvar (1884-1964), Sadri Ertem (1900-1943), Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar (1864-1944), Peyami Safa (1899-1961) and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu (1889-1974) were widely read. The works by these writers were discussed by critics and other writers and were included in anthologies. In the meantime, there was another group of writers who worked industriously, who were widely read, but received no attention from critics. For instance, Aka Gündüz (1886-1958), a popular writer of plays, novels and short stories with patriotic and nationalist themes, published fourteen volumes of novels and short stories, six children's books and five plays. Selâmi İzzet Sedes (1896-1964) published seven novels, mainly romances and melodramas, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap (1905-1973) published ten novels, ranging across a number of popular genres, such as romance, detective fiction and the battle story. During the same period Yurdatap also published 29 rewrites of folk tales. İskender Fahrettin Sertelli (?-1943) published sixteen novels, of which the majority was historical fiction. Peyami Safa published detective stories and other popular novels under the pen name Server Bedi.

In 1928-1938, folk tales were also popular. These books were dominated by romances and battle stories, some of which were published in numerous editions.

Kerem ile Aslı, Tahir ile Zühre, Ferhat ile Şirin and *Kan Kalesi* were among the most popular titles that mainly addressed a rural audience. These stories were rewritten by numerous authors in the early republican period and came in many editions. According to a circular issued by the Directorate General of Press in the mid-1930s, some of the folk tales sold around fifty thousand copies which meant that the sales of these books were over ten times higher than the sales of canonical books published around 2000-3000 copies per edition (Güloğul 1937: 68). Folk tales were often criticized for being “harmful” for the readers (Yaşaroğlu in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 368-369). Faruk Rıza Güloğul, who published a book titled *Halk Kitaplarına Dair* (On People’s Books) in 1937, pointed out that these books were accused of being full of “fundamentalist ideas” [“irticai fikirlerle dolu”] and of reinforcing superstitions (1937: 5). In a letter to the First Turkish Publishing Congress in 1939 publisher Halit Yaşaroğlu wrote:

Unfortunately, the semi-literates in our society, that is to say those belonging to the older generation, only read those meaningless and harmful books called folk romances. It would be a wise step to pass a law to ban the publication of these books which are rather detrimental with their grammar, illustrations, style and ideas. However, we also need to prepare a body of works to replace these (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 368-369).

[Maalesef halkımızın biraz okur yazar kısmı yani eski nesle mensup olanlar sadece âşık kitapları denilen manasız ve zararlı kitapları okumaktadırlar. İmlâsı, resimleri, ifadesi ve fikirleri itibarıyla zararı daha çok olan bu eserlerin basımını bir kanunla menetmek çok yerinde bir hareket olacaktır. Fakat buna mukabil onların yerine koyabileceğimiz eserleri de hazırlamak lâzımdır (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 368-369).]

A statement written by Arslan Kaynaradağ in 1960 indicates that little had changed in terms of critical response towards the people’s books during the twenty years that

had passed. In his article informing the English-speaking world of books and publishing in Turkey, Kaynardağ suggested: “The books addressed to the uninformed villager are badly written and consist of tales, stories, fortune-telling, dream interpretations and love poems” (Kaynardağ 1960: 310).

I would like to argue that the long-lived popularity of these books can be interpreted as a sign of the existence of a separate poetics which stood as an alternative to the poetics created by the intellectuals and writers of canonical literature. In the villages, familiarity with and fondness for folk literature continued. It is evident that folk tales, with their imaginary and supernatural characters, adventure-like plots and religious overtones were in complete opposition to social realism in literature, which foresaw a direct relationship between the universe of fiction and the outside world. This was not only the case for folk literature; urban readers also sought alternatives that would give them reading pleasure, which apparently, realist fiction did not always provide. Detective fiction, which remained popular throughout the period under study, romance and melodramatic novels written by female writers such as Kerime Nadir (1917-1984) and Muazzez Tahsin Berkand (1900-1984), Esat Mahmut Karakurt’s (1902-1977) novels blending the adventure story with romance, Fazıl Hikmet Tülbentçi’s (1912-1982) historical fiction, Murat Sertoğlu’s (1912-?) historical novels of heroic adventure were other examples that offered the reader an alternative to realist fiction.⁸ Kemal Karpat who commented on these works in his book on social themes in Turkish literature wrote:

⁸ Some of the works by these writers became bestsellers and were repeatedly reprinted until the end of the 1950s. Kerime Nadir’s *Hıçkırık* was published fourteen times in 1942-1960. *Çölde Bir İstanbul Kızı* (1934), *Allahaismarladık* (1936), *Son Gece* (1942) by Esat Mahmut Karakurt were published nine times until 1960 (*TB* 1928-38; 1938-1948; 1949; 1950; 1951; 1952; 1953; 1954; 1955; 1956; 1957; 1958; 1959; 1960). Many of these popular novels were also made into feature films.

Apart from this “literary literature” [social realist fiction], that unavoidable, tearful literature popular among the majority, still continues. Family disasters, broken hearts, solitary walks under the moonlight... These kinds of books, which have a large readership, have a certain impact on people’s behaviour. Among this class of writers, Kerime Nadir, Esat Mahmut Karakurt, Muazzez Tahsin Berkant, Etem İzzet Benice are the most famous. In this study we have rather dealt with the authors that have had a real impact on the development of the country⁹ (Kemal Karpaz 1962: 40-41).

[Bu “edebi edebiyat”ın yanısıra da çoğunlukça beğenilen, ağlamaklı, o kaçınılmaz edebiyat sürüp gitmektedir. Aile faciaları, yıkılan aşklar, ayışığında yalnız başına dolaşmalar... Okuyucusu çok olan bu çeşit kitapların, davranışlar üzerinde belirli etkisi görülmektedir. Bu sınıf yazarlar içinde Kerime Nadir, Esat Mahmut Karakurt, Muazzez Tahsin Berkant, Etem İzzet Benice en ünlüleridir. Memleketin gelişmesinde asıl etkisi görülen yazarları bu incelemede ele almış bulunuyoruz (Karpaz 1962: 40-41).]

Karpaz’s judgment about these popular works was shared by many writers and academics of the day. As the above quote suggests, literature was thought to have an immediate effect on readers’ behaviour. Popular novels with melodramatic themes were condemned for their exaggerated emphasis on lust, the grief of separation, sentimentalism and for exploiting the readers’ emotions (Şardağ 1944: 6). Children and youth were regarded as the group most vulnerable to the “negative effects” of adventure fiction, detective stories and romances. Furthermore, these works would lead to an erosion of moral values in the youth (“Çocuklarımız Neler Okuyor?” 1943: 7; Arısoy 1944 originally published in *Vakit* on 24 March 1944, reprinted in “Bize Bir Çocuk Edebiyatı Lâzım” 1944: 7). The reading material recommended for teenagers was fiction that prioritized love of the nation, the society and humanity (Çoruh 1944, originally published in *Çığır* No. 133, reprinted in “Çocuklar İçin Yayınlar ve Önemi” 1944: 7).

⁹ In his book, Karpaz focused on Turkish writers belonging to the realist tradition and had special emphasis on writers who gave rise to “village literature”. The statement cited above reveals Karpaz’s bias towards popular literature as a form of literature that does not have a social function.

This small-scale survey of the state of the publishing market for indigenous literature suggests that the fields of canonical and popular literature were under the influence of two different poetics. The first poetics was created and maintained by intellectuals and the state and foresaw the creation of a realist literature that built strong ties between the narrative and the outside world. The themes covered by works produced according to this poetics included social issues and an altruistic concern with the human subject. The discourse of the writers and critics of the early republican period positioned works that treated such subjects in a realist fashion at the centre of the literary system. In my view, this poetics did not govern the production and consumption of popular fiction. The themes of the popular works were marked by elements of adventure, fantasy and romance, which were largely labeled as “harmful” by intellectuals. This hints at the presence of an alternative poetics which allowed, and even encouraged the publication of such works. Publication and sales data reveal that a major force behind this poetics was popular demand, which constantly sought these types of works in the market. This is a fact that is proven by the continuous reprints of folk tales, adventure novels, melodramatic and romantic fiction. The poetics governing the production and consumption of popular literature avoided, and even discouraged, a realist approach. It was thematically marked by a concern for the individual as a subject detached from the socio-political environment. The subject matter was diversified and ranged from the romance to the battle story, yet there were two common features which characterized books written and published according to the poetics of popular literature: a melodramatic conceptualization of human life and emphasis on action.

Translated literature during the same period displayed a similar duality. On the one hand, translations of western classics were published, on the other hand a large

market existed for translations of detective and adventure stories. In the next section, I will offer a survey of translated literature in 1923-1960 in terms of the titles published. Again I have divided the period into two. The first section will present an outline of translated literature prior to the establishment of the Translation Bureau. The second section will concentrate on translations after 1940.

My presentation of the market for translated literature in 1923-1960 will concentrate on the series launched by different publishing houses. Rather than offering a list of individual translated titles, I have decided to place the series of translations in the foreground. My intention in the rest of this chapter is not to offer an exhaustive survey of translated literature, but rather to concentrate on examples which are indicative of certain trends in the publishing market and draw attention to the diversity which ruled the field of translated literature in Turkey in 1923-1960. There are a number of reasons for my focus on the series. First and foremost, I consider the different series created by publishers as an indication of their publishing and marketing strategies. Secondly, the series format occupied a significant portion of the supply of translated literature in the publishing market in early republican Turkey. Finally, I would like to argue that the series format was born out of an intention to concentrate on specific types of works, generically, stylistically or thematically. This might be due to the publishers' wish to demonstrate and control the diversification of their activities (Genette 1997: 22). In my view, adopting the series format was not only a marketing decision for Turkish publishers, writers and translators, but also a planned effort to affect the publishing market, and the readership, in a certain manner. In my view, publishers who presented their products to the market in the form of series contributed to the shaping of the market, as much as they were shaped by it. They caused new segments of readership to form and led

to new reception patterns through the ways they grouped and categorized various works. This evidently implied an impact on the cultural system. The following survey of translated literature will offer evidence about how such impact surfaced and transformed production and reception patterns in Turkey in 1923-1960.

4.3 Translated Literature in 1923-1940

The preferred source literature and language for translation was French in the 1920s and 1930s. According to the *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*, 181 French works were translated in 1928-1938, compared to 119 English and 28 German works. Translations of English, German, Greek and Russian works were also usually done through French, as had been the case during the pre-republican period.

In the following sections, I make a distinction between translated literature published by the Ministry of Education, and translated literature published by private publishing houses. The role of the Ministry of Education in terms of translation planning is crucial and a survey of the pre-Translation Bureau publications of the Ministry of Education may help us to contextualize the role of the state as a patron of the classics.

4.3.1 Translations Published by the Ministry of Education

The Ministry of Education had been involved in publishing and translation activity since its conception within the Grand National Assembly in 1920 before the Republic was proclaimed. Until the setting up of the Translation Bureau in 1940, it launched two significant initiatives to publish translations. In this section I will offer

some information about two series started by the Ministry of Education covering translated books.

The first official republican translation body which was set up in early 1921 under the Ministry of Education was named “Telif ve Tercüme Encümeni” (Committee on Original and Translated Works). The Committee continued its activity after the proclamation of the Republic until it was closed down in 1926. During the five years of its operation, it was run by six different directors, including prominent literary figures and intellectuals of the time such as Samih Rifat, Yusuf Akçura, Ziya Gökalp and Fuat Köprülü (Kayaoğlu 1998: 200-250). The main purpose attributed to the Committee was “to follow and select the masterpieces needed by our National Library and important textbooks and to commission their translation to competent translators” [“Millî Kütüphanemizin muhtaç olduğu şaheserler ile en kıymetli bulduğu ders kitaplarını takip ve tefrik ile erbabına tercüme ettirmek”] (Kayaoğlu 1998: 227). Throughout the five years of its operation, the Committee published both indigenous and translated educational material and did not have focus on the translation of “masterpieces”, which I interpret as literary classics. In fact, the Committee was hardly involved in literary translation activity. Out of a total of 68 works it published, 30 were translations of works mainly on sociology, history and education, while the remaining 38 were indigenous books covering educational subjects (For a list of books published by the Committee see Kayaoğlu 1998: 250-264). The publications by the Committee did not appear in specialized series, but were merely numbered. An exception was the series “Çocuklar Kütüphanesi” (Children’s Library) published in 1923 which featured three books: *Altın Işık* (The Golden Light) by Ziya Gökalp, *Çocuklar Cenneti* (Children’s Paradise) by Mustafa Rahmi (Balaban) and *Altın Çiftlik* (The

Golden Farm)¹⁰ by Johanna Spyri. *Altın Çiftlik* was identified as an "adaptation" in the catalogue of books published by the Ministry of Education (Tuncor 1989: 1) and was the only one out of the thirty translations that could be described as "literary". This children's booklet consisting of 35 pages was translated by Mustafa Rahmi Balaban who was the translator and author of various books published by the Committee.

It is not clear why the Committee was abolished in 1926. The official explanation given for its closure was that the Committee deviated from its goals and that it was not as productive as desired (Kayaoğlu 1998: 248). The few authors who wrote on the subject do not offer detailed reasons for the closure. Vedat Günyol simply stated that the Committee was not very productive (Günyol 1983: 328). In 1935, Hilmi Ziya Ülken wrote that the Committee had mainly produced "vulgarisations" and that despite its good intentions, this strategy only gave superficial knowledge of the works it claimed to have published as translations (Ülken 1997: 343). While Ülken does not mention any titles, the numbers of pages indicated in the list given by Kayaoğlu reveals that the Committee did not produce abridgments. Kayaoğlu suggests that there were ideological reasons behind the Committee's abolishment and that the members of the Committee were slow in adapting to the political atmosphere of the day, yet he offers no evidence to verify this hypothesis (Kayaoğlu 1998: 248). The Committee was not very active in the field of literary translations, and it is impossible to claim that it created substantial options for the repertoire of translated literature in Turkey.

¹⁰ The English translation is of the Turkish title is The Golden Farm, however I was not able to find a similar title among Spyri's works.

The second planned translation activity carried out by the young Republic was also undertaken by the Ministry of Education. In 1927 the Ministry launched a series under the title "**Cihan Edebiyatından Nümuneler**" (Samples from World Literature). 10 books, nearly all classics, were published in 1927 and 1928 within this series which was discontinued with the transition to the Latin alphabet. The series included translations of *Nicomède* and *Horace* by Pierre Corneille (Sevük 1940b: 38-39; Tuncor 1989: 9-10), *The Iliad* of Homer¹¹ (Sevük 1940a: 65; Tuncor 1989: 9), a collection of excerpts from *Eugénie Grandet*, *César Birotteau*, and *Le Père Goriot* (Sevük 1940b: 240; Tuncor 1989: 8), *The Pickwick Papers* by Charles Dickens (Sevük 1940b: 262; Tuncor 1989: 10), *Hamlet* by William Shakespeare (Sevük 1940a: 531; Tuncor 1989: 9), *R.U.R (Rossum's Universal Robots)* by Karel Čapek (Tuncor 1989: 10), *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* by Molière (Sevük 1940b: 50; Tuncor 1989: 8), *Années de Printemps* by André Theuriet (Sevük 1940b: 407; Tuncor 1989: 9) and *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* by Johann Friedrich von Schiller (Sevük 1940b: 162; Tuncor 1989: 12). These translations all consisted of 24 to 82 pages and according to Sevük, they were all summaries of source texts or summaries that included fully translated extracts (Sevük 1940b: 50, 162, 407).¹² Both Sevük and Ülken have stated that these books were published for high school students (Sevük 1940a: 530; Ülken 1997: 342).

The Ministry of Education appears to have had a certain translation policy in terms of the publication of the series which may be summed up as follows: the

¹¹ *The Iliad* included in this series had previously been translated and published in serial format. Ömer Seyfettin, who was a famous short story writer, produced this incomplete version which was published in *Yeni Mecmua* for 12 issues in 1918 (Sevük 1940a: 65; Paker 1986: 415).

¹² I have checked this claim against one of the books in the series: *Mister Pikvik'in Maceraları*, the translation of *The Pickwick Papers* and identified a strong tendency for omissions. The cover of the book informs the readers that Kâmurân Şerif had "translated and summarized" the book ["tercüme ve hülâsa eden]. The translation consists of only 57 pages.

translation of some western classics in a format that was easy to read for educational purposes. This policy governed the selection of the titles translated, as well as the operational norms at work during the translation process (Tourey 1995: 58-59). The titles conformed to the criteria of the prevailing westernization project and included western classics. The format, however, shows that a compromise was made between translating these canonical works in full and making them more easily accessible to the public. Sevük's study informs us that instead of giving full renderings of the source texts, the translators wrote summaries which included full translations only of what they regarded as the important sections of the works, i.e. they exercised omissions (Sevük 1940a: 65; 1949b: 38-39, 50, 162, 240, 262, 407, 531). Fullness of translations was an important criterion for the canonical status of works especially in the 1940s with the setting up of the Translation Bureau. As discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.1, refraining from omissions and additions and preserving the textual integrity of the source text were regarded as an important prerequisite of fidelity by numerous writers and translators. Hilmi Ziya Ülken and İsmail Habib Sevük also touched upon the importance of full translations. To give an example, let me quote Sevük's presentation of Schiller's *Orlean Kızı* (*Die Jungfrau von Orleans*):

This book is also included in the series which the Ministry of Education had commissioned to be summarized under the title "Samples from World Literature" for the benefit of high school students. After a one and a half page biography of Schiller, the subject matter of the work is summarized in two pages. Following this, extracts which show the progression of the plot are translated and the work is thus crammed into 72 pages (Sevük 1940b: 162).

[Bu kitab da Maarif Vekaletinin lise talebeleri için "Cihan Edebiyatından Nümuneler" serlevhasile hulasa olarak yazdırıldığı seriye dahildir. Eserin başında Şiller'in hayatına dair bir buçuk sahifelik malumat verildikten sonra iki sahife içinde eserin mevzuu da hulasa edilmiştir. Ondan sonra vak'anın seyrini gösterecek tarzda parçalar tercüme edilerek eser 72 sahife içine sıkıştırılmış oluyor (Sevük 1940b: 162).]

Sevük's presentation does not read as one introducing a canonical work. Especially his use of the informal and, to an extent, pejorative verb "to cram" ["sıkıştırılmış"] is an indication of this.

After the alphabet reform, during the period before the establishment of the Translation Bureau in 1940, the Ministry of Education did not launch any translation series. However, it continued its translation activity in a sporadic way, by publishing some children's literature and some classics. Between 1929 and 1932 six children's and youth books were translated and published by the Ministry. These included two novels by Louisa May Alcott, one by Francis Burnett, one by Edmondo de Amicis, one by Waldemar Bonsels and one collection of fairy tales by Mood Lindsay (Tuncor 1989: 13-17).

The catalogues show that the Ministry also published some classics before 1940. In 1929, a collection appeared of Horace's works translated by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, a renowned novelist (Tuncor 1989: 14). Shakespeare's *Othello* translated by Nuri Rafet was published in 1931 (Tuncor 1989: 1931). In 1933 and 1936 two volumes of the dialogues of Plato were published, translated by Semiha Cemal, a woman translator (Çelgin 1996: 31).

As the above data illustrates, although the Ministry of Education was involved in the translation and publication of literature until 1940, the two series it launched during the 17 years which elapsed from the proclamation of the Republic until the setting up of the Translation Bureau did not constitute a viable alternative to the activities of the private publishers. The Ministry's publications were not comprehensive and systematic enough to provide an actual body of works which would meet the demands of the intellectuals who insisted on the importance of

translating classical western literature into Turkish and thus, placed western literature in a canonical position through their discourse.

Private companies were much more active in publishing indigenous and translated literature both before and after the 1928 alphabet reform. Seyfettin Özege's catalogue has revealed that in 1923-1928, private publishers released around 230 literary translations (Özege 1971). Between 1928 and 1938, the state published 7,445 books, of which only 195 have been classified as “literary”, including anthologies and textbooks. Only 13 of these were translations (*TB 1928-1938*). On the other hand, private companies published a total of 8,618 books within the same period: 2,439 were literary titles, of which 420 (17.2 per cent) were literary translations (*Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1928-1938*). To give an idea about the extent of private publishing activity, let me mention that in 1933 there were 51 private publishing companies in Istanbul, which was the publishing centre of the country (İskit 1939: 270).

4.3.2 Private Publishing and Translation (1923-1940)

Before the Alphabet Reform

The translations brought out by private publishers before the alphabet reform were dominated by popular works, which will be the topic of the next section. Although there were a considerable number of western classics published by private companies during this period, they were far from being systematic. There were only a limited number of series present during this time. In this section I will offer a survey of five of these series.

Tanin newspaper's "**Ölmez Eserler Külliyyatı**" (The Collection of Immortal Works) constituted one of the earliest series of translated literature in early republican Turkey. This series featured three books including Daniel Defoe's *Robenson Krüzoe* (*Robinson Crusoe*), translated by Şükri Kaya and published as a supplement to the *Tanin* newspaper in 1923 (Sevük 1940b: 145; Özege 1971: 1485), Emile Zola's *Assomuar* (*Asommoire*) translated by İsmail Müştak and published in 1923 (Sevük 1940b: 376; Özege 1971: 2155), and Anatole France's *İlahlar Kana Susamışlar* (*Les Dieux Ont Soif*), also translated by İsmail Müştak, published in 1924 (Özege 1971: 678). Sevük who mentioned the first two novels has suggested that they were full translations (Sevük 1940b: 376, 145).

Cihan Publishing House published two different translation series between 1923 and 1928 (Sevük 1940b; Özege 1971). The first one, "**Meşahir-i Asar Külliyyatı**" (The Collection of Famous Works) mainly consisted of reprints of Ahmet Vefik Paşa's translations of Molière's plays published in the 19th century (Özege 1971: 1109, 2097, 2129).

The second series by Cihan was launched in 1924. The series which featured works by Tolstoy was titled "**Rus Meşahir-i Hükemasından L. Tolstoy Asarından**" (From the Works of the Famous Russian Thinker L. Tolstoy). Between 1924 and 1928, Cihan published 9 booklets in this series selected from Tolstoy's philosophical writings, all translated by Ali Fuad (Sevük 1940b: 278). Sevük informs us that this series of Tolstoy's later philosophical writings was originally started in 1914 by Kâinat Publishing House but was discontinued upon the early death of the first translator, Ahmed Midhat Rifatof, after the publication of two books (Sevük 1940b: 276).

Resimli Ay, a publisher especially active in children's literature, was also involved in planned translation activity before the alphabet reform. Their series “**On Kuruşa Bir Kitap**” (Books for Ten Kurush) published abridgements of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (*Robenson Krüzoe*) (Özege 1971: 1485), Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (*Cüceler Memleketinde*)¹³ (Özege 1971: 217) and Jules Verne's *De la Terre à la Lune* (*Aya Seyahat*) in 1927 (Özege 1971: 93).

The same publishing house brought out another series of popular (indigenous and translated) children's fiction including *Haydi* (*Heidi*) by Johanna Spyri (Özege 1971: 527) and *Hollandalı İkizler* (The Dutch Twins) by Lucy Fitch Perkins (Özege 1971: 583) under the title “**Himaye-i Etfal Cemiyeti Çocuk Kütüphanesi**” (Children's Library of the Society for the Protection of Children). Resimli Ay owned by Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel, a prominent left-wing journalist couple, was the only publishing house which continued its translation activity immediately after the alphabet reform.

After the Alphabet Reform

The alphabet reform created a standstill in translation activity for at least a year. Server İskit wrote the following about the activity of private publishing houses immediately after the change in script:

1928 and the following couple of years were a transitional period for readers. Although work was under way, things could not be expected to reach a perfect stage immediately. Nowadays the growth in publishing is visible almost hourly whereas there was hardly any development in publishing in these early years (İskit 1939: 269).

¹³ This translation will be analyzed in Chapter 7, Section 7.2.3 where detailed information on the Resimli Ay publishing company is also available.

[1928 senesi ile onu takip eden bir iki sene milletin okuma inkişafında bir intikal devresi oldu. Hemen işe girişilmesine rağmen, iş derakap kemalini bulamazdı. Bugün her saat artış nisbeti gözle görülebilecek derecede olduğu halde, ilk seneler kitap neşriyatında bir inkişaf olamadı (İskit 1939: 269).]

After the initial stagnation, the publishing market responded well to the new alphabet and new series of translations started to flourish especially in the second half of the 1930s. In the following paragraphs, I will offer an outline of the books covered by three major series published in 1929-1940.

In 1929, while there were no titles translated from French or Russian, and only one from German, twelve books were translated from English and American literatures, which included a reprint previously published in Ottoman script. The number of translations from English was high due to the continuation of the “**Himaye-i Etfal Cemiyeti Çocuk Külliyyatı**” series published by Resimli Ay which featured eight more books by L.F. Perkins (*TB 1928-1938*: 647-649).

The first series of translated western classics after the alphabet reform was launched by Vakit publishing house. Haydar Rıfat (Yorulmaz)¹⁴, who was himself a well-known and productive translator, became the editor of the series titled “**Dün ve Yarın Tercüme Külliyyatı**” (Translated Works of Yesterday and Tomorrow). Hilmi Ziya Ülken has suggested that the series was launched in 1933 (Ülken 1994: 384). Although I was not able to trace the first book in the series, the second book, *Aile Çemberi* (*Le Cercle de Famille*) by André Maurois (translated by İsmail Hakkı Alişan) was published in 1934 (*TB 1928-1938*: 659). According to the data offered by the *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*, by 1936, the series had produced over 60 titles, including some works on politics and philosophy. It covered many French classics

¹⁴ Although appreciated for his vigour and dynamism, Haydar Rıfat’s translations have been criticized for their slack style and mistakes (Sevük 1940b: 612).

during this time, as well as Russian ones. German and English works were fewer in the series which also included Greek and Latin classics fitting in with the “discursive” and targeted canon of the day. Haydar Rıfat personally translated four *Lives* from Plutarch (TB 1928-1939: 665-666) and *The Constitutions of Lacedaemonians and Athenians* by Xenophon (Çelgin 1996: 29). He also translated books on Heraclitus and Democritus (TB 1928-1938: 665). *The Metaphysics* of Aristotle translated by Hilmi Ziya Ülken (Çelgin 1996: 22), Vergil's *Aeneid* translated by Ahmet Reşit (Çelgin 1996: 50) and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* translated by S.Z. Aktay (Çelgin 1996: 45) were also among the books in the series.

Another planned translation movement was launched by Remzi publishing company in 1937 in a series titled “**Dünya Muharrirlerinden Tercümelere**” (Translations from World Authors) (Remzi Kitabevi 1948 Kataloğu 1948: 105). The first book which appeared in this series was a translation of Anatole France's *Thais* by Nasuhi Baydar. This series prioritized translations from French authors: The first year ten French and four Russian novels were published. Three of the latter were indirect translations from French. Meanwhile, no English or German works were published in that first year (TB 1928-1938: 641- 673). The translations that appeared in this series are too numerous to list. Ivan Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons*, Alexandre Dumas Files' *La Dame aux Camélias*, Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Grey* and Xenophon's *Anabasis* are some examples.

To sum up, following the alphabet reform of 1928 there was a temporary stagnation in the private publishing market in Turkey in terms of the translation of canonical works. Yet translation activity was revived throughout the 1930s and many works of western literature were translated into Turkish. With a few exceptions (such as the three different versions of *Don Quijote* published in this

period¹⁵) they did not appear to be abridgements or summaries of their source texts. Paker writes that the 15 Greek classics translated in the 1930s show that “there was a growing tendency to produce ‘full’ translations instead of texts either ‘adapted’ or incomplete” as had been the case in the previous years (Paker 1986: 417). Nevertheless, I will illustrate in Chapter 7 that some translations of the 1930s were also marked by heavy omissions, and also additions.

The literary translation activity of the 1930s should not be overlooked. Vakit and Remzi publishing companies launched extensive translation series covering western classics, which had not attracted systematic interest from private publishers before the 1930s. However, their publishing activity was considered to be insufficient by Turkish intellectuals who constantly stated the need for a more systematic translation movement as discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.1.2.1.

4.3.2.1 Translated Popular Literature (1923-1940)

Before the Alphabet Reform

Popular literature of the early republican period, which was exclusively published by private companies, consisted of detective fiction with the exception of some series in the 1930s. Crime became a popular genre in Turkish in the 19th century: both translations and indigenous works have been published since 1881 (Üyepazarcı 1997: 72). This genre was often translated and published in series, which had already become an established feature before the Republic was founded. Series

¹⁵ A. Halit, Akşam and Sebat publishing companies published abridgements of the work in 1931, 1933 and 1939 respectively. No full translation of *Don Quijote* existed at the time.

continued to be launched after 1923 which usually lasted for one or two years and consisted of the translations of “dime novels” which adhered to a standard format of about sixteen to thirty pages. In what follows I will offer examples of from six series published in the field of translated popular literature in 1923-1928.

In 1924, İktbal Kütüphanesi launched a large series titled “**Şarlo Polis Hafiyesi ve Gülünçlü Sergüzeşleri**” (Detective Charlie Chaplin and his Comic Adventures) featuring 16 titles, all translated by a mysterious woman translator called Bedia Servet¹⁶ whose name does not appear as a translator in any other book. This was a humorous series parodying the crime genre. Although Bedia Servet was presented as the “translator” of the series, the writer has not been identified. Erol Üyepazarcı, who has studied the target texts written in Ottoman script, claims that the series may have been written by the translator herself who wrote a number of passages about Turkey in the books, especially in one of the stories where Chaplin the detective visits Istanbul (Üyepazarcı 1997: 157).

A series published by Sühulet publishing house in 1925 and 1926 bore the title “**Arsen Lüpen**” (Arsène Lupin). While rendering the original Leblanc stories, translator Mustafa Remzi did a vast amount of manipulation, omitting from and adding to the stories, even to the point of merging some of them (Üyepazarcı 1997: 121). In the “Şarlo” and “Arsène Lupin” series, the authors' names were not indicated on the target texts. However, Üyepazarcı has traced the source texts for the latter series (Üyepazarcı 1997: 120-121).

Some of the detective series published before the alphabet reform may be identified as pseudotranslations. A series of pseudotranslations titled “**Şarlok**

¹⁶Erol Üyepazarcı, who suspected “Bedia Servet” to be one of Peyami Safa’s pseudonyms due to its resemblance to Peyami Safa’s common penname “Server Bedi”, reports that he was not able to find any evidence corroborating this idea (Üyepazarcı 1997: 156).

Holmes" (Sherlock Holmes) was brought out by Cemiyet publishing house in 1925. There were five books in the series with the titles *Esrarengiz Parola* (The Mysterious Password), *Haydutlar Kumarhanesi* (The Casino of Bandits), *Kanlı Elbise* (The Blood-stained Dress), *Vahşiler Klübü* (The Club of Savages) and *Siyah Mantolular* (People wearing Black Coats). These books were all written by M. Kemalettin and none of them are original Conan Doyle stories (Üyepazarcı 1997: 108).

Selâmi Münir Yurdatap wrote a series of pseudotranslations for Cemiyet Kütüphanesi in 1926 and brought Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin together in "**Şarlok Holmes'in Arsen Lüpen ile Sergüzeştləri**" (The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin) (Üyepazarcı 1997: 109). Maurice Leblanc had in fact written a series of stories where Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin met. Leblanc, who initially intended to use Holmes' original name, later changed the name to "Herlock Sholmes" following objections from Arthur Conan Doyle. Nevertheless, the Leblanc stories bear no resemblance to the pseudotranslations published in the Turkish series.¹⁷

Another series of pseudotranslations was launched under the title "**Şarlok Holmes'in Sergüzeştlərindən**" (From the Adventures of Sherlock Holmes) in 1927, with four titles written by Selami Münir Yurdatap and Remzi (Üyepazarcı 1997: 110): *Sahte Prens* (The False Prince) and *Zevk Çılgınlıkları* (The Madness of Bliss), *Maskeli Süvari* (The Masked Horseman) and *Fahişeler* (Prostitutes). The books in

¹⁷ Below is a list of those stories:

"Herlock Sholmes Arrive Trop Tard" (Herlock Sholmes Arrives Too Late), in *Arsène Lupin, Gentleman Cambrioleur* (Arsene Lupin, Gentleman Burglar) (Je Sais Tout No. 17, 1906; Volume, Lafitte, 1907)

Arsène Lupin contre Herlock Sholmes (Arsene Lupin vs. Herlock Sholmes) (Vol. Lafitte, 1908) (Comprised of two stories: "La Dame Blonde" (The Blonde Lady) (JST Nos. 22-27, 1906/07); and "La Lampe Juive" (The Jewish Lamp) (JST Nos. 32-33, 1907).

L'Aiguille Creuse (The Hollow Needle) (Je Sais Tout Nos. 44-52, 1908/09; Vol. Lafitte, 1909) (Information is available at <http://www.coolfrenchcomics.com/sherlockholmes.htm>. This site also offers summaries of these stories, of which none resemble the pseudotranslations written by Yurdatap.)

this series published by Ahmed Kâmil Matbaası fall more within erotica than crime except the first title.

Another series of pseudotranslations, appearing in 1928, also by Yurdatap, was a Nick Carter series called “**Nik Karter Dünyanın En Meşhur Polis Hafiyesi**” (Nick Carter the Most Famous Police Inspector in the World). Üyepazarcı has identified eleven books in this series (Üyepazarcı 1997: 136).

The abundance of pseudotranslations in the field of translated popular literature in the 1920s indicates that the boundaries between indigenous and translated works were rather blurred.

After the Alphabet Reform

The alphabet reform caused a standstill also in the field of translated popular literature. The dynamic activity in translation / pseudotranslation experienced before 1929, disappeared from the publishing scene until 1932. Below, I will offer a survey of five series of translated popular literature launched after the alphabet reform.

In 1932, Tefeyyüz, a publishing company which existed before the alphabet reform but became more active in the 1930s in publishing translations, produced the “**Küçük Romanlar Serisi**” (The Little Novels Series). This series consisted of short books of a maximum of 40 pages including both children’s and adult fiction by authors such as H.H. Bashfort, Dale Collins, Robert Hichens, Edwin Müller, Maye Edington, who were probably popular at the time but left no mark in their home systems¹⁸ (*TB 1928-1938*: 642-649). All the books in this series were translated by

¹⁸ A study of the Library of Congress catalogue revealed very little data about these authors. The Library had no record of most of the books. More information is required to decide whether these translations were genuine or fictitious.

the same person: Vasif K.M., who was exceptionally productive between 1932-1936. He translated 29 short books as well as two longer ones in four years and mysteriously disappeared from the field after 1936. It was quite common for translators to use aliases. Some famous literary figures such as Hasan Ali Ediz, Peyami Safa and Kemal Tahir are known to have translated popular books under assumed names. My attempts at tracing Vasif K.M., however, was not successful.

In 1934, Sühulet launched the “**Mis Piriston**” (Miss Priston) series of five short books of 16 pages each, while a new publishing company called Umumî brought out a “**Nat Pinkerton**” and a “**Nick Carter**” series. Neither the authors nor the translators of these three series have been traced. In 1939, a crime series titled “**Cinai Romanlar Serisi**” (The Series of Homicide Novels) was published by Tan publishing house and all books were translated by Hikmet Münir Ebcioğlu. No source author was named. These are clearly cases which bring pseudotranslations to mind.

4.4 Translated Literature in 1940-1960

After 1940, translation increased its share within the total number of literary publications. 5,948 literary books¹⁹ were published in Turkey in 1938-1950 of which 2,123 were translations. 1,431 of the translations were published by private companies while 692 were published by the Ministry of Education.²⁰ This meant that

¹⁹ These statistics are based on the figures published by the state in the annual bibliographies. The category “literature” does not only consist of fiction; literary criticism, surveys, anthologies are also included. Other categories under “literature” are “novel and short story”, “poetry”, “drama”, “children’s books” and “people’s books”.

²⁰ The statistics on the Translation Bureau and the publications by the Ministry of Education also cover non-fiction translations. The Bureau published scholarly writing and philosophical works along with literature which are included in this figure. Nevertheless, the biggest part of the Bureau’s output consisted of literary translations.

35.6 per cent of all literary books published in Turkey during this time were translations. This was a vast increase compared to 17.2 per cent in the previous decade, i.e. 1930s. Another point that must be mentioned is that the books published by private publishers outnumbered the output of the Bureau more than twice, even during the Bureau's most productive stage. However, the Translation Bureau played a major role in shaping the poetics of canonical translation activity in Turkey after its establishment in 1940. Its role becomes especially evident when we study the translation activity of the private publishers in terms of their translations from western literature.

4.4.1 Translations by the Translation Bureau (1940-1960)

The scope of the translation activity launched by the Ministry of Education was impressive by any standard. The Translation Bureau produced a total of 1,247 volumes, some of which were reprints, in 1940-1966. However, its translations were not distributed evenly throughout the 26 years it was active. The table below summarizes the quantitative production of the Bureau in 1940-1960 (after *Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* 1967: 6).

As I indicated in Chapter 2, the Translation Bureau was most productive during its initial seven years in terms of the number of translated titles. The Bureau produced a total of 947 translations in 1940-1960, corresponding to 76 per cent of its total production. The number of first-time editions during this period was 875, corresponding to 90 per cent of the total number of first-time editions. The chart below illustrates that the Bureau was most productive in 1943-1946, when it published over 34 per cent of the total number of its translations. The number of new

translations, which rose steadily until 1946, started to decrease after this year. The possible political reasons behind this pattern was explained in Chapter 2.

Translations by the Translation Bureau

	Number of translations published and percentage value within the total number	First editions	Reprints
1940	10 (0.8%)	10	-
1941	13 (1%)	13	-
1942	27 (2.1%)	27	-
1943	67 (5.3%)	68	1
1944	97 (7.7%)	97	-
1945	115 (9.2%)	110	5
1946	152 (12.1%)	143	9
1947	57 (4.5%)	57	-
1948	46 (3.6%)	46	-
1949	64 (5.1%)	64	-
1950	42 (3.3%)	42	-
1951	23 (1.8%)	23	-
1952	31 (2.5%)	31	-
1953	18 (1.4%)	17	1
1954	26 (2%)	24	2
1955	36 (2.8%)	32	4
1956	24 (1.9%)	21	3
1957	11 (0.9%)	10	1
1958	36 (2.9%)	14	22
1959	26 (2.1%)	18	8
1960	25 (2%)	9	16

In 1940, the Translation Bureau worked on the translation of a series of plays. This series was launched under the title “**Devlet Konservatuarı Yayınları**” (Publications of the State Conservatory) and published ten plays within the first year (*Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* 1967: 330-332). The plays were by Maurice Maeterlinck, Anton Chekhov, Jules Renard, John Millington Synge, Jean Cocteau, Denys Amiel, Charles Vildrac, Martial Piéchaud, Henri Duvernois and Georges Courteline. Translators who would leave their marks on the translation activity of the Bureau such as Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Nurullah Ataç and Orhan Burian carried out the

translations of these plays which were highly appreciated by critics. These first translations by the Bureau should not be taken as representative of its later work, for starting with 1941, the Bureau concentrated on the translation of the seminal classics of western literature and mainly of Ancient Greek works under the title “**Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeler**” (Translations from World Literature). Translations also carried a subtitle which indicated their source literature, such as “İngiliz Klasikleri” (English Classics).

Translations from Greek occupied a significant place in the Bureau’s activities during its first decade. Combined with Latin classics, which started to be published in 1943, Greek works served to import the humanist infrastructure that was necessary in order to turn the rhetorical canon into a reality. In 1941, 7 plays by Sophocles were translated (*Klâsikler Bibliyografyası*²¹ 1967: 303-305). These were accompanied by one Latin work written in the early Renaissance, *Encomium Moriae* (*Deliliğe Övgü* translated by Nusret Hızır) by Desiderius Erasmus (*KB*: 231), 4 French works, Molière’s *Le Misanthrope* (*Adamcıl* translated by Ali Süha Delibaşı) and *L’école des Femmes* (*Kadınlar Mektebi* translated by Bedrettin Tuncel and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu), Stendhal’s *Le Rouge et Le Noir* (*Kırmızı ve Siyah* translated by Nurullah Ataç), Balzac’s *Le Lys Dans La Vallé* (translated by Nahid Sırrı Örik) (*KB* 1967: 65-66), and one German work, the first volume of Goethe’s *Faust* (translated by Recai Bilgin) (*KB*: 3). The Bureau continued to translate Greek classics at an impressive speed and “5 of the 10 translations from Euripides were completed by 1943, the rest following shortly, and 26 of 31 works by Plato were translated in 1942-1944” (Paker 1986a: 418). The most intensive activity in terms of the translations of Greek works took place until the end of the 1940s. Among the 94

²¹ I will refer to *Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* as *KB* in the rest of this chapter.

translations, only five were carried out after 1949. A similar trend was observed for Latin classics. Out of the 31 Latin titles translated by the Bureau, 27 were published between 1941-1948 and four were published in 1949-1951. After 1951, only reprints appeared and no new translations were carried out from Latin. It should be noted that in spite of the policy adopted by the Translation Bureau which recommended the translation of works directly from their source languages (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 126), Greek and Latin works were mostly translated from French (Paker 1986a: 418).

Starting from 1943, Russian classics were included among the titles translated by the Bureau. Between 1943 and 1950, the Bureau translators translated 68 Russian classics into Turkish. Between 1950 and 1960, this number dropped to only 6 titles (*KB*: 253-276).

Translations of “Oriental-Islamic Works” started to be published in 1942, with the first volume of Mevlana’s *Mesnevi*, from the Persian (*KB*: 281). Between 1942-1946, 13 Persian works and one Arabic were translated, between 1947-1960, 23 Persian and Arabic works were translated (*KB*: 281-288). Although the number of works translated from Arabic and Persian did not show a dramatic increase, their share within the total number of translations rose. As I indicated in Chapter 2, Section 2.2.3, Arabic and Persian works made up 3 per cent of the Translation Bureau’s output between 1940-1946 with 15 works. This rate more than doubled and increased to 7 per cent between 1947-1966 with 52 works within the total number of translations published, including reprints. The rates change when only the first-time editions are taken into consideration. Between 1940-1960, 38 new translations from Arabic and Persian were published. As pointed out above, the rate of Arabic and Persian works within the total number of new translations was 3.2 per cent. In the

1947-1960 period, this rate was 5.6 per cent. In short, despite the slight increase, the share of Arabic and Persian works within the repertoire of the Bureau remained rather low.

Translations from other literatures joined the repertoire of the Bureau starting from 1942. *Gilgamesh* was translated in 1944 from French under the heading “Babylonian Classic” (KB: 53), translations from Chinese started in 1944. Until 1960, four Chinese works were translated from French. Only one could be considered a literary work: *Çin Hikâyeleri* (Chinese Stories) translated by Wolfram Eberhard and Haryünnisa Boratav in 1944. The remaining three were: *Büyük Bilgi* (*Konfüçyüs Felsefesine Ait Notlar*) (Great Knowledge, Notes on Confucian Philosophy) translated by Muhaddere Nabi Özerdim, *Taoizm* (Taoism) by Lao-Tzu, translated by Muhaddere Nabi Özerdim and *Çin Denemeleri* (Chinese Essays) translated by Wolfram Eberhard and Nusret Hızır (KB: 57-58).

One Danish work, *Marie Grubbe*, was translated by Selâhattin Batu in 1949 (KB: 61). Two translations were carried out from Indian literature, in 1945 and 1946 respectively (KB: 157). A series of Norwegian and Swedish works started to be translated in 1942 under the subtitle “Scandinavian Classics”. The first translation brought out as a Scandinavian classic was *Nora* by Henrik Ibsen (KB: 195). A total of 19 works were translated from Norwegian and Swedish literatures in 1942-1960. The source authors included Henrik Ibsen (6 works), August Strindberg (3 works), Selma Lagerlöf (5 works) and Knut Hamsun (4 works). Two Spanish classics were translated, in 1948 and 1951 respectively (KB: 203), 20 Italian classics were translated and published starting in 1944 (KB: 207). Nine of these translations were of works by Carlo Goldoni. One Latin American classic was published in 1954: Enrique Larreta’s *La Gloria i Don Ramiro* (*Don Ramiro* translated by Nurullah

Ataç) (*KB*: 235). 18 Hungarian works were translated in 1944-1960 (*KB*: 239-243), and 2 Polish works were translated, in 1949 and 1952 respectively (*KB*: 249).

French remained as the most popular source language and literature for the Translation Bureau throughout the period under study. Between 1940-1966, the series of French classics included 308 translated French works.²² French was followed by German (113 translations), Greek (94 translations) Russian (88 translations) and English classics (80 translations). Oriental-Islamic classics ranked sixth with 66 translated titles. During the period under study, some of the most popular source authors for the Bureau were Plato (30 works) Molière (27 works), Balzac (22 works), Shakespeare (22 works), Dostoevsky (14 works), Goethe (10 works), Tolstoy (9 works), and Chekhov (8 works).²³

The Translation Bureau did not only commission literary translations. Throughout the initial few years, philosophy occupied a significant place due to the translation of Greek classics. Western philosophers such as Descartes, Voltaire and Rousseau were also widely translated and published by the Bureau (*KB*: 65-150). Nevertheless, the greatest proportion of the Bureau's activity consisted of literary translations.

When the activities of the individual translators translating for the Bureau are considered, some common trends emerge. Nurullah Ataç²⁴, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu²⁵,

²² These figures belong to the "classics" category. The Ministry of Education published translations from these languages under several categories like "modern literature", "school classics" and "dramatic works". Nevertheless, the classics were the largest and the longest-lasting category of all. Therefore the number of titles published under the "classics" category may be said to reflect the general trend.

²³ For a full list of translations commissioned by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education see *Klâsikler Bibliyografyası* 1967.

²⁴ Ataç was active in 1940-1953 and translated a total of 29 works from French for the Translation Bureau.

²⁵ Eyüboğlu was active in 1940-1964 and translated a total of 18 works from French and English for the Translation Bureau.

Lûtfi Ay²⁶, Orhan Burian²⁷, and Yaşar Nabi Nayır²⁸ were some of the most productive translators of the Bureau, especially in the 1940s. These translators were all engaged in some other form of literary activity than translation. Ataç and Eyüboğlu were teachers and prominent essayists. Lûtfi Ay was a theatre critic. Orhan Burian taught English literature at the university. Yaşar Nabi Nayır was both a literary critic, a writer and a publisher. Furthermore, they had all received western-style education, either in Turkey, at Lycée de Galatasaray, where instruction was carried out in French, or abroad. In interviews held with them, Ataç, Eyüboğlu and Nayır stated that western literary works, especially by French writers, were their main sources of inspiration (*Dünkü ve Bugünkü Edebiyatçılarımız Konuşuyor* 1976). Other translators who translated books for the Bureau during the 1940s, such as Hasan Âli Ediz, Vedat Günyol, Suut Kemal Yetkin, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu²⁹ all mentioned translations when they were asked about their early reading experience (*Dünkü ve Bugünkü Edebiyatçılarımız Konuşuyor* 1976: 24, 74, 80; Seyda 1970). This indicates that these translators (the majority of whom were also writers, academics or critics) carried a set of dispositions that was already different from intellectuals and writers with more traditional backgrounds. In fact, the sheer fact that one spoke a foreign language could imply a certain cultural habitus. I would like to argue that although knowledge of foreign languages did not always imply a westernist approach to culture and literature in early republican Turkey, contact with foreign literatures and cultures

²⁶ Ay was active in 1940-1957 and translated a total of 15 works from French for the Translation Bureau.

²⁷ Burian was active in 1940-1952 and translated a total of 10 works from English for the Translation Bureau.

²⁸ Nayır was active in 1940-1951 and translated a total of 18 works from French for the Translation Bureau.

²⁹ The last three names were the embodiment of the writer-translator model of the 1940s.

gave one an advantaged position in terms of an awareness of western literary and cultural sources.

The position of the products of the Translation Bureau within the general book market in 1940-1960 can be analyzed in terms of Pierre Bourdieu's concept of "restricted production". Bourdieu suggests that the market for literary works is governed by two fields: the field of restricted production and the field of large-scale production. Bourdieu argues that the field of restricted production is the field where producers produce for other producers and where artistic and literary consecration is the only criterion for legitimacy (Bourdieu 1993: 38-39). According to Bourdieu, the second field is symbolically discredited by critics or historians, and artists and writers (*and* certainly translators) who produced for the market are left to oblivion in later periods (Bourdieu 1993: 38). The degree of disinterestedness is a defining line between the two fields and in Bourdieu's terminology, the field of restricted production is supposed to be the most autonomous from commercial or political concerns. The case of the Translation Bureau requires a modification of this classification, for the field of restricted production was increasingly, and strictly governed by political concerns in Turkey. Although the translations published by the Ministry of Education remained independent of economic concerns, they were heavily dominated by political and ideological ones. This was also more or less true for publishers of canonical translated literature, who subscribed to the same poetics as the state.

4.4.2 Private Publishing and Translation (1940-1960)

The year 1940 was a turning point for the system of translated literature in Turkey. The Translation Bureau introduced a new set of standards by which translations were selected and carried out, and set an “example” for a number of publishing houses. Private publishing continued to depend on state aid which usually came in the form of book purchases. Following the establishment of the Translation Bureau, publishers had the chance to cooperate with the state in terms of the selection of the titles that they would commission for translation. Furthermore, if they chose books from the list created by the Translation Bureau, and had their translations edited and authorized by the Bureau, they would be able to sell more books to the Ministry of Education (“Haberler” 1940a: 112; “Tercümesi Tavsiye Edilen Eserler” 1942: 12; *Maarif Vekilliğince Bastırılacak veya Basılması Teşvik Edilecek Tercüme Eserlerin Ne Suretle İnceleneceği Hakkında Talimatname* 1944: 8). Nevertheless, the general trend among publishers in the 1940s and 1950s was to publish contemporary canonical literature. It appeared as though they left the task of publishing western classical literature written before the 20th century to the Ministry of Education. Even Remzi, which had a reputation as a publisher of “canonical” literature preferred to concentrate on the field of contemporary literature where works by certain writers became the first choice.

A visible trend starting in the 1940s was the rise in the number of works translated from English and American literatures in the market, especially in the private publishing market. Although French maintained its status as the main source language for translations, English and American works became more popular and more available in the market for translated literature, especially in the 1950s. In the

1938-1950 period, the number of translations of English and American works and the number of translated French works were roughly equal in the market, including both books published by the Ministry of Education and the private book market: 511 books were translated from American and English literatures, whereas translations from French literature consisted of 508 titles. German was far behind the two, with only 76 translations. In 1951-1960, 930 translations were carried out from English and American literatures. This figure was only 365 for French literature. Although the number of translators who translated from English increased throughout the 1940s and 1950s, there was a clear shortage and many English and American works continued to be translated from French.

The 1940s and 1950s was a period when the series format was the main marketing and publishing strategy in the book market. According to *Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1938-1948*, there were 93 series that published translated novels and short stories for adults during this decade. Most of these series were short-lived. Some series only produced one book, while some continued to exist for several years. Series flourished especially around 1943-1946. This was the most productive period of the Translation Bureau, and also, a period when translation as a concept and an activity occupied a significant place in the literary agenda, receiving considerable coverage from dailies and literary magazines. It can safely be assumed that the momentum created by the Translation Bureau and *Tercüme* reflected on the private publishing market during this period. In the following paragraphs, I will offer a brief survey of fifteen major series covering translated canonical literature and bestsellers by private publishers.

Some of the series which started to be published in the 1930s, continued in the 1940s. Remzi's "**Dünya Muharrirlerinden Tercüme**" (Translations from World

Authors), which was launched in 1937, continued to be published in the 1940s and 1950s. By 1940, the series had produced 33 titles of mainly canonical western works. In the 1940s, Remzi offered a mixed selection for its readers, consisting of classical and contemporary canonical fiction. (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1381, 1396-1401, 1412-1440, 1474-1487). Its repertoire included works by Gorki, Dostoevsky, Alfred de Musset, Balzac and Daudet. At the same time, books that became bestsellers throughout the period were also published. Pearl Buck, Panait Istrati, John Steinbeck, Erskine Caldwell featured in Remzi's series with several of their works. This was a strategy adopted by most of the publishers involved in canonical literature. 106 books were published in Remzi's series until 1950. In the 1950s no new titles were published. Although the series continued, it mainly consisted of reprints of works previously translated.

Semih Lütü's "**Dünya Şaheserlerinden Tercümeler Serisi**" (Translations from World Masterpieces) launched around 1938 continued to be published until 1948 and produced a total of 58 titles (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493). This series featured canonical literature, including works by Balzac, Knut Hamsun, André Gide, Ivan Turgenev and Stefan Zweig. Kanaat's "Ankara Kütüphanesi" (The Ankara Library), launched in 1939, was published until 1946 (*TB 1939-1948*: 1231-1493). This series offered both translated and Turkish literature. Its translated titles consisted of a spectrum that ranged from canonical to popular literature, covering authors such as Emile Zola and Jules Verne.

One of the major series of the 1940s was Ahmet Halit's "**Şarktan Garptan Seçme Eserler**" (Selected Works from the East and the West). The series was launched in 1940 and ran until 1947 (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493). Although the title of the series suggested that it would publish both western and eastern works, only

five out of the 79 volumes it published were eastern works, including two from Persian and three from Indian literature. (*TB 1939-1948*: 1484, 1487). The eastern works featured in the series were by Sadi, Rabindranath Tagore and Ramayana Valmiki. The series offered a combination of classical and contemporary canonical fiction and some bestsellers, publishing works by, among others, Dostoevsky, R.L. Stevenson, Shakespeare, Daphne Du Maurier, A.J. Cronin and Pearl Buck. Ahmet Halit also published popular literature which will be explored in the next section.

Arif Bolat, which was also active in the field of popular literature, launched its “**Dünya Edebiyatından Seçme Eserler**” (Selected Works from World Literature) started to be published in 1943 and continued until 1952, producing a total of 22 translations. This series concentrated on contemporary bestsellers by authors such as A.J. Cronin, Ernest Hemingway and Pearl Buck (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493; *TB 1949*: 86-90, 213-216, 335-339, 464-468; *TB 1950*: 87-92, 220-223, 347-348, 467-470; *TB 1951*: 80-86, 201-205, 310-312, 424-427; *TB 1952*: 86-90, 226-230, 325-326, 439-443).

Güven, a company especially active in the field of popular translated and indigenous literature, published two series of canonical literature in 1944-1947, namely “**Güven Basımevi Tercüme Romanlar**” (Translated Novels from Güven Publishing House) and “**Büyük Muharrirlerden Tercümeler**” (Translations from Great Authors) which offered a total of 7 canonical translations from authors such as Gorki, Somerset Maugham and Turgeniev (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493).

İnkılap’s “**Seçme Tercümeler Serisi**” (Selected Translations) published a mixture of classical western literature and western bestsellers between 1944-1950 (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493; *TB 1949*: 86-90, 213-216, 335-339, 464-468; *TB 1950*: 87-92, 220-223, 347-348, 467-470). Hilmi’s “**Son Asır Dünya Edebiyatı Serisi**”

(World Literature from the Last Century) adopted a similar strategy and published 19 classics and contemporary bestsellers in 1942-1944. “**Akba’nın Tercümeler Serisi**” (Akba’s Series of Translations), published between 1943-1945, offered a similar selection of books (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493).

“**Varlık Cep Kitapları**” (Varlık Pocket Books) was the largest series publishing canonical translations in the 1950s. Varlık’s pocket books started to be published in 1948. The series was published throughout the 1950s and had published over 160 titles by 1960 (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493; *TB 1949*: 86-90, 213-216, 335-339, 464-468; *TB 1950*: 87-92, 220-223, 347-348, 467-470; *TB 1951*: 80-86, 201-205, 310-312, 424-427; *TB 1952*: 86-90, 226-230, 325-326, 439-443; *TB 1953*: 212-215, 460-462, 729-733, 914-917; *TB 1954*: 358-387; *TB 1955a*: 193-214; *1955b*: 69-80; *TB 1956a*: 58-65; *TB 1956b*: 75-79; *TB 1956c*: 31-33; *TB 1956d*: 112-118; *1957a*: 69-75; *TB 1957b*: 66-71; *TB 1957c*: 39-44; *TB 1957d*: 60-65; *TB 1958a*: 67-74; *TB 1958b*: 89-96; *TB 1958c*: 92-100; *TB 1958d*: 93-101; *TB 1959a*: 127-135; *TB 1959b*: 83-92; *TB 1959c*: 146-151; *TB 1959d*: 112-121; *TB 1960a*: 96-103; *TB 1960b*: 94-100; *TB 1960c*: 115-123; *TB 1960d*: 164-173). The pocket books series followed the same formula as Remzi and combined classical canonical fiction and contemporary bestsellers fiction. It published works by such contemporary writers as John Steinbeck, Ernest Hemingway and Erskine Caldwell and also provided space for works by Dostoevsky, Gogol and Edgar Allen Poe. Some of the books in this series became extremely popular and were published several times. Books by Panait Istrati, translated by the owner of Varlık, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, became bestsellers and had up to five reprints.

Varlık launched four other series throughout the 1950s: “**Büyük Cep Kitapları**” (Large Pocket Books), “**Büyük Eserler Kitablığı**” (The Library of Great

Works), “**Dünya Klâsikleri**” (World Classics) and “**Çocuk Klâsikleri**” (Children’s Classics) (“Varlık Yayınları” 1957: 23). All of these series combined canonical 19th century fiction with contemporary bestsellers which could still be regarded as part of the system of canonical literature.

Türkiye publishing house’s series “**Yıldız Romanlar**” (Star Novels) followed a different strategy and combined contemporary bestsellers with popular, non-canonical works. Launched in 1949, the novels published in this series included works by such writers as A.J. Cronin, Pearl Buck and John Steinbeck³⁰ which could be considered as canonical writers of the period. “Yıldız Romanlar” also included romances and adventure novels by less known writers like Edison Marshall, Frank Yerby and Edna Lee. Despite the activities of Varlık and a few other publishers involved with canonical translations, the market for translated literature in the 1950s was heavily dominated by popular literature. The most popular names in canonical literature were contemporary writers of bestsellers. A.J. Cronin, Pearl Buck and Erskine Caldwell were the most frequently published authors. Ernest Hemingway and John Steinbeck were the two other names that were published widely, both in the 1940s and 1950s. Some of the translators who translated books for private publishing companies in the 1940s and the 1950s were Ömer Rıza Doğrul, Sabiha Sertel, İskender Fahrettin Sertelli, Vahdet Gültekin, Nihal Yeğınobalı, Ferid Namık Hansoy and Tahsin Yücel. Some publishers such as Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Avni İnsel and Hamdi Varoğlu also translated literature throughout this period. The names of the majority

³⁰ Both Pearl Buck and John Steinbeck were winners of the prestigious Nobel and Pulitzer prizes. Pearl Buck became a Nobel laureate in 1938, while Steinbeck won the prize in 1962 (<http://www.nobel.se/nobel/>). Buck won Pulitzer with her *The Good Earth* in 1932. Steinbeck received Pulitzer’s prize in 1940 for his *The Grapes of Wrath*. (<http://www.between-the-covers.com/aw-ab/pul-lit.htm>). Cronin’s canonical status is debatable today. Although his novels which were published in the 1930s won him critical acclaim, his literary reputation declined in the 1950s. After his death, he came to be associated with “middlebrow” literature (<http://www.slainte.org.uk/scotauth/cronidsw.htm>).

of these translators are not registered in literary dictionaries or encyclopedias. Literary recognition could not be earned only through translations. Among the above names, Behçet Necatigil's *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü* (Dictionary of Literary Personalities) only mentions Tahsin Yücel and Yaşar Nabi Nayır's names, mainly because they were also involved in literary criticism and indigenous literary production at the same time. Translators such as Ömer Rıza Doğrul³¹, Vahdet Gültekin³² and Ferid Namık Hansoy³³, who worked systematically and industriously during the 1930s-1950s are rarely recalled in our day and have been condemned to oblivion, as many other literary figures who worked in the field of large-scale production.

A significant change that occurred in the private publishing industry in the 1950s was the inclusion of the title of the source text in the translation. This practice, which was seen rarely during the previous decades, became standard for some publishers like Türkiye, Varlık and Arif Bolat in the 1950s. I suggest that this practice was mainly due to two facts. One of them was that the Translation Bureau always included the original title of the source text in its translations. Private publishers may have associated this approach with a "prestigious" form of publishing and decided to adopt it in order to look more respectable. A second reason may be the fact that pseudotranslations abounded in the market for translated literature and publishers might have wished to create credibility in the readers' eyes by proving

³¹ Doğrul translated literary, historical and religious books in the 1920s-1940s. He was an extremely efficient and productive translator. He has over 100 records at the National Library of Turkey, including reprints of the books he translated. He also wrote books on history and Islam.

³² Gültekin translated numerous novels from English and French. He specialized on the translation of some of the best-selling authors in the 1940s and 1950s such as Cronin, Buck, Steinbeck and Hemingway. He also translated a number of works by Balzac. The National Library data base has over 230 records in his name.

³³ Hansoy was the translator of a Jules Verne series published by İnkılâp publishing house in the 1940s and 1950s. He translated all of the books in this series, which included a total of 43 Verne novels (Koz 2000: 155-159).

that their translations were indeed “genuine”. In any case, the increasing emphasis on the “original” title and author indicated a significant shift in the poetics of translation. In my view, the major motive behind this shift in favour of the concept of “the original” was the activities of the Translation Bureau and the discourse formed around translation in the 1940s. In the meantime, the field of translated popular literature was governed by a different type of poetics. This poetics relied on the concept of “genre”, rather than “authorial originality”, i.e. the authorial provenance of the work.

4.4.2.1 Popular Literature and Translation (1940-1960)

Translations of popular literature continued to be published after the establishment of the Translation Bureau. The Bureau’s selection of titles, the translational norms it propagated, or the discussions on the functions of translation did not appear to affect publishers of popular fiction in any way. The series format had been used by publishers of translated popular literature since the turn of the century and it continued to be the dominant publishing strategy after 1940.

One interesting difference between series canonical and semi- and non-canonical literature lay in their titles. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, series with a claim to canonical literature adopted names that identified them with “world literature”. “Translations from World Literature”, “Translations from World Authors” and “Selected Works from World Literature” mentioned above, are only three examples among many. In my view, these series intended to highlight the universal appeal, and prestige of their books, which were properties canonical literature was expected to carry as discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.1.4.

Series in popular translated literature adopted a different approach in their selection of titles. Some of them chose titles that underscored the popularity of their books. Arif Bolat's "Milyonların Okuduğu Eserler" (Works Read by Millions), Güven's "Dünyada En Çok Okunan Romanlar Serisi" (The Best-Selling Novels of the World), Vakit's "Batının En Çok Okunan Romanları Serisi" (The Most Widespread Novels of the West) are examples to this approach. A more common approach was to use a generic designation in the title. İnkılap's "Polis Romanları" (Detective Novels), Ahmet Halit's "Macera ve Polis Romanları Serisi" (Adventure and Detective Novels), Güven's "Meraklı, Heyecanlı, Macera Kitapları" (Curious, Exciting, Adventure Books) are some examples. This latter approach illustrates that readers of popular fiction choose their books based on genre, rather than author.

Thomas J. Roberts writes that the "serious reader", i.e. a reader of the classics, reads by author, expects originality and his/her stimulus to read are good reviews; on the other hand, the "paperback reader", i.e. a reader of popular literature, reads by genre, expects some form of psychological gratification and chooses his/her reading material based on titles or covers (Roberts 1990: 32). Indeed, the covers of popular fiction published in Turkey in the 1920s-1950s, or their advertisements used promotional statements and titles that underscored the generic or thematic aspects of the books. Popular translated books were identified in terms of their protagonists, rather than their authors. The various Sherlock Holmes, Nick Carter, Nat Pinkerton and Arsène Lupin series published in the 1940s and 1950s, the Mike Hammer series of the 1950s are all examples of this approach.

There were numerous series of popular translated fiction published throughout the 1940s-1950s. I was able to identify 25 such series in the various volumes of *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* of which the majority ran for only two or three books. In the

rest of this section I will offer a brief survey of the major series in popular translated literature and cover seven series in the following paragraphs.

Güven Yayınevi was the leading name in the field of popular translated literature in the 1940s. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, it published a range of series offering the reader detective and adventure fiction. One of the longest and the most popular series it published was “**Meşhur İngiliz Polis Hafiyesi Şerlok Holmes Serisi**” (Famous English Detective Sherlock Holmes). This series, which featured 83 16-page booklets, was published in 1944-1945 (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493). Unlike translations of canonical works which placed special emphasis on their author and the source text on their covers and title pages, the books published in Güven’s series did not feature the author’s, or the translator’s name on the cover. They did not even indicate that the books were translations (*Uğursuz Gerdanlık* 1944; *Çelik Odanın Esrarı* 1944, *Kırık Tabanca* 1944). Nevertheless, it is most likely that these books were received as translations by the readership, given the popularity of Sherlock Holmes in Turkey since 1909, the year its first translation appeared (Üyepazarcı 1997: 91). Some of the books in this series were abridged translations of original Sherlock Holmes stories (*Denizaltının Planı* 1944).³⁴ Some of them were written by Turkish writers, constituting examples of pseudotranslations (*Uğursuz Gerdanlık* 1944).

Güven Yayınevi also launched two series of historical popular fiction in the 1940s. The first one was “**Pardayyanlar Serisi**” (The Pardaillan Series) published in 1945-1946. This series featured novels by Michel Zévaco and included ten titles. The

³⁴ A comparison of this story with original Sherlock Holmes stories has revealed that *Denizaltının Planı* (The Submarine Plan) is a translation of “The Adventure of the Bruce-Partington Plans” published in *His Last Bow* (Conan Doyle 1981). The translation displayed systematic omissions and the resulting text is a rough retelling of the story. There was no attempt to recreate Conan Doyle’s style.

second series was “**Kahramanlık Romanları Serisi**” (The Series of Heroic Novels) launched in 1945. This series also featured books by Zévaco and produced 22 titles until 1952 (*TB 1939-1948*: 1361-1493; *TB 1949*: 86-90, 213-216, 335-339, 464-468; *TB 1950*: 87-92, 220-223, 347-348, 467-470; *TB 1951*: 80-86, 201-205, 310-312, 424-427; *TB 1952*: 86-90, 226-230, 325-326, 439-443).

Petek Yayınları also launched a short-lived historical adventure series in 1954 under the title “**Tarihi Cinai Romanlar Serisi**” (Historical Homicide Novels Series).

While popular literature in the 1940s was mainly published in a periodical format in 16-page booklets, the 1950s were marked by the “pocket book”, both in the field of canonical translated literature, as represented by Varlık’s pocket books series and in the field popular literature. Detective stories and thrillers published in such series as Türkiye’s “Cep Romanları” (Pocket Books), “Polis Cep Kitapları Serisi” (Pocket Detective Books) and books by publishers such as Çağlayan, Ekicigil, Plastik Yayınlar all made use of this format.

In the 1950s, the publishing house that left its imprint in the field of translated popular literature was Çağlayan. Çağlayan was set up in 1953 and started its publishing activity by offering a selection of popular thrillers to the readers. The format of its books was somewhat different than the conventional format. They had glossy covers in colour and used a modern method of binding. The books by Çağlayan became immensely popular immediately after they were published. The first book published by Çağlayan was Refik Halid Karay’s *Yeraltında Dünya Var* (There is an Underground World), which sold 70,000 copies in two weeks. This was an unprecedented success (Kabacalı 2000: 227). Yet, Çağlayan’s real success came in 1954, when it started publishing its “**Mike Hammer**” series, consisting of

translations of detective novels by Frank Morrison (Mickey) Spillane. Novelist Kemal Tahir³⁵ translated five Spillane novels in 1954 under the penname F.M. İkinci and each of these four books sold over 100,000 copies within the first six months (Üyepazarcı 1999: 4³⁶). In September 1954, the first Mike Hammer pseudotranslation was published: *Kanun Benim (I, the Jury)*. The editors wanted to further exploit the popular interest for these books and asked Kemal Tahir to write new stories featuring Mike Hammer. Tahir wrote four new stories, which were published in 1954 and 1955.

Three other publishers, namely, Hâdise, Plastik and Ekicigil, also wanted to have a share of the market created by Mike Hammer books and also started commissioning and publishing pseudotranslations featuring Mike Hammer. Between 1954 and 1960, at least 250 Mike Hammer pseudotranslations were published (Üyepazarcı 1999: 5). Mike Hammer stories dominated the market for translated literature especially in 1954-1958. For instance, according to *Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1956*, in 1956, 89 books were translated from American and English literatures, 31 of these, i.e. over one third, were Mike Hammer pseudotranslations (*TB 1956a*: 58-60; *TB 1956b*: 75-77; *TB 1956c*: 31; *TB 1956d*: 112-114).

Çağlayan Yayınevi published another series in 1954-1955. This series titled “**Yeni Dünyalarda Serisi**” (In New Worlds) consisted of translations of science-fiction. There were ten books in the series written by contemporary science-fiction writers such as Wilson Tucker, Roger Lee and Isaac Asimov and translated by Necati

³⁵ Chapter 7 will present a descriptive analysis of three works by Kemal Tahir, including *Kanun Benim*.

³⁶ Üyepazarcı specifies the number of these translations as four. I have personally recovered the fifth one which is not mentioned in Üyepazarcı’s article: *Kanlı Takip*, a translation of Mickey Spillane’s *Vengeance is Mine*.

Kanatsız and A. Kahraman, allegedly another one of Kemal Tahir's pennames (*TB 1954*: 358-387; *TB 1955a*: 193-214; *1955b*: 69-80).

Türkiye Yayınevi's "**Cep Romanları**" (Pocket Novels) series was one of the major detective fiction series of the 1950s. Eight novels were published in the series between 1952-1954 including works by such novelists as Dorothy Sayers, Edgar Wallace and Gordon Mc Donell (*TB 1952*: 86-90, 226-230, 325-326, 439-443; *TB 1953*: 212-215, 460-462, 729-733, 914-917; *TB 1954*: 358-387).

The books published by the companies active in the field of popular literature featured a few main genres. Detective fiction and thrillers were the most dominant. Petek and Güven publishing houses brought out some historical adventure fiction. Some of the novels published in the series "Yıldız Romanlar", mentioned in the previous section, offered the readers romantic reading material. Regardless of their genres, the themes and styles of these works were considerably different from those of the works by foreign writers published by companies specializing in canonical fiction, such as Varlık and Remzi. For instance, A.J. Cronin, Erskine Caldwell, Pearl Buck and John Steinbeck, best-selling names in the field of contemporary canonical fiction, were all known by their realist style and their treatment of social issues in their work. Cronin wrote his novels based on the characters he met during his practice as a country doctor. Pearl Buck wrote about China in a period of transition and the problems of Chinese immigrants in America. Erskine Caldwell treated issues about social injustice in terms of class, race, and gender in his novels based on his personal observations in the South of the USA. Steinbeck depicted the problematic relations between workers and employers in 20th century California. In contrast, the books published in the field of popular literature pushed such social concerns aside

and concentrated on excitement and action, maintaining a different poetics in the field of popular literature.

4.5 Summary

Chapter 4 presented a survey of the state of the publishing market in 1923-1960 and explored publishing trends in both indigenous and translated literature during the period under study. The chapter also provided an introduction to the literary canonization process in Turkish literature which resulted in the creation of a “realist” literature and argued that two different poetics existed in the fields of indigenous and translated literature. The first poetics valued literature with a social concern and positioned social realist works in the centre of the literary polysystem. The second poetics was valid in the field of popular literature and did not foresee a social function for literature. Chapter 5 will offer a study of the poetics of translated popular literature, exploring the concepts of “people” and “popular literature”.

Chapter 5

Literature for the “People”

Chapter 4 presented a brief outline of publishing activity in Turkey in 1923-1960. The present chapter will have closer focus on one section of the system of literature, namely the field of translated popular literature. It will concentrate on the historical Turkish conceptions of “popular” literature based on two significant and interrelated concepts, i.e. “halk” (“people”) and “halk kitapları” (“people’s books”). The former concept requires a digression into the social and political fields where “halk”, both as term and concept, occupied a significant place in terms of defining the ideology and practices of the early republican regime. I will argue that the latter concept is a reflection of this socio-political category in the literary field and that the “people’s books”, and the way this concept was used and promoted, offer interesting insight into the segmentation of the readership for literature in early republican Turkey.

The attribute used to refer to popular forms of art and entertainment during the Ottoman period, “avam” [“people”] had largely become obsolete from literary and intellectual debates by the 1930s and was not replaced by a new term.¹ Therefore a study of translated popular literature in the 1930s-1950s needs to base itself on terms and concepts that imply, or connote popularity², rather than directly signify it. I argue that two concepts, namely, “people” and “people’s books” were the key elements of a discourse that created a literary category corresponding to what may be referred to as “popular literature” today.

¹ This is not to say that it was no longer used in print language. Although rare, exceptions could be found. An example is Abidin Dino’s article published in *Yeni Edebiyat* in 1940 where he suggested that Turkish art needed an “avampesent” (“popular”) approach to develop (originally published in *Yeni Sanat* 1940, reprinted in İleri 1998: 67-69).

5.1 “People”, Populism and Public Edification³

Any analysis of the concept of “people” for early republican Turkey needs to take into account its political implications. In the present thesis, I will not go deep into the details of the political aspects of the issue and will adopt a socio-cultural and literary perspective, referring to the political uses and delineations of the concept only when it has immediate consequences for the fields of culture and literature.

During the national struggle prior to the establishment of the Republic, populism was present as a significant pillar upon which the idea of the nation-state rose. During this period, populism was identified with political democracy and the term “people” covered the whole population, regardless of sex, age or social class. “Populism” as an idea and an ideal had been under discussion during the last two decades of the Ottoman Empire. It was imported into the Ottoman intellectual agenda by such immigrant intellectuals as Yusuf Akçura and Ahmet Ağaoğlu and was heavily affected by “narodnik”, the Russian populist movement playing a significant role in forming the Turkist and populist element in the conception of the Turkish nation-state (Toprak 1998: 12). The Republican People’s Party adopted populism as one of its six fundamental principles and the social content of this concept was elaborated in clearer terms during the first decade of the Republic. The republican conception of “populism” foresaw a society composed not of social classes, but of individuals belonging to various occupational groups. The main motive behind this conceptualization was the avoidance of class conflict (Toprak 1998: 13). This, in

² Here I am using “popular” in two senses: as “widely admired” and as “prevailing among the general public”.

³ I am using the term “public edification” to translate “halk terbiyesi” as distinct from “education” which I use to refer to formal schooling.

turn, served to strengthen the need for a single party to rule in the newly-formed republic. If there were no social classes, then there would be no need to establish different political parties to reflect their conflicting demands. In a speech he held prior to the proclamation of the Republic on 7 February 1923, Mustafa Kemal offered a definition of populism that largely relied on occupational distinctions rather than social class. He mentioned several occupational clusters, namely farmers, small tradesmen, workers and intellectuals as the main groups constituting the Turkish nation (Toprak 1998: 18). According to Mustafa Kemal, farmers made up the majority of the population, and they mainly consisted of small-scale landowners who needed to be protected by the state. The role attributed to the intellectuals (referred to as “münevverler” [“the enlightened”] and “ulema” [“scholars”] by the speaker) was rather striking. They were expected to mix with the *people*, to show them the right path, to elevate them to progress and civilization [“halkın içine girerek onları irşat etmek, yükseltmek ve onlara terakki ve temeddüne yol göstermektir”] (cited in Toprak 1998: 18-20). This statement is indicative of the general attitude in the early republican period towards intellectuals and their social responsibilities. It also makes it rather evident that the distinction between “people” and the “intellectuals” was a sharp and clear one. “Intellectuals” (generally referred to as “münevverler”) were invariably held separate from the “people” [“halk”]. What is more, a “wide gap” was said to exist between the intellectuals and the “people” (Nurullah Ataç in Güloğul 1937: 48). Furthermore, the category “people” was not monolithic and included two main sub-categories: the rural and the urban population. Although no clear definitions of these two categories existed, a statement written by Sabiha Zekeriya Sertel on the groups to be covered by “publishing for the people” [“halk neşriyatı”] implied that rural people included the peasants [“köylü”] and the urban people

included the urban population with less than 8 years of formal education (report submitted to the Publishing Congress by Sertel, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 403)

In theory, “people” covered all Turkish citizens. For instance in *Halkçılık ve Cumhuriyet ve Türk Halkçılığı ve Cumhuriyeti*, his book on populism and the Turkish Republic, Halil Nimetullah, a professor at the Istanbul University, offered a formal definition and stated that the term “halk” would cover all individuals except children sharing the same culture (Halil Nimetullah 1930: 19). Nevertheless, in the discourse of many statesmen and intellectuals, “halk” came to be used as a category denoting the majority. In various articles and speeches “halk” was identified with a “lesser” population, in need of education and intellectual guidance. For instance, Nusret Kemal (Köymen) known for his work for the advancement of village life in Turkey, was at the forefront of those who identified “populism” with “köycülük” (“peasantism”). For Nusret Kemal, “halk” was the majority, a large group of people representing the great middle class [“büyük orta tabaka”] in a country (Nusret Kemal 1934: 8). He made a deduction based on the urbanization rate in Turkey in the 1930s, excluded and stated that ten million out of seventeen million people living within the borders of Turkey constituted the rural population and that since they were the majority, they represented “halk” (Nusret Kemal 1934: 9).

The need to edify the public and the question of how this edification could be carried out was a major educational and social topic throughout the 1930s and 1940s. The initiative behind the Nation’s Schools, followed by the People’s Houses and the Village Institutes can be considered as part and parcel of this concern. A clear demarcation was retained between the approaches adopted towards the rural and the urban populations. In the various proposals submitted for the edification of the

people, different forms of education were suggested for villages and urban centers. Nusret Kemal offered a comprehensive list of the different educational tools to be used to edify the rural and the urban groups (Nusret Kemal 1934: 21). For the edification of peasants, he proposed the launch of a “peasant’s gazette” [“köylü gazetesi”], traveling movie theatres, traveling libraries, agriculture and health exhibitions, radio, village libraries, fairs, agricultural competitions, excursions, traditional theatre shows like “karagöz” and “meddah” (Nusret Kemal 1934: 33). These methods proposed by Nusret Kemal concentrated on the agricultural, hygienic and cultural improvement of village life. His list of the various tools for the edification of the urban population was much longer and more comprehensive. In this list he included publishing-related issues like re-organizing the publishing structure in the country, centralizing the purchase of paper and equipments for publishing, book competitions, the transliteration of Ottoman books into the new alphabet and the launch of a magazine to announce new books to the readers. The proposal to organize conferences, debate sessions and the setting up of an educational film bureau was also included in this list. The second list appeared to place weight on intellectual activities and helped crystallize Nusret Kemal’s diverging perceptions of the needs of the rural and the urban individual, which also marked the views of the majority of statesmen and intellectuals of the time.⁴

Reading was presented as a significant tool of edification. Writers, journalists and academics lamented the lack of good reading material to address the rural and the urban populations. The First Publishing Congress provided an opportunity for the participants to air their views on this subject. The articles printed in the press on the

⁴ The same view also dominated the Village Institutes project. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the Village Institutes curriculum included technical and agricultural training-related subjects in addition to regular classes. In the meantime, classical secondary schools had a pronounced focus on academic subjects and placed much less weight on practical training.

occasion of the Congress, as well as the reports submitted to the Congress stressed the need to provide suitable reading material for the “people”. The demarcation between the “people” and the “intellectuals” was also evident in these statements. Writers and intellectuals were held as a separate category and the term “halk” was used to cover the uneducated majority in the country. There was agreement on the need to prepare simple and intelligible reading material for this majority. In its report to the Congress, the Committee for Awards, Assistance and Propaganda stated that a prerequisite for making the public read was to offer them books they would love and understand (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 103). In a newspaper interview, Halit, a book-seller in Istanbul, pointed out that books offering information in a language accessible for the “people” had the highest sales figures and added that the “people” refused to buy works that they did not understand [“Halk, birçok eserleri anlamadığı ve anlayamayacağı için almıyor.”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 146). Mr. Halit maintained that “intellectuals” usually preferred to read books in foreign languages while the majority of the readers belonged to the “middle level” [“orta seviye”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 146).

Osman Cemal Kaygılı wrote that peasants could not be expected to read and enjoy Shakespeare, Goethe or Knut Hamsun. He suggested that they should instead be given “useful and fine tales, stories or novels written with a theme and a language that they can understand” [“kendi anlayacağı dil ve mevzu ile iyi, faydalı, güzel masallar, hikâyeler, romanlar”] (originally published in *Yeni Sabah* on 15.4.1939, reprinted in *Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 166). A report submitted to the Congress by Istanbul University suggested that publishing for the “people” and the peasants could include rewrites of some traditional stories like “Leylâ and Mecnun”, “Tahir and Zühre” and “Battal Gazi” with due consideration for the new life style of

Turkey. The report added that the rewrites should be edited by experts who are familiar with the “psychology” of the Turkish people and peasants (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 353). The distinction between the rural population, the urban population and the intellectuals was articulated in clear terms in the Ministry of Agriculture’s report to the Congress. The report claimed that the peasants and the urban population could not fully communicate even when they spoke the same language, a point mainly due to cultural differences and different vocabularies. The Ministry recommended the formation of a “simple Turkish” [“basit Türkçe”] to be used in publications addressing peasants. The report read:

A village vocabulary and a village written language based upon this vocabulary must be formed in order to create a common written language among all the villages in the country so as to assist the urban intellectual in addressing the village ... Illustrations may play a significant role in the success of “Simple Turkish”. The most basic means of communication between a peasant and a city dweller is a picture (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 345).

[Şehirli münevvere köye hitap edebilmesinde yardım etmek ve memleketin bütün köyleri arasında müşterek bir yazı dili vücude getirmek için bir köy lûgatı yapılmak ve bu lûgat üzerinde bir köy yazı dili bina edilmek icap eder ... “Basit Türkçe”nin muvaffakiyetinde resim çok büyük rol oynayabilir. Köylü ile şehirli arasında en müşterek ifade vasıtası resimdir. (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 345).]

In the above statement, one should note the way the Ministry positioned the peasant not only as an uneducated or uncultivated citizen but also as an individual with a completely different set of predispositions than the urbanite. The Ministry was not only concerned with devising ways to edify the rural population, or making them literate. Its aspirations lay at a more fundamental level and involved the creation of a common ground for communication between the peasants and the urbanites, which meant that the rural population would be introduced into a new habitus, i.e. they

would be re-habituated. This entailed a process of “dishabituating” as well, since acquiring new ways of communicating would require a modification in their present cultural habitus.⁵

Intellectuals of the day were aware of a major gap between what I term as the urban and the rural cultural habituses, and their planning project included ways of eliminating this gap, almost always at the cost of the rural habitus. Nevertheless, they planned to approach the rural population in a language and manner familiar to them. So learning the rural “psychology”, i.e. cultural habitus, was considered a prerequisite, and a significant challenge for the intellectuals. For instance, in a comment he made at the Publishing Congress, Nusret Köymen stressed the need to take the “psychological differences” between the rural and urban children into account while offering them books to read. He added: “These two groups of children have indeed different languages and concepts, their situations are different. They should be addressed differently” [“Bu iki çocuk hakikaten ayrı ayrı dil ve mefhumlarda, ayrı ayrı haldedir. Her ikisine ayrı ayrı hitap etmek lâzımdır.”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 88).

In the early republican period, especially in the 1930s and partly in the 1940s, state officials and intellectuals, i.e. groups with a high degree of cultural and symbolic capital, made patronizing statements about what the “people” needed to read and in essence, what they needed to “become” culturally and intellectually. They intended to “dishabituate” the majority of the people. Therefore they set out to shape their worldview, by providing a new repertoire of beliefs and ideas to them.

⁵ I am grateful to Daniel Simeoni who introduced me to the concepts of “habituation” and “dishabituating”. He draws attention to the acquisition of a new habitus as a process, which necessarily involves the abandoning, or at least modification of an old habitus. Simeoni suggests: “To take on a (new) habitus, either smoothly or, in a more imperious sense through (more or less) violent mediations, entails losing or jettisoning old ways of thinking, old beliefs that used to be taken for granted” (personal communication, 23 May 2001).

This was done through several routes including formal education, state involvement in publishing activity and the People's Houses which all served to "habituate" the "people" into a new set of socio-cultural values. Reading was one of the most significant tools that could be used during the process of habituation. As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, writers and academics defined "good" versus "bad" reading material for the "people" and attempted to dictate what and how they would read. I see this attitude as a reflection of the attempts to re-shape the existing cultural habitus among the rural and the urban populations. Indeed, the kind of reading material judged suitable for the "people" consisted of books that conveyed the republican ideology. As mentioned in Chapter 4, popular folk tales were criticized for instilling wrong ideas in people, mainly due to the fact that they borrowed their themes from religious legends and relied on widespread superstitions. Throughout the 1930s some "improved" copies of folk tales were published (Güloğul 1937: 4). The improvements consisted of omitting religious and superstitious elements. A note was added in the preface or epilogue of books that retained those elements, which read: "Bu gibi kitapları inanmak için değil, ancak hoş vakit geçirmek için okumalısınız. Çünkü bunların hiç birisi tarihe ve hakikate dayanmaz" ["Read these books not to believe them but for entertainment, because none of these are based on history or reality"] (Muharrem Zeki in Güloğul 1937: 5). I suggest that these improvements were the result of two major trends in Turkish culture: the canonization of realism in literature and the need to diffuse the republican principles to the people. The former trend required a revision and elimination of non-realistic elements in these stories, while the latter trend called for an adherence to the principle of secularism. Both of these trends constituted parts of the dishabituation

process for the “people”, as they required the disposal of an older system of beliefs, mainly governed by Islam.

The state probably realized the difficulty of changing a society’s cultural dispositions overnight. Therefore it needed to devise instruments that would enable it to transform the “people’s” convictions and life style smoothly. As mentioned in Chapters 2 and 3, literature was regarded as a tool that could assist the state to instill the republican principles in the society. As folk literature was the most prevalent and popular type of literature read in the countryside, the state decided to make use of folk literature as an instrument of edification. This becomes evident a campaign that was launched in 1937 to produce rewrites of traditional folk tales. These rewrites would be prepared in line with the principles of the republican regime. The Directorate General sent a circular to known literary personalities to announce the campaign, in which it was stated that the “people” liked the protagonists of folk tales and that these characters would be retained in the rewrites. The change would take place in the plots which would have to agree with the spirit of the regime and carry a higher meaning. Popular characters would appear within new themes and live on in adventures which would propagate the aims of the Turkish revolution and civilization (Güloğul 1937: 56-57).

In the same circular, the Directorate General of Press also indicated that the number of novels and stories published so far for the “people” exceeded the number of novels and stories of those published for the “intellectuals”(in Güloğul 1937: 56-57). This once more proves that there were indeed various categories of readers, and therefore various types of reading material governed by different poetics in the Turkish literary polysystem in the 1930s. I suggest that this segmentation continued throughout the period under study. The products of the Translation Bureau in the

1940s and 1950s addressed a certain group of readers while a major part of the readership was catered for by private publishers operating in the field of large-scale production, i.e. non-canonical, or popular literature.

Indeed, canonical literature, both translated and domestic, remained within the field of restricted production. Some Turkish writers who wrote canonical fiction were concerned for the limited circulation and reception of their works. For instance in an article he wrote for *Ufuklar*, Samim Kocagöz admitted that he wrote for the people, expressed the troubles and joys of the people, yet his readership belonged to the “intellectual” and educated groups. He complained that he was not accessible to his real target audience (Kocagöz 1953: 360). There were different formulas proposed by various intellectuals and writers. Vildan Aksu suggested that writers could only reach the majority when they became as popular as singers (Aksu in Kocagöz 1953: 360). Some suggested that the secret of reaching the people with one’s work lay in using a language that peasants could understand and themes that were closer to the heart of the rural population (Yücel 1935: 225-226). Nevertheless, this was not only a question of creating themes that people could identify themselves with. Ali Rıza wrote in *Yeni Edebiyat* that writers had to combine social themes with a good form and artistic technique in order to create long-lived and populist works (originally published in *Yeni Edebiyat* in 1940, reprinted in İleri 1998: 63,77). Yaşar Nabi Nayır pointed out that one could also address the general public without having to sacrifice the artistic value of one’s work. He maintained that there was nothing wrong with writing books that “people” could love and understand, and criticized writers who wrote in a language and style that was not accessible for “people” (originally published in *Varlık* in 1954, reprinted in Nayır 1971: 70-72).

As these debates continued, the “people”, i.e. the rural population and the urbanites with little education continued to read. Although it is difficult to offer an exact list of the books that they received, purchased or read, the wide availability of non-canonical fiction in the market, and the popularity of various authors, titles and series, as proven by repeated re-editions, give an idea of the repertoire they were offered. The readers helped this repertoire to be maintained and reproduced through the interest and demand they showed for these works. These books were covered by a broad category, namely “people’s books” [“halk kitapları”] in the discourse on literature and reading. This concept is crucial in any exploration of the field of translated popular literature in Turkey in 1923-1960.

5.2 People’s Books

The term “people’s books” was widely used in the discourse about literature and reading in Turkey in the 1930s and 1940s. As in the case of the “people”, the concept “people’s books” showed some variations in different instances of discourse. There were cases where it was used synonymous with folk literature. However, there were also cases where it was used to refer to what has come to be termed as “popular literature” by modern literary criticism, and covered not only folk literature but also indigenous stories treating themes such as patriotism, romance, crime and adventure and translated detective and adventure fiction. In the rest of this section I will explore these two approaches in some detail.

5.2.1 People's Books as Folklore

In the 1930s, eminent Turkish folklorist Pertev Naili Boratav limited his definition of “people’s books” to traditional forms of Turkish literature, yet he also held it as a separate category within the larger heading of “folk literature”. Under “people’s books”, Boratav placed tales, poetry, stories, hymns, prayer books, dream interpretations, fortune telling books, folk tunes and song books and similar material that were widely read by the public and therefore had numerous re-editions by different publishers. He also suggested that such books were often subject to changes and revisions, since publishers showed a concern for adapting the books to the circumstances of the day (Boratav 1939: 210). Boratav’s reference to two significant characteristics of these books needs to be mentioned at this point. First of all, the popular appeal of the books was an important defining feature. Secondly, the ease with which publishers revised these books changing their style and plots showed that authorial provenance was not a major issue. Most of the indigenous⁶ “people’s books” were anonymous. They derived from the oral story-telling tradition and were rewritten many times by various poets and writers since the 19th century (Özön 1985: 72). Writers who continued to prepare re-editions of these books credited them to their names and did not even attempt to justify this appropriation. The official bibliography of Turkey, *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*, placed their names as the authors of these stories. In the 1930s, some authors wrote indigenous stories under the heading “folk tale” (*Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1928-38: 577-600; 1939-1948: 1307-1326*). These authors used patriotism, heroism and the newly emerging Turkish identity as

⁶ It is debatable whether the “people’s books” were ever fully indigenous. The origins of many traditional narratives can be traced back to different eastern cultures.

their themes.⁷ However, these never became as popular as the older anonymous stories (Boratav 1988: 162).

Faruk Rıza Güloğul, in his book on “people’s books” defined these works in a manner that very much identified them with folk literature. Among them he mentioned religious books, religion inspired battle stories, romances, folk poetry, national battle stories as well as recent imitations of these (Güloğul 1937: 3). Güloğul’s book offers interesting information about the state’s and the intellectuals’ view of the “people’s books” in the 1930s. As mentioned above, Güloğul quoted the official announcement by the government extending a call for writers to rewrite folk tales (Güloğul 1937: 56-57). He also provided excerpts from articles written on the topic by a number of writers. The statements cited by Güloğul illustrate that there was a series of diverging opinions on the issue of the people’s books. Out of seven writers who expressed their views on the re-editions of folk tales, the majority adopted a demeaning attitude towards “people’s books”. This attitude should not surprise one as it was rather widespread and *the* legitimate way of looking at these books. Boratav, Turkey’s most celebrated folklorist, also made a distinction between “folk literature” and “high literature”, inadvertently implying that folk literature was a “lesser” or “lower” literary form (Boratav 1939: 46).

⁷ Some of these works were *Yanık Ömer ile Güzel Zeynep* by Selâmi Münir Yurdatap (Istanbul: Yusuf Ziya, 1937), *Ateş Olup Sardılar* by Muharrem Zeki Korgunal (Istanbul: Emniyet, 1936), *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* by Selâmi Münir Yurdatap (Istanbul: Yusuf Ziya Balçık, 1937), *Yeni Türk Kahramanları* by Bahattin Tevfik (Istanbul: İkbâl, 1932). For summaries and short commentaries on these books see Güloğul 1937, pp. 32-40.

5.2.2 Rewriting People's Books

The rewriting of “people’s books” appeared as a topic for critical literary debate in the 1930s. As mentioned above, the Istanbul University made a proposal to the First Publishing Congress for the rewriting of some of the popular folk tales. Two years prior to that, in 1937, the Directorate General of Press, under the Ministry of the Interior, had issued a circular where it announced the launch of a campaign for rewriting folk tales. This campaign evidently had ideological and propagandistic aims. This was first of all implied by the fact that the campaign was launched by the Ministry of the Interior. Secondly, the Ministry openly stated that the rewrites would convey ideas that would reinforce the principles of “the new Turkish revolution and civilization” to the people (quoted in Ozansoy in Güloğul 1937: 57). Some writers heatedly approved this idea, while some appeared more skeptical. In the meantime, rewrites of a great number of folk tales were available in the market, and some writers had already done modifications that would reflect the ideological orientation of the republican regime. Muharrem Zeki Korgunal who had authored numerous rewrites in the 1930s (*Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1928-1938*: 577-600) told Güloğul that he made changes in the books he wrote by purging them of “false notions and superstitions” [“hırafe ve batil itikat”] (Güloğul 1937: 44). In one of his rewrites, *Yedi Yol Cengi* (1932), Korgunal had a preface where he wrote about the importance of using pure Turkish. Furthermore, he rewrote the dialogues of the Arab characters and made them praise the Turkish nation on every occasion (Güloğul 1937: 15-16).

The writers quoted by Güloğul, except Nurullah Ataç and Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, considered the “people’s books” to be of poorer quality in terms of content and style. They all agreed on the wide availability and popularity of these books, yet

some of them regarded these books as works that had become outdated and foresaw a need to replace them with more modern stories. For instance B rhan Cahit, who was a prolific writer at the time, referred to folk tales and fairy tales as “trivial adventures that have become sagas and tales through the thirst for adventure and excitement in the people’s spirit” [“halk ruhunun susadığı macera ve heyecan ihtiyacı ile birer destan ve masal haline gelmiş k çük maceralar”] (B rhan Cahit in G loğul 1937: 43). He suggested that such stories could be used as instruments in the hands of “intellectuals” for cultivating reading habits in the people, and that they could later be replaced by new sagas whose themes could be based on the “great events of the Turkish revolution” [“b y k inkıl p vak’aları”] (B rhan Cahit in G loğul 1937: 43). Behçet Kemal  ağlar saw a great opportunity for writers in the proposal to rewrite “people’s books”. In his view, the rewrites could be used “to shed popular heroes of their Oriental idleness and to introduce them to the atmosphere of the present day” [“halk kahramanlarını miskin Őark havasından sıyırıp bug n n atmosferine getirmek”] ( ağlar in G loğul 1937: 63).  ağlar also suggested that the rewrites would serve to familiarize the readership with new ideas and wrote that the “best medicine for a child should come in the form of a sweet candy” ( ağlar in G loğul 1937: 62).

Some writers were skeptical about the possibility of producing the rewrites in the desired quality. İsmail Hakkı Baltacıođlu stated that he saw no need to rewrite people’s books, since the heroes of these books had become outmoded and that the people needed new heroes who could take part in more contemporary stories (Baltacıođlu in G loğul 1937: 52). Halit Fahri Ozansoy expressed his admiration for the intention to rewrite folk tales but was skeptical about the extent to which such rewriting could be possible. He claimed that most of the “people’s books”, such as

traditional romances like *Leylâ ile Mecnun* could not be adapted to the present day's circumstances because they were the embodiments of mystical symbols (Ozansoy in Güloğul 1937: 57-59). Nurullah Ataç mentioned the difficulty of writing "people's books". He pointed out that the style of these stories were different from urban narratives and that adopting the folkloric style would demand great effort (Ataç in Güloğul 1937: 49-50). The most oppositional writer in terms of the production of rewrites was Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın who suggested that improvement in people's literary taste could only be possible through free competition, not by a government intervention. He also pointed out that the government's proposal had a propagandistic nature, whereas art and literature needed to be independent of propaganda (Yalçın in Güloğul 1937: 54-55).

There is little information available about the success or failure of this campaign. Alpay Kabacalı writes that the Directorate General of Press published only a few rewrites after it launched the rewriting campaign and that these were not popular among the readers (Kabacalı 1994: 89).⁸ Nevertheless, there were a great number of rewrites published during this period, and more of them might have been inspired, or downright triggered by the calls by the state. Whether these rewrites had the kinds of plots, protagonists and styles demanded by the state can only be revealed after a detailed analysis of these books, which is clearly the subject of another study.

A crucial defining feature of the "people's books", except more modern stories written in the style of older forms such as Selâmi Münir Yurdatap's *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* (1937), and *Sürmelibey* (1935) and *Ateş Olup Sardılar* (1936) by Muharrem Zeki Korgunal, was their anonymous provenance. This was the main reason behind the numerous re-editions and why each writer who prepared a re-

⁸ These books included *Keloğlan Çanakkale Muharebelerinde* by Fahri Celal Göktulga (1939) and *Arzu ile Kanber* by Bekir Sıtkı Kunt (1940) (Kabacalı 1994: 89).

edition felt free to sign the book in his name. This had become an established literary convention since the 19th century, when most of these folk tales started to be printed and entered mass distribution (Özön 1985: 73).⁹

I would like to argue that the relaxed attitude towards the issue of “authorial originality”¹⁰ was the sign of a certain literary habitus which was strong and widespread among especially the rural readership. This habitus did not comply with the desired poetics of the early republican system of literature which placed authorial originality in the foreground. This was a fact that was closely interrelated with the socio-cultural background of the country. The republican literary “institution” attempted to create a modernist aesthetics that was mainly imported from the West where a different cultural and philosophical context existed. The relatively late introduction of the printing press in the Ottoman Empire meant that the mass distribution of books, and therefore of literature, came at a later stage than the West. The book that played a key role in the formation of the national identities in the West (Anderson 1991) started affecting the lay population in the Turkish system of culture only in the 19th century. This belated encounter with the printed book also delayed the creation of an awareness of the literary text as a unitary structure. A rural society

⁹ Folk tales were read in manuscript form in the Ottoman Empire as early as in the 18th century. There is evidence indicating that they were read out in public places like coffee houses. It is also known that these books were sometimes rented out, for they were expensive and therefore only the lucky few could afford them (Özön 1985: 73). The expansion in the availability of these books took place after 1835, following the establishment of the first lithograph press in the Ottoman Empire in 1831. The first printed folk tales were published in the 1840s and became immensely popular. Only a few of these books were attributed to a specific author and even those with a known author had the style of anonymous stories (Özön 1985: 72). Most of these books had their roots in the oral story-telling tradition. The first publishers recorded some of the known stories, bought manuscripts or commissioned authors to rewrite oral stories they discovered (Boratav 1988: 160). The early Turkish novels were influenced by the language and style of these folk tales (Boratav 1939: 139).

¹⁰ John Milton terms what I call “authorial originality”, “sacredness”. He suggests that “commercial production ultimately undermines the so-called sacredness of the author” resulting in a “loss of sacredness” (Milton 2001: 58). My argument challenges this view. In my view, the relative indifference towards authorial originality in the field of popular literature did not consist of a “loss of sacredness” due to commercialization, but was rather due to the persistence of a literary habitus among the people which derived much of its source from folk literature and the concept of anonymity.

that traditionally received literature through oral stories, either told, or read out in public, might have a difficult time imagining the literary text as a fixed and permanent entity with a “known” producer. Yet, the western literary polysystem was governed by the opposite perception since the Renaissance. As Jerry Palmer puts it:

In the analysis of canonical literature, the text and the author are both absolutely central and taken for granted: it is ‘obvious’ that texts exist and that they are produced by authors, even if there are occasional difficulties of attribution ... In Post-Renaissance literature, the text is regarded as a self-contained entity which has a meaning contained within it, co-extensive with it. This meaning is the result of the activity of the author (influenced, of course, by his or her culture). Understanding the text consists of unveiling this meaning. The fact that there is an author is a guarantee of the unitary nature of the text (Palmer 1991: 5-6).

This western perception of the text prevailed in the field of canonical literature in Turkey. This was the part of the literary polysystem governed by the notion of authorial originality which was especially evident in the discourse on translation as illustrated in Chapter 3. I suggest that the idea of authorial originality remained largely confined to the field of canonical literature in early republican Turkey. I maintain that during this period popular literature continued to be affected by the poetics maintained by a literary habitus that inherited its literary reception patterns from a pre-literate past where the existence of texts and authors was not so “obvious”.¹¹

The numerous rewrites widely produced and read by the public challenge a number of concepts that we simply take for granted today. One of these is the concept of the “author”. The producers of rewrites signed the books in their names

¹¹ Anonymity also prevails in a number of products of popular culture in our day. Films, magazines, internet sites are examples of cultural products that are produced and maintained by a number of people who are not always credited and remain anonymous. Nevertheless, this kind of anonymity is closer to the idea of co-production. The kind of anonymity that I am referring to in this thesis is composed of cases where the source of a text is truly unknown.

and did not appear to question whether they were entitled to do it. To what extent can we call the writers who prepared re-editions of the folk tales “authors”? How do we define an “author” when the crucial concept of “originality” disappears? Furthermore, if the act of rewriting those folk tales cannot be considered as “indigenous” or “original” production, then what is it? Is it merely an act of “editing” (in which case we need to start questioning the concept of editing)? Or can we associate rewriting with translation in the wider sense of the concept as André Lefevere (1992: vii) has done? I would like to argue that regarding the rewrites of folk tales as products of a process of translation may enable us to adopt a fresh perspective towards these works and their reception as culture-governed phenomena.

The folk tales, being anonymous works, were based on a source text (or several source texts in many cases) that derived from oral (and therefore unfixed) texts. The rewriters must have prepared their versions with a number of concerns in mind. In some cases, they intended to “improve” the stories, in some cases, they intended to “adapt” the story to the present day’s circumstances. Still in some other cases, they struggled with issues of format and had to show a concern for the illustrations to be used, as well as the balance between prose and poetry. All of these concerns led them to produce considerably different target texts, where length, style and sometimes even the plot were extensively manipulated. These varying processes of rewriting can offer invaluable clues into the socio-cultural factors which affected the production and reception of fiction, much akin to the way the study of translation offers data about the socio-cultural context within which translations are produced. Furthermore, the abundance of rewrites of the same stories (traditional and popular tales such as *Kerem ile Aslı*, *Arzu ile Kanber*, *Kan Kalesi*, *Battal Gazi* were rewritten and published by different writers and publishers many times during the period under

study) provides unusually rich material for study (see various volumes of *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* covering the years 1928-1960). In Turkey, only during the first four decades of the Republic, a series of folk tales were rewritten a surprisingly high number of times, providing unique material into a study of the cultural dynamics that shape the rewriting of such stories.¹²

Rewriting activity was not limited to the field of folk narratives. It was present as a literary form and a marketing strategy in the field of popular literature in general. In the field of adventure and detective fiction it appeared mainly in the form of pseudotranslations, indigenous stories with imported characters and abridgements.

In the following section I will set out to explore the “people’s books” written for the urban population. I will argue that the poetics which governed the production and reception of folk tales also had an impact on some writers and translators who catered for an urban readership. A number of writer-translators carried the poetics of folk literature into the field of indigenous and translated popular literature, creating a body of works that conflicted with the dominant poetics fostered by the republican literary “institution”. These writers and translators undermined the crucial concepts of “realism” and authorial “originality” which were upheld in the field of canonical literature and created and maintained an alternative repertoire of fiction.

¹² According to the records in the National Library of Turkey database, *Kerem ile Aslı* was published seven times in 1928-1960. Four of the editions were signed by different names while three of them appeared as anonymous stories. *Arzu ile Kanber* was rewritten by three different writers and published three times in 1928- 1940. *Battal Gazi* was published in four different editions by four different writers. (This number excludes the sequels of the story relating adventures of Battal Gazi’s son and grandson.) *Kan Kalesi* was published four times. Two of the re-editions were anonymous, while the other two were attributed to two different writers. These numbers include first-time editions only. Nearly all editions of these stories were published several times. Moreover, it is likely that the number of rewrites for these stories are higher, since the National Library archives are known to be incomplete.

5.2.3 “People’s Books” and Other Popular Fiction for Urbanites

As mentioned in the above sections, the term “people’s books” was not a sharply defined category. It referred to various types of works, covering both folkloric books and recent productions with known authors. Furthermore, the category “people’s books” also included a series of translated books. It can be safely assumed that the different types of “people’s books” addressed different groups of readership.

The segmentation of the readership did not only take place between the “intellectuals” and the “people”. As indicated earlier in this chapter, the category “people” also contained two separate segments of readers: peasants and urbanites. The reading material directed at the rural population was the folkloric “people’s books” mentioned above. These books were different from canonical Turkish fiction, not only in terms of their production strategies but also in terms of their marketing and sales strategies. The folkloric “people’s books” were usually sold by traveling salesmen who bought them from the publishers in Istanbul and sold them in smaller towns and villages along with other items such as perfumes and pictures (Güloğul 1939: 7).

The urban readership read different types of books. Faruk Rıza Güloğul developed a separate category for the books read by city dwellers he termed “urbanite’s books” [“şehirli kitapları”]. According to him, these were books written for the urban readership which remained in the urban market and did not reach the rural areas (Güloğul 1939: 40). He did not specify what he exactly meant by the term “urbanite’s books”, however a study of the lists offered by different volumes of *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* enables one to form an impression of what those books were.

Türkiye Bibliyografyası for 1928-1938 covered Turkish and translated literature under several headings like “poetry”, “novel and short story”, “children’s literature” and “folk literature” [“halk edebiyatı”]. The category that the present thesis is concerned with, i.e. novels and short stories, covered a selection of canonical and non-canonical fiction. In the section on Turkish literature books by established canonical writers such as Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Halide Edip Adıvar and Reşat Nuri Güntekin were listed along with a number of books that were characterized by a number of aspects which distinguished them from canonical fiction. Some of these books carried titles which associated them with certain genres generally classified as non-canonical. Some of them featured well-known heroes of adventure and detective fiction. Furthermore, these books were rather short and some of them came in the series format. There were booklets of around 16 pages which were periodically published by a number of publishing houses. The format of these booklets allowed them to be marketed along with other periodical publications. Most of them were published on a weekly or monthly basis and were on sale in the newspaper stands as well as bookshops.¹³

It should be noted, however, that not all non-canonical fiction in the list displayed the same features. I would like to argue that there were degrees of canonicity and that the division I use between canonical and non-canonical works should not be considered as absolute and decisive. In early republican Turkey there was a body of works which could be considered “best-sellers” of the day, but not

¹³ An advertisement published on the back cover of one of Server Bedi’s 16-page stories provides an example to this. *Gece Tuzağı* (The Night Trap) published in the series “Şerlok Holmes’e Karşı Cingöz Recai” (“Cingöz Recai versus Sherlock Holmes”) by Sabri Özakar publishing company in 1953 featured an announcement on its back cover where the readers were informed that the books published by the company were available in all newspaper stands in Anatolia. Likewise, advertisements published in an *Arsène Lupin* series consisting of pseudotranslations written by Remzi Dâniş Korok (published by Vakit in 1945) and a serialized translation of *The Beasts of Tarzan* (*Tarzanın Canavarları*) by Ali Rıza Seyfi (published by Sinan Basımevi in 1935) indicated that they were published and marketed on a weekly basis, a strategy employed by periodicals.

necessarily as “people’s books”. These also constituted a part of the system of popular literature, yet their poetics also differed from those of “people’s books” which were mainly marked by their short length, simplicity of language, style and plots. The “best-sellers” could be positioned on a continuum between canonical and non-canonical works.

Vâla Nureddin’s novels can be shown as an example to such works. Vâla Nureddin treated crime-related topics in a number of novels throughout the 1930s. These works were written in the style of western detective novels, however, they were rather long (all from 70 to 370 pages) and therefore their style and plots were much more complex when compared to the shorter and serialized adventure fiction. Aka Gündüz was another writer that produced popular novels, fourteen of them between 1928-1938, treating a number of topical themes, ranging from the national struggle to romantic love. Melodramatic fiction by such writers as Muazzez Tahsin Berkand and Kerime Nadir mentioned in Chapter 4 is another example to this body of popular and less canonical novels which I have called semi-canonical for the lack of a better term. I argue that these popular novels distinguished themselves from simpler and shorter popular fiction. First of all, they defied generic categories and blended several genres, such as crime, romance and melodrama within their pages. Furthermore, their paratextual features such as their typeset, covers and illustrations (if any) distinguished them from “people’s books” which were usually printed using larger fonts and with illustrations. These were features that were often encountered in children’s literature as well, indicating that the “people’s books” were directed towards audiences that were still in the process of acquiring their reading skills. These audiences were the rural and urban readers with little formal education, as explained in the above sections. These sectors of the society which constituted a

considerably large group of readers were the main market for the “people’s books”. It can be speculated that these groups, which had learned to read and write through the Nation’s Schools, or at the adult education courses at the People’s Houses, were not equipped with enough cultural capital to embark on long and complicated reading projects. Another group targeted by the “people’s books” was inevitably the younger population in primary and secondary education. For these groups, these works might have constituted a steppingstone towards more sophisticated reading material. Regrettably, my argument on the segmentation of the readership faces the risk of remaining speculative. Although discourse on literature and reading offers clues about a segmentation of the readership, and the presence of value-judgments discriminating between “good” (canonical) versus “bad” (popular), or “useful” versus “harmful” reading material, there is not enough material to conclude which sections of the society read exactly what. Nevertheless, the situation of the market, as represented by the pervasiveness of both “people’s books” and other popular literature and their numerous re-editions, indicate that these works were indeed in high demand.

The list offered by *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* for 1928-1938 clustered canonical and non-canonical fiction under the same heading: “novels and short stories”. In the meantime, “people’s books” for the rural population were listed under “folk literature”. What I term ““people’s books’ for urbanites” belonged to a few main genres, namely battle stories from the War of Liberation, detective and adventure fiction, erotica and romance. These works can be identified through their titles, writers, characters, length, and marketing strategy, which usually meant that they were produced in the series format. To give an impression about how titles offer clues about the generic categories, let me offer some examples: *Türkiye*

Bibliyografyası listed a series by Behçet Rıza, “Pire Necmi’nin Maceraları” (The Adventures of Necmi the Flea) which ran for about eight issues. These books were all published under the same title, with subtitles such as “Görülmemiş Bir Cinayet” (A Unique Murder), “Haydut Milyoner” (The Bandit Millionaire) and “Kanlı Bıçak” (The Blood-stained Knife). All books were sixteen pages long. The title of the series suggests that it belongs to the detective/adventure genre. The use of the name “Pire Necmi” in the title suggests that it aimed to capture the readership by the help of this well-known Turkish burglar-hero.¹⁴ *Çanakkale’de İntepe Topçuları* (The Intepe Artillery Troops at Dardanelles) and *Çanakkalede Kumkale Muharebesi* (The Battle of Kumkale at Dardanelles) were two books, respectively 23 and 48 pages, by a writer named Fuat. These two books clearly belonged to the war story genre. *Bir Çapkının Hatıratı* (The Memoirs of a Lecherous Man) and *Kadınlar Hamamında* (At the Women’s Bath) by Selâmi Münir or *Üç Ay Yatakta* (Three Months in Bed) by M. Turhan can easily be associated with erotica.

In the same list, the names Peyami Safa and Server Bedi appeared with a number of books. The presence of these two names is indicative of the co-existence of canonical and non-canonical books in the same list. Peyami Safa, a well-known and respected writer of canonical fiction, used the pen name Server Bedi for his non-canonical novels and stories. In the 1928-1938 list, Server Bedi appeared with three popular series, featuring two famous characters: Arsène Lupin and Cingöz Recai. “Arsen Lüpen İstanbulda” (Arsène Lupin in Istanbul) had the world-famous gentleman-burglar as its hero. The series which ran for 15 issues, each of 16 pages, was classified under Turkish literature and was credited to a Turkish writer, although

¹⁴ Some of the books in this series were published in 1928 in the Ottoman script. Although several of the titles are the same, the two series are credited to different writers. The first series was by C. Cahit and M. Rakım (see Üyepazarıcı 1997: 218) and the second one was by Behçet Rıza.

it carried the name of Arsène Lupin in its title. Server Bedi's other popular character, Cingöz Recai, appeared in two separate series, "Cingöz Recainin Maceraları" (The Adventures of Cingöz Recai) and "Cingözün Esrarı" (Cingöz's Mystery). The mention of the main characters in the title made it possible to classify these works under the crime/adventure genre. The Arsène Lupin series deserves a closer look in terms of the way it imported a character created by Maurice Leblanc, a well-known French writer, into an indigenous story. Arsène Lupin was a well-known and popular character among some sections of the readership and the use of his name in the title made it likely that the book would be received as a translation. The fact that the book was credited to Server Bedi did not require an explanation or justification, which indicates that the borders between translation and original were rather blurred unlike the field of canonical fiction.

Somewhere after 1938, a breaking point occurred in the field of popular literature, and "people's books" became an official category laid out by *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*. This classificatory strategy was only used for the decade between 1938-1948. The bibliographies published after 1948 returned to the "folk literature" classification and listed popular literature along with canonical novels and short stories.

In the 1928-1938 bibliography, the term "people's books" was not used, and non-folkloric "people's books" were listed along with canonical literature and popular novels. In the 1939-1948 bibliography, the term "people's books" covered both folk literature and shorter detective and adventure fiction. During this period, the term "people's books" was also used by publishers which launched series under the title "people's books" or "people's novels".¹⁵ Some of these series published folk

¹⁵ Some of these publishers included Ebüzziya, Ülkü, Ak-ün, Alaëddin Kırıl, Maarif, Emniyet, Ar, Güven and Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu (Society for the Protection of Children).

literature, while some focused on non-canonical fiction. The bibliography seems to have used specific criteria while classifying certain works as “people’s books”. Works of folk literature were invariably placed under “people’s books”. Shorter detective stories appearing in a generic series format, like books published in “Semih Lûtfinin Polis Romanları Serisi” (Semih Lûtfi’s Series of Police Novels) were also classified as people’s books. Furthermore, some titles with erotic overtones such as Selâmi Münir Yurdatap’s *Şehvet Geceleri* (Nights of Passion) and Sermed Muhtar Alus’ *Eski Çapkın Anlatıyor* (A Lecherous Man Speaks) were placed under this category. Stories of adventure and espionage, several series by Güven Publishing House carrying the words “curious” [“meraklı”] or “exciting” [“heyecanlı”] in their titles were considered as “people’s books”. In the meantime, longer popular novels, representing mainly melodrama, romance, adventure, and also erotica, were placed under the title “Novels and Short Stories” along with canonical fiction. The classification was done in a somewhat arbitrary manner and it is difficult to identify the reasons behind the classification of each item as a “people’s book”. Nevertheless, shorter works, serialized adventure and detective stories were invariably classified as “people’s books”.

Some translated books were also referred to as “people’s books”. While canonical literature, i.e. translations of western classics or contemporary canonical fiction were placed under the category of “novels and short stories”, detective and adventure fiction, especially in their serialized and shorter form, were classified as “people’s books”. Novels by such writers as Agatha Christie and Arthur Conan Doyle, who are considered to be “canonical” writers of the detective genre in our day, were included among the “people’s books”. On the other hand, translations of books by popular writers such as Daphne Du Maurier who wrote romantic fiction,

appeared on the list of canonical fiction. The list for 1939-1948 reveals that numerous publishing houses launched series of detective fiction in the 1940s. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the titles of these series usually included generic connotations and aimed to capture the readership based on the genre or the popular protagonists of the stories.

The term “people’s books” seems to have lost its topicality in the 1950s. *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* no longer used the classification and went back to classifying folk and popular fiction either under “novels and short stories” or “folk literature”. Nevertheless, the production of short and long popular narratives continued throughout the 1950s. The 1950s was the decade of the pocket book. “People’s books” for the rural and the urban population continued to be published in series featuring short stories. Nevertheless, both Turkish and translated popular fiction showed a tendency towards the pocket book format, which meant that most of the stories became longer, and the plots more complicated.

Although the terminology seems to have disappeared from the literary agenda in the 1950s, the poetics of the “people’s books” which constantly blurred the demarcation between “indigenous writing” and “rewriting/re-edition” or “translation” mainly due to its lack of focus on the question of “authorial originality” continued to have an impact in the field of translated popular literature. I suggest that the field of translated popular literature was largely affected by the poetics of folk literature in the early republican period, mainly due to the literary habitus fostered by the readership for popular literature which resisted a view of a literary text as a unitary and fixed structure.

5.3 The Poetics of Translated Popular Literature

As illustrated in Chapter 4, the field of translated popular literature was rather rich and dynamic in 1923-1960. The poetics created around the Translation Bureau foresaw close adherence to the source text as an “original” that should be manipulated as little as possible.¹⁶ As mentioned in Chapter 3, in the books commissioned by the Translation Bureau, the original titles of the translated works often accompanied the translated title, while the author’s name always appeared more visible than the translator’s. In the meantime, the field of popular literature was governed by the opposite strategy. Throughout the 1930s-1950s, one could encounter a range of different attitudes towards the source text, source author and the translator. There were cases where both the translator and the author of the work were credited.¹⁷ On the other hand, it was also common practice to leave out names of the original authors of the works, although the works could be credited to a translator.¹⁸ In some cases there were no translator’s or author’s names on the covers of popular translated fiction and the text’s status as a translation or an indigenous work was not specified.¹⁹ In certain cases the writer of the work could be specified on the cover, while the translator would remain invisible.²⁰ The lack of a consistent approach towards the source text and the source author indicated that the publishers, writers, translators, and above all, readers, were indifferent to who wrote or translated the books, or to whether the books were indigenous or translation. Readers were first and foremost drawn to the generic features of translated popular fiction as discussed in

¹⁶ Nevertheless, it will be remembered that fluency was also a major issue.

¹⁷ See *Arsen Lüpen Kaplan Dişleri* by Maurice Leblanc, translated by Pertev Şevket. Kütüphane-i Sudi (1928).

¹⁸ See *Tarzanın Canavarları*, writer unidentified, translated by Ali Rıza Seyfi, Sinan Basımevi (1935).

¹⁹ See *Şarlok Holmes Arsen Lüpen Karşı Karşıya*, writer and translator unidentified, İnkılâp Kitabevi (1940).

Chapter 4. Furthermore, even though bibliographies classified these works under foreign fiction, in many cases the books did not bear any statements suggesting that they were translations. The attribute “nâkil” was often used instead of “translator” in translated popular fiction especially until the 1950s.

In the 1950s the translation and publishing strategies in the field of translated popular literature changed considerably. The unprecedented success of Mike Hammer translations changed the production patterns and a number of publishing houses started to publish their translations in the pocket book format. During this decade, the massive wave of Mike Hammer pseudotranslations published by several companies indicated that the undifferentiated attitude towards original and translation continued. However, the way these pseudotranslations positioned themselves was different from the way translated popular literature was positioned in the previous decades. The Mike Hammer pseudotranslations of the 1950s, except four written by Kemal Tahir, credited the writer as Mickey Spillane and the pseudotranslator as “çeviren” (“translator”). Some of these books even claimed to be “full and unabridged” translations.²¹ I suggest that this is a reflection of the dynamics in the field of canonical literature on the field of popular literature. I also regard this attitude as the symptom of a change in the reception patterns of the readers who became more experienced readers and started acquiring a different kind of cultural and literary habitus as a result of the republican planning project. The increasing rate of urbanization and close contact with American culture which rapidly started to replace the French culture, which had been the dominant source of foreign cultural influence until the 1950s, also meant that the new generation of readers developed a

²⁰ See *Kanun Dışı* by Wade Miller, translator unidentified, Ekicigil Yayınları (1955).

²¹ See *Ölüm Çemberi*, writer indicated as Mickey Spillane, translated by Ümit Deniz, Ekicigil Yayınları (1954). This book is a Mike Hammer pseudotranslation and Ümit Deniz is its writer, not its translator.

taste for urban themes with a dash of action. Furthermore, as represented by the Mike Hammer novels, the hard-boiled genre with its strong language, naturalistic depictions and violence content was a compromise between the by-then canonized realism of canonical fiction and popular literature, which had thus far been characterized by escapist and fantasy-related features. Nevertheless, the defining characteristic of the older “people’s books”, i.e. the tendency towards undermining a literary text’s provenance and unitary structure, still dominated translated popular literature in the 1950s, a fact proven by the ease with which hundreds of pseudotranslations using the same popular character were produced within the course of a decade.

Apart from the crucial concept of anonymity which derived from the rural literary habitus, there was another defining factor that shaped the poetics of the field of translated and indigenous popular literature in early republican Turkey: the links among the texts located within the same system. The production and reception of each novel or tale was largely shaped by the expectations of the readers which were based on their previous exposure to literature and their familiarity with specific types of texts. In other words, each text stood in a certain relationship to its cultural and literary context. The concept of “metonymy” may explain the relationship between a literary text and other texts preceding or succeeding it in clearer terms. Metonymy is “a figure of speech in which an attribute or an aspect of an entity substitutes for the entity or in which a part substitutes for the whole” (Tymoczko 1999: 42). As a metonymy, a text may come to stand for a whole literary system. The readers, or the audience in the case of an oral tradition, establish links between the individual stories they receive and other literary forms which the stories derive from, or have led to through the metonymic aspect of language and culture. According to Tymoczko,

metonymy in literary rewritings and retellings is a significant instrument of continuity and change (1999: 46).

The poetics of Turkish rewrites of folk tales can also be analyzed from a perspective that explores their metonymic aspects. While each rewrite retained the major elements of the story it was based on, such as the plot, the protagonists and sometimes the verse sections, it also introduced changes to it. These changes could both consist of ideological manipulations to the plot or the dialogues, and interventions with the language and style of the story. Therefore, each rewrite contained both continuity and change within it. The same strategy was valid for popular modern stories and novels which were built upon the audience's habitual familiarity with certain forms, such as the battle story or traditional romance.

Maria Tymoczko has written about the importance of taking the metonymic aspects of literature into account while exploring translations from a "non-canonical or marginalized literature" (Tymoczko 1999: 47). She discusses translations of early Irish literature into English within the framework of the position of Irish as a marginalized literature and culture vis-à-vis a dominant-culture, i.e. the English speaking audience. She therefore explores a case where the metonymic aspects of a literature are opaque to a target audience, i.e. the audience is not familiar with the characters, plot, form, genre, and literary allusions (Tymoczko 1999: 46-47). Translators and pseudotranslators operating in the Turkish system of translated popular literature were faced with a similar issue. They needed to convey the readership stories which existed in a metonymic relationship to the rest of the foreign literature in question, while the popular readership was not equipped with the necessary background to perceive the larger system behind the translated texts. I suggest that the Turkish readers rather received these texts in relation to a system of

literature that they were familiar with, i.e. Turkish folk literature. This severed the translated texts from the larger network of relations they held within their home systems and transferred them onto the Turkish system of literature where their translations into Turkish granted them new kinship ties with the Turkish tradition.

5.4 Summary

Chapter 5 explored field of popular literature in early republican Turkey. It delved into the concepts of “people” and “people’s books” and discussed the kind of literature considered suitable for the rural and the urban population by the literary institution. The chapter discussed the impact of folk literature on the field of popular literature and concluded that the idea of anonymity prevailing in the field of folk literature had repercussions on the field of indigenous and translated popular literature. It argued that translations of popular literature were characterized by the blurring of the line between indigenous writing and translation and suggested that this literary strategy largely owed to an older cultural habitus which resisted to an idea of the literary text as a fixed entity with a known producer.

Chapter 6 offers a case study on several works by writer-translators who operated in the field of translated popular literature. The findings of the case study will shed some light upon the literary habitus addressed by these writer-translators and reveal aspects of the poetics which governed the field of popular literature in early republican Turkey.

Chapter 6

Case Study I:

Translating on the Margin

The previous chapters concentrated on the ideological and poetological factors which shaped the production and reception of translations in the fields of canonical and popular literature. Chapter 6 will take a closer look at some of the works that were available in the market for popular literature in Turkey in 1923-1960 by carrying out a case study on nine works by three writer-translators.¹ These writer-translators, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi (Seyfioğlu)² and Kemal Tahir, were chosen from the field of translated popular fiction from English.³

I have chosen to base the analysis in Case Study I on the work of three individuals whose literary activities illustrate the diversity and richness extant in the field of popular literature. Case Study I will also trigger a methodological and theoretical discussion about the validity and use of concentrating on the work of individual writers/translators rather than, or complementary to, dwelling upon the products of 'schools' or institutions. The focus on the writer-translators as agents within the larger literary and cultural systems will enable me to explore their individual literary strategies and discover points of contact, and of divergence in their

¹ By adopting the term 'writer-translator' I do not suggest that translators are not writers. The term is introduced for practical purposes in order to distinguish a person who is involved in both indigenous writing and in translating from one who is only engaged in translations and does not produce indigenous works.

² Ali Rıza Seyfi was the name used by the author prior to the law that required the adoption of surnames. After 1934, he used both Seyfi and Seyfioğlu as surnames. In the present thesis I refer to him as Ali Rıza Seyfi.

³ There were two reasons for the choice of English. The first obvious reason was that the scope of the present thesis did not allow for an extensive analysis of translations done from all source literatures. Secondly, especially in the 1940s and 1950s, translations from English dominated the market for translated popular literature.

works. I will further set out to trace the norms they have observed during their processes of writing and translating and question to what extent such norms complied with the norms propagated by the canonical view of translation explained in Chapter 3. The study of the three writer-translators will also trigger a set of questions about the diffusion of the translational norms and the poetics created in the center of the literary polysystem in early republican Turkey. The case study will offer clues about the literary repertoire shaped by agents located further away from the center of the cultural polysystem and consider the options available in the field of popular literature as signs of an act of planning, i.e., a deliberate or inadvertent attempt to shape the course that literature and culture would take.

The reason behind the selection of three specific writer-translators, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir, as subject for Case Study I pertains to the broad literary spectrum they operated in. All three writer-translators were prolific and industrious personalities, producing works in the field of both indigenous and translated literature. Furthermore, their engagement in borderline translational phenomena such as concealed translations and pseudotranslations offers interesting evidence about the literary habitus they addressed and the poetics they subscribed to. Selâmi Münir, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir were not solitary individuals within a large field of popular literature. They competed with a number of similar writers who produced literary works in a ubiquitous way, switching back and forth between indigenous literary production and translation.⁴

In each case, I will examine first the translation, then the pseudo- or concealed translation and conclude with a brief look at the indigenous writing of each. The motive underlying my decision to include indigenous works in this study is to be able

⁴ Such writers included Dâniş Remzi Korok, Vedat Örfi Bengi, İskender Fahrettin Sertelli, Selâmi İzzet Sedes and others.

to pin down the specific similarities and differences between each writer's translation and writing strategies. Such data will help me to question whether they adopted a different style, different syntax, different thematic structure during their activities as translator and writer. This, in turn, will reveal the concept of translation held by each. The choice of pseudotranslations and concealed translations for a case study is especially fitting when one studies a literary environment where the boundaries between indigenous writing and translation are blurred. The analysis of these works will serve to carry out an enquiry into the production of pseudotranslations and concealed translations and will investigate to what extent the writers used specific literary strategies in order to create an impression of translation or authenticity in their works.

6.1 Tools of Analysis

The analysis of the translations in Case Studies I and II will make use of the concepts, terminology and methodology developed in Descriptive Translation Studies (Toury 1995). Some additional concepts will be borrowed from other fields, such as literary criticism where necessary. During the analysis of the translations I will mainly focus on the operational, and especially on the matricial norms observed by the translators. The matricial norms govern the fullness, distribution and segmentation of the target text offered as the translation of a source text (Toury 1995: 59). The description of additions to or omissions from a source text can be useful in investigating the linguistic or ideological manipulations carried out by the translator. The linguistic manipulations offer clues about how the translator views her/his own language. The gaps and deficiencies s/he discovers when the source and

the target languages are juxtaposed become clearer when one studies the additions in the target text, or the omitted parts in the source text. Nevertheless, the majority of the matricial manipulations are done with cultural and/or ideological motives. Additions and omissions or potential reshuffling of the source text in translation may serve as crucial links between the universe of the translated text and the general cultural context it takes its departure from. I will come back to this argument during the case studies.

The second tool which will be used during the analysis of the corpus selected for both case studies will consist of a survey of paratextual elements surrounding the translated and indigenous texts. Paratexts consist of such textual elements as prefaces, postfaces, titles, dedications, illustrations and similar phenomena that mediate between the text and the reader. Such elements serve to ‘present’ a work to its audience (Genette 1997: 1). In the present thesis I have been using the term “extratextual material” to refer to general meta-discourse on translation circulating independently of individual texts. Paratexts, on the other hand, are presentational materials accompanying translated texts and the text-specific meta-discourse formed directly around them in the form of reviews or advertisements prepared for the work in question. Paratexts offer valuable clues into a culture’s definition of translation. The target culture plays a significant role in distinguishing a translation from a non-translation. The concept of “assumed translation”, which suggests that all utterances assumed as translation in a specific culture can be regarded as translation (Toury 1995: 32), rests largely on the conditions of the reception of texts. The assumption is made by the members of the target culture and it is they who will mainly determine a text’s status as a translation. The process of reception is affected by a number of factors which are not confined to the text assumed to be a translation. Translated

texts can offer us a number of clues hinting at their status as translations. The use of foreign names and foreign cultural elements, the subject matter and an unusual syntax may all warn the reader about the possibility of encountering a translation. Nevertheless, the majority of these clues, such as the title of the text, the name of the author, the name of the translator, the name of the source text, the title of a series the book appeared in, are identified by the reader before the translated text begins. They can be located ‘around’ the translated text, on the cover, on the title page or in a preface; Genette speaks of ‘peritexts’ in this case (1997:5). Alternatively, such presentational elements can be located outside the book and can be found in bibliographies, in advertisements in magazines, in review articles or in interviews; according to Genette, these are ‘epitexts’ (Genette 1997: 5). Most of the works included in Case Studies I and II will be analyzed on the basis of their peritextual elements, because little or no epitextual discourse was formed about these books in the form of reviews, criticism or advertisements. Paratextual elements have a strong bearing on how the text will be received, at least at the beginning, before the process of reading the actual text starts. Then it can be safely assumed that 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. This assumption makes it imperative for any study engaged in translation analysis to include paratextual material within its scope. In Chapter 3, I made use of paratextual elements in order to trace the translator’s visibility in a number of works. In Case Study I and II, I will explore paratextual elements that impinge upon the presentation and reception of translations and expand the analysis beyond translator’s visibility to cover the specific ways in which the texts position themselves and relate to their readers.

The treatment of proper names in translation will also be used as a tool for analysis. In texts in Ottoman script, foreign names were usually transcribed phonetically. There were cases where proper names were printed in their original spelling in the Latin alphabet, but those were indeed rare.⁵ After the alphabet reform of 1928 foreign proper names in the translations continued to be printed in their phonetic spelling. This was the case for both canonical and non-canonical translations alike, continuing to be a general norm until the 1940s when the Translation Bureau adopted the opposite strategy of printing foreign names according to their original spelling. This was one of the basic principles adopted by the Bureau at its first meeting (“Haberler” 1940: 112). However, the Bureau affected only a part of the system of translated literature. Popular literature remained largely indifferent to this strategy and continued to use the phonetic spelling throughout the 1940s and 1950s.

“What’s in a name?” one may ask. Why go into a long argument regarding a subject that may appear trivial at first sight? I suggest that the treatment of proper names in translation is first and foremost a cultural issue. Offering the readers phonetic transcription or foreign spelling are two dramatically different approaches. Each of them defines a separate way of handling the source text. The adoption of a foreign spelling is a strictly “foreignizing” strategy, interfering with the text’s fluency, alienating the reader from the translation or inviting the reader to ponder it as a mediated work, i.e. a translation. This sense of alienation is much contrary to “popular aesthetics” which “requires fluent translations that produce the illusory effect of transparency ... [T]his means adhering to the current standard dialect while

⁵ For an example combining both phonetic transcription and original Latin-alphabet spelling see the translation of Charles Dickens’ *Posthumous Papers of Pickwick Club* published by the Ministry of Education in 1927: *Mister Pikvik’in Maceraları*, translated by Kâmurân Şerif. İstanbul: Maarif Vekâleti.

avoiding any dialect, register, or style that calls attention to words as words and therefore preempts the reader's identification" (Venuti 1998: 12). That is why the use of phonetic transcriptions can be considered an attempt to cover up, or reduce an awareness of the text as a translation (versus an "original") in order to facilitate reader's identification with the narrative and its fictive characters. One may argue that in the latter strategy, the "foreignness" of the foreign culture being translated is phased out by avoiding distractions that may be caused by unfamiliar letters, unexpected accent marks or names that have such 'strange' and complicated spelling that one stops reading and concentrates on possible ways of pronouncing it.

The treatment of proper names also defines specific ways of addressing and relating to the readers. Providing phonetic transcriptions of names may be indicative of a patronizing attitude on the part of the translator. A translator who writes all foreign proper names in their phonetic spelling may appear as an agent with more cultural, and also symbolic capital. By dictating to the reader the "correct" way of pronouncing the foreign name, such a translator may appear to position the reader at a lower educational level. On the other hand, retaining the original spelling in the translated text may be perceived as a translational strategy that treats the reader as an intellectual peer.

The rest of this chapter is devoted to the analysis of nine works by three writer-translators. The descriptive analysis to be carried out, will be based on three criteria explained above: matricial norms, paratextual elements and the treatment of proper names.

6.2 Selâmi Münir Yurdatap: A Literary Jack of All Trades

The first three works to be analyzed in Case Study I are by Selâmi Münir Yurdatap (1905-1973).⁶ During his long career, spanning through half a century, Yurdatap worked as a journalist, writer and translator. He produced over one hundred indigenous and translated works displaying an immense variety in terms of genre, theme and style. He wrote both fiction and non-fiction consisting of rewrites of folk tales, novels, stories, tales, dream interpretations and religious books (Yalçın 2001: 921-922). His fictional books belong to a wide range of genres, such as folk tales, adventure, detective fiction and erotica. He was the translator of numerous books from English, French and Arabic. In the meantime, the number of his pseudotranslations seems to exceed the number of his translations. He wrote many detective and adventure novels with imported characters. Among these, his Sherlock Holmes, Arsène Lupin, Nick Carter and Mike Hammer pseudotranslations were the most popular ones. Yurdatap almost exclusively concentrated on writing and translating popular works and operated in the field of large-scale production. He was an industrious writer and his works which have survived to our day offer interesting clues about his concept of translation, as well as his views on the function of literature and the kind of poetics he adopted in the fields of indigenous and translated literature.

In the following sections I will offer three samples selected from among his various works. The first work to be taken up is Yurdatap's translation of Bram

⁶ There is some confusion regarding Yurdatap's birth and death dates. *Tanzimattan Bugüne Edebiyatçılar Ansiklopedisi* (The Encyclopedia of Literary Figures from the Tanzimat until Today) gives the birthdate as 1910 (Yalçın 2001: 920). The National Library catalogue indicates 1905 as his year of birth. 1905 appears more likely, since Yurdatap published some of his works as early as 1926. Furthermore, the encyclopedia does not specify a date of death for Yurdatap, while the National Library supplies the date as 1973. Here, I have adopted the dates given by the National Library.

Stoker's *Dracula*. This will be followed by an analysis of his pseudotranslation, *Şerlok Holmes'in Arsen Lügen ile Sergüzeşleri: Hindistan Ormanlarında* (The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin: In the Forests of India). The last work I will analyze by Yurdatap is his indigenous collection of battle stories, *Mehmetçik Çanakkale'de* (Mehmetçik in the Dardanelles).

6.2.1 *Drakyola Kan İçen Adam* (Dracula, the Blood-drinking Man)

Drakyola Kan İçen Adam, an abridged translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, was published in 1940 by Güven, a publisher operating in the field of popular literature throughout the 1940s. Although the first title page of the book⁷ indicates that it is a "full novel" ["başlı başına bir roman"], *Drakyola* is a 16-page booklet. Its length was defined by the format used by Güven as a production and marketing strategy as I will explain in the section on paratextual features of the book. Rather than translating the novel sentence-by-sentence, Yurdatap has summarized the general plot and offered a rough outline of *Dracula* to his readers. *Drakyola* carried a series title: "Exciting-Curious-Adventure Novels" ["Heyecanlı-Meraklı-Macera Romanları"]. Nevertheless, it did not feature a number, unlike most books published in the series format and I have not been able to trace any other books published within this series.

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* was first published in 1897, and since then, has become one of the best known works of Gothic fiction internationally. It has been published

⁷ The "title page" is the page following the front cover and the inside front cover. It usually includes the title, the author, the translator, the publisher's name and other relevant presentational elements. The title page may be preceded by the "flyleaf", a blank sheet of paper and a half title page where only the title of the book is printed (Genette 1997: 32-33). Many detective and adventure stories published in Turkey throughout the 1920s-1950s featured only the title page. Some did not even have a title page and the book started immediately after the cover. *Drakyola* did not have a flyleaf or a half title page. It had a cover which bore an illustration of Count Dracula climbing down the wall of his castle. This was followed by the title page.

in numerous editions, adapted to both the screen and the stage. It was first made into a film starring Bela Lugosi in 1931, which was also shown in Turkey under the name *Drakyola Kan İçen Adam*, the title of Yurdatap's translation. However, it is not clear whether the screening of the film in Turkey preceded the translation. In what follows, I will offer a descriptive analysis of *Drakyola* by focusing on three aspects of the translation. These are peritextual elements, the matricial norms observed by Yurdatap and the treatment of proper names.

6.2.1.1 Peritextual Elements

Despite all the radical omissions and changes the target text went through, which I will explore in the following sections, *Drakyola* was still presented as a translation of *Dracula*. On its title page, the publishers printed Yurdatap's name as the "translator" ["çeviren"]. On the same page there is also a paragraph introducing the book: "This mind-boggling, mysterious and fearsome novel has been 'borrowed from' / 'quoted after' the work by the famous English author B. STOKER" ["Akıllara hayret veren bu esrarengiz ve korkunç roman meşhur İngiliz muharriri B. STOKER'in eserinden iktibas edilmiştir"] (Stoker 1940). The use of the term "iktibas" in this context is rather interesting. As explained in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1, "iktibas" (a word of Arabic origin, meaning "borrowed from" or "quoted after") was used to refer to poetry translation in the 1940s (see Devrim 1940: 276). On the other hand, the term could also be used to refer to indigenous writing, especially if the work in question was based on an external source or the work of another author. Yurdatap's indigenous work *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede*, which will be analyzed in the following pages, is an example of such "iktibas". By using the term "iktibas" in the title page of

the story, Yurdatap, or the publishers, have shown Stoker as the “source” of *Drakyola*. On the other hand, the use of “iktibas” may also indicate that the translation is only based on or borrowed from the work of Stoker, rather than being a full translation of it. This attitude is proven by the marginal space allocated for Bram Stoker’s name in the title page. Stoker’s name is mentioned only once, and his first name never appears in full, testifying the publishers’ relative indifference towards introducing the author and his work to the Turkish readership.

The promotional paragraph printed in the title page has a number of functions. Apart from introducing the author of the story, it serves to offer information about *Drakyola*’s generic features. The attributes “mind-boggling, mysterious and fearsome” help to position the story in terms of its genre. The presentational elements stressing the generic features of the book appear more important than the author’s name. As mentioned earlier, the title page also features a paragenic designation, introducing the book as an “adventure novel” placed at the top of the page. Furthermore, the title page tells the reader that the 16-page booklet is a full “novel” printing the statement “Each book is a novel in itself” [“Her kitap başlı başına bir romandır”.]

The emphasis on the status of the work as a translated novel seems to be of specific importance although it is difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons for that. I suggest that the popular success of novels in the book market made it a prestigious and financially lucrative literary form. The attribute “novel” was often used in the title of indigenous books, even when the number of their pages indicated that they were short stories or novellas rather than novels proper.⁸ As a western literary form,

⁸ During the 1930s-1950s, titles of Turkish novels were often accompanied by a statement indicating their generic features. The term novel was invariably used in all of these generic designations. The following list offers a short selection chosen from among numerous titles:

the novel only entered the Turkish literary system in the 19th century mainly through translations.⁹By the 20th century, it had become an established and popular literary form. I argue that publishers and translators active in the field of popular literature wished to capitalize on the popularity attained by the novel. They used the term “novel” in their works freely, to entice their audiences and to boost their sales. The use of this term cannot be considered as the communication of sheer information, like the printing of the name of the author, or date of publication. It is rather an intention and a promise: the publishers seem to imply “we promise that what you will find here is a novel”. After all, as Genette maintains, “a *novel* does not signify ‘This book is a novel,’ a defining assertion that hardly lies within anyone’s power, but rather, ‘Please look on this book as a novel’” (1997: 11). In the meantime, the publishers operated within a given format for each series. In the case of *Drakyola*, and many other translations and pseudotranslations published by Güven in the 1940s, the “dime” format, i.e. 16 page-booklets published at regular intervals, dictated the publisher’s publishing and marketing strategy. Yurdatap was confined to a length of 16 pages, and this concern gave shape to many of the omissions he carried out.

Nurettin Ayyüce, *İki Sevda Arasında: Aşk ve İzdırıp Romanı* (Between Two Loves: A Novel About Love and Suffering), İstanbul: Devrim Kitabevi, 1944; İskender Fahrettin, *İstanbulu Nasıl Aldık? Tarihi Roman* (How Did We Conquer İstanbul? Historical Novel), İstanbul: Muallim Ahmet Halit Kitaphanesi, 1930; Vâlâ Nureddin, *Mazinin Yükü Altında: Aşk ve Macera Romanı* (Under the Burden of the Past: Love and Adventure Novel), İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1942; Fâkihe Odman, *O ve Ben: Aşk ve Seyahat Romanı* (“S/he and I: Love and Travel Novel), İstanbul: Şehir Matbaası, 1952; Nezihe Muhittin Tepedelenligil, *Çıplak Model: Aşk Romanı* (The Nude Model: Love Novel), İstanbul: Arif Bolat, 1943.

⁹ For information on the rise of the novel in the Turkish literary system see Özön 1985. For the innovative role assumed by translation in 19th century Turkish literature, see Parker 1991.

6.2.1.2 Matricial Norms in *Drakyola*

The first edition of *Dracula* published in 1897 was 384 pages long. The 1993 Penguin edition contains 486 pages. It is, therefore, evident that Yurdatap's *Drakyola* went through intensive abridgement. Yurdatap has exercised vast omissions and reduced or removed many features of the source text during the process. These omissions did not only affect the length of the novel, they also led to a number of manipulations which meant that Yurdatap's version assumed dramatically different qualities than Stoker's *Dracula*. The narrative structure, the plot and the characters created by Yurdatap differed considerably from those of Stoker. Let me discuss each of these headings separately.

Narrative Structure

The most significant manipulation Yurdatap carried out in the translation was to change the narrative structure of the novel. Bram Stoker's novel is written in the style of a series of letters and journal entries where different characters relate events from their points of view. This structure enables the readers to follow the plot and to learn more about the personal traits of the characters with the help of the shifting points of view. This strategy also allows for the emergence of a series of leading characters and provides multiple possibilities of identification for the readers. Yurdatap eliminated this structure from the story and made Jonathan Harker, the male protagonist, the only leading character of the novel. He rewrote the story in third person singular, having an omniscient and implicit narrator tell the series of events that Harker encounters. This enabled Yurdatap to omit a number of events and

characters in the translation. It further led to the rewriting of *Dracula* as an action-oriented story with a rather linear and simple plot.

Yurdatap has adopted a different principle of segmentation in his translation than that employed by its source text. Stoker's *Dracula* is divided into 27 untitled chapters, each consisting of a series of letters and journal entries. Yurdatap has divided *Drakyola* into two sections: "Korkunç Şato" (The Horrific Castle) and "Drakyola İngilterede" (Dracula in England), narrating the adventures of Jonathan Harker against Count Dracula in, respectively, Transylvania and London. The translator has focused on the first four chapters of *Dracula* and has magnified them out of proportion in *Drakyola*. The first four chapters of Stoker's *Dracula* which recounts Harker's stay at Dracula's castle, constitutes around one fifth of *Dracula*. In Yurdatap's case, this part takes 11 pages, and four fifths of *Dracula* is summarized in 5 pages. The translator has concentrated on action-related parts and chose to include details that would evoke the readers' curiosity and fear. He has isolated adventure and action-related elements and placed them in the foreground. This is very much in line with the paragenetic¹⁰ designation the book carries on its first title page: "Exciting-Curious-Adventure Novels" ["Heyecanlı-Meraklı-Macera Romanları"].

Plot and Culture-specific Elements

Yurdatap has modified *Dracula*'s plot and changed a number of events. He has simplified the story line to a large extent and left out elements that were not central to the progression of the main plot. Details of Harker's journey before he reaches Dracula's castle, the two men who propose to Lucy, the events which take place on

¹⁰ Paragenetic indications are those terms that specify the thematic scope of a literary work. See Genette 1997: 95.

the ship carrying Dracula before he reaches England are all omitted from the story. Furthermore, events or objects that relate to Christianity, which abound in *Dracula* are absent from *Drakyola*. In addition, the Turkish equivalent of the word “vampire”, “vampir”, is not used in *Drakyola* where it is replaced with the attribute “blood drinking” [“kan içen”]. Yurdatap must have assumed that his target audience would not be familiar with the term “vampir” and therefore resolved to paraphrase it. Specific information on vampirism and the history of Vlad the Impaler have been omitted from the translation. Culture-specific items pertaining to Transylvanian culture and history or to superstitions about vampires have not made their way into *Drakyola*. All in all, Yurdatap has reduced *Dracula* down to a simple thriller, providing a rough outline of the plot. Rather than translating the target text sentence by sentence, he seems to have summarized the story quite freely.

Characters

Yurdatap has dramatically reduced the number of characters and the textual variety of Stoker’s *Dracula* which introduces a number of side characters and themes into the narrative through newspaper articles, journal entries and letters to or among minor characters. Stoker has created at least eight central characters in *Dracula* whereas in Yurdatap’s *Drakyola* there are only four. As mentioned earlier, *Drakyola* concentrates on Jonathan Harker, one of the leading characters in *Dracula*, and presents him as the main protagonist who successfully embarks on a series of adventures to kill Count Dracula. This becomes clear when Yurdatap makes him speak: “Count Dracula, the blood drinking monster has arrived in England. Nobody knows his mystery but me. The country must be saved from his evil and murders,”

[“Kan içen canavar Kont Drakyola İngiltereye gelmiş. Benden başka onun esrarını kimse bilmiyor. Memleketi onun şerrinden ve cinayetlerinden kurtarmak lâzım.”] (Stoker 1940: 13). Stoker’s Professor Van Helsing, who appears as a figure representing scientific wisdom and light versus Dracula’s occult and dark forces, and who plays a major role in the extermination of Count Dracula, is absent from Yurdatap’s version altogether. In *Drakyola*, Harker prepares the plans against Dracula and mobilizes Lucy’s fiancé to join him in his struggle. Unlike *Drakyola*, in *Dracula* Harker is a weak and instable personality, especially after his sojourn at Count Dracula’s castle which nearly costs him his sanity.

Yurdatap’s female characters, as represented by Harker’s fiancée Mina and her friend Lucy, are also rather different from Stoker’s. Stoker places significant emphasis on Mina, Harker’s fiancée and, later, wife, whom he has depicted as an angelic figure, as well as a strong and wise woman. She has a central role in the novel as the antithesis of evil apart from being an embodiment of the sexually chaste and loyal female. Yurdatap has provided very little space for Mina in his version. She only appears in the last four pages as Harker’s fiancée and assumes a rather passive role along with her friend Lucy. In Stoker’s *Dracula*, Mina travels with the entourage accompanying Harker and Van Helsing in their final expedition to Transylvania and witnesses Count Dracula’s extermination. Yurdatap makes Mina stay behind. His Harker conjures up the plan to catch the Count before he arrives at his castle in Transylvania and convinces Lucy’s fiancé to join him. Harker declares that the two men should immediately go after the count and that the women would naturally stay home since “there is many a doctor to take care of our ill fiancées” [“Hasta nişanlılarımıza bakacak doktor arkadaşlarımız çoktur”].

6.2.1.3 Treatment of Proper Names

Yurdatap supplies phonetic transcriptions of names throughout the story which is evident from the title of the book: *Drakyola*. Furthermore Hawkins becomes “Hokenz”, Lucy is transcribed as “Lusi”, Golden Krone as “Kron” and Carfax as “Kârfaks”. Lucy’s fiancé Arthur Holmwood was re-baptized as “Doktor Arser” based on the Turkish pronunciation, which is a distorted form of the name “Arthur”. An interesting strategy for the transcription of names used by Yurdatap was to write them in brackets. Proper names, belonging to people or places alike, were given in brackets when they were printed for the first time. This was a strategy which was widespread in the field of indigenous and translated popular literature around the time. I suggest that this strategy was inherited from Ottoman script which used brackets to separate Turkish proper names or foreign names transliterated into Ottoman from the rest of the text in order to facilitate their reading.

6.2.1.4 Siting *Drakyola*

Yurdatap’s omission of significant portions of *Dracula*, the changes he introduced to the plot and the way he undermined the psychological and philosophical aspects of *Dracula* by foregrounding action and adventure-related features show that his intention was to create a text addressing readers who were after unsophisticated reading material that could be consumed in a short time. Furthermore, his omission of culture-specific items and his representation of women in a more traditional role than that depicted by Stoker indicate that Yurdatap avoided probing issues that have socio-cultural implications and steered clear of topics that could potentially interrupt

the flow of the adventure plot. Above all, Yurdatap's translation demonstrates that he was not afraid to take liberties with *Drakyola*, and that he did not show any concern to adhere to the thematic or stylistic features created by Bram Stoker. Rather than regarding *Dracula* as an "original" that needed to be rendered into Turkish as closely as possible, Yurdatap took an authorial initiative and rewrote the novel in a format that addressed a different audience than a fuller translation of *Dracula* would. He severed the text from its metonymic network within the western literary tradition by isolating Christian elements and issues relating to vampiric myths.¹¹

The specific style used by Yurdatap, especially in the beginning of the narrative, is reminiscent of folk tales. The opening paragraph of *Drakyola* reads: "(Karpat) dağlarının karlı, yüksek tepelerinin birisinde büyük ve tarihî bir şato vardı. Issız ve sarp bir yerde bulunan bu şatoda Drakyola adından bir kont oturuyordu. Günün birinde bu kont, Londranın en tanınmış avukatlarından olan (Hokenz) e bir mektup yollayarak İngilterede tarihî bir şato satın almak istediğini ve bu işi hal ve müzakere etmek için güvendiği adamlarından birisini yollamasını istemişti" ["There was a big and historical castle on one of the snowy, high hills of the Carpathians. There lived a count by the name of Dracula in this castle with a desolate and precipitous location. One day this count sent a letter to Hawkins, one of the best-known lawyers of London and expressed his wish to buy a historical castle in England, asking him to send one of his trustworthy colleagues to deal with the matter."] (Stoker 1940: 3). Compare this with the opening sentence of Yurdatap's rewrite of the famous folk tale *Arzu ile Kanber*: "Bundan yıllarca evvel Horasanda

¹¹ We should not be misled into thinking that this translation strategy and the alteration of a text's metonymic network is a hallmark of all systems of popular literature. Jean-Marc Gouanvic has shown that in Post-War France translators of American science fiction avoided this approach and acted contrary to it. The translator appeared as "the privileged agent of a product that proclaims its American origin through every means available, textual as well as paratextual" (Gouanvic 1997: 143). The translators apparently attempted to import not only the genre, but its whole metonymic network

fevkalâde zenginlik ve ticaretile, akıl ve dirayetile meşhur Hoca Behram adında bir tüccarbaşı vardı. Hindistanda, Çinde, Arabistanda ortakları ve vekilleri bulunan bu tacirin aynı zamanda çok eli açıktı. Fakir fıkaraı her zaman ikram eder, onların dertlerine derman olmayı sever, iyilikten hoşlanır tam bir insandı” [“Many years ago there was a chief merchant in Khorasan by the name of Hoca Behram famous for his extraordinary wealth, commercial wisdom, intelligence and sagacity. This merchant who had partners and representatives in India, China and Arabia was also very generous. He always helped the poor and found remedies for their troubles; he was truly a pious man.”] (Selâmi Münir [Yurdatap] 1936: 3).

Apart from the style, the plot created by Yurdatap recounting the adventures of a hero against a villain, also fits the narrative structure of Turkish folk tales which have an emphasis on action over dramatic or lyric features and focus on fantastic events (Boratav 1988: 64). I suggest that by rewriting the novel in this fashion, Yurdatap has tried to place it within the Turkish literary tradition and therefore made sure that the readership was equipped with the necessary literary background, i.e. habitus, for the reception of the story.

In the meantime, the close connection between the translation and the pre-determined format of *Drakyola* deserves a closer look. The need to comply with the general concept and size of the format adopted by Güven publishing company appears to have been a strong factor affecting decisions taken by the translator. This demonstrates the commercial drive behind the observation of specific norms by Yurdatap. Contrary to Genette (1997: 12) who suggests that the paratext is always subordinate to its text, we may conclude that in certain cases paratextual elements, such as the series format, may be established before the texts themselves, and guide

into the French system, unlike Yurdatap, who isolated the source text from its original context of production and reception.

not only their reception but also their translation/writing. Commercial motives were indeed strong factors dictating both the translational norms observed by Yurdatap and the production and marketing strategy employed by the publishers. I would like to argue that the series title *Drakyola* carried was also printed for marketing purposes. It has been suggested that translated books published within series sold more than individual publications in the 1930s: in 1939, Mr. Halit, owner of a book shop in Istanbul, claimed that “translated novels are purchased by readers when they are published in series and are advertised well. These works do not sell much when they are published individually” [“Tercüme romanlar seri halinde çıkarıldığı ve iyi reklam yapıldığı takdirde kari buluyor. Bu eserler teker teker çıkarılırsa pek satılmıyor.”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 147).

Based on the findings of the descriptive analysis of *Drakyola* carried out above, it can be suggested that Yurdatap’s translation of *Dracula* violated a number of norms propagated by writers and translators who operated in the field of canonical literature. His (deliberate or inadvertent) resistance towards the norms propagated at the center of the system of literature starts with the initial decision to translate this specific novel. *Dracula* did not suit the thematic categories that were approved for translation as it consisted of a fantasy and adventure-related narrative, detached from social concerns. Furthermore, the omissions exercised by Yurdatap were against the principle of textual integrity whose preservation was regarded as a prerequisite for fidelity even before the Translation Bureau was established.¹² Moreover, commercial concerns, which played a crucial role in the production and presentation of *Drakyola*, were largely condemned and criticized by writers and translators who operated in the

¹² For a discussion on the importance attached to “fullness” in translation see Chapter 3, section 3.4.3.1.

field of canonical literature throughout the 1920s-1950s.¹³ In that sense, Yurdatap's *Drakyola* may be considered a case of "resistant" translation, serving a different poetics and a different literary habitus than translations intended for the centre of the literary polysystem.

6.2.2. *Şerlok Holmes'in Arsen Lûpen ile Sergüzeştləri: Hindistan Ormanlarında* (The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin: In the Forests of India)

Selâmi Münir Yurdatap wrote numerous pseudotranslations in the 1920s-1960s. His first pseudotranslations were published in a series bringing Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin together. This series consisted of six booklets, each of 16 pages, and was published by Cemiyet Publishing House in 1926. This was followed by another series of pseudotranslations consisting of four booklets under the title "Sherlock Holmes'in Sergüzeştləri" ("The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes") in 1927 (Üyepazarcı 1997: 109-110) In 1928, Yurdatap wrote fictitious Nick Carter stories under the series title "Nik Karter-Dünyanın En Meşhur Polis Hafiyesi" ("Nick Carter, the Most Famous Police Detective in the World"). Eleven booklets of sixteen pages were published under this series (Üyepazarcı 1997: 135). Yurdatap continued to write pseudotranslations throughout his literary career. His Nick Carter series was expanded and reprinted in the 1940s (Türkeş 2001: 12). He also wrote Mike Hammer pseudotranslations which were published in the 1950s and 1960s.¹⁴

Hindistan Ormanlarında (In the Forests of India) is one of the early examples of Yurdatap's work as a pseudotranslator. It was published by Cemiyet Kitaphanesi

¹³ For a discussion of commercialization in the field of translated literature and its critique, see Chapter 3, Section 3.1.2.1.

¹⁴ Examples include *Devler Çarpışıyor* (Fighting Giants), published by Samim Güniz-Sadık Özyaygen in 1955 and *Korkunç Tuzak* (The Horrible Trap), published by Hakikî Ucuzluk Kitabevi in 1962.

in 1926 and was printed in Ottoman script.¹⁵ *Hindistan Ormanlarında* was published in a series with the title “Şerlok Holmes’in Arsène Lupin ile Sergüzeştləri” (“The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin”). This series featured at least five other 16-page booklets with the titles *Gece Çocuğu* (The Child of Night), *Mukaddes Heykel* (The Holy Statue), *Saray Rakkasesi* (The Court Dancer), *Siyah Güller* (Black Roses) and *Şöhret Uğruna* (For the Sake of Fame) all published in 1926 (Üyepazarcı 1997: 109-110). A review of known titles by Arthur Conan Doyle proves that he never brought Sherlock Holmes together with Arsène Lupin (see Conan Doyle 1981). On the other hand, Maurice Leblanc wrote several stories about the encounters of Arsène Lupin and Sherlock Holmes, disguised as “Herlock Sholmes” after some legal objection from Conan Doyle (for a list of these stories see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.2.1). Yurdatap’s books may have been inspired by Leblanc’s stories. Nevertheless, the plots of Lupin stories are of a different nature to which *Hindistan Ormanlarında* bears no resemblance, making Yurdatap’s Sherlock Holmes vs. Arsène Lupin series a case of pseudotranslation.¹⁶

6.2.2.1 Peritextual Elements

The foreign provenance of *Hindistan Ormanlarında* is visible in its peritextual elements. The cover of the book features two pictures, representing Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin. Both illustrations had become established “faces” of the two characters since they were previously used in a number of books. In fact, the Arsène

¹⁵ All transliterations from the Ottoman are mine.

¹⁶ For summaries of Leblanc’s stories see the French popular literature site on the Internet: <http://www.coolfrenchcomics.com/sherlockholmes.htm>.

Lupin illustration was borrowed from the original Leblanc books published in France.¹⁷

There is no author's name on the cover, or anywhere else in *Hindistan Ormanlarında*. Selâmi Münir Yurdatap is introduced as the "nâkil" of the book. "Nâkil", meaning "agent of transfer" in Turkish, denotes a gray area between translation and indigenous writing as it could refer to both.¹⁸ Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin were already popular fiction characters in Turkey since the beginning of the century. The readership had grown familiar with them mainly through translations carried out by various translators and published by different publishers.¹⁹ The knowledge of Holmes and Lupin as foreign characters coupled with the presentation of Yurdatap as "nâkil" made it likely that *Hindistan Ormanlarında* would be received as a translation.

As indicated earlier, *Hindistan Ormanlarında* was part of a larger series which featured books in 16-page booklets (Üyepazarcı 1997: 109-110). As in the case of *Drakyola*, this indicates that Yurdatap had to operate within a pre-defined format, not only in terms of generic and stylistic features, but also in terms of size. This appears to play a role in the arrangement of the relatively simple plot and in the depiction of characters, which remain rather sketchy.

¹⁷ A similar illustration was used in the cover of the Lafitte edition of *L'Aiguille Creuse* (Leblanc 1909).

¹⁸ For different usages of "nakil" see Chapter 3, section 3.4.1.

¹⁹ For a comprehensive list of these books see Üyepazarcı 1997: 91-121.

A selection includes the following:

Conan Doyle, Sir Arthur (1909) *Dilenci*, tr. Faik Sabri, İstanbul: Asır Kütüphanesi.

Conan Doyle, Sir Arthur (1912) *Sherlock Holmes'in Sergüzeşleri*, anonymous translation, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ebüzziya.

Conan Doyle, Sir Arthur (1917) *Sherlock Holmes*, tr. Süleyman Tevfik, İstanbul.

Leblanc, Maurice (1905) *Arsène Lupin'in Tevkifi*, tr. Fazlı Necip, Selanik: Asır.

Leblanc, Maurice (1910) *Delik İğne*, anonymous translation, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Ebüzziya.

Leblanc, Maurice (1912) *Sherlock Holmes'e Karşı Arsène Lupin*, tr. Mehmet Ali, İstanbul: Kanaat.

Leblanc, Maurice (1920) *Dolaşan Ölüm*, tr. S. Suat, İstanbul.

The two main characters, Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin, were the major assets of this series, which is evident from the cover of *Hindistan Ormanlarında* at first sight. The title “Şerlok Holmes’in Arsen Lüpen ile Sergüzeştleri” is located at the top of the cover, above the actual title of the story, namely *Hindistan Ormanlarında*. The most salient elements on the cover are two separate illustrations, respectively of Holmes and Lupin, occupying around three fourths of the page. This shows that the publishers intended to attract the readers through the two characters which also identified the book’s genre.

One should also note that popular heroes such as Holmes and Lupin start leading lives of their own once they became established figures in the domestic literary system. It may well be that the authors Arthur Conan Doyle and Maurice Leblanc were less famous among the readership than the two heroes they created.

Antonio Gramsci writes:

One of the most characteristic attitudes of the popular public towards its literature is this: the writer’s name and personality do not matter, but the personality of the protagonist does. When they have entered into the intellectual life of the people, the heroes of popular literature are separated from their ‘literary’ origin and acquire the validity of historical figures (Gramsci in Bennett and Woollacott 1987: v).

The representation of Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin in the Turkish translations is worthy of a comprehensive study. I would like to argue that the tendency towards adding and omitting passages from the source text in translations of popular novels and stories in the 1910s and 1920s, and the intensive pseudotranslation activity around the two heroes during this time made it evident that Turkish translators, writers and readers appropriated Holmes and Lupin as popular heroes at an early stage. Loyalty to their “original” traits did not become an issue for writers and

translators as exemplified by *Hindistan Ormanlarında*. This is not to say that Conan Doyle and Leblanc were never mentioned in the translated Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin stories. Throughout the period under study, numerous translations were published, bearing the names of the authors. Nevertheless, it is difficult to claim that the translators and the publishers of the translations placed special emphasis on the authors which could become visible through a promotional statement or preface. This attitude was partly modified in the 1950s which was a decade where the system of popular literature started to go through a transformation in terms of its poetics as I will illustrate in Section 6.4.²⁰

6.2.2.2 Narrative Structure and Characters

Hindistan Ormanlarında narrates Sherlock Holmes' search for Arsène Lupin who escapes to India after having robbed a number of banks in Paris under the disguise of a Russian prince. Sherlock Holmes, who is depicted as a member of the British police, is on a special mission to catch Lupin and follows him to India with his assistant Harry Taxon. Holmes and Taxon discover Lupin's hideout in the jungle, yet they are taken as captives by the clever burglar. Lupin releases them when Holmes

²⁰ A series of Sherlock Holmes stories published by Hâdise Yayinevi in 1958 constitutes evidence for this. The Sherlock Holmes stories published by Hâdise were translated by Selâmi İzzet Sedes, a prolific translator and writer of mainly popular fiction. The stories were published in the pocket book format and they were all accompanied by a promotional statement printed on the back of the title page: "Hâdise Yayinevi is proud to introduce this work by Conan Doyle who is the most powerful creator of English literature, the giant of detective fiction" ["Hâdise Yayinevi İngiliz edebiyatının en kudretli yaratıcısı, polis romanlarının dev yazarı Conan Doyle'un bu eserini takdim etmekle şeref duyar"] (Doyle 1958). The first book in the series *Kanlı Yolda Üç Erkek* (Three Men on the Bloody Road), a translation of *A Study in Scarlet*, features an illustration of Conan Doyle and a preface introducing him and his works to the readers. Furthermore, there is a paragraph on the back of the title page asking the readers to "patiently" read the first 20-25 pages of the story, which offered a general description and analysis of Sherlock Holmes' personality, before the "mysterious events" ["esrarlı hadiseler"] started. This provides proof for the argument that although the readers targeted by Hâdise had started to show a concern for "authorial originality", they were still in possession of a literary habitus dominated by a poetics that prioritized action plots over literary style and aesthetic pleasure.

rescues him from a tiger's attack. Holmes and Harry Taxon leave the forest, determined to continue their struggle against Lupin.

In *Hindistan Ormanlarında* Yurdatap has represented Arsène Lupin as a skillful and clever burglar of gentlemanly manners. This is proven by his noble act of releasing Sherlock Holmes because he owes Holmes his life. In that sense, Yurdatap may be said to adhere more or less closely to the main traits of the original Arsène Lupin created by Maurice Leblanc. The same cannot be claimed for Sherlock Holmes. Yurdatap has introduced a number of changes in the Holmes character and presented him as a different person. Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes is an utterly smart, gentleman-like cynical hero. He owes his success with solving difficult cases to his observational skills and his mastery over collecting information upon which he bases his deductive method. Furthermore, he is a man of means, working privately on cases that attract his interest. Yurdatap's Sherlock Holmes is an English police officer cooperating with the French police to catch Arsène Lupin. He is assisted by a Harry Taxon, and his usual assistant, Dr. Watson, is absent from the story.

The Harry Taxon character was not Yurdatap's original creation. A Turkish series of Sherlock Holmes pseudotranslations "Polislerin Piri Sherlock Holmes'in Gizli Dosyaları" ("The Secret Files of the King of Policemen Sherlock Holmes") of pseudotranslations introduced this character into the Turkish system of popular literature for the first time. This series, published by İkbâl Kütüphanesi in 1912 served as a prototype for many Sherlock Holmes pseudotranslations published until the 1950s. It was the first series that introduced Sherlock Holmes as a member of the police force, rather than a private detective (Üyepazarcı 1997: 98).

Unlike the detective in the original Sherlock Holmes stories, Sherlock Holmes in Yurdatap's *Hindistan Ormanlarında* is not very intelligent. He is rather ill-

tempered and the story shows no trace of his famous deductive method. The case progresses in a very action-oriented manner providing an opportunity for Sherlock Holmes to use his gun which he carries with him, unlike Conan Doyle's hero. The intelligent partner is Harry Taxon, who is depicted as a loyal junior police officer who helps his "master" ["üstad"] trace Arsène Lupin. Taxon warns Holmes about the information he misses and ignores, carries out most of the tasks required to find Lupin and becomes a major character in the story. The following dialogue from the beginning of the story offers an impression of the way Yurdatap depicted Taxon and Holmes. Before the dialogue takes place, Sherlock Holmes tries to phone Marseille from Paris, but the operator tells him that the connection is unavailable. Holmes becomes angry and blames the telephone company:

-Bu telefon şirketini hükümet adam akıllı tecziye etmeli. Böyle medeni bir memlekette bu gibi yolsuzluklara meydan veriyor. Bu ne kepezeliştir, diye söylenmeye başladı:

Bu esnada Harri içeri girdi. Üstadını münfail ve hiddetli bir vaziyette görünce yanına yaklaştı, nazikâne bir surette hatırını sorduktan sonra hiddetini mucip olan şeyi berây-i istifsar sordu.

Şerlok Holmes önünde genç ve zeki muavinini görünce hiddeti biraz zail oldu. Marsilya ile Paris telefonu işlemediğini söyledi. Ve bu sebeple beynelmilel büyük bir hırsız göz göre göre firar etmesine meydan verildiğini beyan etti.

Harri zeki ve cevval nazarlarını üstadına teveccüh ederek:

-Efendim: Kabahat telefon şirketinde değil.. Teller henüz yeni kesilmiştir. Çünkü iki saat evvel Marsilya ile muhabere münkatı değildi (Yurdatap 1926: 3).

[- The government should strictly punish this telephone company. It allows such problems in a civilized country like this. This is a scandal, he started complaining.

At this moment Harry walked in. When he saw that his master was rather annoyed and angry, he approached him, politely greeted him and inquired the reason for his anger.

When Sherlock Holmes saw his young and clever assistant in front of him, he calmed down. He told him that telephone lines between Marseille and Paris did not work causing an international burglar to escape.

Harry turned his allert and intelligent eyes to his master and said:

-Sir, this is not the fault of the telephone company... The wires have recently been cut. Two hours ago the connection to Marseille was still available (Yurdatap 1926: 3).]

The attributes chosen to describe Harry Taxon and Sherlock Holmes indicate that Yurdatap gave Taxon the upper hand in terms of skill and intelligence. Yurdatap's Sherlock Holmes is "annoyed" and "angry", whereas his assistant is "clever", "polite" and "skillful". Furthermore, Taxon is calm and cool, helping Sherlock Holmes to obtain the necessary information for solving the case. In other words, Yurdatap's Taxon assumes the qualities normally held by Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes.

The presentation of Sherlock Holmes as a policeman is rather interesting. I suggest that because the idea of a private detective was rather unfamiliar to the Turkish audience in the 1920s, Yurdatap featured Holmes as a member of the official police force to make it easier for the readers to relate to the character.

6.2.2.3 Treatment of Proper Names

Yurdatap used the phonetic transcription method in his treatment of proper names and separated foreign proper names from the text by placing them within brackets. This was a standard practice in texts written in Ottoman script, in that sense, *Hindistan Ormanlarında* did not distinguish itself from real translations of Sherlock Holmes stories. Sherlock Holmes translations published before the adoption of the Latin alphabet used brackets or quotation marks to separate proper names from the rest of the text and used the phonetic transcriptions of foreign names in Ottoman script (see Conan Doyle 1909a and 1909b).

In Yurdatap's transcription, Arsène Lupin became "Arsen Lüpen", Sherlock Holmes "Şerlok Holmes" (note that Holmes was read in two syllables in Turkish, unlike English) and Harry Taxon "Harri Takson". Yurdatap also added another character to the story: "Lord Klod", what would have corresponded to Lord Claude in French.

6.2.2.4 The Status of *Hindistan Ormanlarında* as a Pseudotranslation

The popularity of Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin appears as the major motive behind Yurdatap's appropriation of the characters. Readers who saw the pictures of Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin on the cover would probably receive the work as a translation. Moreover, Yurdatap's presentation as the "nâkil" of the work also blurred the status of the work as an indigenous story. In my view, these were deliberate strategies used by the publishers to position *Hindistan Ormanlarında* as a translation. It is likely that Yurdatap and his publishers wished to capitalize on the commercial success of previous editions of stories featuring the two characters. It is difficult to trace other reasons to explain why *Hindistan Ormanlarında* used Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin as its main characters, instead of domestic characters. For instance, ideological motives, which may play a significant role in the production of pseudotranslations in other cultures, appear absent from the book.²¹ *Hindistan Ormanlarında* contains no ideological statements and does not communicate anything other than its intention to amuse the reader. It does not express any ideas or situations that were not tolerable in indigenous works. Furthermore, it does not appear to have an innovatory literary force, as pseudotranslations often do.

²¹ For a discussion of how pseudotranslation was used as an ideological tool in Stalin's Soviet Union, see Toury 1995: 44.

Gideon Toury discusses the transformative role assumed by pseudotranslations in the shaping of certain literatures. He cites the examples of Russian and French literatures which were both heavily influenced by pseudotranslations in forming their concept of the novel in the 19th century. By writing novels of a specific kind and presenting them as translations, Russian and French writers constructed a prototype, a “required” type of novel for their domestic literary systems (Toury 1995: 43). This does not seem a likely function for *Hindistan Ormanlarında* which was published in 1926 in a context where the detective story had already established itself as a familiar and popular genre. *Hindistan Ormanlarında* is an exception to the law Toury formulates by suggesting that “there is hardly a single case where the decision to pseudo-translate, and the way this decision was implemented, could not be accounted for in terms of a more or less deliberate attempt to introduce new options into a culture while neutralizing many of the objections that might have arisen, had the novelties been offered in a straightforward, non-disguised manner” (Toury in press a: 9).

Hindistan Ormanlarında also offers information about the kind of readership it was intended for. Its generic and stylistic features, as well as its peritext, i.e., the paratextual elements printed in the book, supply clues about the metonymic context within which it intended to position the readership.

6.2.2.5 Siting *Hindistan Ormanlarında*

The simplicity of the plot, the treatment of characters, the emphasis on action and adventure over dialogues and the lack of a marked literary style are the main features that distinguish *Hindistan Ormanlarında* from Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes

stories. It seems that Yurdatap's purpose was to write a full story, bringing Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin together, in a limited format of 16 pages.

While *Hindistan Ormanlarında* appeared to position itself within the western tradition of detective fiction with its status as a pseudotranslation, the literary network within which it was received was a domestic one. A list advertised on the back cover of the book, presumably addressing the same readership as *Hindistan Ormanlarında*, demonstrates this in clear terms. The titles of some of these books offered an idea about their paragenic properties. Some of the books were clearly erotic fiction: *Kız mı Dul mu?* (Is She a Virgin or a Widow?), *İkisi de Gebe* (They Are Both Pregnant), *Kudurtan Geceler* (Maddening Nights). This shows that *Hindistan Ormanlarında* was published for an adult readership that mainly consumed non-canonical literature.

The list published in *Hindistan Ormanlarında* also featured a series of correspondence books, i.e. letter samples, were also included in the list. These letter samples were rather popular in early republican Turkey. There were letter samples for all subjects; love letters, marriage letters, letters of separation, samples of official petition to name a few. Yurdatap himself wrote several books of letter samples in the 1930s, some of which were printed more than once.²² The books containing letter samples have been published throughout the republican period, including the 1970s-1990s. Love and marriage letters have remained the most popular type of letters among these books. The reason behind the popularity of the letter samples merits a broader sociological investigation. The supply of letter samples in the market

²² The National Library catalogue offers the following list: *Yeni Sevda Mektup Nümuneleri* (New Love Letter Samples) (1933/1936), *Yeni İstida Örnekleri* (New Petition Samples) (1934), *Yeni ve Mufassal Aşk ve Evlenme Mektupları* (1938/1940) (New and Detailed Love and Marriage Letters), *Büyük Güzel Mektup Nümuneleri: Tebrik, Taziye, Düğün, Tören* (Great and Beautiful Letter Samples: Congratulations, Condolences, Weddings, Ceremonies) (1940).

indicates a demand by the readership, apparently incompetent in expressing themselves in writing. I suggest that the readership targeted by these books consisted of those sections of the public with lower cultural capital. Lack of formal schooling, shortage of proper knowledge of grammar and spelling rules, a cultural habitus that encouraged an affinity for oral communication over written expression were the traits that marked that specific readership.

The advertisement published on the back cover of *Hindistan Ormanlarında* also featured three folk tales, "people's books", which have been taken up in Chapter 5, Section 5.2. These were *Ferhat ile Şirin*, *Malik Şah* and *Arzu ile Kanber*. This indicates that some translations, or pseudotranslations, addressed the same group of readers as folk tales and that *Hindistan Ormanlarında* was one of those. This was not only a phenomenon valid in the 1920s. A number of publishers, which were active in the field of popular literature, published both indigenous and translated fiction and used the same advertising and marketing strategies to sell these books. Güven publishing house, the publishers of *Drakyola*, can be named as an example to these. For instance, Güven published a 16-page adventure story in a series titled "Resimli, Heyecanlı, Meraklı, Macera Romanları Serisi" ("Illustrated, Exciting, Curious Adventure Novels Series") in 1943. The story, which bore the title *Baytekin ile Tarzan Karşı Karşıya* (Baytekin Face to Face with Tarzan) was also written by Selâmi Münir Yurdatap.²³ The back cover of the book included an advertisement for other books published by the company and among these were also several indigenous "people's books" such as *Nasreddin Hoca ile Salamon*, *Selahaddin Eyubi* and *Bağdat Hırsız* (The Thief of Baghdad). This makes it clear that books published by Güven,

²³ Baytekin was the Turkish name given to Flash Gordon, and Tarzan was a popular and well-known character in Turkey by the 1940s mainly through the novels and films which featured him (see 6.3.1). Although the story was presented as an indigenous novel, the illustrations were borrowed from original Flash Gordon comics, which brings the possibility of a concealed translation to mind.

translation or non-translation, addressed a similar literary habitus. Although some of its books, or certain characters and plots in the stories, were borrowed from the western tradition, they stood in a metonymic relationship to domestic literature in terms of their reception.

6.2.3 *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* (Mehmetçik in the Dardanelles)

*Mehmetçik Çanakkalede*²⁴, published in 1937 by Yusuf Ziya Balçık Kitapevi, relates events from the Campaign of the Dardanelles which took place in 1914 during the First World War. It was presented as a work relating “war memoirs” [“harp hatıraları”] and contained a collection of battle stories. *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* was reprinted three times until 1945²⁵, indicating its popularity among the readership.

The title page indicates that the book is based on the memoirs of a Kâzım Kayatürk who fought in the First World War. This places the book within a narrative frame, and gathers all the individual battle stories into a meaningful whole, as a historical narrative. Nevertheless, the book’s narrative structure implies the presence of several narrators and displays thematic and stylistic variety. This variety positions *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* within an intergeneric area and prompts questions regarding the concepts of authorial originality and historical authenticity in a book claiming to be based on historical material.

²⁴ “Mehmetçik” is a general term used affectionately to refer to all Turkish soldiers, especially footsoldiers.

²⁵ According to *Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1938-1948*, the third and fourth editions were published in 1944 and 1945. There is no available information about the date of the second edition.

6.2.3.1 Peritextual Elements

The peritext of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* presents the book as a historical-documentary work. Although the cover offers no indication about the book's fictional or non-fictional features, the title page carefully emphasizes its documentary value. The cover features the illustration of a soldier in uniform, holding his bayonet. The title of the book is printed in capital letters over the illustration, at the top of the cover. There is no author's name or any generic designation on the cover. However, it should be stressed that the presence of the words "Mehmetçik" and "Çanakkale" indicated the thematic scope of the book and associated it with wartime stories which appeared as examples of nationalist fiction in the 1920s and 1930s.

Selâmi Münir Yurdatap's name is only mentioned in the title page without any authorial attributes like "writer" or "nâkil". This was a common practice for indigenous novels, both in and outside of the field of popular literature. Writers credited some books to their name without using a title introducing them as the "writer". The presence of the name was enough to indicate that the novel in question was written by the specific writer mentioned.²⁶ Evidently Yurdatap's name in the title page presented him as the writer of the book.

The title page of the book features a subtitle: "Hakiki, Resimli Savaş Vak'aları" ["Real, Illustrated Wartime Incidents"]. On the same page a statement is printed in smaller letters: "Quoted after / Borrowed from / Based on the war memoirs of Kâzım Kayatürk who served as cavalry reserve officer during the First World War." ["Umumi Harpta Çanakkalede süvari yedek subay olan Kâzım Kayatürk'ün harp hatıralarından iktibas edilmiştir."] Through this statement, Yurdatap seems to have

extended a plea to the readership, requesting them to regard the book as a piece of history with real documentary value. In other words, he appears to have intended to guide the readers' reception of the book and to increase its credibility in the eyes of the lay readership. The presentation of the book as historical memoir involved a commitment and included "a more binding contractual force" in terms of telling the "truth", than, for example, a novel (Genette 1997: 11). Nevertheless, this generic indication did not guarantee the documentary value of the work, since it was only a presentational element. Indeed, a look at the book itself reveals that the work mixes fact and fiction and travels between different narrative techniques with shifting points of view.

The book has several illustrations, as its subtitle promises. Six of the nine illustrations printed in the book are photographs featuring soldiers in uniform. Two of the photographs belong to Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk). The photographs showing soldiers are random pictures. The captions do not identify the soldiers, or the locations where the photos were taken. Nevertheless, it can be suggested that the use of photographs fixes the stories told in *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* in a certain period and location, adding to the credibility of the book in terms of its factual value.

The back cover of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* has an advertisement for four books published by the same company. These books were *Yanık Ömer ile Güzel Zeynep* (Love-struck Ömer and Pretty Zeynep), *Aşık Emrah ile Selvi* (Bard Emrah and Selvi), *Aşık Sümmani ile Gülperi* (Bard Sümmani and Gülperi), *Sağlık Kılavuzu ve Yaşama Bilgileri* (Guide to Health and Information on Life).

²⁶ Examples include *Turgut Reis* by Ali Rıza Seyfi (Resimli Ay Matbaası, 1932) *Bahar Çiçeği* (The Spring Flower) by Muazzez Tahsin Berkand (İnkılap Kitabevi, 1943), and another one of Yurdatap's

6.2.3.2 The Plot and Characters

Mehmetçik Çanakkalede is made up of two kinds of narration: historical information conveyed by a third-person, an omniscient narrator, and short stories told by a first person narrator. It is possible to view the eleven different chapters constituting the book as parts of a larger narrative: that is, the story of the Çanakkale Campaign. The book revolves around the events which took place during the war, and regardless of the various points of view adopted by the author, which will be the topic of the next section, there is a form of narrative progression. This narrative progression, coupled with the fact that the stories are told by a first-person narrator, presumably Kâzım Kayatürk, also enables the assessment of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* as a novel, despite the fact that it appears as a collection of historical stories at first sight. Furthermore, in his *Halk Kitaplarına Dair*, Faruk Rıza Güloğul describes the book as a new form of “people’s book” which he terms “the national story” [“millî hikâye”] (Güloğul 1937: 37-38). This indicates that *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* was in fact received by the readership as fiction, rather than history.

Mehmetçik Çanakkalede opens with a chapter informing the readers of the identity of Kâzım Kayatürk and offers a general historical outline of the Çanakkale Campaign. Chapter 2 reports the achievements of Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) at the Çanakkale Campaign. The remaining chapters are accounts of heroic deeds carried out by individual soldiers in various battles, except for Chapter 11, which relates the end of the Çanakkale Campaign resulting in the victory of Ottoman troops.²⁷

indigenous novels, *Şehvet Geceleri* (Nights of Passion) (Ay-Bey Yayınevi, 1946).

²⁷ Chapter 3 is the story of a group of soldiers who sneak into the enemy barracks to steal their food. Chapter 4 is an account of Sergeant Mehmet who defends the Turkish ramparts at the cost of his life. Chapter 5 is about a night in the barracks where soldiers dig up tunnels and encounter the enemy. In Chapter 6, a group of soldiers are sent on a reconnaissance mission where they meet the enemy troops. Chapter 7 is the story of a solo flight over Gelibolu by the pilot of a scout plane. Chapter 8 is yet

In *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* there are no female characters. Two women mentioned by the characters are the wife and the mother of two of the soldiers (Yurdatap 1937: 3, 22). The book, dominated by male characters, narrates the adventures of soldiers on the front, providing no room for civilian characters or stories. All characters, except the English spy who appears in Chapter 9 are “flat characters” endowed with a single trait, which makes their behaviour very predictable (Chatman 1989: 132). Yurdatap has not introduced any distinguishing features among the various characters. He has used similar attributes while describing the various characters and their achievements. These attributes were similar for all Turkish characters and although their names were different, they all appeared to be representations of the same character: the Mehmetçik. The following list can be offered to give an impression about the kind of attributes used by Yurdatap while depicting the characters: “düşman karşısında bir çelik kale” [“a castle of steel before the enemy”] (p. 33), “his handsome body strong as a lion” [“arслан gibi levent vücudu”] (p. 44), “çelik pençesi” [“claw of steel”] (p. 45), “cesur ve kurnaz” [“brave and cunning”] (p. 52), “Mehmetçiklerin azim, fedakârane ve cesurane hareketleri” [“the determination shown by the Mehmetçiks, their sacrificial and courageous behaviour”] (p. 56), “Mehmetçik bir aslan gibi kükredi” [“Mehmetçik roared like a lion”] (p. 62), “kafası yalçın kaya gibi duran Mehmetçikler” [“Mehmetçiks, who held their heads up high like steep rocks”] (p. 63), “arсланlar” [“lions”] (p. 68). The enemy, represented by the English spy in Chapter 9, is depicted by opposite traits like “the presumptuous, foolhardy, precarious

another reconnaissance story. Chapter 9 narrates the apprehension of an English spy in the Turkish garrison. Chapter 10, preceding the final chapter, is the story of a famous tunnel dug at Kikirikdere which successfully served as a battlement for the Turkish ramparts.

fellow” [“pişkin cüretkâr, kellesi koltuğunda herif”] (p. 58), “the brute” [“hınzır herif”] (p. 58), “the treacherous spy” [“hain casus”] (p. 61). Indeed, Yurdatap created a sharp demarcation between the Turkish characters, who are always qualified by heroic and positive attributes, and the enemy, exemplified by the British spy, who is invariably described in negative terms.

6.2.3.3 Narrative Structure and Narrative Voice

Mehmetçik Çanakkalede consists of 71 pages, divided into 11 short chapters. The first and the last chapters present a general account of the battles fought during the Çanakkale Campaign. The opening sentences of the first chapter titled “Çanakkale Harbi” (“The Campaign of the Dardanelles”) introduce the narrator, a young officer who was drafted into the army in 1914 leaving behind his wife of two months. The stories in Chapters 1, and 3-6 are presented by the narrator as a series of events which took place during various battles around Gelibolu. There are several narrator functions in the stories despite the fact that the title page of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* claims that the book is “Based on [quoted after/borrowed from] the war memoirs of Kâzım Kayatürk who served as cavalry reserve officer during the First World War.” [“Umumi Harpta Çanakkalede süvari yedek subay olan Kâzım Kayatürk’ün harp hatıralarından iktibas edilmiştir.”]

The chapters told by the “narrator”, Kayatürk, are narrated in first person singular. Kayatürk acts as an “overt” narrator, where he audibly communicates with the reader in his descriptions and in the dialogues he conveys (Chatman 1989: 219). There is also a “covert” narrator in the book, expressing events or speech in an indirect form, without making his presence visible (Chatman 1989: 197). The covert

narrator is an implicit omniscient one, relating events in third person singular. This narrator partly relates Chapter 1 where Kayatürk disappears from the discourse after a one-page introduction until he starts his narration again in Chapter 3. It appears as though Kayatürk is used as a narrative device by Yurdatap to express some of the individual battle stories included in the book. On the other hand, general historical statements and accounts in Chapters 1,2 and 11, as well as the individual battle stories in Chapters 8-10 are related by the covert narrator.

In the meantime, Chapter 7 introduces yet another narrator, a fighter pilot who had apparently given an account of his solo flight over the Dardanelles to *Harp Mecmuası* (The War Magazine). Yurdatap has borrowed the full story published in the magazine in full and used it as a chapter on the heroic acts performed by Turkish pilots in the Çanakkale Campaign. In the beginning of the chapter, Yurdatap assumes the role of the overt narrator in an introductory paragraph and directly addresses the readers. The following statement serves as a link between the introductory paragraph and the main story: “Bakınız o zaman intişar eden (Harp Mecmuası)nda kahraman tayarecimizin gönderdiği mektupta neler yazıyordu” [“Take a look at what was written in the letter sent by our heroic pilot to the War Magazine, which was published at the time.”] (Yurdatap 1937: 46). The pilot’s letter starts following this statement. He writes in first person singular the story of one of his flights over enemy positions. The use of this letter adds to the documentary value of the book which Yurdatap attempts to enhance by giving full reference to the magazine in a foot note. Nevertheless, Yurdatap does not appear to have written a historical-documentary book. Although the title page presents the book as a historical work based on the memoirs of an officer, Yurdatap interferes in the narrative structure of the text at various points and shifts the narrative voice. Furthermore, he creates a fictional

universe inside the text through his personalization of the war by focusing on the adventures of a group of soldiers and his neglect of the general historical and political background of the Çanakkale Campaign.

Chapter 3, the longest chapter in the book, is significant in that it initiates the fictional part. After Chapter 2, which resembles an informative history text and informs the readership of the heroic deeds performed by Mustafa Kemal in the Dardanelles, there is a paragraph which reads:

Bu tarihe kadar Çanakkalede Mehmetçiklerin toplu olarak gösterdikleri kahramanlık ve cesaret dolu vakalarından başka, insanı heyecana sürükleyen ve hayrette bırakan ayrı maceraları vardır ki her birisi başlı başına bir roman olabilecek kadar meraklıdır. Biz burada bu vakalardan bir kaçını anlatmadan geçmeyelim (Yurdatap 1937: 14).

[Apart from the heroic deeds and brave acts performed collectively by the Mehmetçik in the Dardanelles, there are exciting and amazing individual adventures which are so curious that each of them may constitute a novel in itself. Let us tell some of these events here (Yurdatap 1937: 14).]

This paragraph marks the passage into the fictional part of the book. The language used in the paragraph contains a number of terms that are common to fictional narratives, rather than history books. Attributes like “exciting” [“heyecana sürükleyen”] “amazing” [“hayrette bırakan”] “adventure” [“macera”] “novel” [“roman”] and “curious” [“meraklı”] were used to describe and promote popular fiction to the readers. These terms were used in the titles of a number of series of adventure and detective fiction as indicated in Section 6.2.1. What is more, the writer stresses that the events told in the book may constitute novels in themselves, suggesting that he has built his work on fiction material.

Yurdatap has shifted the point of view in this paragraph and interfered as the writer of the book, using the royal “we”. Furthermore, this paragraph is printed in

smaller typeset, providing a break in the narrative and suggesting a change of style – the move from “collective history” down to “individual adventure”. The combination of these two elements within a linear plot – the beginning of the campaign, adventures experienced by various soldiers contributing towards a final victory and the end of the campaign – lends the book a fictional narrative structure, rather than a history book.

An interesting feature of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* is its emphasis on action. Yurdatap has not explained the political, strategic or logistic motives behind the arrival of enemy troops to the Dardanelles. Neither has he touched upon the importance of the final victory won by the Ottoman Empire in terms of World War I. He has avoided delving into the political and military aspects of the war and placed sole emphasis on action-related aspects of the battles.

6.2.3.4 Siting *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede*

Yurdatap’s idea of writing battle stories set in the Dardanelles was not unique. Prior to the publication of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede*, a series of similar books had been published.²⁸ The popular success of these books appears as natural when one considers the short time period that had elapsed since the First World War and the War of Liberation. These novels addressed people’s fresh sense of nationhood and used a nationalist discourse to reinforce the idea of “Turkishness”. Nevertheless, the battle story was not a new genre that emerged in the republican period.

²⁸ Among many others, popular examples include *Gazinin Gizli Ordusu* (Gazi’s Secret Army) and *Meçhul Asker* (The Unknown Soldier) by Aka Gündüz (both published by A. Halit in 1930); *Çanakkale’de İntepe Topçuları* (The Intepe Artillery Troops at the Dardanelles) and *Çanakkalede Kumkale Muharebesi* (The Battle of Kumkale at the Dardanelles) by Fuat (both published by Anadolu Türk in 1932); *Gazinin Dört Süvarisi* (Gazi’s Four Horsemen) by Bürhan Cahit Morkaya (Kanaat Kitabevi, 1932).

It can be argued that the reception of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* was mainly governed by the familiarity of the readership with the battle-story genre. Battle stories, which started flourishing in the 1920s, were not confined to the books about the War of Liberation or the Çanakkale Campaign (Kaynaradağ 1983: 2825). The Turkish folk tradition also offered a series of folk tales on battles, such as *Yedi Yol Cengi*, *Battal Gazi* and *Hayber Kalesi* (Güloğul 1937: 3). Furthermore, there was also a tradition of tales narrating the deeds of heroic characters, such as *Köroğlu*. These heroic tales or battle stories display a similar narrative structure to the one followed by Yurdatap: rather than dwell upon love or other human emotions, they relate adventures where victories are always won by the sword (Boratav 1988: 35). The peritext of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* also indicates that the publishers positioned the book in the same segment of the market as they did with folk tales. Two of the books advertised on the back cover of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede*, namely *Aşık Emrah ile Selvi* and *Aşık Sümmüni ile Gülperi*, were folk tales.

Mehmetçik Çanakkalede displays a number of nationalist features in terms of its theme and style. The theme of the book, the Çanakkale Campaign, is associated with one of the major victories of the Turkish troops during World War I. Apart from his choice of the inherently nationalist subject matter, Yurdatap adopted a nationalist discourse in the book in terms of his selection of vocabulary and phraseology. This becomes evident after a close examination of the stories in the book where one frequently encounters statements such as “Dönmek bir Türk için en büyük günahdır” [“To surrender is the biggest sin for a Turk”] (p. 23) and “Vatanımıza ayak basan kirli çizmelilerin hergün beş on tanesini ahirete gönderdikçe avcılarımızın keyfi artıyordu” [“Our snipers felt merrier as they daily shot five or ten of those with dirty boots who treaded on the soil of our motherland.”] (p. 69).

Yurdatap's treatment of the enemy character, i.e. the British spy, also has ideological overtones. By depicting him as a hard-skinned traitor, Yurdatap creates an "other" in the spy and markedly sets him apart from the Turkish characters. The spy appears as the antithesis of the Turkish characters who appear are portrayed as the embodiment of "Turkishness".

In his *The Morals of History*, Tzvetan Todorov problematizes the understanding of a foreign culture as a general hermeneutic process where anything that is foreign to us, or anything that is not "I" is regarded as an "other". He suggests that the "other" can differ from us temporally, spatially or simply on an existential plane as "anyone who is not-I" (Todorov 1995: 14). The distinction maintained between "self" and "other" is crucial in the construction of national identities. As Ann Norton maintains, "In choosing what they will reject, nations determine what they signify and what they will become" (Norton 1988: 55). In his nationalist discourse, Yurdatap has defined the qualities of the "self", i.e. the nation, and the "other", i.e. the enemy, through the attributes he used to describe both parties. His discourse identifies Turkishness with bravery, heroism and physical strength, while he qualifies the enemy, presumably representing the western world, as brutal and insensitive. I would like to argue that Yurdatap's discourse must be regarded as part of the nation-building efforts in early republican Turkey. In the 1930s, the field of domestic literature witnessed the canonization of social realism through the works of authors such as Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu and Halide Edip Adivar who wrote about the National Struggle and Anatolia in the aftermath of the War of Liberation, as discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1. These works were shown as examples of "national literature", a type of literature that was unique and suitable to the Turkish context (various authors in Coşkun 1938). Through this reduction of Turkishness to

heroism and the stereotyping of Turkish and foreign elements in sharp contrast to each other Yurdatap's nationalist discourse represented a cruder approach towards the emerging Turkish identity. In fact, Yurdatap may be said to have created a form of "nationalist literature" which was condemned by writers and critics operating in the field of "serious" literature in the 1930s and 1940s (Nayır 1937: 30-31; Tuncel 1943: 1).

The assessment of the metonymics of *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* has to involve a series of factors which are not confined to the literary field alone. Yurdatap has created a text that combined at least two genres and two separate types of discourse. He has presented the text as a book of historical memoirs, but behind this presentation there lay a number of features that hinted at fictional aspects. He has both made use of an informative/historical discourse which is especially visible in the opening and closing chapters of the book, and a fictional narrative discourse switching back and forth among three narrators. Furthermore, Yurdatap added an explicitly nationalist tone to the stories, which must be evaluated within the ideological context of the day. The textual and stylistic variety combining fact and fiction, different narrative voices and the frequent use of nationalist elements places *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* within an intergeneric and multi-discursive field in the intersection of the folk tale, the modern battle story, the novel and the factual history book, all surrounded by an intensively nationalist discourse.

The statement in the title page illustrated Yurdatap's emphasis on "Kâzım Kayatürk" as the author of the memoirs, i.e. source of the events which are narrated in the book. Nevertheless, Yurdatap also overrode Kayatürk's status as the source of the book by replacing him with other narrators in various stories. In my view, this demonstrates that Yurdatap was trying to arrive at a compromise between writing a

factual book with a claim to represent reality and creating an action-oriented battle story. He prioritized the factual elements of the book in the peritext but placed heavier emphasis on action-oriented fictional elements in the text.

6.2.4 Siting Selâmi Münir Yurdatap

A fair impression of Selâmi Münir Yurdatap as a writer and translator cannot be built on only three of his works. Nevertheless, a descriptive analysis of these books has revealed four common tendencies which should be mentioned, not for the purpose of generalizing the present findings to all of his corpus, but to provoke a set of questions about the system of popular literature in Turkey in the first three decades of Yurdatap's literary career, i.e. in the 1920s-1950s.

The first and the most striking common tendency to be noted in three of his works analyzed above is the attitude towards the issue of authorial originality. The earliest work in this corpus, indeed one of Yurdatap's earliest works, *Hindistan Ormanlarında* (1926) is a pseudotranslation. It constitutes a case where Yurdatap readily appropriated two famous foreign characters, Sherlock Holmes and Arsene Lupin, and signed the book as "nâkil". The names of Conan Doyle and Leblanc, the original creators of the characters, were nowhere to be seen in the book. In *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* (1937) Yurdatap combined several genres and several discursive strategies, leaving the reader in doubt as to the factual and authorial grounds of the story. Although he signed the story in his name, he credited the stories to Kâzım Kayatürk. What is more, one of his chapters was composed of a letter written by a fighter pilot, cited from a magazine published during the war. This leads to the question of the function served by Yurdatap in authoring the book. Who was

Yurdatap in relation to *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede*? Was he merely a compiler, creating a collage out of various stories he had read or recorded? Was he the original author of the book, using Kayatürk and the fighter pilot as narrative instruments to increase the credibility of his stories and to catch the wave created in the market for popular literature by other nationalist wartime novels published before *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede*? And finally, did the identity of the creative force behind the book matter for the readership? In his translated work, *Drakyola* (1940), Yurdatap demonstrated that he was not much concerned with reflecting the original thematic and stylistic structure of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. He wrote a 16-page summary of a book whose source text adds up to over four hundred pages. The format clearly constrained him to simplify the plot, the narrative structure and the characters in *Dracula*. These findings imply that the poetics of popular literature allowed for a flexible view of originality and that it did not attach significance to the unitary structure of texts, as demonstrated by Yurdatap's indifference to rendering Bram Stoker's text in full. As maintained in Chapter 5 Section 5.3, the findings discussed in previous sections also suggest that the borders between translation and original were not at all clearly defined.

A second feature shared by the three works of Yurdatap analyzed is their kinship with folk literature. *Drakyola* shares some of its stylistic features with the Turkish folk tale. The peritexts of *Hindistan Ormanlarında* and *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* featured advertisements for folk tales, implying that they addressed the same segment of the readership. I consider the folk tradition as the main context in which Yurdatap's books were produced and received. The works stand in a metonymic relationship to Turkish folk literature. In my view, even those works that

displayed imported or translated characters were detached from their western context and placed within a specifically Turkish literary network.

Thirdly, the narrative style adopted by Yurdatap in all three works emphasized action over psychological, social and stylistic elements. This feature is markedly visible in *Drakyola* where Yurdatap preferred to convey action and adventure-related features rather than the gothic elements of *Dracula* which were completely purged from the story.

Finally, all three books were products of the field of “large-scale production”. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to consider them only as products of a commercial mind. The motive behind their production may have been commercial, but their production and marketing strategies offer invaluable information about the literary habitus that they served and the general literary background against which they were received. Furthermore, the translation and writing strategies employed by Yurdatap in *Drakyola* and *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* draws attention to how he, as a writer active in the field of large-scale production, viewed and implicitly communicated ideological messages such as those about gender and national identity through his works.

It should also be stressed that *Hindistan Ormanlarında* and *Drakyola* differed from *Mehmetçik Çanakkalede* in terms of their relationship to their paratextual features. Both *Hindistan Ormanlarında* and *Drakyola* were mainly governed and constrained by the series format utilized by their publishers, Cemiyet and Güven respectively. Although they were active in two different periods separated by fourteen years, both publishers used the 16-page format, which must have forced Yurdatap to adopt literary strategies that would enable him to write or translate in a concise and uncomplicated manner. The dramatic effects of these strategies are

easier to spot in *Drakyola*, where Yurdatap produced an action story with fewer and “flatter” characters. This case also provides an interesting example of how translators are bound not only by cultural, linguistic and ideological constraints, but also by formal features such as size and format.

6.3 Ali Rıza Seyfi: Nationalist at Heart

Ali Rıza Seyfi (1879-1958) was a translator, novelist and writer of historical books. He studied at the naval academy and served as a naval captain in the Ottoman army. In 1906-1909 he worked at the translation department at the Office of the Chief of General Staff. He left the navy in 1909 and continued his career as an independent translator and writer. His career as a writer started in the late 19th century and extended into the 1950s. Nevertheless, it would be fair to suggest that the most productive period in his career was the 1930s and the 1940s. He wrote 29 books, including his translations, novels and works on Turkish naval history (Yalçın 2001: 74). He also translated a play for the Translation Bureau: *Yanlışıklar Gecesi* (1946), a translation of Oliver Goldsmith’s *She Stoops to Conquer*. On the basis of his works, one can conclude that Ali Rıza Seyfi was mainly interested in Turkish history; the majority of his indigenous and translated works treated various historical themes of national importance for Turkey. His naval career appears to have affected his literary production; several of his books treat naval subjects or historical naval battles (Seyfi 1900; 1910; 1932; 1934; 1940; 1943; Karliyan-Belleyir 1934). Perhaps it is not a coincidence that a significant proportion of *Tarzanın Canavarları*, his translation of Edgar Rice Burroughs’ *The Beasts of Tarzan* which will be discussed in the next section, is set in a boat.

The majority of Ali Rıza Seyfi's works can be regarded as examples of "nationalist" writing. As it will become evident in the following sections, his works were characterized by nationalist elements that he merged into historical themes. His indigenous writing, which covered both fiction and non-fiction, carried nationalist overtones and possibly appeared to evoke feelings of patriotism in the readership. His translations, as represented by his *Tarzanın Canavarları* and *Kazıklı Voyvoda* (*Dracula*) in this section, also carry nationalist connotations both implicit and explicit. Apart from their nationalist features, Seyfi's works which will be subject to analytical description in this section, share at least one significant characteristic with Yurdatap's works taken up in Section 6.2, namely their lack of concern for authorial originality.

In this section I will analyze three of Ali Rıza Seyfi's works. The first one is his translation of Edgar Rice Burroughs' *The Beasts of Tarzan* (*Tarzanın Canavarları*). This will be followed by an analysis of Ali Rıza Seyfi's translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (*Kazıklı Voyvoda*). The last work which will be analyzed by Ali Rıza Seyfi is his collection of battle stories *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* (Turkishness Stands for Heroism).

6.3.1 *Tarzanın Canavarları* (The Beasts of Tarzan)

Tarzanın Canavarları was published in 1935 by Sinan Matbaası as a serialized novel which appeared in fifteen weekly issues of 16 pages. The readers were expected to collect the weekly issues and bind them in a book with the free cover supplied by the publishing company. *Tarzanın Canavarları* appeared as the third volume in a series of *Tarzan* novels. The first volume which was published in 1934, consisted of the

novel *Tarzan* (a translation of Burrough's *Tarzan of the Apes*) whose translator is unknown. This was followed by the second volume, *Tarzanın Dönüşü* (a translation of Burroughs' *The Return of Tarzan*) translated by Ali Rıza Seyfi in 1934 and 1935 respectively. The last issues of *Tarzanın Canavarları* advertised the upcoming Volume Four which would consist of *Tarzanın Oğlu* (a translation of Burroughs' *The Son of Tarzan*). However no information is available as to whether the book was published is available. The book is not included by the *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*. Furthermore, it is not available in the National Library.

Tarzanın Canavarları is a translation of Burrough's *The Beasts of Tarzan*, which was first published in 1918. The length of the two novels are similar: *Tarzanın Canavarları* contains 238 pages, while the 1920 Methuen Edition of *The Beasts of Tarzan* has 248 pages. Although the title of the source text was not indicated in the target text, the presentation of *Tarzanın Canavarları* as a translation and the similarity between the titles of the target and the source texts enabled me to locate the source text without many problems.

The format and appearance of *Tarzanın Canavarları* seem to have been shaped by the marketing strategy of the publishing house which used stills from Tarzan films as illustrations in the book and took advantage of the serialized format to encourage the readership to continue buying the future issues of the novel.

6.3.1.1 Peritextual Elements

Tarzanın Canavarları is a direct translation of Burroughs' *The Beasts of Tarzan*. Nevertheless, the author's name and the title of the source text are not mentioned once in the book. The cover features the title *Tarzan* in capital letters. There are two

illustrations from the American film “Tarzan, the Ape Man” where Johny Weismuller representing Tarzan is shown with various apes. There is a curious statement at the bottom of the cover which reads: “Roman Tarzandır” [“Novel is Tarzan”]. The cover also features the number of the issue (which is Number 1 for the general cover of the novel) and the price (5 kuruş). Names of the translator and the author are absent from the cover. The translator is introduced on the title page with the statement “İngilizceden Dilimize Çeviren: Ali Rıza Seyfi” (“Translated into Our Language from English: Ali Rıza Seyfi”). This brings about an interesting visibility for the translator at the expense of the author’s, since the author’s name is absent on the title page. The covers for the individual issues, dividing the novel into fourteen parts, only feature the novel’s title along with an illustration from the film but contain no translator’s or author’s name.

The novel features a great number of illustrations. In each issue, there is at least one full-page and one half-page illustration depicting one of the events related in the novel. The illustrations are accompanied by a caption, explaining the visual material printed on the page. For instance, while the photo shows Johny Weismuller leaning on a tree and resting, the caption reads “Tarzan leant on a tree trunk in order to overcome his fatigue as he watched his surroundings” [“Tarzan yorgunluğunu almak için bir ağaç kütüğüne yaslanarak hem dinleniyor, hem de etrafı seyrediyordu”] (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 145). The illustrations in the novel are taken from various films. The two major sources are “Tarzan, the Ape Man” (1932) and “Tarzan and His Mate” (1934).²⁹ The Turkish translation of the novel appears as a tie-in to

²⁹ *Tarzan* started appearing on the silver screen in 1918 and became the protagonist of a number of films until 1932, when the most famous film thus far, “Tarzan, the Ape Man” was released. *Tarzanın Canavarları* has borrowed the majority of its illustrations from the first two Tarzan films featuring Johny Weismuller and Maureen O’Sullivan. This enabled me to trace them to the two films shot before 1935: “Tarzan, the Ape Man” (1932) directed by W.S. Van Dyke and “Tarzan and His Mate” (1934) directed by Cedric Gibbons and Jack Conway. But there are also a few photographs printed in

these two films. It is not certain whether the films were screened in Turkey before 1935. However, a statement printed on the back covers to the first six issues of *Tarzanın Canavarları* suggests the existence of a close relationship between at least one of the films and the novel on which it was based by claiming that the Tarzan films promoted Tarzan novels. Another statement by the publishers printed on the back covers of the seventh and eighth issues also emphasized this relationship and maintained: “We enable you to follow the film of Tarzan with its pictures along with *the novel you enjoy so much” [“Seve seve okuduğunuz Tarzan romanile beraber sinemasını da resimlerle takip ettiriyoruz.”]. In the meantime, the peritextual elements around *Tarzanın Canavarları* place special emphasis on the status of the book as a novel. The cover states that “the Novel is Tarzan”, likewise the promotional statements printed on the back covers of the book carefully emphasize the status of *Tarzanın Canavarları* as a novel by describing it as “The Tarzan novel” [“Tarzan romanı:”] (issues 1-8) and “people’s novel” (“halk romanı”) (issues 1-6). The motive behind this emphasis may be a commercial one as the publishers felt the need to underscore the “unitary” structure of the individual issues composing the novel. In my view, the emphasis on the attribute “novel” originated from the need to warn the reader that each issue was not a self-contained text and that they would need to buy the forthcoming issues in order to find out the rest of the story.

The back covers of the various issues of *Tarzanın Canavarları* mainly featured promotional material advertising the novel and the previous volumes of *Tarzan* which appeared in the same series. Issues 1-6 carried an extract from a review of the novel printed in the newspaper *Cumhuriyet*. This epitextual element, which was

Tarzanın Canavarları which feature other actors as Tarzan. These were obviously taken from previous Tarzan films. Between 1918 and 1929 eleven films featuring Tarzan were shot. The first of these was by Stellan Windrow: “Tarzan of the Apes”. The last one, “Tarzan the Tiger” was directed by Frank Merrill in 1929 (<http://www.ac.wvu.edu/~Stephan/webstuff/tarzan.html>).

interestingly cited in the book and incorporated in the peritext, drew attention to the popularity of the *Tarzan* novels by stating that they sold millions of copies in the West and that they were translated into 17 languages. The successive issues contained various statements by the publishers on their back cover which advertised *Tarzanın Canavarları*, the two previous volumes of the series and the forthcoming volume.

The serialization of the translated novel led to a new form of segmentation in the book. While Ali Rıza Seyfi preserved the original segmentation of the novel into 21 chapters, the weekly issues introduced a secondary segmentation and stopped the novel in the middle of a chapter to be continued in the following week. It was not unusual for an issue to end in the middle of a sentence and the following issue would continue from where it left off. I suggest that there were two reasons behind this strategy. The first one was the format required by the publishing company which used 16 pages as a standard size for each issue. The second one had to do with a deliberate effort at triggering the curiosity of the readership in order to guarantee the continued sales of *Tarzanın Canavarları*. Instead of offering full chapters which could be regarded as self-contained narrative units, the publishers used the serial format in order to create cliff-hangers for the readership who would be willing to buy the next issue to find out the rest of the story.

6.3.1.2 Plot and Narrative Structure

Tarzanın Canavarları narrates another episode in the story of Tarzan of the Apes who is forced to return to his native Africa after his wife and son are kidnapped by his arch-enemy Rokoff. Tarzan has taken residence in London with his family as

Lord Greystoke. Rokoff, who has escaped from prison, devises a scheme to kidnap Tarzan's young son in order to avenge himself of Tarzan's previous court testimony which resulted in a sentence for life imprisonment. Tarzan and his wife get on board the ship Rokoff has arranged to take them to Africa. They arrive in Africa together and after a series of adventures, Tarzan manages to rescue his wife and son from the hands of the evil Rokoff and his accomplices. Tarzan's lion-friend Sheeba kills Rokoff, relieving Lord Greystoke and his family from Rokoff's curse forever.

The plot summarized above corresponds to that constructed by E.R. Burroughs in *The Beasts of Tarzan*. Ali Rıza Seyfi has not manipulated the storyline and has followed the same progression of events. The characters and the narrative structure are also identical. On the other hand, there are a number of shifts in the translation vis-à-vis the source that deserve a detailed analysis which will be carried out in the following section.

6.3.1.3 Matricial Norms in *Tarzanın Canavarları*

Any study of norms in a translated text requires a comparison with the source. The first step involves the mapping of a translation onto its assumed source (Toury 1995: 77) which proves to be unproblematic for *Tarzanın Canavarları*. The second step in the comparison of the translation with its source involves the selection of units of analysis (Toury 1995: 88). I have chosen to concentrate on one specific aspect of the translated text, namely, additions to the source text. These additions become visible in a preliminary analysis involving the comparison of individual paragraphs chosen randomly from different parts of *Tarzanın Canavarları*. Let us consider the following examples:

Example 1:

Target Text:

-Çocuk nerede?

Karanlığın içinde yüzü seçilmeyen yabancı elini denize doğru uzattı:

-Bakınız, şurada küçük bir vapur var ki: Fenerleri seçiliyor. İşte çocuğunuz o vapurun içindedir!

Tarzan bu adamın yüzünü görmeğe çalışıyordu, **ancak bütün gücünü ve aklını gözlerine vermiş iken** yine karşısındakini bundan evvel görmüş olduğunu bir türlü hatırlayamamıştı.

Eğer Tarzan bu adamın **büyük düşmanı (Rokof) un yoldaşı ve fenalık arkadaşı** (Aleksi Pavloviç) olduğunu seçebilseydi böyle bir adamın içinde **kancıklık** ve alçaklıktan başka hiç bir şey olamayacağını hemen anlar ve attığı her adımın kendisini **büyük ve korkunç tuzaklara** düşüreceğini düşündürdü (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 7-8).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

- Where is the child?

The stranger whose features were difficult to distinguish in the darkness pointed his hand at the sea:

- See the small boat there: Its lights are visible. Your child is on that boat!

Tarzan was trying to see the man's face, but **although he had concentrated all his power and intellect on his eyes**, he did not recognize the man as one whom he had ever seen.

Had Tarzan recognized that this man was (Aleksi Pavloviç), **his big enemy (Rokof's) comrade and partner in crime**, he would immediately have known that there could be nothing but **betrayal** and treachery in such a man's deed and he would also have thought that each step he took would lead him to **huge, horrible traps** (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 7-8).]

Source Text:

-Where is the boy, asked Greystoke.

-On that small steamer whose lights you can see just yonder.

In the gloom Tarzan was trying to peer into the features of his companion, but he did not recognize the man as one whom he had ever been seen. Had he guessed that his guide was Alexis Paulvitch he would have realized that naught but treachery lay in the man's heart, and that danger lurked in the path of every move (Burrouhgs 1920: 11).

Example 2:

Target Text:

Genç kadın bir iğrenme ve **ürkme** titreyişiyle **hemen geri dönüp** yukarı çıktı ve **merdivenin başındaki sağlam kapıyı** büyük bir **özen (itina)** ile kapayıp kilidini vurarak **sarhoşları aşağıda mahpus bıraktı** (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 161).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

With a shudder of disgust and **alarm** the young woman **turned back** at once and clambered above. Shutting the **strong door at the top of the stairs** and locking it with great care, **she imprisoned the drunkards down** below
(*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 161).]

Source Text:

With a shudder of disgust she clambered above and to the best of her ability closed and made fast the hatch above the heads of the sleeping guard (Burroughs 1920: 174).

The phrases shown in bold characters are additions to the source text made by Ali Rıza Seyfi. These additions offer clues about some of the matricial norms observed by the translator. The translation of *Dracula* described and analyzed in Section 6.2.1 was the product of an intensive process of abridgement governed by a high number of omissions, both in terms of plot and characters. This illustrated that the matricial norms observed by its translator, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, were largely regulated by the initial decision to publish the book in a specific series with a specific format. In *Tarzanın Canavarları*, the matricial norms observed by the translator do not appear to be governed by the 16-page format. Instead, the additions seem to serve a variety of purposes.

When studied collectively and systematically, the additions to *The Beasts of Tarzan* can help trace the concept of translation held by Ali Rıza Seyfi. The matricial norm observed by Yurdatap, i.e. intensive omission activity with a view to complying with the foreseen format of the book, which stemmed from commercial concerns, need not apply for his contemporary Ali Rıza Seyfi. The above examples demonstrate that rather than omitting elements of the source text, Ali Rıza Seyfi chose to add to the text.

What was the function of these additions and what were the underlying motives that may have encouraged the translator to engage in such additions? The answers to these questions are to be found in the target text itself and in an in-depth descriptive analysis of the additions made by Ali Rıza Seyfi.

In the above examples one comes across three main types of additions: explanatory, lexical and stylistic. The first type of addition can be encountered in Ali Rıza Seyfi's description of Alexis Paulvitch in Example 1. Here, he adds an introductory statement to the paragraph emphasizing Paulvitch's close connection with Rokoff. A second example to explanatory additions is Ali Rıza Seyfi's paraphrase of "hatch" as "merdivenin başındaki sağlam kapı" ["the strong door at the top of the stairs"] in Example 2. Another example to additions in the target text are the lexical supplementations which can be found extensively in *Tarzanın Canavarları*. These are additions where Ali Rıza Seyfi used a neologism in purist Turkish in the main text and explained the word by giving the Ottoman equivalent in brackets. There is a lexical addition in Example 2 where Ali Rıza Seyfi uses "özen (itina)" to translate "to the best of her ability", both meaning "care" or "attention" in Turkish. An overwhelming number of additions made by Ali Rıza Seyfi in *Tarzanın Canavarları* are motivated by stylistic concerns. Ali Rıza Seyfi has made use of a strong and visual language in his translation. In many instances he has embellished the language of the source text with additional adjectives and colloquial vocabulary, which reinforced the air of adventure and mystery offered by the plot. In the above examples, the stylistic additions can be encountered in two instances: one is the conjoint phrases of near-synonyms "kancıklık ve alçaklık" (used to translate "treachery") and "iğrenme ve ürkme" (used to translate "disgust"). The second instance where additions were carried out for stylistic purposes can be encountered in

the translation of “danger” as “büyük ve karanlık tuzaklar” [“huge, horrible traps”] and of “closed and made fast the hatch above the heads of the sleeping guard” as “kapıyı ... kapayıp kilidini vurarak sarhoşları aşağıda mahpus bıraktı” [“shutting the strong door ... locking it with great care, she imprisoned the drunkards down below”].

Throughout his translation Ali Rıza Seyfi seems to have invented various details for undetailed descriptions, added dialogues to enrich certain ideas and shown a tendency to make general statements more specific. Let me now dwell upon each of the three types of additions in more detail.

Explanatory Additions

In *Tarzanın Canavarları* Ali Rıza Seyfi introduced a number of additions to the source text with a view to filling gaps of information or conveying the meaning of certain terms or proper names.

In the introduction of *Tarzanın Canavarları*, Ali Rıza Seyfi added three new paragraphs to the source text for the purpose of refreshing the readers’ memory about the identity and adventures of Tarzan. These paragraphs may also have served to introduce the adventures of Tarzan to the readers who had not read the two previous books in the series. In the source text Burroughs made a similar introduction by writing “John Clayton, Lord Greystoke – who had been ‘Tarzan of the Apes’ sat in silence in the apartments of his friend, Lieutenant Paul d’Arnot, in Paris” (Burroughs 1920: 1). In Ali Rıza Seyfi’s translation, this short introduction assumes the following form:

Target Text:

Dorno bu sözünü söylediği sırada karşısında bizim eski ve sevgili tanıdık (Tarzan) vardı. Ancak Tarzan şimdi Afrika ormanlarında gördüğümüz çıplak, yaban adamı (Tarzan) değildi.

O şimdi babasından kalan mirası almış, Opar şarından (Şehir) getirdiği altın külçelerini paraya çevirmiş, sevgilisi Ceyin ile evlenip bir de çocuğu olmuştu; Tarzan artık Greystok lordu Con Kleyton idi (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 3).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

As d'Arnot said these words, our good old friend (Tarzan) sat across him. However Tarzan was no longer the naked, savage (Tarzan) we had seen in African forests.

Since then he had inherited his father's property, cashed in the gold bars he brought from the city of Opar, married his sweetheart Jane and had a child; Tarzan was now John Clayton, Lord Greystoke.]

A similar addition was made to the first paragraph of Chapter 10, "İsveçli Ahçı" ["The Swedish Cook" – "The Swede" in Burroughs (1920: 110)] (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 100). Ali Rıza Seyfi introduced a sentence reminding the readers of an event which had taken place in Chapter 8: "Tarzan kudurmuş yabani yamyamlar arasında, kazığa bağlı, ölüm karşısında bulunurken birdenbire Kaplan Şitanın ormandan fırlayıp onun yanına geldiğini söylemiştik" ["We had said earlier that as Tarzan was facing death, tied to the stake, among mad savage cannibals, Sheeta the Tiger leapt out of the forest and came to him."] (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 100).

Ali Rıza Seyfi also added small explanatory notes in various parts of the translation. He explained "infernal machine" (Burroughs 1935: 200) as "öldürücü cehennem makineleri, yani kurularak istenilen vakıtta patlatılan tahrip bombaları" ["the lethal infernal machines, in other words, destructive bombs that can be time-set and exploded whenever required"] (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 183). Similarly, he used an addition to explain "anthropoid" (Burroughs 1920: 26): "antropoitler (yani

maymun adamlar)” [“anthropoids (that is to say, ape men)”] (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 21).

Lexical Additions

Tarzanın Canavarları was published in 1935 in a period where the language reform movement was at its peak and neologisms and derivations from old Turkish roots were widely promoted by the republican administration as a significant tool in their culture planning efforts as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1. Ali Rıza Seyfi who seems to have been affected by the purist movement to a large extent, made use of a large number of neologisms in his translation. However, he must have avoided the risk of not being understood by the readers by supplying in brackets the Ottoman equivalents of the terms he used. Among the words he used were “tutsak (esir)” [captive/prisoner] (p. 4), “anık (hazır)” [ready] (p. 8), “doğu (şark)” [east] (p. 29), “doyumluk (ganimet)” [booty] (p. 44), “gök bitimi (ufuk)” [horizon] (p. 50), “ateşli mızrak (tüfenk)” [rifle] (p. 74), “acun (cihan, alem)” [world] (p. 76), “avul (köy)” [village] (p. 77), “alan (meydan)” [square] (p. 85), “belge (alamet)” [sign] (p. 91), “yaratık (mahluk)” [creature] (p. 91), “yıldız (şimal)” [north] (p. 106), “düş (rüya)” [dream] (p. 108), “sonuç (akibet)” [result] (p. 126), “kaygı (keder)” [concern] (p. 126), “durum (hal)” [situation] (p. 131), “oymak (kabile)” [tribe] (p. 131), “oymak başı (kabile reisi)” [tribal chief] (p. 132), “dilmaç (tercüman)” [interpreter] (p. 132), “güven (itimat ve emniyet)” [trust and safety] (p. 148), “urunç (heyecan)” [excitement] (p.152), “lodos (cenubigarbi)” [southwest] (p. 219).

Stylistic Additions

As mentioned above, Ali Rıza Seyfi used a more vivid language and a higher amount of slang than E.R. Burroughs in *Tarzanın Canavarları*. He embellished the style by exaggerating the sensational aspects of the novel with additional descriptive elements and additional dialogues. Consider the following expansion introduced by Ali Rıza Seyfi helping to dramatize the tension between Tarzan and Rokoff, his principal enemy:

Target Text:

Ulan alçak yaban adamı! Maymunların pis çocuğu, bu yamyamlar şimdi seni dilim dilim yemeğe başlayınca bende senin yüreğini şu keskin bıçağımla kesip alacağım, çiğ çiğ yiyeceğim! Sen şimdi yamyamlara vermiş olduğum sevgili çocuğunun başına gelecekleri de düşün! Yamyamlar bu piçi yemiyecekler. Eğer yerlerse senden öcümü istediğim gibi almış olamam: çocuk kesilip yamyamların karnına girerse iş kolayca bitmiş olur. Ben ise senin yüreğine en büyük acıları vermek için daha iyi düşündüm. Büyüyüpte İngiltere parlamentosunda kurumlu, zengin bir lort olacağını sandığın o mini mini çocuğun yabanilerin elinde bir kıcı çıplak yamyam yabanisi olarak büyüyecek adam eti yemeğe alışacak; orman canavarlarından daha kötü, daha iğrenç bir yaratık olacak! Avrupanın, bayındır Londranın, o parlak Parisin yüzünü bile görmeyecek! Evet, sen şimdi dilim dilim kesilip yamyamların karnına gideceksin. Çocuğun senin gibi birden kurtulmıyacak. Ölünceye kadar yamyamların içinde delik burnunda kocaman, çirkin ağaç, bakır, demir yuvarlaklar taşıyarak, yemek için adam eti arıyacak! Ya karın Ceyinin sen öldükten sonra çekeceklerini düşünüyor musun maymun azmanı alçak! (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 86-87)

[Target Text in Back-translation:

You hideous wild boy! The ugly child of the apes, when these cannibals start slicing you up and eat you I will cut your heart out with this sharp knife of mine and eat it raw! Just think of the destiny of your beloved child whom I have just handed over to the cannibals! They are not going to eat the bastard. If they eat him I will not have taken my revenge on you; if your child is eaten up by the cannibals, it will all end much too easily. I've thought of something better in order to give the greatest pain to your heart. Your little boy whom you thought would become a proud, rich lord with a seat in the English parliament, will grow up among the savages as a bare-assed wretched cannibal, will get used to eating human flesh, will become a worse and more disgusting creature than the beasts of the jungle. He will never see Europe, the fine city of London

and the glittering Paris! Yes, you will now be cut into thin slices and make food for the cannibals. Your child will suffer much longer. Till the day he dies he'll live among the cannibals, carrying huge ugly wooden, copper, iron rings in his pierced nostrils, looking for human flesh to feed on! Have you thought of the suffering which awaits your wife Jane after your death, you wicked giant of a monkey!]

The context within which he placed his addition was the following:

Source Text:

He told Tarzan that he himself was going to eat the ape-man's heart. He enlarged upon the horrors of the future life of Tarzan's son, and intimated that his vengeance would reach as well to Jane Clayton (Burroughs 1920: 95)

Ali Rıza Seyfi's expanded version continues with details of the future sufferings of Jane which I have not included here. In the above quote, Ali Rıza Seyfi appears to have "enlarged upon the horrors of the future life of Tarzan's son" in extensive detail. These additions have been made without an attempt to reflect Burroughs' literary style. I suggest that Ali Rıza Seyfi's purpose was to foreground striking and adventure-related elements. Some of the additions he made also serve to exaggerate some of the traits of Burroughs' characters. The two villains of the story, Rokoff and his accomplice Paulvitch, are depicted in stronger and more vivid language in *Tarzanın Canavarları*. Their dialogues are characterized by a colloquial language as exemplified above. This mainly adds to their evil traits and heightens excitement and tension in the story. Ali Rıza Seyfi has added detailed descriptions in passages dealing with these two characters. An example can be found in a passage describing the Nihilist past of Paulvitch to which Ali Rıza Seyfi added dramatic details about Paulvitch's betrayal of his Nihilist comrades. Burroughs gave the following description:

Source Text:

Paulvitch winced as he recalled the denunciation of him that had fallen from the lips of one of his former comrades ere the poor devil expiated his political sins at the end of a hempen rope (Burroughs 1920: 200).

Target Text:

Çarlık hükümetinin sıra sıra astığı Nehlistlerden biri son dakikasında darağacında acı acı haykırmış, kendilerine böyle kançıklık eden arkadaşın dünyanın en korkunç, en eziyetli işkencesile can vermesi için dua etmişti. Pavloviç şimdi Afrika ormanının karanlığında bu hadiseyi düşünürken istemeyerek titredi; ipe, ölüme teslim ettiği arkadaşlarının darağacı altındaki solgun yüzleri tekrar gözlerinin önünde canlandı, kendisi için edilmiş olan o uğursuz lânet ve bedduayı orman dallarının hışırtısı içinde açıkça işidiyorum sandı (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 183).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

One of the Nihilists the Tsar government hung one after the other had given out a bitter cry in his last moment on the gallows and prayed that their friend who such betrayed them should die the most horrible, the most torturous death. As Paulvitch thought of this event in the darkness of the African forest he shivered; he had a vision of the pale faces of his friends under the gallows whom he took to death and he thought that he actually heard that ominous damnation and malediction through the sound of the branches in the forest (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 183).]

The way Ali Rıza Seyfi dramatized Paulovitch's thoughts and feelings and the details he added to Burroughs' short reference to the denouncement of Paulvitch by his comrades offers a good example to his stylistic expansions.

Another character whose description introduced a number of additions is Anderssen, the Swedish cook of the ship. In *The Beasts of Tarzan* Anderssen does an unexpected favour for Jane saving her and a baby thought to be Tarzan's son from the ship where they are imprisoned. This shocks Jane who had previously thought of the Swedish cook as an evil person, mainly because of his ugly appearance. Anderssen pays a high price for this good turn, and is killed by a native African while he is on the run from Rokoff's men. It is interesting to note that Ali Rıza Seyfi has described the heroic character of Anderssen through adjectives that are rather

unique to Turkish culture. While Burroughs wrote that Anderssen had “the heart of a chivalrous gentleman beneath a repulsive exterior” (Burroughs 1920: 121), Ali Rıza Seyfi’s epithets for Anderssen “batur” and “Alp”: “İsveçli ahçının çirkin kılığı, sevilemeyecek yüzü altında bir yiğit adamın, temiz yürekli bir batur [*] ve Alp’in büyük yüreği çarpıyordu” [“Under the ugly appearance and the repulsive face of the Swedish cook, there beat the great and innocent heart of a brave man, of a ‘batur’ and ‘Alp’.”] (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 111). What is even more noteworthy is that Ali Rıza Seyfi also added a footnote, explaining the heroic attributes he used: “* Batur: öz Türkçe kahraman demek. Bahadır sözü Türkçe Batur’un Farisi telâffuzudur. Hindistana nice yüz yıllar hükmetmiş Türk devletleri beylerinin bu güne kadar kalmış oğullarına Hindistanda bu güne kadar (Bahadır) ünvanı verilmektedir. Ahlâk ile yiğitliği birleştirenlerin adıdır” [“*Batur*: means hero in pure Turkish. The word *Bahadır* is the Persian pronunciation of Turkish *Batur*. In India, the title (*Bahadır*) is given to the offspring of the princes of the Turkish states which ruled India for many centuries. It is a name for those who combine high morals and bravery.”] (*Tarzanın Canavarları* 1935: 111). In my view, Ali Rıza Seyfi’s addition in this example does not only serve stylistic purposes. It appears as though Ali Rıza Seyfi took the opportunity to introduce a nationalist statement in the text using the of the translation in order to convey some information about the term “batur”. While he did that, he also made a point of drawing attention to the historical achievements of the Turks of Central Asia.

6.3.1.4 Treatment of Proper Names

Ali Rıza Seyfi gave Turkish transcriptions of the proper names and placed all proper names within brackets. As mentioned in Sections 6.2.1.2 and 6.2.2.2, this was a strategy inherited from Ottoman script and was widely used in the fields of both translation and indigenous writing. In *Tarzanın Canavarlarında* Tarzan remained as “Tarzan”, due to the fact that the word is pronounced in this manner in Turkish. Jane became “Ceyin”, Rokoff “Rokof”, Sheeta “Şita”, and d’Arnot “Dorno”.

Paulvitch was transcribed as “Pavloviç” by Ali Rıza Seyfi. He changed the Anglicized transliteration of the name and converted it back to its original Russian pronunciation which was probably more familiar to the Turkish readership.

6.3.1.5 Siting *Tarzanın Canavarları*

There are three main features of *Tarzanın Canavarları* that enable us to explore various aspects of the field of translated popular literature in Turkey in the 1930s. The first one is its close connection with the world of cinema, demonstrating the strong relationship between popular literature and film which the publishers utilized as a major marketing strategy. The second feature pertains to the actual translation decisions taken by Ali Rıza Seyfi which show a clear preference for the generic expectations of the readership, rather than a concern for preserving the style of the source author. The third feature is also based on the translation decisions and helps us to reveal how norms observed in translations of popular literature served nationalism and nation-building in early republican Turkey.

Cinema was a popular form of entertainment in the Turkish cities throughout the period under study. This also had a large impact on the field of translated and indigenous popular literature. Publishers tried to follow new foreign films coming to Turkey and showed an effort to publish their novel simultaneously (Garan 1949). Some of these novels were translations of novels which were made into popular feature films such as *Ölmiyen Aşk*³⁰ and *Yağmurlar Gelince*³¹. A number of novels were launched under the name “sinema romanı” (“cinema novel”) combining two forms of popular representation: cinema and novel. This combination appeared to have a great deal of commercial success which is evident from the fact that it was widely available in the market. The strategy used by publishers was to acquire the synopsis or the dialogue list of popular feature films and to have them translated, or rather, enlarged into full novels (Garan 1949). An example is an abridged and anonymous translation of *Gulliver’s Travels* published in 1941 by Türkiye Yayınevi. The book claims to be the “novel of the film” [“filmin romanı”] and features numerous illustrations from *Gulliver’s Travels*, an animated cartoon by Paramount Pictures.³² These findings require one to go beyond the level of the individual work, or even beyond an individual field within the larger system of popular culture while studying translated popular literature. Some translated works, such as *Tarzanın Canavarları* played on the popularity and familiarity of their characters mainly

³⁰ Translation of Emily Brontë’s *Wuthering Heights*. Translated by Avni İnel and Hamdi Varoğlu. Published by İnel Kitabevi in 1942. The title of the translation was borrowed from the title of the movie based on Brontë’s novel (Erem 1943: 428).

³¹ Translation of Louis Bromfield’s *When The Rains Came*. Translated by Ömer Rıza Doğrul and published by A. Halit in 1942.

³² Numerous examples can be shown for such novels. A brief list includes:

Charles Brackett (1944) *Sabah Olmasın*, tr. Vahdet Gültekin, İstanbul: Arif Polat. Appeared in the series of “Filme Alınmış Şaheserler Serisi” (Series of Filmed Masterpieces).

John Steinbeck (1944) *Kenar Mahalle*, tr. ?, İstanbul: İstanbul Basımevi. Appeared in the series of “Filme Alınmış Şaheserler Serisi” (Series of Filmed Masterpieces).

Eleanor Smith (1945) *Yılan Kadın*, tr. O. and N. Yar, İstanbul: Stad Basımevi. Appeared in the series of “Sinema Romanları Serisi” (Series of Cinema Novels).

through their films. There is little doubt that the kinship between these examples of popular fiction and popular cinema would have a bearing on the way translated popular literature was received. By referring to the films and using stills as illustrations in those books, publishers emphasized the relationship between the book and the film, thus creating a new intertextual field, where the metonymic context of the book was no longer confined to the field of translated or indigenous literature, but also expanded into the realm of cinema.

The second feature that needs to be mentioned about *Tarzanın Canavarları* concerns Ali Rıza Seyfi's translation strategy. As mentioned in the previous sections, Ali Rıza Seyfi radically changed E. R. Burroughs' literary style through the additions he made in *The Beasts of Tarzan*. He undermined the concise and sophisticated language used by Burroughs in the book and replaced it with a much more vivid and colloquial language. He did not confine himself to the ideas or depictions offered by Burroughs and added new information, dialogues and stylistic embellishments. Although Ali Rıza Seyfi followed the plot created by Burroughs rather closely, he did not follow his style. I would argue that *Tarzanın Canavarları* capitalized on the popularity of its protagonist, Tarzan, rather than the literary merits of Burroughs. As mentioned in Section 6.2.2.3, popular heroes enter public circulation, often at the cost of their writers' fame. Likewise, in *Tarzanın Canavarları* Ali Rıza Seyfi, or the publisher, ignored the source author altogether, providing no room for his name anywhere in the book. The generic features of the novel were placed in the foreground, through the cover, the illustrations and the idiomatic language which characterized Ali Rıza Seyfi's style as a translator.

When *Tarzanın Canavarları* is compared with *Yanlışlıklar Gecesi*. Ali Rıza Seyfi's translation of Oliver Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer*, one is faced with a

different set of translational norms. Like other translations published by the Ministry of Education, *Yanlışlıklar Gecesi* foregrounds its source text and author in its peritextual features. Unlike *Tarzanın Canavarları*, Ali Rıza Seyfi did not make any additions to the source text, except for some footnotes which serve to explain foreign cultural elements (Goldsmith 1946: 4, 14, 46). He observed the norms recommended by the Translation Bureau in terms of the preservation of the textual integrity of the source text and the use of original English orthography in the translations. The difference in Ali Rıza Seyfi's translational behaviour might have originated from a series of factors such as the editing mechanism of the Bureau, the canonical status of *She Stoops to Conquer* and the existence of two different target readerships.

Although *Tarzanın Canavarları* was presented as, and was, an adventure novel, Ali Rıza Seyfi introduced a political and ideological aspect to it. The most explicit ideological intervention to the translation was carried out in his addition of a footnote describing the adjective "batur". This footnote made a small excursion into Turkish history and recalled one of its heroic episodes. Interestingly, Ali Rıza Seyfi claimed a continuity between modern Turkey and a Turkic state which was founded and disappeared a long time ago. As suggested in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1.2, the creation of a common past was one of the tools used by republican culture planners. The Turkish Historical Society was active in proving that the Turkish nation and culture dated back to a time immemorial, preceding the Ottoman Empire. In my view, Ali Rıza Seyfi's addition of the term "batur" and its explanation can be considered a small-scale effort at reinforcing the suggested deep-rootedness of Turkish history. Moreover, Ali Rıza Seyfi's purist approach to the Turkish language is evident in the translation. His use of neologisms can be

viewed as an attempt to integrate popular entertainment and public education in a time when the purist movement was associated with nationalism and patriotism.

Tarzanın Canavarları was a translation that belonged with the field of large-scale production. Nevertheless, its analysis serves a purpose that goes beyond an exploration of marketing strategies. One can encounter the use of two significant tools of nation-building in the translation, namely history and language. The lexical additions and the addition of a footnote with strong nationalist overtones point at a nationalist undertext created by the translator. Seen from this perspective, the book adds nationalism as a new dimension to the poetics within which it was produced and received..

6.3.2 *Kazıklı Voyvoda* (Viad the Impaler)

In Section 6.2.1, I offered a descriptive analysis of Selâmi Münir Yurdatap's translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula: Drakyola, Kan İçen Adam*. In this section, I will introduce another *Dracula* translation: *Kazıklı Voyvoda* by Ali Rıza Seyfi, published in Ottoman script in 1928 by the Resimli Ay Kütüphanesi (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928). Eighteen years later, in 1946, the novel was reprinted in the Latin alphabet by Çığır Kitabevi (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1946). While the content and structure of the two editions are identical, the vocabulary of the second one was revised to reflect the changes Turkish had undergone in the eighteen years that had elapsed. In particular, many Ottoman words were replaced by less sophisticated new Turkish lexical items. Both texts offer the same approach towards translation. In this section, I will refer to

both editions to illustrate my arguments. Quotations are from the first edition of 1928.³³

An interesting feature of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* is the fact that it was presented as an original Turkish novel. In fact, it was explicitly presented as the first in a series of “Meraklı Romanlar” (Curious Novels), launched by the Resimli Ay Publishing House. On the covers of both editions, Ali Rıza Seyfi was presented as the book’s “author”. The first edition presented him as the “author” (“muharrir”), while the second edition gave his name in the cover page, without any attribute, as this was the convention regarding authors of books, as mentioned in Section 6.2.3.1. However, the status of the book as a translation of *Dracula* has recently been revealed (Scognamillo 1997: 5; Scognamillo 1998: 56). Indeed, my comparison of source and target texts shows that *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, however manipulated, is a translation of Stoker’s *Dracula*. This means that throughout the 69 years that elapsed between the first edition of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* and the publication of Scognamillo’s articles drawing attention to its status as an “adaptation”, the novel functioned in the Turkish system of popular literature as a “concealed translation”, as defined by Gideon Toury. Toury suggests that even if a text is presented as original writing, the existence of another text which may have served as a source for that text will be sufficient for making the former text an object of study for translation studies. He writes:

Knowledge of the existence of a text in *another* language and culture, which a target-language text is taken to have replaced, may also serve as a trigger for adopting the assumption that that text is a translation. This last possibility is of paramount heuristic importance for cultures, or historical periods, where translations exist as concealed facts – whether it is only the presentation of a text as being of a derived nature which is not customary or whether the very distinction between translations and non-translations is not culturally functional and is hence blurred (Toury 1995: 70-71).

³³ All transliterations from the Ottoman are mine.

Kazıklı Voyvoda was not only produced and received as an indigenous novel; it was also adapted to the screen. Ümit Deniz, a popular writer of detective fiction, wrote a script based on *Kazıklı Voyvoda* and the film “Dracula İstanbul’da” (Dracula in Istanbul) was released in 1953.³⁴ The credit titles of the film explicitly acknowledged Ali Rıza Seyfi as the author of the book. *Kazıklı Voyvoda* was reprinted in 1997 under the title *Dracula İstanbul’da*, this time accompanied by a preface by researcher Giovanni Scognamillo (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1997). Although this most recent edition also credited the novel to Ali Rıza Seyfi, Scognamillo mentioned its true source and presented the book as an interesting case of abridgement and adaptation. He wrote: “What Ali Rıza Seyfi did was to carry out an adaptation, a summary and a form of Turkicization” [“Ali Rıza Seyfi’nin aslında yaptığı bir uyarlamaydı, bir özetleme ve de bir Türkçeleştirme”] (Scognamillo in Ali Rıza Seyfi 1997: 5). Scognamillo did not specify what he meant by “adaptation”, “summary” or “Turkicization”. Nevertheless, his preface is important as regards Count Dracula’s trajectory in Turkish, because it was the first peritextual element that presented the book as a form of translation. For the first time, the readers were offered the information that they were about to read a translation, instead of an indigenous novel. The 1997 edition merits a separate analysis. It revised the language of the 1928 and 1946 editions and carried out extensive omissions, especially of elements that have ideological connotations. Some of these elements will be discussed in the following pages. *Drakula İstanbul’da* is a recent publication and falls outside of the scope of the present study. Therefore, I will not examine the details of this edition.

³⁴ “Drakula İstanbul’da” was directed by Mehmet Muhtar and produced by Turgut Demirağ. Annie Ball, Ayfer Feray, Cahit Irgat, Bülent Oran and Atif Kaptan were in leading roles (*Türkiye Bibliyografyası* 1953: 188).

The paratextual elements of the first two editions of the novel deserve a detailed analysis, since they enabled the presentation and functioning of the novel as an indigenous work.

6.3.2.1 Paratextual Elements

Both the 1928 and the 1946 editions were published within a series carrying the same title, although they were published by different companies, Resimli Ay and Çığır respectively: “Meraklı Romanlar” (Curious Novels). This was a rather ambiguous generic designation. Nevertheless, I suggest that it associated the book with adventure fiction, rather than “high literature”. Bram Stoker’s name was not mentioned in either of the editions and there was no indication that the book had been translated. The 1928 edition has a plain text cover where the title of the book, the “author”, the publisher, the title of the series and the year of publication are mentioned. There is no title page. The back cover is blank. The 1946 edition has an illustrated cover where the title of the book is printed at the top in capital letters. The rest is occupied by an illustration where Count Dracula’s face is shown looking sinisterly down from above at a young woman who is staring at him with a horrified expression in her face. The two figures are placed against a dark blue background, probably representing night. The title page indicates the name of the series, the title, Ali Rıza Seyfi’s name without any attribute, the number of the edition and the name and address of the publisher. The back cover of the book advertises nine other books published by the same company. These are works by well-known writers such as Halide Edip Adıvar, Baha Dürder and Sait Faik Abasıyanık. There are no examples

of popular fiction in the list. Nevertheless, I suggest that *Kazıklı Voyvoda* was intended for readers of popular literature, given the series it was included in.

The peritext of the 1928 edition includes a preface by the publishing company. This preface reinforces the reception of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* as an indigenous work. In the preface titled “Meraklı Romanlar Serisi” (Series of Curious Novels), the editors of Resimli Ay introduce their new series. They imply that the books included in this series are indigenous works by stating that they are to be penned by “the most competent writers” of Turkey [“memleketin en selâhiyyetdâr kalemleri”] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 3-4). The same preface suggests that the series would produce one book monthly, adding up to twelve books in one year. Nevertheless, I have not been able to trace any other books in that series. This may mean that the series was discontinued due to the alphabet reform which took place in 1928 creating a general stagnation in the publishing market as explained in Chapter 4. Section 4.1. The preface also offers a significant clue in terms of the series’ genre. The editors write that “the events told in the novels are so full of impact that they will keep the reader in a state of gentle excitement from the beginning until the end” [“romandaki vakalar kariyi başından sonuna kadar tatlı bir heyecan içinde sürükleyecek kadar kuvvetlidir”] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 3). I take this as a clear indication of *Kazıklı Voyvoda*’s connection with the adventure genre, and therefore with popular literature.

From the epitextual elements of the two editions, it becomes clear that *Kazıklı Voyvoda* was acknowledged as an indigenous novel. Bibliographies contributed to the preservation of *Kazıklı Voyvoda*’s identity as an original novel: the compiler of the most authoritative bibliography of Turkish books published in Ottoman script, Seyfettin Özege, mentioned Ali Rıza Seyfi as the author of the book of the first

edition (Özege 1973: 852), and the *Türkiye Bibliyografyası* for the years 1938-1948, covering books published in the Latin alphabet, recorded the second edition as an indigenous novel in the category of “Turkish Literature” (*Türkiye Bibliyografyası* 1950: 1275).

The book’s status as a translation was publicly disclosed for the first time in the preface to *Drakula İstanbul’da* in 1997, which was followed up by an article on legends of vampires published in the periodical *Albüm* in January 1998, both by Giovanni Scognamillo (Scognamillo in Ali Rıza Seyfi 1997: 5; Scognamillo 1998: 56). In both publications, Scognamillo referred to the work as an adaptation and a summary. Why Scognamillo identified *Kazıklı Voyvoda* an adaptation was probably due to the domestication³⁵ of the characters and places as well as Ali Rıza Seyfi’s additions to the source text, which carry clear target-cultural overtones. Above all, while translating *Dracula*, Ali Rıza Seyfi renamed the novel *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, associating it right from the start with an evil figure from Turkish history.³⁶

6.3.2.2 Plot and Characters

In *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, Ali Rıza Seyfi has retained the narrative structure of *Dracula* by using letters and diary entries as the main narrative tool. The plot is also similar to that of *Dracula* with the exception of a number of omissions and additions to be analyzed in the next section. *Kazıklı Voyvoda* relates the story of a young lawyer sent to Transylvania to assist Count Dracula in his purchase of real estate in the lawyer’s

³⁵ Throughout the two case studies, I use the terms “to domesticate” and “domestication” to refer to a lexical process of replacing foreign cultural elements of the source text with elements more familiar to the target readership.

³⁶ Turkish for “Vlad the Impaler”. Vlad Dracula, who reigned briefly as the voivode of Wallachia in the 15th century, was known for his cruel method of torture whereby he had his victims impaled slowly on stakes.

country. Count Dracula holds the lawyer hostage until he has secured his own departure out of the country. Having become acquainted with the Count's horrific deeds, the lawyer returns to his homeland where he soon finds out that the Count is there to haunt and suck the blood of his loved ones. Assisted by a number of people, including his fiancée, he sets out on an expedition to exterminate the vampire. The Count flees back to Transylvania, but the lawyer and his friends are there to kill him.

This plot is common to both *Kazıklı Voyvoda* and *Dracula*. Nevertheless, Ali Rıza Seyfi has modified some of the details. First and foremost, he changed the location of the story and had Dracula come to Istanbul, instead of traveling to London, unlike Stoker's *Dracula*. Furthermore, Ali Rıza Seyfi domesticated the characters, gave them Turkish names and equipped them with a number of new traits associated with heroism and patriotism. In *Kazıklı Voyvoda* "Jonathan Harker" was represented as "Azmi", "Mina" as "Güzin", "Lucy" as "Şadan", "Dr. Seward" as "Doktor Afif" and "Dr. Van Helsing" as "Doktor Resuhi".

6.3.2.3 Matricial Norms in *Kazıklı Voyvoda*

Although Ali Rıza Seyfi domesticated the novel by giving the characters Turkish names and setting the plot in Istanbul, he still retained many features of the source text. Major events are the same, except for one large-scale omission: the final trip taken by Jonathan Harker, Mina and their friends to Dracula's castle. Whereas Stoker had his characters travel from London to Transylvania to exterminate Dracula, Ali Rıza Seyfi kept them in Turkey, to do the job in one of Istanbul's historical districts, Eyüp, thereby shortening the text by some fifty pages. The characters remain the same too, the only significant difference being the Turkish names they now carry. All

in all, Ali Rıza Seyfi seems to have produced an abridged version of the source text, which inevitably means that he carried out a number of omissions. The omissions are not evenly distributed throughout the book: certain sections, especially at the beginning, were translated in full, whereas towards the end omissions become more frequent.

The first five chapters of *Dracula* are probably the most adventure-like section of the book, with details of Jonathan Harker's encounter with Count Dracula and his forced stay at his castle. In the first half of *Kazıklı Voyvoda*. Ali Rıza Seyfi translates many of the details of Harker's stay and renders the source text in full. He even adds certain elements which will be taken up shortly. In the second half, however, Seyfi engages in heavy omission activity. Although he retains the plot and the way the narrative is structured through the letters and diary entries of some of the characters, he summarizes the parts that are of less relevance for the main theme. For instance, Ali Rıza Seyfi has dramatically shortened a diary entry by Dr. Seward, one of Lucy's suitors. In *Dracula*, Dr. Seward explains in some length what happened following Lucy's death. He writes about the sadness and desperation he and his friends feel at Lucy's death and goes into a great deal of psychological description. Ali Rıza Seyfi has reduced this entry, which lasts about four pages in *Dracula* (Stoker 1993: 224-228) down to one short paragraph. The first three sentences of the paragraph give the main idea conveyed in the diary entry: that all are very sad. But this is followed by several sentences added by Ali Rıza Seyfi where he dwells upon the noble qualities of one of the characters and praises his character by referring to a number of patriotic qualities (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 163).

Ali Rıza Seyfi has preserved action-related parts in the novel and rendered sections which are essential for the narrative progression. He has left out lengthy

descriptions or details related to the characters' emotional states. Consider his translation of an afternoon outing by Mina and her friend Lucy who fell prey to Dracula:

Target Text:

Şadan her zaman denizi seyrettiğimiz o tepeciğe, oradaki taşa adeta meftun. Gidip orada oturuyor, istigrâklara dalıyor. Bugün gurupta oturuyorduk... O dalmıştı... Müphem bir noktaya baka baka kendi kendine şöyle mırıldandı:
- Yine o kırmızı gözler! Tıpkı onlar! (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 105)

[Target Text in Back-translation:

Şadan is nearly in love with the hill we visit to watch the sea, and the rock there. She goes to sit there and is carried away in deep contemplation. Today we were sitting there at sunset... She was lost in thought... Staring at an unidentifiable spot, she murmured to herself:
- Those red eyes again! They are just the same! (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 105)]

Source Text:

On the East Cliff, reading and writing all day. Lucy seems to have become as much in love with the spot as I am, and it is hard to get her away from it when it is time to come home for lunch or tea or dinner. This afternoon she made a funny remark. We were coming home for dinner, and had come to the top of the steps up from the West Pier and stopped to look at the view, as we generally do. The setting sun, low down in the sky, was just dropping behind Kettleness; the red light was thrown over on the East Cliff and the old Abbey, and seemed to bathe everything in a beautiful rosy glow. We were silent for a while, and suddenly Lucy murmured as if to herself:-
'His red eyes again! They are just the same!' (Stoker 1993: 125).

In the above passage, Ali Rıza Seyfi omitted the description of the evening view, proper names and details of Lucy's obsession with the spot. I suggest that these were elements that Ali Rıza Seyfi did not consider of primary importance for the progression of the main plot; therefore he felt free to omit them from his version.

Some of the most interesting features of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* stem from the additions introduced to the target text by Ali Rıza Seyfi. The additions can be located

throughout the novel in numerous instances. In fact, *Kazıklı Voyvoda* starts with an addition the translator introduced before the beginning which partially modifies the narrative structure in the novel. In this added preface, termed “Başlamadan Evvel” (“Before the Start”) Ali Rıza Seyfi explains how he allegedly acquired the letters and diaries forming the basis of the story. The preface serves to set the story in Istanbul, telling how the author found the letters in a boat while crossing the Bosphorus, and mentions the names of some specific districts of the city. Furthermore, it aims to highlight the verisimilitude of the story, giving it a seemingly documentary basis:

Target Text:

Asırlarca evvelki müthiş hadisatın tüyler ürpertici bir devamı ve hitamını iddia eden bu hadisat acaba esrarengiz İstanbulun muzlim köşelerinde vaki oldu mu? Fakat elimdeki vesâike ne mana verebiliriz? Bu hakikatten şüphe edenler gelip vesâiki hal-i aslilerinde görebilirler (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 6).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

Did these events that announce the hair-raising sequel to and end of terrible events that took place centuries ago really happen in far corners of mysterious Istanbul? If not, what is the meaning of the documents I have? Those who doubt their truth can come and see these documents for themselves (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 6).]

Following the preface, the narrative of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* opens with another addition in the first paragraph:

Target Text:

3 Mayıs (Bistriç kasabası - Transilvanya)

Mayısın ikinci günü Viyana'ya geldim. Budapeşte'yi şöylece istasyonundan gördüm Fakat anladığım şudur ki, Budapeşte adeta garpten şarka yahut şarktan garbe girilecek bir kapı mahiyetinde bulunuyor... Türk milletinin, büyük ve şanlı ırkımın şanlarına canlı ve kanlı bir şahit gibi çağlayıp giden Tuna nehrinin üzerine atılmış köprülerin en muazzamlarından birinden geçen tren, beni, türk tarihiyle samimiyetle alakadar eden muntıkalara doğru uçurdu... İçimde tatlı ve acı, fakat hepsi gururlu hepsi ruh yükseltici hisler, heyecanlar çırpınıyor... Milliyet hissi, milliyet gururu... Ruhun ne büyük mucizesi! Beşeriyet kümelerinin ne tatlı, ne bitmez tükenmez ab-ı hayatı! (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 7-8)

[Target Text in Back-translation:

3 May (The town of Bistritz - Transylvania)

I arrived in Vienna on the second day of May. I only had a brief glimpse of Budapest from the station. But as much as I can gather, Budapest is like a gate which provides entrance from west to east and from east to west... The train that crossed one of the longest bridges over the Danube, flowing as a live and bloodied witness to the glories of the Turkish nation, of my great and famous race, flew me to regions closely related to Turkish history.... I am full of bitter-sweet feelings, of proud and noble excitement quivering inside me... A feeling for one's nation, pride for one's nation. Such a great miracle of the soul! Such a sweet and eternal elixir of life for human societies!... (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 7-8)]

Source Text:

3 May. Bistritz. — Left Munich at 8.35 p.m. on 1st May, arriving at Vienna early next morning; should have arrived at 6.46, but train was an hour late. Buda-Pesth seems a wonderful place, from the glimpse which I got of it from the train and the little I could walk through the streets. I feared to go very far from the station, as we had arrived late and would start as near the correct time as possible. The impression I had was that we were leaving the West and entering the East; the most Western of splendid bridges over the Danube, which is here of noble width and depth, took us among the traditions of Turkish rule. (Stoker 1993: 7)

The hyperbolic tone of nationalism is quite evident in the cited paragraph. The additions in this paragraph made by Ali Rıza Seyfi mainly concern Turkish history, the superiority of Turkishness and the features of Turks, possibly encouraging the reader to construct a fictional Turkish identity.

Some of these additions evolve around a theme already offered by Stoker and appear as elaborations of the information given in the source text itself. Regard the following example:

Target Text:

Buralarda yolların temiz, geçit verir bir halde bulundurulmaması için adeta tarihi bir anane vardır, Türk kılıcının buralarda keskin olduğu, Türk hakimiyetinin buraları titrettiği eski asırlarda Erdel (Transilvanya) gospodarları (prensleri) yolları tesviye ve tathîr etmekten çekinirlermiş. Çünkü yollar tesviye edilecek olursa Türkler, Transilvanyalıların Türkiye aleyhine Alman, Leh askerleri celp edeceklerinden şüphelenirler ve zaten bir kıl ile bağlı duran

mütarekeyi bozup hemen harbe girişirlermiş (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 23).

[Target Text in English Translation:

Here it was almost a historical custom not to clear and repair the roads. In the old times when the Turkish sword was sharp and Turkish rule made everyone tremble here, the Erdel (Transylvania) gospodars (princes) were afraid to clean and repair the roads. Because if the roads were repaired the Turks would suspect that Transylvanians were preparing to call German and Polish soldiers and they would break the truce and start the war which was always at loading point (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 23).]

Source Text:

In this respect it is different from the general run of roads in the Carpathians, for it is an old tradition that they would not repair them, lest the Turk should think that they were preparing to bring foreign troops, and so hasten the war which was always really at loading point (Stoker 1993: 10).

In this case, it is the expression “the Turk” used in the source text which triggered a series of additions. Ali Rıza Seyfi uses the sentence “Türk kılıcının buralarda keskin olduğu, Türk hakimiyetinin buraları titrettiği” [“The Turkish sword was sharp and Turkish rule made everyone tremble”] to refer in quite sentimental and nationalist terms to the Turkish rule in the region. Furthermore, he makes some informative additions, thus letting the reader know of the Turkish name of Transylvania (“Erdel”) and the names of the local rulers in the area (“gospodarları”) as well as which foreign troops Transylvanians collaborated with against the Turks (namely, German and Polish).

However, some of Ali Rıza Seyfi’s additions have no textual-linguistic basis in the original. At times he takes breaks from the source text to digress into details of Turkish history. Regard the following, rather long passage that Seyfi wrote to present the genealogy of Count Dracula, which dates back to Vlad the Impaler:

Target Text:

Gece yarısı: Kont ile uzun bir musâhabede bulundum. Milletimin tarihiyle, o kahraman Türk orduları ve Türk akıncılarıyla, eski Türklerin siyaset fikriyle o kadar alakadar olan bu memleketin, (Erdel) yani Transilvanyanın tarihi hakkında Konta bazı sualler sordum; benim suallerime karşı bir Transilvanyalı için bile hayret-i mucib bir vukuf, katıyyet ve canlılıkla malumat verdi. Bu memleketin tarihi seknesi, hadisatı, bilhassa muharebeleri hakkında söz söylerken güya bu hadiselerin hepsinde kendisi bulunmuş gibi kuvvet, şiddet ve coşkunlukla davranıyordu. Fakat vakit vakit durarak zabt-ı nefis ettiğini, tavrına, tabirlerine mülayemet verdiğini görüyordum. Hele *Türkiye İmparatorluğuyla* cereyan eden vakai mümkün mertebe atlamak, yahut pek üstünkörü geçmek istiyordu ve bu bence de tabii idi; muhatabım bir Türke karşı başka türlü davranabilir mi idi? O, kendi namdaşı olan ve Türkler hakkında o derece feci zulümler, işkenceler yapmış, ahdını, namus sözünü müteaddid defalar bozmuş, tarihimizde (Şeytan Voyvoda), (Kazıklı Voyvoda) gibi meş'um lakaplar kazanmış olan eşhas-ı tarihiyeden da - velev ki, o Transilvanyalılar için bir kahraman olsun - bana karşı fahir ve gururla bahsetmeği nezakete muvafık bulmayacaktı. Fakat bu münasebetle ben de ihtimal çok mübalağalı ve lüzumsuz bir teessür ve ikrah hasıl eden bir hakikate vakıf oldum. Bu gün işte memur olduğum, şatosunda yattığım, ekmeğini yediğim ve şimdi karşımda duran bir Transilvanyalı Kont (Drakola) o tarihi, zalim Eflak Prensi Drakolanın, uğursuz (Kazıklı Voyvoda) nın ailesinden değil mi imiş. Hatta bu kartalların yuva yapmaktan korkacağı harap şatoda Kazıklı Voyvodanın zamanından kalma, son sığınaklarından olan bir mahal imiş... Ah benim güzel, mini mini tarihçi "Güzin"im; şu anda seni nasıl göreceğim geliyor; sen olsan isim müşabeheti tesadüfünün böyle nesil, aile ayniyeti şekline girmesine karşı kim bilir neler söyler, neler hissederdik. Bu musâhabemiz esnasında Kontun bütün söylediklerini buraya yazmayı ne kadar ister idim. Fakat doğrusu ben zihnimdeki endişelere ilaveten bu tesadüfe de o kadar şaşırılmış idim ki, bu geceki sahne bende çok gayrı hakiki, müphem bir intiba bıraktı. Demek ben şimdi bir zaman damları altında Kazıklı Voyvodayı saklayan bir binanın içinde bulunuyorum. İhtimal elleri, elbisesi, silahsız öldürdüğü, kazığa vurdurduğu, başına çivi çaktırdığı Türklerin, masum kadın vle çocukların kanlarıyla bulaşık olduğu halde yalın kılıçlı Türk akıncısının intikam kılıcından kaçan Kazıklı Voyvoda kaç defa bu kuş uçmaz kervan geçmez şatosuna nefes nefese kaçmış, saklanmıştı. İhtimal elinde kalan son Türk esirlerini şu aşağıdaki ıssız, karanlık avluda, hatta şu dışardaki uzun salonda işkencelerle öldürtmüştü (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 60-62).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

Midnight: I have had a long talk with the Count. I asked the Count some questions about the history of Erdel, in other words Transylvania, that is so closely related to my nation's history, to the brave Turkish armies and Turkish pioneer troops and to the political idea of the old Turks; I was surprised by the informativeness, precision and vigour of his answers which were quite advanced even for a Transylvanian. He was behaving with such power, rage and enthusiasm when he was talking about the historical past, events, and especially battles of this country that it seemed as if he had personally witnessed all these events. But I noticed that from time to time he restrained

himself to give a milder tone to his attitude and words. Especially he wanted to skip or only give a rough account of events concerning the *Turkish Empire* and I thought this was only natural: could he possibly behave otherwise in front of a Turk? He would not find it polite to talk highly and proudly of a man who carried his name, who practised such sad and horrible cruelties and tortures on Turks, who broke his oath, his word of honour, so many times and who was called by such sinister names as Evil Voivode, Impaling Voivode - Kazıklı Voyvoda in our history - even if he may be a hero for Transylvanians. But I found out a fact that evoked perhaps an exaggerated and unnecessary resentment and disgust in me. The Transylvanian Count (Dracula) who employs me, houses me in his castle and feeds me, who is standing before me today, comes from the lineage of that historical, cruel Wallachian prince, Kazıklı Voyvoda! And this wreck of a castle where even eagles would be afraid to nest is a remnant from Kazıklı Voyvoda's times and one of his last shelters. Oh my beautiful, little historian Güzin; how I long to see you now; if you were here who knows how we would speak and feel about this coincidence of a name resemblance turning out to be a lineage, a family. I wish I could write down everything the Count said. But I was so amazed at this coincidence which added up to all the concerns in my mind, that tonight's experience left a very surreal and ambiguous impression on me. So I am now in a building which once sheltered Kazıklı Voyvoda under its roof. He may have taken shelter in this deserted castle short of breath, running from the swords of the Turkish troops, perhaps his hands and clothes still stained by the blood of the Turks, the innocent women and children whom he killed with his bare hands, whom he impaled and nailed on the head. Maybe he had the last Turkish prisoners tortured to death in the abandoned and dark courtyard down here, or even in the long hall out there! (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 60-62)]

And the following is the original context in which this addition is placed:

Source Text:

Midnight – I have had a long talk with the Count. I asked him a few questions on Transylvanian history, and he warmed up to the subject wonderfully. In his speaking of things and people, and especially of battles, he spoke as if he had been present at them all. This he afterwards explained by saying that to a *boyar* the pride of his house and name is his own pride, that their glory is his glory, that their fate is his fate. Whenever he spoke of his house he always said we,' and spoke almost in the plural, like a king speaking. I wish I could put down all he said exactly as he said it, for to me it was most fascinating (Stoker 1993: 41).

It is clear that Ali Rıza Seyfi's addition makes several features of the source text more salient. First of all, the addition tells of Vlad the Impaler's cruel deeds against Turks, thus serving as a precursor of the events to follow: fighting Count Dracula becomes something the characters do to protect their country. Dracula is identified

with the nation's enemies, and it is only fair that the Turkish characters should take revenge on him once he starts his second campaign against the Turks, this time by taking a trip to Istanbul. It is no coincidence that Ali Rıza Seyfi makes the group that will eventually kill Dracula a small troop of officers who served in the Turkish War of Liberation (1919-1923). Fighting against Dracula thus appears not just an individual struggle against dark forces, but something a solid citizen should do in respect for the memory of those whom Dracula had once impaled. Regard the passage below where Jonathan Harker (Azmi in Seyfi's version), the lawyer who is held hostage in Dracula's castle, realizes that he has become an instrument in Dracula's scheme to have himself transported to Istanbul:

Target Text:

Ben böyle tasavvuf olunamayacak bir canavarın İstanbul'a, sevgili vatanıma girmesine alet oluyordum!... Orada bu melun, ihtimal asırlarca önce gelmiş mel'un Kazıklı Voyvoda gibi doya doya Türk kanı içecek, etrafında bir lanet ve felaket muhiti teşkil eyleyecekti. Cinnet-i tehevürüm büsbütün coştı; kanlı Kazıklı Voyvodanın bu ifrit hafidinden dünyayı kurtarmak azmine düştüm (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 87).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

I almost became an instrument for this outrageous monster to enter Istanbul, my beloved homeland!... There this fierce creature would greedily suck Turkish blood and would create curse and disaster around him just like fierce Kazıklı Voyvoda who perhaps was there centuries ago. I became mad with rage; and I felt determined to save the world from this evil son of bloody Kazıklı Voyvoda (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 87).]

Again, it is no coincidence that, at the end of the novel, as Dracula is being stabbed to eternal death, Seyfi has one of the characters say: "Tuna boylarında kazığa vurulan milletdaşlarımın intikamı!" [This is the revenge of my fellow nationals impaled on the banks of the Danube!] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 240).

Heroism is not confined to men. The addition below shows that Turkish women, as embodied by Güzin in *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, also display virtues such as an awareness of history and the heroic Turkish heritage:

Target Text:

Güzinin tarihe ve Türk tarihine olan merakı milletimizin destanlar ve kahramanlıklarla dolu mazisine karşı daima duyduğu heyecanlı rabita ve meftuniyet bu seyahati onun için çok kıymetli bir hale getirecekti. Zaten benim de kulağıma aşına gelen (Drakola) namına ilk defa daha İstanbul'da dikkatimi sevgili Güzin celp etmedi mi? (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 9)

[Target Text in Back-translation:

The interest Güzin has always had in history and in Turkish history, the enthusiastic loyalty and love she has felt for our nation's past full of legends and heroic deeds would make this trip precious for her. Wasn't it dear Güzin in Istanbul who first called my attention to Dracula's name, with which my ear was familiar anyway? (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 9)]

Yet for Ali Rıza Seyfi, Güzin's awareness of history and her patriotism are not enough to make her a real hero. Although she plays an important role in solving the mystery behind Dracula's presence in Istanbul, she has to remain in the background and cannot join the final battle against the Count. While men go to kill the creature, unlike Mina in Stoker's *Dracula*, Güzin consents to staying behind. Ali Rıza Seyfi's perception of the identity and role of women in the Turkish society are best explained in his own words, a complete addition to the source text:

Target Text:

Bu korkunç mücadeleye bilâ-tereddüt giriştim. Korktuğum şey sevgili Güzinin bana mani olmaya kalkışması idi. Fakat bu gül gibi nazik, sümbül gibi şivekâr Güzinim meğer çelik gibi, hayır, hakiki bir Türk kızı gibi metin imiş. Türk kızı... Nasıl bir muayyarla seçilmeli? En basiti sevgilisini, kocasını tehlikelere, müşküllere, manialara hücum etmiş görerek takındığı gurur ve duyduğu iştirak sevkiyle (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 232).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

I entered this struggle without a doubt in my mind. One thing that I was really

afraid of was that Güzin would try to stop me. But it turns out that my Güzin, delicate as a rose and charming as lilacs, is strong as steel, no, strong as a true Turkish girl. How can you judge a Turkish girl? The easiest way is to judge her by the pride she feels and the strong commitment she shows when she sees her beloved one, her husband, surrounded by danger, difficulty and obstacles (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 232).]

As part of the domestication of the text, Ali Rıza Seyfi also makes certain omissions, changes and additions to Christian elements in the original. On more than one occasion, he replaces a crucifix with a Koran as an instrument used to keep vampires away. In the beginning of the novel, he takes the opportunity to make a sentimental addition on how Azmi's mother, a devout Moslem, gave him a small religious charm to protect him from evil forces (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 18). Indeed, in *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, it is not a crucifix but this charm which rescues Azmi from being bitten by Count Dracula. When the landlady at the inn tries to give him a cross before he sets out for the castle, Azmi accepts the present out of sheer kindness, but adds, "Madam, merak etmeyin, bakınız boynumda bizim dinin kitabı, Büyük Allahın kelamı da var... Bu da beni muhafaza eder" [Madam, do not worry, look, I have the book of our religion, the word of the Great Allah around my neck... It too can protect me] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 19). Likewise, as the characters exterminate Dracula's victims one by one to let them all rest in peace, they call the Koran to their service: "Sonra doktor çantasını açtı, buradan yazı makinesi ile bazı Kur'an ayetleri yazılmış büyük kağıtlar çıkararak bunları sandıkların içine ve toprağın üzerine ihtimamla yerleştirdi" [And then the doctor opened up his bag and took out large sheets of paper on which some Koran verses were typed, he then carefully placed them inside the boxes and on the soil] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1928: 237).

6.3.2.4 Siting *Kazıklı Voyvoda*

Kazıklı Voyvoda is clearly very similar, although by no means identical, to *Dracula* in terms of its purpose and impact. *Dracula* is normally considered to be a horror novel. But it also offers literary-aesthetic pleasure with its dreamlike images, the emphasis it puts on the tension between the sources of light and darkness, Christ and Satan, as well as its allegories on sex and blood (Wolf 1975: ix). Ali Rıza Seyfi too has produced a horror novel. However, especially in the second half, the images he creates are much less dreamlike, and his style much less literary. The struggle he recounts is still one between the light and forces of darkness, but this time the oppositional forces are represented by the Turkish nation and its enemies, embodied in a western-Christian myth. Moreover, *Kazıklı Voyvoda* carries additional qualities which position the novel in an intergeneric field, combining what has been termed as “nationalist” literature with an adventure theme.

In the 1930s and 1940s the term “nationalist literature” was widely discussed by literary critics and carefully distinguished from “national literature” as explored in Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1. “Milliyetçi” [nationalist] literature was regarded as a specific literary genre with a special relationship to its readers (Nayır 1937: 30-31). This form of literature was represented by the wartime novels and battle stories which were rather popular throughout the 1920s and 1930s. I have offered a brief list of some of these novels in Section 6.2.3.4. *Kazıklı Voyvoda* occupies a paradoxical position within the general field of popular literature. It was presented as an indigenous novel with a Turkish theme, a claim that is evident from the title of the novel. Nevertheless, Ali Rıza Seyfi chose a non-Turkish source text, Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*, as a basis for his work. It is difficult to explain why he preferred to work

from a foreign text, instead of writing an indigenous work. It is not possible to claim that indigenous works were more prestigious than translations. I have discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 that western literature was offered as a model for an emerging Turkish literature. As explained in Section 6.2.2.4 translations sold more than indigenous works in all literary fields. Therefore there were both commercial and literary reasons behind the publication of translations. My suggestion is that Ali Rıza Seyfi wished to expand on the elements that he associated with Turkish history in *Dracula*. He probably regarded the action-oriented and adventure-related aspects of the source novel an ideal central plot around which he could assemble his nationalist digressions. The nationalist additions he made mainly served to bring out past glories which were clearly used to evoke a nationalist sentiment in the readership. These additions clearly aimed to create a sense of shared history and continuity between the heroic deeds of former Turkish soldiers with the present Turkish population. The fight against Count Dracula conducted by the characters in the novel came to symbolize the battles against Vlad the Impaler by Turkish forces centuries ago.

The 1946 edition has an additional ideological aspect in the sense that it replaced many words of Ottoman origin with newly-derived synonyms. This edition stands as an interesting example of the effect of the purist movement in Ali Rıza Seyfi's work. The effect was also evident in his translation of *The Beasts of Tarzan*.

The presentation of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* as an indigenous novel, and the fact that it also served as a source for a feature film, offer clues about the concept of translation Ali Rıza Seyfi held. By concealing the novel's status as a translation and by appropriating Bram Stoker's plot and characters Ali Rıza Seyfi showed that he was not at all concerned with the question of authorial originality. Furthermore, he ignored the principle of "fullness" in translation and undervalued the source text's

unitary structure. This has interesting implications for the linguistically updated 1946 edition, which was published in a period where the question of translational norms and originality was under intensive discussion, mainly due to the activities of the Translation Bureau and the publications which appeared in the journal *Tercüme*. It can be assumed that in preparing a new edition for publication Ali Rıza Seyfi was consciously violating the norms propagated by the writers, translators and critics operating in the field of canonical literature. Yet in doing that, he did not only act with commercial concerns, as many translators active in the field of popular literature had done. He focused on an issue he had been pushing forward throughout his literary career, namely, the use of literature as a tool for reinforcing feelings of nationhood.

Yanlışlıklar Gecesi, which he translated for the Bureau appeared in the same year as the second edition of *Kazıklı Voyvoda*. Unlike in *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, Ali Rıza Seyfi followed the norms upheld by the Bureau closely in *Yanlışlıklar Gecesi* and did not seem to be involved in an effort to violate them. The dramatical difference in Ali Rıza Seyfi's translational behaviour may be explained through the different readership addressed by the two books and the different poetics governing the fields of translated popular literature and translated canonical literature.

6.3.3 *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* (Turkishness Spells Heroism)

In this section I will offer an analysis of one of Ali Rıza Seyfi's indigenous literary productions: *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*, published in 1940 by T. T. Kaptan ve Makinistler Cemiyeti. The strong nationalist reference in the title of the book offers some clue about its genre and suggests that it belongs to what has been

termed “nationalist” literature. Nevertheless, an analysis of the work will reveal that it lay in an intergeneric area, combining fiction and non-fiction. The book also has close connections with the oral story-telling tradition for it consisted of a number of radio talks given by Ali Rıza Seyfi in 1940. It is difficult to classify these talks as fiction or non-fiction. Ali Rıza Seyfi offers a great deal of factual information in these talks about the Turkish naval history. However, he also recounts a number of legends, or what he calls “menkıbe”³⁷. The ambiguous generic status of the book is embodied in this term which referred to both fiction and non-fiction. The majority of the talks published in the book contain a large proportion of fiction in the form of short historical anecdotes about the Ottoman marine captains. These are interwoven with comments by Ali Rıza Seyfi about their heroism and the information he offers about naval battles between the Ottoman Empire and the western nations.

I was able to discover that the talks which constitute *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* were broadcast by the Ankara radio in weekly programmes in 1940, between 12.1.1940 and 31.5.1940. The book gives no indication of where the talks were held, apart from occasional addresses by Ali Rıza Seyfi to his readers as “dear listeners” [“sayın dinleyicilerim”] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 3, 9, 10, 27, 33, 43, 53, 56, 61, 67, 68). Prompted by this form of address, I decided to explore whether these were radio talks. Indeed, when I consulted the newspapers of January 1940, the date given to the first talk in the book, I found the following announcement in the daily radio programme “Talk: National Heroic Legends” [“Konuşma: Milli Kahramanlık Menkıbeleri”] (*Vakit* 1940: 6). The speaker’s name was not given.

³⁷ The term “menkıbe” is nearly obsolete today, but it was used during the period under study to refer to stories of heroic deeds. In fact, the term itself ambiguously referred to both fictional and non-fictional accounts of heroic events. Ferit Devellioğlu’s Ottoman-Turkish dictionary, published for the first time in 1962, defines “menk(a)ıbe” as follows: “anecdotes and stories about the situation of well-known or historical personalities” [“çoğu tanınmış veyâ târihe geçmiş kimselerin ahvâline âit fıkralar,

The talks were broadcast in weekly installments between January-May 1940 every Friday evening around eight o'clock and lasted for about fifteen minutes. The talks published in the book indeed last for about fifteen minutes when read out. *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* offers only a selection of these talks, since there are seven chapters published in the book, whereas the programme continued for at least fifteen weeks.

6.3.3.1. Peritextual Elements

Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir consists of seventy-two pages, divided into seven different chapters with individual subtitles. In its title page the book is credited to Ali Rıza Seyfi with the inscription: "Yazan: Ali Rıza Seyfi" ["Written by: Ali Rıza Seyfi"]. The title page includes the title of the book, the name of the association "Kaptan ve Makinistler Cemiyeti" ["Association of Sea Captains and Engine Drivers"] which published it, the name of the printing house and the year of publication. An analysis of *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* reveals that the book combines a number of historical sources with fictional material. This inevitably indicates that the historical information offered in the book was borrowed from certain sources, yet these sources are not mentioned anywhere on the peritext, or the text itself. Furthermore, the attribution of the book to Ali Rıza Seyfi as the author hints at a significant characteristic of the poetics within which the book functioned: the ease with which writers appropriated various sources, including foreign works, and rewrote them into works which were presented as indigenous production.

hikâyeler"] (Devellioğlu 1998: 615). The Redhouse Turkish-English dictionary defines it as "1. legend; narrative. 2. exploit, heroic deed" (Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük 1979: 754).

There are two illustrations consisting of paintings of sailing boats, the first one on page 17 and the other on page 52 of the books. They bear no direct relationship to the text and appear to serve a decorative function only.

There is no preface or postface in the book. The first chapter, i.e. talk, titled “Levent Kaptanları” (Galley Captains) constitutes a general introduction. On the back of the title page, a poem is printed as a peritextual annex that offers clues about the general theme and the intended function of the book. The anonymous poem, which carries the title “Kahramanlık” (Heroism), has strong patriotic and militarist elements. To offer an impression of the theme and the style of the poem let me include the first of its four stanzas here:

*Kahramanlık: Ne yalnız bir yükseliş demektir,
Ne de yıldızlar gibi parlayıp sönmektir,
Ölmezliği düşünmek boşuna bir emektir;
Kahramanlık : Saldırıp bir daha dönmektir (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940 : 2).*

[Heroism : Means not a solitary rise,
Means not to shine bright forever like stars,
It is in vain to dream of immortality;
Heroism: Means to attack and never to return (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940 : 2).]

These lines serve as a presentational element that is intended to shape the reception of the book by creating the general thematic and stylistic background against which it will be read. The poem implies that the chapters that follow will have patriotic overtones and that the book will exhibit a militaristic approach. Combined with the title of the book, *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* (Turkishness Spells Heroism), the poem creates an explicitly nationalist undertext.

6.3.3.2 Narrative Structure and Narrative Voice

In *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*, basically a collection of battle stories, the writer Ali Rıza Seyfi is also the narrator of the stories, directly addressing his implied readers or listeners. The narrator's voice is the same throughout the book and appears as the voice of a wise and authoritative historian relating anecdotes from Turkish history.

There is no plot that runs through to all the stories. If one regards the work as a piece of fiction, the short story would be the closest genre it would relate to. Nevertheless, there is a common theme in the different chapters of the book: heroism and the achievements of Ottoman sailors. The chapters combine a historical, seemingly factual narrative with adventures of famous sailors. Furthermore, Ali Rıza Seyfi has often intervened in the stories, or in the factual information he gave, with his personal comments. Each chapter is allocated to a different sailor or a different battle. Ali Rıza Seyfi first explained the general background behind the battles he recounted and then offered one or two anecdotes involving the adventures of celebrated sailors from Ottoman history. Since the material was prepared for the radio, it was intended for oral transmission. This is both visible and audible in the written text where Ali Rıza Seyfi emerges as an explicit narrator. As mentioned in the introduction, Ali Rıza Seyfi often addresses the readers as "dear listeners". Furthermore, he used a conversational language, more fitting for a talk than a historical essay or short story. In the first paragraph of the first chapter, he addressed the readers in the following manner:

Sayın dinleyicilerim,

Bu gece size söz söylemek şerefini kazanıyorum, bunun sebebi Türk milletinin kahramanlık sahasında yaptığı büyük işlerden bahsetmektir.

Bu sözüme karşı belki şu suali soranlar olacaktır:

- Binlerce senelerden beri dünyanın en geniş sahaları üzerinde en büyük imparatorlukları kurmuş olan Türklerin kahramanlıklarını anlatmağa lüzum kalmış mıdır?

Evet, bu çok haklı bir sualdir (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 3).

[Dear listeners,

Tonight I have the honour of addressing you with the purpose of explaining the great deeds the Turkish nation has performed in the field of heroism.

Upon my words, some will perhaps ask:

- Is there any need to speak about the heroism of Turks who set up the greatest empires in the largest territories in the world?

Yes, that is indeed a very fair question (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 3).]

In this paragraph, Ali Rıza Seyfi appears to be involved in a form of oral dialogue. Rather than the writer of a history text, he sounds like a story-teller in direct contact with his audience. Throughout the book Ali Rıza Seyfi displayed the same narrative attitude which provided room for two different types of discourse. The first type of discourse Ali Rıza Seyfi used was factual-informative, while the second type of discourse he used was a fictional one. The fictional discourse is embedded within the factual discourse and is often offered as proof or support for the historical events explained. The exception to this is the first chapter/talk, where Ali Rıza Seyfi offered no anecdotes and concentrated on setting up a general framework for studying the significant acts performed by Ottoman sailors as part of Turkish national history. In the first chapter he stated: "This framework will be useful while telling their [the Ottoman sailors'] adventures in our future talks" ["Şimdi yaptığımız bu çerçeve sonraki konuşmalarımızda onların maceralarını anlatırken işimize yarıyacaktır."] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 6). The first chapter purports to be an informative one, relating how the Turkish nation became sailors and accomplished successes. Throughout the

chapter Ali Rıza Seyfi referred to some historical facts such as the recruitment of young sailors, the role of the Ottoman administration in the rise of the Ottoman navy and the role of sailors in battles. However, he has mentioned no historical sources for the events he referred to, except the words of “an English historian” he quoted. Even then, he does not give the name of the historian (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 7). He ended the chapter by promising that he would supply “historical documents” [“tarih vesikaları”] to prove his arguments in the following episodes (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 9), a promise that remains undelivered.

In the following chapters Ali Rıza Seyfi started combining an informative discourse with a fictional one. In Chapter 2, titled “Oruç Reis”, Ali Rıza Seyfi told the story of the Ottoman marine commander by the same name. He started the lecture by explaining the readers/listeners the meaning of the term “levant”. This informative introduction is supported by his claim to base the information he offered on historical documents. He stated: “Türk korsanları dediğimiz kahramanlara bizim tarihlerimizde ve resmî vesikalarda ‘levant kaptanları’ yahut ‘gönüllü reisler’ denilir” [“The heroes whom we call Turkish pirates are called “galley captains” or “voluntary chiefs” in our chronicles and official documents”] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 10). This is followed by his introduction of Oruç Reis. He briefly informed the readers about the identity of Oruç Reis and then made a comment: “Oruç Reisin denize çıktıktan sonra, başından geçen maceralar romanlar dolduracak kadar uzundur” [“The adventures Oruç Reis experiences after he sets sail are long enough to fill many novels.”] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 10). In this sentence Ali Rıza Seyfi made it clear that he makes no distinction between “history” and “fiction”. He presented Oruç Reis as a fictional character that deserved to appear in novels. Moreover, Ali Rıza Seyfi resorted to fiction to prove “Oruç Reis’ greatness as a hero” rather than any historical sources

(Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 11). The fictional part starts with a paragraph that resembles the opening lines of a novel or a short story:

... yalnız şu anlatacağım hâdise bile onun ne büyük çapta bir kahraman olduğunu meydana koyacaktır.

Geniş Akdenizin mavi sularını pırıl, pırıl parlatan güzel bir yaz gününde, Korsika adasıyla İspanya yalıları arasındaki engindeyiz. Pek hafif bir Batı rüzgârı bu engin suları ancak mini, mini dalgacıklarla harekete getirebiliyor, dört yanı kaplamış ufuklar bomboş... Lâkin bu boş ufukların tam ortasında, geniş ve muhteşem bir tekne var... Küçük narin bir tekne... On sekiz çift kürek ve bir yan yelkeni ile giden bu narin tekneyi tanıyacağız.. İşte direğinde gelin gibi dalgalanan zülfikar kılıçlı yeşil sancak.. İşte kıç tarafında heybetli bir heykel gibi dikilmiş duran kahraman Oruç Reis (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 11).

[...even this event that I am about to tell will prove his greatness as a hero.

We are on high seas between the island of Corsica and the Spanish coast on a beautiful summer day that made the blue waters of the vast Mediterranean shine. A slight westerly wind can only move these deep waters in tiny waves and the surrounding horizons are empty... Yet in the middle of these empty horizons there is a wide and magnificent boat... A small and graceful boat. We will soon get to know this graceful boat that sails with eighteen pairs of oars and a side sail... Here is the green standard with the split-tipped sword waving in the air like a bride... Here on the rear is Oruç Reis the hero, who stands erect like a majestic statue (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 11).]

This introduction into one of Oruç Reis' many battles shifts the narrative from an informative discourse into a fictional one. The descriptive paragraph is clearly written by Ali Rıza Seyfi himself, or taken from an unspecified fictional source. Rather than offering historical or factual information, it functions as an introduction to a longer story presenting details that help the reader visualize the setting within which the adventure is about to take place. It also introduces Oruç Reis, the protagonist of the story, with attributes that foretell his heroic performance to follow in the rest of the story.

In the rest of *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*, Ali Rıza Seyfi pursued the same narrative strategy and created a work that is situated on an ambiguous terrain. The ambiguity operates on two levels: in terms of the work's relationship to

history and to literary genres. An analysis of the book brings to the surface such questions as: does the book convey authentic historical information? What are Ali Rıza Seyfi's sources? Is this a factual or a fictional book? Is its intended function to educate or to entertain? What kind of a readership is it aimed at?

In my view, Ali Rıza Seyfi was not interested in producing a book with factual qualities. He appears to have used the historical information he offered as a means of mobilizing feelings of nationhood in the readership. The nationalist elements evident in both the factual and the fictional discourse reveal that Ali Rıza Seyfi put forth an ideological agenda in *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*. Let me explore this agenda in more detail in the next section.

6.3.3.3 Nationalism as Ideological Agenda

Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir treats a number of themes that concern Turkish history such as naval battles and the role of the Ottoman navy in the military achievements of the Empire. Ali Rıza Seyfi's style in the book is marked by a number of nationalist elements originating from the themes and the lexical items used by the writer. These elements also reflect the nationalist ideology propagated by the writer in the book.

The principal theme which spans across the various talks in the book is the glorious past of the Turkish sailors. Ali Rıza Seyfi made use of both historical information and fictional elements to create a discourse that reproduced the idea of the superiority and strength of the Turkish nation. He used a number of attributes that qualified Turkish sailors as unique heroes. Consider the extract below:

Issız, matemli deniz üzerinden süzülüp giden bu kara hayaletlerin sinesinde ne kadar kahraman yürekleri çarpıyor, nasıl korkunç bir kuvvet, ölümlere gülen şecaat ve imkânsızlıklarla boğuşmağa aşık metanet kaynaşıp duruyor (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 37).

[These black ghosts floating over the deserted, mourning sea had the hearts of heroes that beat with an overwhelming strength, with courage that laughs in the face of death and with an endurance that longs to overcome difficulties (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 37).]

Apart from the fictional passages, Ali Rıza Seyfi also used (unspecified) historical sources to prove his argument about the superiority of Turkish soldiers. For instance he referred to one Admiral Hobart, who presumably said: “Türk askeri aslan gibi şecaatlı, kuzu gibi itaatlıdır!” [“The Turkish soldier is brave as a lion and obedient as a lamb!”] (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 29).

Ali Rıza Seyfi’s discourse in *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* appears to praise armed struggle and to encourage a militaristic approach towards conflicts. He himself called this the concept of “a soldierly death” [“askerce ölüm”]. He considered this approach a defining feature of Turkishness, as evident in the following paragraph:

Türk milleti harp ve savaşı da tarihinin seyrinde yalnız fen ve san’at olarak bakmıştır, onu adeta “güzel san’atlar, bedii meslekler” mertebesine yükseltmiştir! “Askerlik ve askerce ölüm” telâkkisinin bu bedii ve heyecanlı azametini hem kara harplerimizde, hem de dalgaları sıcak kanımızla tutuşturduğumuz yüzlerce, binlerce deniz savaşımızda görebilirsiniz (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 27).

[During its history the Turkish nation has always regarded war and combat as only a science and an art; it has almost elevated it to the level of “fine arts, artistic professions”! You may see the beautiful and exciting magnificence of the concept of “Serving as a soldier and dying a soldierly death” in both our land battles and in hundreds, thousands of sea battles where we set the waves on fire with our warm blood (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 27).]

Ali Rıza Seyfi appears to establish continuity between non-Ottoman Turkish history and the present Turkish republic by numerous references to the heroic deeds of pre-Ottoman Turks (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 7, 18, 61) apart from discussing the achievements of Turkish sailors who fought during the Ottoman period. He excludes the Ottoman administration from the glorious Turkish past as the following example illustrates:

Büyük deniz adamlarımızın yetişmesinde Osmanlı imparatorluğu resmî idaresinin hiç yardımı olmamıştır. ... Osmanlı imparatorluğunun saray paşaları bu kahramanlarımızın yüzüne bakmıyorlardı (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 6)

[The Ottoman Empire's official administration did not play a role in the training of our great seamen. ... The Ottoman commanders in the court did not even take our heroes seriously (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 6).]

Ali Rıza Seyfi has displayed a teleological view of history, which he explicitly used in order to reinforce patriotic feelings in his readers. In his third lecture, he explained the reason behind the importance he attached to history:

Yalnız kendine inanmak, tam mânasıyla “yaşamağa lâyık bir millet” olduğumuza iman etmek düşüncesinin bir an ruhumuzdan uzaklaşmaması lüzumdur ki bizi tarihimizden sahifeler okumağa sevk ediyor. ... Tarihin vazifesi, milletlerin altüst olup battığı ve çıktığı korkunç anlarda, milletin her ferdine, böyle nice fırtınaları atladığımızı bildirmek, bilhassa atlatacağımız imanını vermektir (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 19).

[We feel the need to learn our history because we have a constant need in our souls to have faith in ourselves and to believe that we are “a nation that deserves to live”. ... The task of history is to convince all members of the nation that we have overcome many a storm and, most importantly, we will overcome even more in the future in difficult times of national turbulence (Ali Rıza Seyfi 1940: 19).]

According to these lines, the motive behind the production of *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* was to create national self-esteem in the eyes of the readers, to reinforce a common sense of history and to manufacture a belief in the common future of the country. These aims were also shared by the culture planners associated with the republican government, as discussed in Chapter 2.

6.3.3.4 Siting *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*

In terms of its poetics and ideological framework, Ali Rıza Seyfi's *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* points at several directions which offer clues about the dynamics of the field of popular literature in the 1940s. The book must primarily be taken into consideration in terms of its dual generic structure as a talk and a written essay with fictional elements. Apart from being a cross between an oral and a written text, the book can also be considered to offer a hybrid structure in terms of the way Ali Rıza Seyfi has chosen to combine fact, fiction and personal commentary in his narrative discourse. The individual lectures, or chapters, include both factual and fictional elements – therefore it is possible to regard them both as historical essays, or short stories.

Why did Ali Rıza Seyfi choose to position the book on such an ambiguous literary terrain? Why did he need to introduce fictional elements to a book that had overt ideological objectives? I argue that the intergeneric structure of the work functioned to establish a specific kind of relationship with the readership. In my view, both the oral and the written texts made use of similar tools to reach their target. The radio programme spanned over a time period of nearly five months and it needed to ensure the presence of the audience week after week. It can be suggested

that the fictional elements and the stories of battle and adventure in the lectures created a degree of excitement and suspense in the audience that ensured the survival of the programme on the long run. On the other hand, the printed book addressed a readership that also needed an action-oriented narrative structure to hold their attention. I argue that this was required by the literary habitus that still survived among certain sections of the readership who grew up with traditional folk tales and continued to read them.

Throughout the book Ali Rıza Seyfi has made his ideological aim rather explicit: to create an awareness of Turkish national history. We should also bear in mind that the programme was broadcast during World War II, probably in an attempt to mobilize nationalist feelings. In Ali Rıza Seyfi's discourse, the Turkish nation assumed a strong, brave and militant character as represented by the sea heroes whose adventures he related. These were the qualities of the "self", the major characteristics of the Turkish identity, which he defined in distinction to the "other", the enemy naval forces that usually came from the West in the adventures he told. Furthermore, there is little doubt that Ali Rıza Seyfi's personal history as a naval officer played a decisive role in his choice of the theme and the style of *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*.

Ali Rıza Seyfi has not introduced a clear line between fact and fiction in the book. His blending of historical factual and fictional material, and his personal comments indicate that he was not concerned with writing a book that had any claims in terms of historiography. This is evident in the way he neglected the references for the historical sources he used. Furthermore, he was apparently not interested in writing a novel or short stories on Turkish sailors. In my view, he devised the narrative structure that best enabled him to put forth his ideological

agenda. That happened to be a mix of fact and fiction. By weaving historical information and fictional stories into a pattern brought together by his personal comments, Ali Rıza Seyfi has produced a work that specifically served to mobilize feelings of nationhood in the readership, while it also had an informative and entertaining function.

6.3.4 Siting Ali Rıza Seyfi

Any effort to define the position of Ali Rıza Seyfi within the field of translated and indigenous popular literature in Turkey in the early republican period must take into account two aspects of his literary production: its attitude toward the issues of authorial originality and textual integrity and its underlying nationalist agenda.

In all three works described and analyzed in the above sections, Ali Rıza Seyfi showed a tendency towards appropriating foreign sources and tampering with their textual integrity. In *Tarzanın Canavarları*, he overrode Edgar Rice Burroughs as the original author of the story. He (or the publishers) omitted Burrough's name from the book's peritext and did not hesitate to introduce a number of additions to the text that altered its stylistic features and some character traits. He twice presented *Kazıklı Voyvoda* as his indigenous novel, domesticated the story, modified the plot and inserted nationalist comments into the text. *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* also constitutes an example of Ali Rıza Seyfi's appropriating tendency: it is a text that raises questions about the historical authenticity and the provenance of the stories it recounts. These once again illustrate that the poetics within which the field of popular literature operated allowed for a flexible view of authorial originality. The

works analyzed in this section also offer some clues about the politics of translated and indigenous popular literature in the 1920s-1940s.

All three of the books described above belong to the field of large-scale production, apparently shaped by market forces. *Tarzanın Canavarları* as a serialized adventure novel, *Kazıklı Voyvoda* as a horror novel published within a series of “curious novels”, and *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* as the printed version of a series of talks partly consisting of battle stories were all works that addressed a large readership that consumed popular literature. This is not to say that they were merely shaped by market forces. The commercial link between *Tarzanın Canavarları* and films featuring Tarzan is clear. It is also evident that *Kazıklı Voyvoda* and *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir* capitalized on the popularity of works with nationalist themes which were highly in demand in the 1920s and the 1930s. Nevertheless, the ideological message they communicated was also a strong defining factor in terms of the production of all three books. In *Tarzanın Canavarları*, the least political of them, Ali Rıza Seyfi embedded his nationalist agenda within his choice of vocabulary. He explicitly contributed to the official language planning efforts by making use of neologisms. In *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, his concealed translation, Ali Rıza Seyfi used the plot offered by Stoker and the characters of *Dracula* as instruments for the construction of a nationalist discourse that enabled him to define his conception of the newly-forming Turkish identity. In his indigenous *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*, he combined numerous sources, factual or fictional, in order to create a sense of pride in Turkish naval battle history. He thus contributed to the construction of a sense of shared history, a project by official culture planners that was already on the way. The strong ideological overtones of all three works suggest that the field of popular literature was not only governed by market forces.

Nationalist concerns also gave shape to the production and reception of the works circulating in the field of popular literature.

6.4 Kemal Tahir: Torn Between Identities

Kemal Tahir³⁸ (1910-1973) is among the most prolific novelists of Turkey in the second half of the 20th century.³⁹ He is also one of the most debated Turkish novelist not only due to his literary production, but also due to his political and social ideas which he raised in his novels, essays and interviews. He was born in Istanbul in 1910 and studied at Galatasaray Lisesi, the French Lycee, until 10th grade. He left school at the age of 18 and went on to work first as a clerk and then as a journalist. He worked as a proofreader, reporter and translator for a number of newspapers and became a popular journalist in the course of a few years. He finally became editor-in-chief of *Tan* in 1938. His literary work during this early period included translations, poetry and short stories. The two translations he published under his own name in the 1930s were *Bir Çalgıcının Seyahatleri* (Travels of a Musician), a pseudotranslation originally written by Mehmet Tevfik in Ottoman script, revised and signed by Kemal Tahir in 1937 and *Görünmeyen Adam* (translation of H.G. Wells' *The Invisible Man*) (1938). He published his poetry in *Yeni Kültür* and *Geçit* magazines and his short stories in *Yedigün*. He was charged with communism and was sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment in 1938. He stayed in prison until 1950 when he was released on general parole. During his time in prison, he wrote numerous novels. Most of these

³⁸ Kemal Tahir adopted the surname "Demir", but did not use it in his literary work. He will be called Kemal Tahir throughout the dissertation.

³⁹ Biographical information on Kemal Tahir is compiled from Dosdoğru 1974; Necatigil 1983; Yazoğlu 1993; Alangu 1965 and Yalçın 2001.

novels were popular works published by major newspapers in serialized form. He wrote these works under various pen-names, including Nurettin Demir, İsmail Kemalettin, Kör Duman, and Bedri Eser. Based on the letters he wrote to Semiha Uzunhasan, whom he later married, we know that he also produced a number of translations during this time, whose titles he did not specify. He became the Istanbul representative of a business newspaper after his release in 1950 and did translations on business-related topics. He joined Çağlayan Yayınevi in 1954 and produced a number of translations, pseudotranslations and novels for them. He published his collection of short stories, *Göl İnsanları* (The Lake People) in 1954, and started publishing his major novels in 1955. He continued his literary career as a novelist until his death in 1973.

Unlike Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi, Kemal Tahir was a well-known and much-debated novelist. He expressed his views on art, literature, politics, culture and society in a series of essays, notes and letters which were collected and published after his death by Bağlam Yayınları (1989-1993). He was known as a Marxist writer, and the reflections of his ideological stance are visible throughout his literary work. His anti-westernist position made him the subject of a number of debates both during and after his lifetime (Moran 2001a: 173-174). These debates focused on his work after 1955 and nearly ignored his popular works or literary production in the first phase of his career as a writer. His best-known popular works are probably his translations and pseudotranslations of Mickey Spillane's "Mike Hammer" series published by Çağlayan in 1954-1955. These works have largely been disregarded by critics and the literary style and translation strategies employed by Kemal Tahir in these works remain to be analysed. An investigation of the poetics dictating the production and reception of these works will offer valuable clues about the field of

translated popular literature in the 1950s. Furthermore, a study of Kemal Tahir's "Mike Hammer" translations and pseudotranslations will help his concept of translation to crystallize. Such a study will form an interesting point of reference against which his indigenous production can be assessed. The thematic, stylistic and ideological differences among his popular works, always signed with pen-names, and his novels with a critical acclaim, which he signed with his own name, will offer insight into the way he conceptualized "popular" versus "high" literature. In turn, this will provide clues about the diversified poetics of the literary field in the 1950s.

In this section I will analyse three works by Kemal Tahir: His translation of Mickey Spillane's *I, the Jury* (*Kanun Benim*), his Mike Hammer pseudotranslation *Ecel Saati* (The Deadly Watch), and his novel *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* (People from the Captive City).

6.4.1 *Kanun Benim* (I Am The Law)

Kanun Benim was published by Çağlayan Yayınevi in 1954 as the first in a series of at least nine books featuring the adventures of American detective Mike Hammer.⁴⁰ The first five books in the series were written by the original creator of the Mike Hammer character, Frank Morrison (Mickey) Spillane and translated by Kemal Tahir who used the pen-name F.M. İkinci. Kemal Tahir's choice of F.M. İkinci as a pseudonym was a pun on Mickey Spillane's initials: F and M. "İkinci" means "the second" in Turkish. Therefore Kemal Tahir assumed the name "F.M. the Second" in these translations (Üyepazarcı 1999: 4). The novels translated by Kemal Tahir in this

⁴⁰ *Kanun Benim* was reprinted in 1962 by İtimat Kitabevi. Two retranslations of *I, the Jury* have been carried out under the same title. Suna Develioğlu (İstanbul Kitap Sarayı, 1978) and Şevket Saraç (Tay Yayınları, 1987) were the translators of these two retranslations. These retranslations deserve a separate study in order to reveal the motives and methods of their translators and publishers.

series were *Kanun Benim* (*I, the Jury*), *Kahreden Kurşun* (*My Gun is Quick*), *Kanlı Takip* (*Vengeance is Mine*), *İntikam Pençesi* (*The Big Kill*), *Son Çılgılık* (*Kiss Me Deadly*).

After these five books were published in 1954, Çağlayan Yayınevi continued to publish novels featuring Mike Hammer in 1954 and 1955: *Derini Yüzeceğim* (*I Will Skin You*), *Ecel Saati* (*The Deadly Watch*), *Kara Nâra* (*The Black Scream*) and *Kıran Kırana* (*The Ruthless Fight*). None of these books were by Mickey Spillane. The peritextual elements of these books shared similar features with the previous translations. The cover design, the size of the book and the illustrations were the same. The major difference was the presentation of these books as novels “written” by F.M. İkinci. The covers presented these books with the statement “Mayk Hammer’in Yeni Maceraları” [“Mike Hammer’s New Adventures”]. A survey of novels by Mickey Spillane written until that date revealed that *Derini Yüzeceğim*, *Ecel Saati*, *Kara Nâra* and *Kıran Kırana* were written by Kemal Tahir. I will explore these works in more detail in the next section.

Kanun Benim was the first book in the “Mike Hammer” series by Çağlayan Yayınevi. It was published in January 1954 and immediately became a big commercial success, selling over 100,000 copies in a few weeks (Üyepazarcı 1999: 4). Established in 1953, Çağlayan Yayınevi had already made itself a name with its innovatory format and glossy covers in colour (Kabacalı 2000: 227). It published one book every fifteen days and sold them through the newspaper stands. Some of its previous publications had also reached high sales figures, but none had beaten *Kanun Benim*.

6.4.1.1 Peritextual Elements

Kanun Benim is a pocket book consisting of 193 pages. Its front cover features a colour illustration, showing a woman undressing herself and a man who is pointing a gun at her. The title of the book is printed in large letters at the top of the page, while the name of the writer, Mickey Spillane, is printed in smaller letters towards the bottom of the page. The cover features the name of the publisher at the bottom. The cover illustration, as well as the title of the book, serve as generic designations. The suggestive pose of the woman in the illustration, the face of the man hidden in the dark and the gun in his hand all indicate that the book is a thriller. The title *Kanun Benim* (I am the Law) also points at the status of the book as a detective novel. The title page includes the name of the writer, the title of the book, the name F.M. İkinci with “translator” [“çeviren”] as the attribute, and the name of the publisher. This emphasis on the source writer in the peritext is a strong distinguishing factor, setting *Kanun Benim* apart from the two translations I discussed earlier: *Drakyola* referred to the source author, Bram Stoker, only once and in abbreviated form as B. Stoker, while *Tarzanın Canavarları* did not mention Edgar Rice Burroughs, its source author, at all in its peritext.

Before I proceed with the analysis of the textual features of the translation, I would like to comment on Kemal Tahir’s frequent use of pseudonyms. As mentioned above, F.M. İkinci was a pseudonym adopted by Kemal Tahir. The use of pseudonyms as a literary strategy may be aimed at creating an effect among the readership (Genette 1997: 48). Biographers and critics have enquired about the possible reasons that may lie behind the use of pseudonyms and have come up with motives like modesty, cautiousness, or dislike of one’s patronym (Genette 1997: 49).

In Kemal Tahir's case, the motive appears to be the wish to differentiate between his several writerly identities: Kemal Tahir who wrote serialized romance or thrillers, Kemal Tahir who translated and wrote detective fiction, and Kemal Tahir who wrote realist literature. By adopting a number of pseudonyms throughout his literary career, Kemal Tahir systematically excluded some of his works from his own biography. His popular works, i.e. romances, melodramas and thrillers, consistently appeared under various pseudonyms, whereas his realist fiction treating social issues such as village life and Turkish history were published under his own name. In his letters, he made it quite clear that he used pseudonyms whenever he was not happy with his own production, which was always the case with his popular fiction (Yazoğlu 1993: 212-213). I will discuss this point in more detail at the end of Section 6.4.1.4.

The majority of Kemal Tahir's pseudonyms, such as Nurettin Demir and Bedri Eser, were ordinary names he must have picked out without any apparent reason. These served the practical purpose of hiding his real identity. On the other hand, one of the surnames he adopted during the early phases of his literary career, Benerci, (Dosdoğru 1974: 430) had clear ideological and intertextual connotations as a name adopted after Nâzım Hikmet Ran's famous poem, *Benerci Kendini Neden Öldürdü* (1932). This name had clear references to his comradeship with Nâzım Hikmet, and therefore placed the works written under this name within a certain context for the readers. His choice of F.M. İkinci as the pen-name for his translated and indigenous works featuring Mike Hammer also seems to serve two purposes. First, Kemal Tahir made sure that he held his writerly identity producing translated and indigenous detective fiction separate from his writerly identity that wrote canonical fiction which he started getting published in the mid-1950s. Secondly, as mentioned above, Kemal Tahir coined his pen-name as a pun after Mickey Spillane's initials. This was a joke

only he, his publishers and readers familiar with Spillane's full name could understand.

The peritext of *Kanun Benim* includes a back cover advertising one of the forthcoming books by Çağlayan Yayınevi. It is printed in colour and features the picture of a girl dressed in a bathing suit. A statement printed above the head of the girl appears to make her ask: "Sizde bu diplomadan var mı?" ["Do you have this diploma?"] The girl points at a framed diploma which reads as follows: "Her türlü cinsî beceriksizlikten kurtulmuş, hem kendine hem başkalarına aşktan azami saadet ve zevki temin edecek hale gelmiştir." ["This person is now free of all forms of sexual ineptness and is competent to derive maximum happiness and pleasure from love both for himself and for others."] Underneath the diploma there is another statement which announces the title of the book: "Aşk tecrübesi mektebinden henüz bu diplomayı almış değilseniz 10 DERSTE CİNSİYET kitabına ihtiyacınız var demektir." ["If you have not already received this diploma from the school of love you will need the book SEX IN 10 LESSONS."] The back cover offers valuable evidence about the kind of readership *Kanun Benim* aimed at. This readership was evidently young and male. The illustration and wording on the back cover associated the book with popular literature, and more specifically, with erotic fiction. This confirmed the initial image formed by the front cover, where a young girl is shown pulling off her shirt and leaving her breasts partly bare. Indeed, *Kanun Benim* does have several erotic scenes and implicit sexual descriptions, a feature that distinguishes it from other detective fiction that was popular until the mid-1950s, such as the Sherlock Holmes, Arsène Lupin and Nat Pinkerton series.

The last two pages of *Kanun Benim* were also allocated for advertisement. One of these pages featured a general advertisement for the publishing company,

informing the readers that they could subscribe to books published by Çağlayan through the post. The second page advertised two forthcoming books to appear in February 1954, *Halk Plajı* (The Public Beach) and *Kanımdaki Şeytan* (The Devil in My Blood), where no information about the authors were mentioned.

6.4.1.2 Plot and Characters

In his translation of *I, the Jury*, Kemal Tahir has fully rendered the plot of the source text. He has, moreover, retained the characters and their traits. The main innovation in the novel, partly responsible for its commercial success, is its introduction of the “hard-boiled” detective genre into the Turkish system of popular literature. The protagonist of the novel, Mike Hammer, was a private eye who often resorted to violence, including the frequent use of his gun. He was an attractive and sexually active man, engaged in several affairs at the same time. The novel reflected the harsh and violent climate of post-war New York where crime was the order of the day. Mike Hammer was rather different from two other detective heroes that had remained popular in Turkey since the beginning of the 20th century: Sherlock Holmes and Arsène Lupin who relied on their intellect, rather than the use of force to fulfill their missions. Furthermore, the stories that they featured in were devoid of the realist and cruel atmosphere of Mike Hammer stories.

I, The Jury is the first novel introducing Mike Hammer by Mickey Spillane, originally published in 1947. The novel is a revenge story where Mike Hammer pledges to find and kill the person who murdered his best friend, Jack Williams. He cooperates with Pat Chambers from the New York Police to solve the case. He starts interviewing people who were invited to a party Jack gave on the night he died.

Through the information he collects, Hammer realizes that Jack had uncovered a drug-dealing scheme. During this process, he befriends several of Jack's female friends and falls in love with Charlotte, a psychiatrist. Soon after, people whom Mike Hammer suspects to be connected with the drug-dealing start to be murdered one by one. His investigations finally reveal that Charlotte is a drug dealer and is responsible for the death of Jack and his friends. Mike Hammer has no other choice but to kill her. The details of this plot is common to both *I, The Jury* and *Kanun Benim*.

The main characters in the book are Mike Hammer, Pat Chambers, Mike Hammer's secretary Velda and Charlotte. Mike Hammer and Pat Chambers share similar traits as men who are engaged in the fight against crime. Mike Hammer is the more passionate and temperamental of the two. He is also the one more prone to use force. Pat Chambers tries to balance him out and keep him out of trouble. The majority of the women in the novel, apart from Velda who also appears in other Mike Hammer adventures, are represented as potentially dangerous. Jack's girlfriend Myrna is a drug addict, Jack's friend Mary is a nymphomaniac and Charlotte is both a drug dealer and a murderer. Kemal Tahir retained all of these character traits in his translation. In fact, his choice of vocabulary in *Kanun Benim* reinforces these traits.

6.4.1.3 Matricial Norms and Treatment of Proper Names in *Kanun Benim*

Kemal Tahir did not make extensive additions or omissions in *Kanun Benim*. He showed a concern for the textual integrity of the novel and translated the source text in full. Nevertheless, there are a number of additions he carried out in *Kanun Benim* that offer clues about his concept of translation.

It is not clear whether *Kanun Benim* was translated directly from English. Erol Üyepazarcı has suggested that since Kemal Tahir spoke only French, the translation must have been done from the French (Üyepazarcı 1999: 7). Tahir Alangu also reports that Kemal Tahir translated only from the French (Alangu 1965: 448). This may indeed be true. Although Kemal Tahir translated Wells' *The Invisible Man*, and also began a translation of an Agatha Christie novel while he was in prison (Yazoğlu 1993: 293), there is no information in his letters or notes about whether he knew English or whether he translated *The Invisible Man* and *I, the Jury* directly from English. Furthermore, there is some evidence inside *Kanun Benim* indicating that the book was indeed translated from French. Kemal Tahir has used a number of French phrases in the translation such as "Mösyö" [Monsieur] (p.22), "bonjur" [bon jour] (p. 36, 84, 85, 121), "bonsuar" [bon soir] (p. 104). However, this evidence is not definitive. These phrases may well indicate that *Kanun Benim* was translated from French. Yet, they may also demonstrate the interference of such French loan words in colloquial Turkish. In the meantime, the effect of French on Kemal Tahir's pronunciation of foreign names is visible in *Kanun Benim*. He has used Turkish phonetic transcriptions of foreign names instead of retaining the original English spelling. However, he spelled some of the names as if they were French names. Jack became "Jak", Charlotte was spelled as "Şarlot", and Mary as "Mari". However, this was not consistent for all names, George was spelled as "Corc" instead of "Jorj", the way it would be spelled according to French phonetics.

The lack of information about the status of *Kanun Benim* as a direct or mediated translation makes its analysis and comparison with the source text difficult. Minor omissions or additions which are encountered in the target text are difficult to trace and can only be analyzed if a French translation as a potential intermediary is

discovered. When *Kanun Benim* is juxtaposed to Spillane's *I, The Jury*, some omissions and additions are discovered. Nevertheless, the omissions are not as radical as those encountered in *Drakyola* and *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, and the additions are not extensive enough to modify thematic features or character traits as those discovered in *Tarzanın Canavarları* or *Kazıklı Voyvoda*. An excerpt from the translation will help clarify my claim:

Target Text:

Nefesim tıkanı. Resim plâjda çekilmişti; siyah mayosuyla kadın kumların üstüne yorgun bir şehvet ilâhesi gibi uzanmış yatıyordu. İnce uzun bacaklar, geniş kalçalar, kumaşı yırtacak gibi geren memeler, pırıl pırıl sarı saçlar. Ama insanı asıl çarpan tarafı yüzüydü (Spillane 1954: 16).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

I could hardly breathe. The picture was taken at the beach; the woman lay down on the sands like a languid goddess of passion in her black bathing suit. Slender and long legs, wide hips, breasts restraining the fabric as if it would tear any moment, shiny blond hair. But the most striking of all was her face (Spillane 1954: 16).]

Source Text:

My heart jumped when I saw it. The picture was taken at a beach, and she stood there tall and languid-looking in a white bathing suit. Long solid legs. A little heavier than the movie experts consider good form, but the kind that make you drool to look at. Under the suit I could see the muscles of her stomach. Incredibly wide shoulders for a woman, framing breasts that jutted out, seeking freedom from the restraining fabric of the suit. Her hair looked white in the picture, but I could tell that it was a natural blonde. Lovely, lovely yellow hair. But her face was what got me (Spillane 1949: 14).

In the target text, there are a number of shifts and omissions. Kemal Tahir, or the French translator, must have changed the woman's description based on the basis of personal or cultural ideas of beauty: The "solid" and "heavy legs" of the source text became slender, the "white bathing suit" became black and the "wide shoulders"

and the “muscled stomach” disappeared. Furthermore, the woman received a new descriptive attribute: goddess of passion. If this is a direct translation, then it can be safely argued that it reflected Kemal Tahir’s personal view of what a beautiful woman ought to look like – which also offers some clues about the cultural aesthetic expectations of the 1950s. If this is an indirect translation, then the shifts and omissions may reflect the French translator’s or French culture’s view. Yet as long as the source of the shifts and omissions are unknown, they cannot constitute reliable data against which Kemal Tahir’s concept of translation can be explored. *Kanun Benim* also includes some additions that are culture-specific. These additions, which are largely stylistic, will form the basis of my descriptive analysis in this section.

The language used in *Kanun Benim* is colloquial. Kemal Tahir has resorted to various idiomatic expressions in the text, which creates the impression of an indigenous novel, save for the foreign names. It seems rather obvious that Kemal Tahir aimed to create a fluent text in Turkish and avoided literal renderings. On the contrary, he seems to have introduced a number of additions to the source text in order to create a style that would sound familiar to the readership. Consider the following examples:

Target Text:

“Ben bu dünyada yaş tahtaya basmaktan Pat kadar korkan bir başka vesveseli adama rastlamadım” (Spillane 1954: 38).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

“I have never seen a fussy man like Pat who is as afraid to step on wet wood” (Spillane 1954: 38).]

Source Text:

“Pat’s not letting any grass grow under his feet,” I mused (Spillane 1949: 30).

Kemal Tahir has translated the idiom “to let grass grow under one’s feet” with another Turkish idiom, “yaş tahtaya basmak” which literally translates as “to step on wet wood”, meaning “not to be prudent”.

Target Text:

“Bu gece metodunuzun sökeceğini zannetmem şekerim; çünkü bu numarayı ben hayatımda çok gördüm, hepsinden de evelallah yakayı sıyırmayı becerdim. İsbatı da hâlâ bekâr oluşum.”

“Yiğitlik sizde değil, kızlar numarayı iyi yapamamışlar” (Spillane 1954: 77).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

“I don’t think your method will work tonight honey; because I have seen this trick a lot of times in my life, and thank god, I managed to save myself from all of them. The proof is that I am still single.”

“Don’t credit yourself. It seems the girls couldn’t pull off the trick properly” (Spillane 1954: 77).]

Source Text:

“Don’t look now,” I told her, but it’s been tried on me before.”

“But not by an expert.” (Spillane 1949: 57)

In the above dialogue Kemal Tahir has expanded on Spillane’s dialogue and introduced a series of common Turkish expressions such as “evelallah”, “yakayı sıyırmak” and “yiğitlik”.

Target Text:

Öyle bir kadın ki bakar bakmaz kollarına almak, ağzını öpmek arzularını duyarsın. Daha beteri, seversin ölesiye Jak. Şarlot öyle bir âfet ki kardeşim, alev vücudunu vermek istediği zaman evliyalar bile mukavemet edemez. Evet, şu benim Şarlot. Katil o (Spillane 1954: 182-183).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

She is the kind of woman that the moment you look at her you want to take her in your arms and kiss her lips. Even worse, you love her to death Jack. Charlotte is such a stunner, brother, that when she wants to give her body of fire even saints can’t resist. Yes, that Charlotte of mine. She is the killer (Spillane 1954: 182-183).]

Source Text:

Charlotte whom you wanted to crush in your arms and feel the wetness of her lips. Charlotte of the body that was fire and life and soft velvet and responsiveness. Charlotte the killer (Spillane 1949: 152).

Kemal Tahir has once more used the expression “âfet”, which literally means “disaster” to describe Charlotte, a Turkish colloquial attribute used to qualify beautiful, ambitious and potentially dangerous women. He also used a culture-specific form of address – “kardeşim” [“brother”] and added the phrase “evliyalar bile mukavemet edemez” [“even saints can’t resist”] to emphasize Charlotte’s irresistibility. Apart from these, Kemal Tahir added two new ideas to the passage: Mike’s love for Charlotte, and the way he considers her to be his. These additions also carry a fluent, colloquial and conversational tone. Interestingly, Kemal Tahir’s shifts or additions carrying common expressions also serve to reflect the tone of *I, the Jury* which is marked by an idiomatic use of English.

Although there is no extratextual evidence to prove this, Kemal Tahir might have well been influenced by some of the major norms propagated by translators and critics associated with the Translation Bureau. As discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.1, preserving the textual integrity of the source text, i.e., refraining from large-scale omissions and additions, was introduced as an important prerequisite for “fidelity” in the discourse of a number of translators who expressed their views on translation strategies (Örik 1940: 205; Güney 1942: 530; İlgün 1942: 147; Ay 1942a: 152). Furthermore, remaining faithful to both the content, the tone and the style of the source text was presented as an ideal in the articles published in the journal *Tercüme* and other literary journals in the 1940s as demonstrated in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.2. These articles written by prominent translators such as Nurullah Ataç

and Sabahattin Eyüboğlu suggested that the use of a natural and free-flowing Turkish was just as important as fidelity to the source text for translation quality (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.4).

6.4.1.4 Siting *Kanun Benim*

Kanun Benim occupies a significant position within the system of translated popular literature in Turkey. It was the translation that introduced Mike Hammer to the Turkish readership and largely defined the course that translated popular literature would take throughout the 1950s. As mentioned in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2.1, Mike Hammer translations and pseudotranslations became immensely popular and constituted a considerable portion of all literary translations from English and American literatures in the second half of the 1950s.

The translation strategies adopted by Kemal Tahir in *Kanun Benim* were rather different from those adopted by Selâmi Münir Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi in their respective translations. Kemal Tahir paid attention to fullness, remained faithful to the content *and* Spillane's tone, if not style, with his fluent and colloquial use of Turkish in the target text, which seem to fit in with the norms propagated by the Translation Bureau and the translators associated with it in the 1940s. This indicates that a change must have started taking place in the poetics of translated popular literature in Turkey in the 1950s, perhaps due to the activities of the Translation Bureau. One of Nâzım Hikmet's letters to Kemal Tahir written in 1941 reveals that they both approved of the Translation Bureau. Nâzım Hikmet wrote, presumably in response to an earlier remark by Kemal Tahir: "You are right in your words about the Ministry of Education's publication of translated works. Indeed, this business is very

useful. Of course we should be brave enough to appreciate good things” [“Maarif Vekâleti tercüme neşriyatı hakkında söylediğin sözler de doğrudur. Elhak bu iş çok faydalıdır. Elbette ki iyiye iyi diyecek kadar cesur olmalıyız.”] (Nâzım Hikmet 1975: 257). The approval of these two oppositional intellectuals for the Translation Bureau is significant for it shows that the Bureau received the support of a wider intellectual group, rather than only the culture-planners associated with the single party government.

Kemal Tahir repeatedly asked for translations of Greek, English and Latin classics by the Ministry of Education from Semiha, his future wife, in his letters to her from the prison (Yazoğlu 1993: 239, 257). This proves that he read the books translated by the Translation Bureau as much as he could have access to them in the prison. His correspondance with Nâzım Hikmet shows that, he also contemplated on the issue of translation and discussed his views with Nâzım Hikmet in his letters (Nâzım Hikmet 1975: 252-258). Unfortunately, his letters to Nâzım Hikmet, where he expressed his views on translation are not available.

As a writer following the debates around translation, Kemal Tahir must have been aware of the newly developing translational habitus in the field of canonical literature. His practice as a translator, as it becomes visible in *Kanun Benim*, appeared to be a part of this new translational habitus which foregrounded fluency and fidelity to the original author.

I interpret Kemal Tahir’s use of a pseudonym in the translation as an indication of his reluctance to be identified with *Kanun Benim*. I suggest that this stems from his violation of one of the major norms being formed in the centre of the system of translated literature throughout the 1930s-1950s. According to this norm, translated works had to be instrumental in the development of Turkish literature and assist the

cultural and educational development of the readership (See Chapter 3, Section 3.1). *Kanun Benim* was a detective novel and as such, was among those books which were considered to have a harmful effect on the readers. On the other hand, *Kanun Benim* was a perfect marriage of popular detective fiction and realist/naturalist literature. Scenes from a crime-ridden New York and depictions of people taken over by sexual perversions, alcohol and drugs in post-war America did not provide escapist fiction. Rather, it formed a new alternative for readers seeking to combine adventure, suspense and a certain dose of social problems in their reading experience. Nevertheless, Kemal Tahir could not have considered this novel suitable for boosting his literary career as a Marxist realist writer, as is evident in his use of F.M. İkinci as his pseudonym. His Mike Hammer translations and novels are in fact a continuation of his career as a writer and translator of popular novels which he launched in the mid-1930s under the pen-name Cemalettin Mahir when he wrote for the magazine *Yedigün*. Kemal Tahir continued this career while he was in prison in the 1940s. His letters to Semiha offer plenty of evidence about his low opinion of his own literary production around this time. For instance he reported his latest literary activity his letter dated 7.7.1947 as follows: “I finally started to work towards the end of last month. I started humorous adventure novels. I am too embarrassed to write you the title of my latest work (!). The Reserve Lover. You can figure out the rest” [“Nihayet geçen ayın nihayetlerine doğru işe giriştim. Komik macera romanlarına başladım. Son eserimin (!) adını sana utanarak yazayım mı? Yedek Aşık, artık ne matah olduğunu anla.”] (Yazoğlu 1993: 217). On 10.4.1947, he criticized his own books: “I sent in the novel I wrote. I still have not received a reply. Let’s see if they like it and agree to publish it. Do you want to hear the truth? I swear to god, I wouldn’t accept to publish it in my own newspaper. I feel ashamed as if I am

cheating my journalist friends and the readers” [“... yazdığım romanı yolladım. Henüz bir cevap çıkmadı. Bakalım beğenip basacaklar mı? Sana doğrusunu söyleyeyim mi? Benim gazetem olsa vallaha kabul edip neşretmezdim. Gerek gazeteci arkadaşlarımı, gerek okuyucuları dolandırıyormuş gibi ayıp bir şeyler hissediyorum.”] (Yazoğlu 1993: 212-213). These statements make his reasons for using pseudonyms quite clear.

6.4.2 *Ecel Saati* (The Deadly Watch)

Ecel Saati was published by Çağlayan Yayınevi in November 1954, presented with the general title, “Mayk Hammer’in Yeni Maceraları” (Mike Hammer’s New Adventures). Until that date, Çağlayan Yayınevi had published six novels featuring Mike Hammer. A comparison of these novels with original novels by Mickey Spillane reveals that the first five, *Kanun Benim*, *İntikam Pençesi*, *Kahreden Kurşun*, *Kanlı Takip* and *Son Çılgılık* are translations of books by Spillane, of *I*, *The Jury*, *The Big Kill*, *My Gun is Quick*, *Vengeance is Mine* and *Kiss Me Deadly* respectively.⁴¹ The sixth Mike Hammer book by Çağlayan, *Derini Yüzeceğim* (I Will Skin You), does not appear to be a translation. The only remaining novel by Mickey Spillane, not published by Çağlayan Yayınevi, was *One Lonely Night* but *Derini Yüzeceğim* is not its translation. *Derini Yüzeceğim* was presented as an indigenous work written by F.M. İkinci. In November 1954 another Mayk Hammer book was published: *Ecel Saati* (The Deadly Watch), followed by two more, *Kara Nâra* (The Black Scream) and *Kıran Kırana* (The Ruthless Fight). None of these books were by Mickey Spillane. In the meantime, the continued commercial success of the Mike Hammer

⁴¹ Information on Mickey Spillane’s biography and works is available from <http://www.interlog.com/~roco/hammer.html>.

series encouraged other publishers to start bringing out similar series. Plastik Yayınlar published 10 Mike Hammer adventures between 1954 and 1956, all by Adnan Semih and Leyla Yazıcıoğlu, Ekicigil Yayınları published 16 during the same period by various writers, the majority being works by Çetin Tümay; and Hadise Yayınevi published 103 Mike Hammer novels in 1955-1958, nearly all by Afif Yesari, who used the pseudonym Muzaffer Ulukaya (Üyepazarcı 1999: 19-22). The books in this last group were presented as translations of novels by Mickey Spillane, and were all classified as translations from “English and American Literature” by the *Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958*. The bibliography obviously accepted the presentational elements in the covers and title pages of these books as its main classificatory criterion. Books presented as translation by the publishers were classified as translation even when they were obvious pseudotranslations. On the other hand, the last four Mike Hammer books published by Çağlayan Yayınevi, *Derini Yüzeceğim*, *Ecel Saati*, *Kara Nâra* and *Kıran Kırana* were classified under “Turkish Literature”, since their title pages indicated that the novels were “written” by F.M. İkinci.

6.4.2.1 Peritextual Elements

Ecel Saati was presented as an indigenous work on its title page which carried F.M. İkinci’s name as the writer [“yazan”]. Nevertheless, all other peritextual elements in the book share a number of features with five “Mike Hammer” translations preceding it published by the same company. I suggest that the peritextual elements, apart from the presentation of F.M. İkinci as the “writer”, serve to position the novel as a translation rather than a Turkish novel. The most significant feature that serves to

associate the book with earlier Mike Hammer translations is its cover. The cover features the title “Mayk Hammer’in Yeni Maceraları” [“Mike Hammer’s New Adventures”]. As indicated in the previous section, books by Mickey Spillane became an enormous commercial success within the course of a few weeks and all sold around 100.000 copies each. This meant that the readership became acquainted with Mike Hammer as an American hero, created by an American writer. Therefore the presentation of a book as a Mike Hammer adventure would be sufficient to position it as a translation in the eyes of the readership. Furthermore, the cover of the book does not include a writer’s name; instead, it focuses on the name of the hero. The cover includes an illustration of a beautiful woman carrying a male costume in her hand which is a reference to the novel’s plot. The woman generously exhibits her naked shoulder and her legs, following the example of other illustrations featuring on the covers of earlier Mike Hammer novels. The pocket book format and formal features of the text such as the length and the division of chapters are also identical with genuine Mike Hammer translations. Furthermore, there is a deliberate strategy in the text in order to create the impression of a translation which I will explore in more detail in Section 6.4.2.5.

The back cover of *Ecel Saati* includes an advertisement for one of the forthcoming books by Çağlayan Yayınevi. This is *Hayata İsyan* (Revolt Against Life), a translated novel by Somerset Maugham, one of the popular writers published by a number of companies operating in the field of both popular and canonical literature in the 1950s. The illustrations used in the advertisement present the book as an adventure story. The pictures seem to represent a series of scenes from the novel and feature an affair between a man and a woman, a man drinking and two men

fighting. Furthermore, there is a family portrait in the illustration whose happy unity seems to be disturbed by the woman in the other pictures.

The last few pages of *Ecel Saati* include advertisements for several banks (İstanbul Bankası, Türk Ticaret Bankası, Doğubank and İşbank), an advertisement for “Gripin”, a painkiller, and another advertisement for “Mental”, a breath-freshener. These are types of advertisements which feature in periodical publications such as newspapers or magazines. The books by Çağlayan Yayınevi were published on fortnightly intervals and were sold at newspaper stands instead of bookstores. This is further evidence for the status of Çağlayan Yayınevi’s books as popular works in the field of large-scale production.

6.4.2.2 Plot and Characters

Ecel Saati was originally written by Kemal Tahir when he was commissioned to write a series of Mike Hammer stories by Çağlayan Yayınevi (Üyepazarcı 1999: 8). The novel features the same main characters as other books in the Mike Hammer series. The protagonist is Hammer. He cooperates with Pat Chambers from the homicide desk of the New York Police. His secretary and long-term girlfriend is Velda who aids him in his investigations.

Ecel Saati has a rather intricate plot. Mike Hammer is called on to help Pat Chambers and his new assistant Wilson with a big mafia case against the leader of the mob, Antonio. They try to convince Antonio’s henchman, Alfieri to testify against him. Alfieri gets killed the night before the trial, but before he is killed, Mike Hammer manages to find out about a watch that is supposed to contain information on a treasure of 50 million dollars. Hammer pursues Alfieri’s girlfriend Linda and

takes the watch from her. This starts a chain of murders, in the course of which Mike Hammer tries to find out the secret behind the watch. At the end of the novel it becomes evident that the watch was a hoax devised by Alfieri to save himself from Antonio's rage. Wilson, the police officer, is revealed as the real criminal who has murdered several people, including Antonio, in his quest for the watch. Hammer kills him and puts an end to the case.

The plot of the novel does not particularly distinguish itself from the plots of original Mike Hammer stories written by Mickey Spillane. The suspense element, erotic scenes, the emphasis on action and violence over reasoning and deduction, which define the hard-boiled detective genre and Mike Hammer stories as part of this sub-genre, are evident in *Ecel Saati*. In that sense, it can be safely argued that Kemal Tahir, a.k.a. F.M. İkinci, was able to write a story that could easily be received as an original Mike Hammer novel. However, his Mike Hammer character varies from Spillane's Hammer to a certain degree. The difference does not lie at the level of character traits. Both Kemal Tahir's and Spillane's Hammer are fond of women and alcohol. They are both strong and prone to be violent, resorting to the use of force whenever necessary. Furthermore, they both have a sense of justice and are cynical and distrustful characters. They refuse to be incorporated in the system and have a problem with the concept of authority. The difference between the Mike Hammer characters created by the Kemal Tahir and Mickey Spillane becomes apparent in terms of character elaboration. Kemal Tahir's Mike Hammer is certainly the more critical of the two, often airing his views on crime and poverty as they surface at various points in the story. Kemal Tahir offers more clues about his Hammer's inner world and makes him an anti-hero who shows greater concern for social issues than his counterpart in novels by Spillane. Furthermore, he appears as a more intellectual

person, alluding to such historical and literary figures as Hamlet (p. 44), Cleopatra (p. 74), Venus (p. 74), Sappho (p. 76) and Saint Paul (p. 76). He also makes a considerable number of philosophical comments such as the following: “Saati elime aldım. Markası malûm olmayan orta cins saatlerden birisi. ‘Zaman’ denilen başsız sonsuz uydurma ölçünün herhangi bir 3 ü çeyrek geçesinin üzerinde durmuş bir saat” [“I took the watch in my hand. One of those mediocre no-name watches. A watch that stopped at a quarter past three within this fictive and infinite measure called ‘time’.” (F.M. İkinci 1954: 57). As this example illustrates, the features that distinguish *Ecel Saati* from Spillane’s Mike Hammer novels are to be encountered at the level of style, rather than of plot.

6.4.2.3 Style and Ideology

Kemal Tahir’s style in *Ecel Saati* carries many of the stylistic features discussed in *Kanun Benim*. The colloquial and fluent use of Turkish, slang and culture-specific expressions abound in *Ecel Saati*. Kemal Tahir makes his characters utter expressions like: “ayaklarını öpeyim” [“I will kiss your feet”] meaning “I implore you” (p. 17), “eşek sudan gelesiye döv” [“beat until the donkey comes back from the river”] meaning “beat really badly” (p. 64) and “ben kül yutmam” [“I don’t swallow ash”] used in the sense of “I am not gullible” (p. 80). The vocabulary used by Kemal Tahir in both *Kanun Benim* and *Ecel Saati* is similar. On the basis of Kemal Tahir’s choice of words it is unlikely that the readers would have detected different writers behind the texts. One stylistic feature which distinguishes *Ecel Saati* from *Kanun Benim* is the rich descriptions offered by Kemal Tahir in the former. Many of these

descriptions pertain to people or psychological states. Here is an example of how Kemal Tahir has described Mike Hammer's perception of police sirens:

Uzaklardan bir canavar düdüğünün feryadı duyuldu. Beklediğimiz buymuş gibi susup kulak verdik. Garip bir hisle, "Korku yaklaşıyor" diye düşündüm, "canlı bir heykel gibi üzerimize geliyor." İşitmekte devam ettiğim düdük sanki insanlar tarafından yapılmış bir âletten çıkmıyordu da, insan kılığına girmiş korkunun hiç duyulmamış haykırışıydı (F.M. İkinci 1954: 13).

[The shriek of a police siren was heard from a distance. We became silent and listened to it as if we had been waiting for it all this time. With a strange feeling, "Fear is approaching" I thought, "it's coming at us like an incarnated statue." The siren I continued to hear appeared as fear embodied in a shriek foreign to human ears, rather than the sound of a man-made machine (F.M. İkinci 1954: 13).]

This sort of literary and metaphoric language is unusual in Mickey Spillane who opts for using concrete expressions and conveys the thoughts of people through their actions or dialogues rather than inner monologues. Kemal Tahir's sophisticated style in *Ecel Saati* does not constitute a unique case among all known pseudotranslations. Anikó Sohár, who studied translations and pseudotranslations of science fiction in Hungary, concluded that in pseudotranslations sometimes "language use is perceptibly more playful, more inventive, using the potential of the language to the full" (Sohár 1998: 44). The reasons for the dramatic difference between Yurdatap's simple and action-oriented style and Kemal Tahir's metaphoric language in their pseudotranslations need to be sought in the 30 years that had elapsed between the two works and the evolving literary habitus which also brought about a gradual shift in the poetics governing pseudotranslations.

The most outstanding of all descriptions in *Ecel Saati* are those depicting the city of New York. Although *Kanun Benim* is also set in New York, Mickey Spillane never included vast descriptions or philosophized over the city in his novel. Through

his various descriptions and the way he placed New York as a backdrop to the events he narrated, Kemal Tahir has almost impersonated the city and transformed it into one of the characters in *Ecel Saati*. He has presented New York as a city of dark and evil forces, in fact, as the very source of crime Mike Hammer combats throughout the story. Consider the passage below:

Uzaklarda Nevyork şehri yaralı bir vahşi hayvan gibi derin derin homurdanıyor. Ateş gibi nefesini sanki ense kökümde hissediyorum. Gene azametine lâyük bir ahlâksızlık, bir cinayet işlenmiştir. Yuvarlanıp giden, yuvarlanıp gittikçe de çığ gibi büyüyen gangster nizamına müdahale edeceğimden mi korktu bu uğursuz Nevyork gecesi? (F.M. İkinci 1954: 6)

[In the distance, New York City moans deeply like a wounded wild beast. I can feel its burning breath behind my neck. Another immorality, another murder must have been committed, one that suits the city's grandeur. Was this ominous New York night afraid that I would interfere in the never-ending and ever-growing gangster order? (F.M. İkinci 1954: 6)]

Kemal Tahir has created an antagonist in New York City for Mike Hammer through the way he associated it with crime and evil deeds. He has used negative qualifiers for the city and likened it to a prostitute (p. 12) or a rabid dog (p. 64). This negative view of New York is also indicative of Kemal Tahir's view of the system underlying it: capitalism. The excerpt below illustrates in clear terms Kemal Tahir's critical approach towards the social system prevalent in New York:

Lenoks avönüye geçtik. Harlem'in içine, 300 bin kişilik nüfusuyla dünyanın en büyük zenci şehri sayılan sefalet dünyasına daldık. Buraya ne vakit yolum düşse bir çeşit can sıkıntısı, bir çeşit öfke duyarım. Hususî hafiye büromu açtığım ilk aylarda – epeyce fakir sayıldığım yoksulluk zamanlarımda – burada bir iki iş kovaladım. Sefaletini yakından gördüm. Bu cenabet Nevyork'un birçok beyaz mahallelerinde de sefalet vardır. Fakat buradaki sefaletin derinliği, milyonlarca Nevyorklunun azametiyle iftihar ettiği gökdelenlerinden birkaç misli fazla (F.M. İkinci 1954: 98).

[We drove into Lenox Avenue. We entered Harlem, the world of misery, the city that is considered to be the largest black city in the world with its population of 300 thousand. Whenever I come here I feel kind of depressed and angry. During the first few months after I set up my private detective office – in those months of poverty when I was quite broke – I pursued a couple of cases here. I got to observe its misery personally. There is poverty in many white neighbourhoods of this disgusting New York. But the depth of the poverty here is much larger than the skyscrapers whose majesty is the pride of millions of New Yorkers (F.M. İkinci 1954: 98).]

Kemal Tahir was known for his leftist political stance since the early days of his literary career. Therefore it is not surprising to encounter such ideological statements in his work. He has also alluded to the Nazis in *Ecel Saati* and drawn an analogy between them and the mafia gang: “Bunlar Nazi döküntüleri... Bunlarda insaf, merhamet aranır mı?” [“These are Nazi leftovers... They lack compassion and sympathy.”] (F.M. İkinci 1954: 38). In fact, Kemal Tahir has anti-Nazi and anti-militarist passages in all his Mike Hammer novels (Üyepazarcı 1999: 5). Although these novels were aimed at the readership for popular literature who mainly read for entertainment, Kemal Tahir introduced political issues into the novels and carried on a significant aspect of his writerly persona into popular works published under a pseudonym.

6.4.2.4 *Ecel Saati* as a Pseudotranslation

As indicated earlier, a comparison with Mike Hammer novels written by Mickey Spillane has revealed that *Ecel Saati* is not a translation. However, Kemal Tahir has used a number of strategies which present the text as a translation. These strategies also help to reveal the concept of translation Kemal Tahir held, since they specifically offer information about what he perceived as the defining elements of a translation. The first of these strategies was the use of imported characters in the

novel. Kemal Tahir borrowed a number of characters initially created by Mickey Spillane such as Mike Hammer, Pat Chambers and Velda, and appropriated them as characters of his novel. Since these characters were known to the readership through translations, it was likely that *Ecel Saati* would also be received as a translation. Furthermore, Kemal Tahir's treatment of proper names in the text was identical to his approach used in the translations. He used phonetic spelling for names of people ("Mayk Hammer", "Vilson", "Karlo", etc.) and of places ("Nevyork", "Bruklin", "Şikago", etc.).

Another strategy used by Kemal Tahir in creating the impression of a translation was his abundant use of place names. Mickey Spillane also used some street names in his books, but Kemal Tahir carried this to an extreme and took every occasion to specify the setting with a name. Some of these names were: "Beşinci Cadde 55 inci sokak 112 numaralı apartman" ["Fifth Avenue 55th Street Apartment Number 112"] (p. 46), "Hadson nehri" ["Hudson River"] (p. 55), "santral parkın sonunda 113üncü sokak" ["113th Street at the end of the Central Park"] (p. 97), "Lenoks avönü" ["Lenox Avenue"] (p. 97), "Kolonyal Park" ["Colonial Park"] (p. 155), "Sen Nikola avönü" ["Saint Nicholas Avenue"] (p. 155). Kemal Tahir had never been to New York. It is evident that he found these names from a map or an acquaintance who had been there. Such detailed addresses and place names serve to reinforce the American provenance of Mike Hammer and his adventures in this work and present *Ecel Saati* as an "authentic" Mike Hammer novel.

The final strategy Kemal Tahir used in *Ecel Saati* was to make it read like a translation was his use of a foreign word and the footnote he added to explain the word, a strategy that was commonplace in translations of both popular and canonical literature. The word used by Kemal Tahir was "layter" (F.M. İkinci 1954: 100). In

Chapter 8, Mike Hammer is trapped and tortured inside a lighter full of petrol. Instead of using the Turkish word “fiçı” or “tekne”, which would roughly correspond to the same object, Kemal Tahir chose to use the English word in Turkish phonetic spelling. In the footnote, he explained the word as “Bir çeşit sarnıçlı tekne. Her çeşit mayı taşır” [“A kind of container. Designed to carry all liquids.”] (Kemal Tahir 1954: 100). These three strategies used by Kemal Tahir illustrate that the readership for translated popular literature expected to find foreign characters, references to foreign place names, words of foreign origin and footnotes in the translations. The question then remains why Kemal Tahir needed to write a psuedotranslation instead of domesticating a Mike Hammer story and presenting it as his own work.

The main reason for Kemal Tahir’s (and the publishers’) choice to present the work as a translation appears to be a commercial one. The first five novels by Mickey Spillane had brought exceptional profits to the publishing company, which apparently wished to benefit more from Mike Hammer’s blessing. It is also evident that Mike Hammer had already become a popular hero by the time Çağlayan Yayınevi published the last original Mike Hammer novel, *Son Çığlık* (The Last Cry) – *Vengeance is Mine*; therefore his name in the cover would be sufficient to entice the readers to buy the book. I have argued in Section 6.2 that in popular literature, it is the heroes that attain fame among the readers, rather than the writers who create the heroes. Mike Hammer was one of them.

Apart from the commercial success achieved by Mike Hammer, Kemal Tahir may have had other reasons not to write a novel set in Turkey with Turkish characters. In my view, the significant place occupied by translations within the Turkish literary system also played a role in his decision. Western literature, which

was granted a pivotal position within the system of canonical literature, also occupied a significant place within the system of popular literature.

As expressed by a number of authors, Turkish literature did not appeal to the readers as much as translations throughout the 1920s-1940s (See Chapter 3, Section 3.1.4). Publishers preferred translations to indigenous works (Ozansoy 1943: 4). Some Turkish writers presented their indigenous works as translations to increase their chances of getting published. In an article he wrote for *Varlık*, writer Şerif Hulûsi told the details of how he changed the names of the characters and places and presented one of his own stories as the translation of a work by a Russian author. The publisher who had turned down his work agreed to publish it when he was convinced that it was a translation (Şerif Hulûsi 1941: 395). Indeed, translations were in higher demand than indigenous writing. Nahit Sırrı Örik, writer and translator, complained that his translation of *Le Lys dans la Vallé* sold very well, while there was no demand for his original work (Örik in Özdenoğlu 1949: 88). I suggest that this trend stemmed from the efforts of Turkish culture planners who tried to position western literature in the centre of the literary polysystem as a model for a new national literature. In fact, this tendency was not triggered by the republican planners, it dated back to the 19th century (See Chapter 3, Section 3.1.2.1). So while the decision to present *Ecel Saati* as a translation had commercial implications, it also pointed at the dominance of western literature over Turkish literature. This confirms Toury who writes:

the decision to present a text as a translation, let alone compose it with that aim in mind, always suggests an implied act of subordination, namely, to a culture and language which are considered prestigious, important or dominant in any other way. An attempt is thus made to impart to the text some of the superiority attributed to that culture, thereby manipulating the text's reception by the audience (Toury 1995: 42).

6.4.2.5 Siting *Ecel Saati*

The comments made about Kemal Tahir's use of F.M. İkinci as his pseudonym in *Kanun Benim* in 6.4.1.4 are also valid for *Ecel Saati*. It is clear that Kemal Tahir wished to draw a line between his literary production as a popular and a "serious" writer by using a pseudonym in his popular novels. However, it is also possible to draw up some connections between his style in *Ecel Saati* and in some of the works he signed with his patronym. As I illustrated in 6.4.2.3, the stylistic features of *Ecel Saati* are rather different from Mickey Spillane's way of writing. *Ecel Saati*, with its literary language, metaphors, descriptions and emphasis on reflecting the inner world of the characters serve as a stylistic precursor to Kemal Tahir's works to be published, starting from the second half of the 1950s. In the next section I will offer a descriptive analysis of one of these novels, *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*.

What was the response of the readers who were exposed to Kemal Tahir's indigenous Mike Hammer novels? As argued in Chapter 4, readers of popular literature usually read by genre, rather than by author, which means that they were interested in generic features, rather than stylistic features created by individual writers. Kemal Tahir's Mike Hammer novels, as represented by *Ecel Saati* in this section, fulfilled the generic expectations with its plot and characters. Kemal Tahir's appropriation of Mike Hammer was a familiar strategy as explained in the case of Yurdatap's and Ali Rıza Seyfi's works. Yet Kemal Tahir went one step further and added a unique literary dimension to the novel which might have expanded his readership and lured readers of canonical literature into the terrain of detective fiction. The tough Mike Hammer character with a strong sense of justice, the violent

and action-oriented plot and erotic side-themes were innovations brought into the Turkish system by Mike Hammer books. In that sense, these books, translated or indigenous, already played a pioneering role for the development of the detective genre in Turkey. Kemal Tahir took the initiative to introduce literary elements into the text and heightened the innovative aspect of the Mike Hammer novels. In *Ecel Saati*, he produced a hybrid text, marked by the discourse of two genres, that of the hard-boiled detective story and the social realist Turkish novel. This was indeed new to the poetics popular translated literature. In *Ecel Saati*, Kemal Tahir represents two distinct literary habituses, one which allows him to travel between translation and indigenous writing, appropriating characters created by a foreign author and using them in a domestic work, and the second, reflecting a view of literature as a socio-political instrument.

6.4.3 *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* (People of the Captive City)

Esir Şehrin İnsanları is one of the early realist novels of Kemal Tahir, published with his patronym. Kemal Tahir wrote the novel in 1948 while he was still in prison (Yazoğlu 1993: 267). The novel was published in 1956 by Martı Yayınları and since then, has been reprinted several times.⁴² *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* was designed as the first book in a series of works termed as “nehir romanı” (“roman fleuve”) (Dosdoğru 1974: 228), dealing with contemporary Turkish history starting from the late 19th century (Alangu 1965: 466). Its sequels were *Esir Şehrin Mahpusu* (The Prisoner of the Captive City) (1962), *Yorgun Savaşçı* (The Weary Warrior) (1965) and *Yol Ayrımı* (The Crossroads) (1971).

⁴² *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* was reprinted three times by Sander Yayınevi (1969, 1972, 1973), once by Can Yayınevi (1982) and twice by Adam Yayınevi (1993, 1995).

Esir Şehrin İnsanları was a landmark in Kemal Tahir's career, demonstrating that he would not be confined to the rural themes he treated in his first two books, *Göl İnsanları* (The Lake People), a collection of short stories, and *Sağırdere*, a village novel. Both books had attracted critical attention and been praised for their realist style which remained descriptive and objective (Alangu 1965: 452). In *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* Kemal Tahir maintained the same profile and carefully focused on narrating a saga of personal awakening and maturation against a backdrop of a city occupied by foreign powers.

Kemal Tahir revised the book for its second edition by Sander Yayınevi which appeared in 1969. The second edition which was adopted in the subsequent reprints is longer by some forty pages. Rather than modifying the plot of the novel, Kemal Tahir reshuffled some of the passages and added several new ones. He also made some stylistic changes. In the following sections I will base my analysis on the first edition of the book which was written in the late 1940s but published in 1956, two years after *Kanun Benim* and *Ecel Saati*.

6.4.3.1 Peritextual Elements

The first edition of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* was published in a medium-sized format, larger than a pocket book. The book, which contains 315 pages, is bound in hard cover in burgundy red. The front cover of the book does not feature any illustration. Kemal Tahir's name appears at the top, followed by the title of the book in larger font. The attribute "novel" ["roman"] is printed underneath the title. As discussed in 6.2.1.3, the novel was a new and prestigious genre generously attributed by publishers even to some short stories or novellas. I argue that by placing emphasis on

the status of the book as a novel, the publishers of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* drew attention to its compatibility with the newly forming modern and western-inspired literary habitus. The front cover was reprinted in the title page, which again used the attribute “novel” to present *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*. The back cover of the book included an advertisement for a translated book by Herman Wouk titled *Denizde İsyân* (The Mutiny). There are no illustrations and only a large box in the middle of the page presenting a promotional statement about the work. The statement reads:

Bu roman İkinci Cihan Savaşının bütün dehşetini, insan ruhunda meydana getirdiği derin ve karanlık sarsıntıları, kahramanlıkla tabansızlığın aynı safta döğüştüğünü çıplak realiteleri ile anlatmaktadır. PULITZER armağanı kazanmış olan bu romanın piyesi halen Amerikada en muvaffak sahne eserlerinden biridir. DENİZDE İSYANI'nı filmi Columbia Şirketi tarafından yapılmış ve memleketimizde de ilgi ile karşılanmıştır.

[This novel narrates the horrors of the Second World War, the deep and dark turmoil it has created in the human soul, and the clash of heroism and cowardice in their naked reality. The play of this novel which won the PULITZER prize is currently one of the most successful stage plays in America. THE MUTINY was also made into a film by the Columbia Company which was met with great interest in our country.]

Two major marketing strategies used by literary publishers are visible in the above statement. The first one is the emphasis on realism. By underscoring the realist perspective underlying the work's novel, the publishers probably aimed to capture the developing readership for realist fiction which had been on the way towards canonization throughout the period under study. The second marketing strategy used by Martı Yayınları was to state the bond between the novel and the film version, thereby attracting the readership who had missed the film or who had seen and liked it.

There are two more advertisements printed in the peritext of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*. Both are published on the same page at the end of the novel. The first one advertises the second print of Kemal Tahir's *Göl İnsanları* (The Lake People) and the second one, a translated novel by Vicki Baum, *Berlin Oteli* (The Berlin Hotel). There are no illustrations in the book, except a portrait of Kemal Tahir which is printed after the title page. The author is represented in this drawing as a middle-aged man, wearing thick glasses and smoking a cigarette. The caption below the illustration reads "Kemal Tahir". The illustration serves to reinforce the status of Kemal Tahir as the book's author and makes him, literally, visible. This indicates that the same Kemal Tahir, who tried to hide his identity in his popular novels and translations by using pseudonyms, did not object to being displayed as the author of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*. In my view, this indicates that the theme and style of this novel were what he wished to be associated and identified with. The novel's theme is mainly political and its style, although colloquial in the dialogues, is quite literary and metaphorical. The political and literary aspects of the novel are also emphasized in the peritext of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* in the form of a poem composed of two lines:

*Teslim olmak başka şey, esir düşmek başka...
Seni sevmek başka bir şey, Hürriyet, uğrunda döğüşmek başka!*

[It is one thing to surrender and another to fall captive...
It is one thing to love you, Freedom, and another to fight for you!]

This poem was printed before the first page of the novel in italics and large print to make sure it would not be missed by the readers. Its intended-function appears to be that of guiding the reception of the novel and presenting it as a political work. The tribute to "Hürriyet" ["Freedom"], the way it is impersonated with a direct

address and a capital “H” alludes to the title of the novel and identifies the theme of the book as a struggle to free a captive city, which turns out to be Istanbul.

6.4.3.2 Plot and Characters

Esir Şehrin İnsanları has a series of themes it unfolds on various levels. The most obvious and pronounced theme is the story of a group of intellectuals in Istanbul who refuse to surrender to the occupying powers and join the national struggle in Anatolia. Kemal Tahir has depicted the situation of the intellectuals with a focus on the main character, Kâmil, and has set the heroism and bravery of the common people against the lethargy of the intellectuals whom he criticized harshly. On a more subtle level, the novel is the story of a series of transitions, some in the life of Kâmil, the protagonist, some in the life of Istanbul and some in the building process of the Turkish nation.

The plot revolves around Kâmil Bey, a young Ottoman intellectual, who is more western in his manners and upbringing than Ottoman. After many years in Europe, he returns to his homeland with his young wife and daughter. Back home, he is faced with poverty and depression. The realities of Istanbul as an occupied city, and a series of encounters with his old acquaintances trigger a strong transformation in him. He starts feeling the need for a purpose in his life, takes up a job as a journalist to assist the wife of a friend, and soon enough, finds himself involved with a group of people working for the liberation movement. At the end of the novel, he is arrested for high treason and sentenced to a seven-year imprisonment.

The central characters in the novel are Kâmil Bey and Nedime Hanım. Kemal Tahir has depicted Kâmil Bey as a man of childlike qualities. Although a man

approaching middle ages Kâmil returns from Spain to Turkey as a person who knows little about the realities of his country. *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* is the story of the making of his consciousness. It covers his “adolescence”, i.e. his efforts at growing up to become like others around him. His ultimate role model is Nedime, who is presented as the summit of courage, patriotism and strength. The novel ends when Kâmil Bey becomes a full adult and suffers real pain for the cause he has started fighting for.

Nedime is the wife of İhsan, one of Kâmil's old friends. After İhsan is arrested, she takes over the newspaper he published and maintains the support he provided for the national struggle in Anatolia. Although pregnant, she does not hesitate to risk her life. This wins her the admiration of everyone around her and presents her as the most positive and idealized character of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*. Kâmil and Nedime, are the focus of two issues which Kemal Tahir tackles in his novel: a critique of intellectualism and the gender issue.

6.4.3.3 Ideology and Style

Esir Şehrin İnsanları provided a platform for Kemal Tahir to carry out a sociological and political evaluation of life in Istanbul during the occupation after the First World War. This approach was based on his general concept of the novel and of the function it was expected to serve. Kemal Tahir was of the opinion that a novel had to provide an accurate representation of the period and place it chose as a background to its theme. To him, the novelist was like a social scientist who objectively depicted persons and situations in a realist way (Moran 2001a: 182). Realism was indeed crucial for Kemal Tahir. In his notes on the novel, he went as far as stating: “Roman:

Büyük ve doğru fikirler, faydalı realiteler ve bir çeşit ilim ve sağlam bir sanatla yazılmalıdır” [“A novel should be written with great and correct ideas, beneficial realities and a kind of science and a sound art.”] (Yazoğlu 1989: 211) *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* reflects these ideas in terms of its plot. As a story of political and military emancipation and maturation, it treats issues of historical and political importance for Turkey, in Kemal Tahir’s words “beneficial realities”. The novel’s style also reflects a realist perspective. There are a series of detailed descriptions in the novel that reveal the writer’s efforts to create a realistic representation of the Ottoman capital under foreign occupation. One of the most striking of his descriptions can be found in the beginning of the novel, when Kemal Tahir narrates Kâmil’s visit to the courthouse with his lawyer (Kemal Tahir 1956: 3-6). The passage involves a physical description of the courthouse and its various sections: “Adliye Nezareti, muazzam bir ahşap bina idi ... Kapılar o kadar yüksek yapılmışlardı ki, kanatlarını şu sıska odacının tek başına açıp kapamasına imkan olamazdı” [“The Ministry of Justice was a huge wooden building ... The doors were so high that it would be impossible for the skinny usher to open and close its wings by himself.”] (Kemal Tahir 1956: 4). There are also various passages describing the people in the courthouse, such as: “Boşanma davalarına da burada bakıldığı için, kalabalığın yarısı kadındı. Bunlardan bir kısmı, - kocaları tarafından terkedilmek üzere olanlar-, dertli, acılı idiler. ... Diğer kısım - yani kocalarından boşanmaya gelenler - ötekilerin taban tabana zıddı idiler. En babayani giyinmiş olanında bile bir bakışla, bir el hareketi, yahut bir adım atışla aşıftelik belli oluyordu.” [“Half of the crowd was women because divorce cases were also heard here. Some of them, those who were about to be abandoned by their husbands, were worried and sad. ... The others, in other words those who were there to divorce their husbands, were completely the opposite. Even the one with the

simplest clothes gave away her coquettishness with a movement of her hand or her gait."] (Kemal Tahir 1956: 6).

These descriptions serve to visualize the settings used in the novel and furthermore, to inform the readers about the social and physical context. The various descriptions of Istanbul given in the novel also serve a similar purpose and create vivid images of a city under the occupation of western powers. Especially in the first half of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, Istanbul appears as one of the characters in the novel and comes to symbolize the state of the Ottoman Empire crushed under foreign power. The attributes Kemal Tahir has used to describe the city represent Istanbul as a gloomy and helpless place, way past its golden age. For instance, after his return to Istanbul, Kâmil thinks: “Uzakta, İstanbul, kurşunilerin ve kir renklerinin koyudan açığa, açıktan koyuya doğru giden bütün zavallı nüanslarından ibaretti. Ara sıra bulutları yaran güneş, bu terkedilmiş ihtiyar şehre daha kederli bir hal veriyordu” [“In the distance, Istanbul was only the poor shades of gray and of the colour of dirt. The sun, which peeked through the clouds every now and then, made this desolate, old city look even more grieving.”] (Kemal Tahir 1956: 33). His descriptions of the city involved references to various neighborhoods and anchored his imagery in specific places. He alluded to the Golden Horn (p. 164), Bâbıali (p. 69), Nişantaşı (p. 167) and Beyoğlu (p. 166) as the setting for the events he related in the novel. His descriptions of these areas are characterized by attributes such as “kendini koyvermiş” [“worn-down”] (p. 70), “yorgun” [“tired”] (p. 164), “köhne” [“aged”] (p. 164), “bakımsız” [“unkempt”] (p. 303), “somurtkan” [“frowning”] (p. 303). Kemal Tahir’s description of Beyoğlu makes it clear that he associates Istanbul with the suffering of the Turkish nation: “Beyoğlu caddesi, elektriklerini keyifle ve cömertçe yakmıştı. Kaldırım yabancı üniformalarla, camekânlar yabancı renklerle doluydu.

Kâmil Bey, bir milyon kederli insana karşı, bu bir karış sokağın kışkırtıcı yılışıklığına şaştı” [“The Beyoğlu street had merrily and generously lit its lights. The pavements were full of foreign uniforms, the shop windows with foreign colours. Kâmil Bey was surprised at the annoying importunity of this small street in the face of one million grieving people.”] (Kemal Tahir 1956: 166).

The emphasis on the setting, and the use of the city as the symbol for socio-political drama was a strategy used by Kemal Tahir in *Ecel Saati* as well. In *Ecel Saati*, Kemal Tahir represented New York as a sinister city. His descriptions of the city in the novel associated New York with criminal activity. Furthermore, his style in those descriptions was not very different from that he used in *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* to describe Istanbul. Consider the following sentence, which is taken from *Ecel Saati* and analyzed as part of a longer paragraph in Section 6.4.2.3: “Uzaklarda Nevyork şehri yaralı bir vahşi hayvan gibi derin derin homurdanıyor” [“In the distance, New York City moans deeply like a wounded wild beast.”] (F.M. İkinci 1954: 6). This sentence, which sums up Kemal Tahir’s view of New York can be compared to his above description of Istanbul as a desolate city: “In the distance, Istanbul was only the poor shades of gray and of the colour of dirt.” The similarity between these passages, and the way Kemal Tahir used the urban background to symbolize the underlying themes in his novels *Ecel Saati* and *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, indicate that although he tried to keep his literary identities separate by adopting different names, the stylistic devices he used were similar enough to be traced across his works. This is also valid for the colloquial and idiomatic language he made use of in his fiction.

In *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, the ideology expressed by Kemal Tahir in the plot and the style is that of nationalism. He makes use of a series of symbols to express the emergence of a new nation in occupied Istanbul. As explained above, Istanbul

emerges as a symbol of the decaying Empire and the sufferings of the common people, while Kâmil Bey symbolizes the passive intellectuals who go through a change of heart during the national struggle and decide to fight actively for their country. Nedime, and women in general, come to symbolize bravery, while the baby Nedime expects, symbolizes the hopeful future of the country. Through his descriptions of occupied Istanbul and Kâmil's experiences Kemal Tahir has introduced a clear division between that which is Turkish and foreign. The novel starts with two passages where Kâmil relates two of his memories about his experiences in Europe. These two events, one which took place in London, and the other in Paris, are about the decadence and immorality of Europeans. One is the story of a young prostitute, and the other, of a lesbian trying to befriend Kâmil Bey's girlfriend in a nightclub. Through these anecdotes, Kâmil Bey reflects his disgust with the western way of life. When he arrives in Istanbul, he notices that people are getting organized to launch a struggle against Allied Occupation. This changes his attitude towards westerners. He thinks: "Henüz bir ay geçmeden, İngilizlerin soğuk gururu, Fransızların sinire dokunan kibarlığı, İtalyanların acemi galip edası, Amerikalıların hoyrat neşesi, Japonların panter ciddiyeti Kâmil Beyin artık zıddına basmaz oldu. Çünkü millet teslim olmamıştı" ["Before one month elapsed, Kâmil Bey no longer cared about the cold pride of the British, the nerve-wrecking politeness of the French, the inept victorious attitude of the Italians, the brutish cheerfulness of the Americans, the panther-like seriousness of the Japanese. Because the nation had not surrendered."] (Kemal Tahir 1956: 44). Kemal Tahir has also drawn a distinction between Ottomans and Turks, and attributed negative traits to Ottomans. He wrote that Ottoman Turks ("Osmanlı Türkleri") were not capable of

thinking as a nation because they still regarded themselves as a religious community (“ümme”) (Kemal Tahir 1956: 30).

Kemal Tahir seemingly reverses the traditional gender roles in *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* and considers women as the active and pioneering spirits in the society. He has portrayed two types of women in the novel. The first, represented by Kâmil’s wife Nermin, is the high-class, western-bred women who are highly indifferent to the struggle the country is involved in. The second type is quite the opposite. They are either strictly Turkish (like Fatma or Çerkes Dadı, two of the female secondary characters), or de-westernized and well-read women who know both worlds and have taken a clear position in favour of the Turkish struggle. The second type is embodied in Nedime, a heroic character who becomes the leader of the struggle in Istanbul. Pursued by the police, she continues to print her newspaper and sends documents to Anatolia. She wins the admiration of all the characters in the novel. They describe her with qualities such as “sakin” [“calm”] (p. 71), “kararlı” [“decisive”] (p.71) “aslan” [“lion-like”] (p. 89), “bir ordu gibi” [“like a whole army”] (p. 199). Yet it is also true that the women in *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* become active when their men are temporarily barred from political activity. The kind of authority vested in women by Kemal Tahir is a vicarious one. They have to stand in for the temporarily powerless men by assuming their role.

An interesting feature in *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* is the intensive use of footnotes, which were deleted from subsequent editions. Kemal Tahir has made use of footnotes to explain certain words of foreign origin in the text (p. 6, 9, 301), some idioms (p. 10, 86, 88), or some neologisms or obsolete Ottoman words (p. 87, 88, 89, 312). In my opinion, this indicates his vision of the role of the writer, not only as an

artist or an entertainer, but also as an educator with a mission to raise awareness about social issues and serve an edifying function.

6.4.3.4 Siting *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*

Esir Şehrin İnsanları is an example of Kemal Tahir's realist fiction strongly driven by his personal political ideas. The novel is shaped not so much by his Marxist inclinations, as by a largely nationalist theme and style. There are a number of interesting aspects of the novel that are worthy of long analytical discussions, yet for the purposes of the present study, I will only elaborate on the relations between *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* and his other works discussed above, *Kanun Benim* and *Ecel Saati*. The main question I would like to focus on is what distinguished Kemal Tahir's literary production, represented by *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, which he credited to his own name, from his works as F.M. İkinci and what connected them.

The most evident element that reveals a kinship among the three works is the style used by Kemal Tahir in the dialogues. Both his translation, pseudotranslation and novel are characterized by a slick idiomatic language. This language serves to render Mickey Spillane's tone in *Kanun Benim* and helps position the characters and the story within a familiar cultural context. *Ecel Saati* and *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, his indigenous works, make use of colloquialisms to represent vivid and realistic characters and settings.

Esir Şehrin İnsanları can best be compared to *Ecel Saati*. In *Kanun Benim*, Kemal Tahir was bound by Mickey Spillane's plot and style and did not display radical deviations from these. However, in *Ecel Saati*, he was free to create his own style and went as far as embedding his anti-capitalist and anti-nazi ideological stance

in the story. Both *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* and *Ecel Saati* placed a city, Istanbul and New York respectively, as their core and communicated a significant portion of their messages through the descriptions of these cities. Furthermore, Kemal Tahir used both books as a free platform to convey his ideological views. In *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, where the plot allowed for frequent ideological statements, he did this more often and explicitly. In *Ecel Saati*, he was more discreet, but, did not restrain himself from expressing his political views.

Although they shared a number of stylistic and ideological features, *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* and *Ecel Saati* were different in terms of the metonymic network within which they were positioned. The novels addressed different groups of readers. This is evident in both the textual and the peritextual features of the books. *Ecel Saati* was marketed as part of a *Mike Hammer* series. Its pocket book format, the paperback gloss cover, the illustration it featured on the cover all indicate that it was intended for a readership consuming popular literature. Furthermore, the erotic leitmotifs in the novel, which were foregrounded on the cover of the book, clearly appealed to a young male audience who were less interested in the provenance of the book, than in the adventures of Mike Hammer. The peritext of *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* indicates that it was aimed at a different group of readers and that it was positioned as a canonical and “serious” book. *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* was bound in hardcover. The cover featured no illustration and the only generic designation it bore was that the word “novel”. A crucial difference between *Ecel Saati* and *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* is the fact that the latter carried Kemal Tahir’s patronym. In my opinion this is an indication of his personal approval of the theme and the style he used in the novel. By using his patronym in the novel, Kemal Tahir offered a clue about the kind of poetics he wished to be associated with. This poetics, which was the poetics of

canonical indigenous literature, foresaw a socio-political mission for the novelist and condemned books produced for commercial motives only. Kemal Tahir wrote and translated a series of popular romances and detective novels while he was in prison in the 1940s. His correspondence with his companion Semiha reveals that he produced these books for commercial purposes only, to be able to sustain his livelihood (Yazođlu 1993: 189-342). The same is valid for his *Mike Hammer* series (Üyepazarcı 1999: 4).

Another feature which distinguishes Kemal Tahir's thematic and stylistic strategies in *Ecel Saati* and *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* is the way he treated issues of sexuality and gender in these books. In *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, Kemal Tahir had no use for the erotic and treated the gender issue as a social and political one. His references to love and sex were romantic or procreative, as represented by Kâmil Bey's love for his wife and by Nedime's pregnancy. He also displayed a moralizing attitude towards sex in the introduction to the novel where he criticized western morals embodied in a young prostitute and a lesbian woman.

6.4.4 Siting Kemal Tahir

Kemal Tahir's works analyzed above constitute an interesting example of the transformation which started taking place in the poetics of popular literature in the 1950s. Although he was unique in terms of the diversity he displayed in his literary production, Kemal Tahir represents a series of issues that affected popular and canonical literature in Turkey in the 1940s and 1950s. These issues were not only literary, but also concerned the fields of politics and society.

Kemal Tahir's indigenous writing was largely influenced by his political ideas which he developed into a unique and paradoxical type of realist, nationalist Marxism throughout his career. His novels became the topic of a series of studies both during his lifetime and after his death, which explored the literary and socio-political concerns which gave shape to his fiction. On the other hand, Kemal Tahir's identity as a translator and the translation strategies he has used never attracted any scholarly attention. His *Mike Hammer* novels have usually been referred to briefly without presenting them within an analytical framework. For instance in the chapter on Kemal Tahir's novels in his *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış* (A Critical Look at The Turkish Novel), Berna Moran, a renowned literary critic, wrote: "In the meantime, perhaps we ought to remember that the writer once translated and wrote detective novels under a pseudonym" ["Bu arada, yazarın bir zamanlar, takma adla dedektif romanları çevirdiğini ve yazdığını anımsamamız da yerinde olacaktır belki."] (Moran 2001a: 210). An exception to this attitude is Erol Üyepazarcı's article often referred to in the present section (Üyepazarcı 1999) and a comment by Aziz Nesin, writer, published in Dr. Hulusi Dosdoğru's biography of Kemal Tahir (Dosdoğru 1974: 450). In his comment, Aziz Nesin suggested the following: "I think those novels which he wrote under the name (Bedri Eser) and other pseudonyms were sketches and research for the novels he wrote as Kemal Tahir. Even those Mayk Hammer action novels which he adapted under the guise of translation bear traces of today's Kemal Tahir" ["Bence (Bedri Eser) ve başka takma adlarla yazdığı o zamanki romanları, Kemal Tahir adıyla yazdığı romanlarının müsveddeleri, araştırmalarıydı. Hatta, çeviri imiş gibi uyarladığı Mayk Hammer adlı vur kır romanlarında bile, bugünkü Kemal Tahir izleri vardır."] (Dosdoğru 1974: 450).

The purpose of this section was not to look for traces of his realist novels in his translations and pseudotranslations. I set out to explore stylistic and thematic similarities and differences between *Kanun Benim*, *Ecel Saati* and *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*. This enquiry revealed a number of clues about Kemal Tahir's concept of translation and the translational habitus he held. The main difference between the three works was Kemal Tahir's use of a pseudonym in his translation and pseudotranslation. Indeed, Kemal Tahir did not publish any translations under his patronym after the initial translations he published in the 1930s, which I referred to in the beginning of this section. Furthermore, his translations, except that of H.G. Wells' *The Invisible Man*, were chosen from popular works circulating in the field of large-scale production. I argue that this reveals his tendency to regard translation as a secondary literary activity, not worthy of including in one's "serious" literary production. On the other hand, he recognized the authority of the writer over the source text in his translation of Mickey Spillane's *I, The Jury*. His concern for preserving the textual integrity and fullness of the source text distinguished him from his colleagues, Selâmi Münir and Ali Rıza Seyfi. It should also be mentioned that a transformation had taken place in his concept of translation since the 1930s. His translation of H.G. Wells' *The Invisible Man*, *Görünmiyen Adam*, published in 1938, demonstrates that as a young translator, he did not show much concern for the integrity of the source text. A brief look at this translation reveals that he made drastic omissions and summarized the text in a number of chapters, producing a shorter target text (Wells 1938). Furthermore, he used an colloquial Turkish, making use of culture-specific expressions such as "Allah Allah" ["good God"] (p. 4), "öküz gibi" ["like an ox"] (p. 78), "herif" ["the lad"] (p. 85), "kabadayı" ["the brute"] (p. 126). Unlike *Kanun Benim*, the style he used in *Görünmiyen Adam* did not imitate or

reflect Wells', which was created in polished 19th-century English. Kemal Tahir preserved the same tendency for using colloquialisms in *Kanun Benim* where it helped him to reflect source author Mickey Spillane's tone, creating a world of criminal activity with gangsters and tough men in the leading roles.

I suggest that the change in Kemal Tahir's translational style is indicative of a stronger trend which affected the field of translated literature, both popular and canonical. Although the poetics in the field of popular literature still allowed for a blurring of the boundaries between translation and indigenous literary production, as exemplified by Kemal Tahir's pseudotranslations featuring Mike Hammer, it attached greater importance to preserving the thematic and stylistic features of the source text. However, the fluent and colloquial language used by Kemal Tahir throughout his work, translated or indigenous, signed as Kemal Tahir or under a pseudonym, points at his wish to place his works within a familiar linguistic and cultural context for the audience. His strategy of using culture-specific idioms was a tendency generally criticized by translators and critics operating in the field of translated canonical literature, as I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.4. Although fluency was offered as a significant norm for translators, its extreme forms were not well received. Kemal Tahir adhered to the norms about preserving textual integrity and creating a style characterized by a fluent use of Turkish. However, he appears to have resisted the discourse formed in the field of canonical translations advising against indulging in fluency in the form of colloquial and idiomatic phraseology.

6.5 Writing/Translating on the Margin

The motives behind the works of all three writer-translators included in this case study are manifold. The generic features in the novels, the adventure and action elements in the plots, the tendency to appropriate characters created by foreign writers and the marketing and sales strategies used for their books indicate the kinship which exists between their works and the field of popular literature. In early republican Turkey, popular literature was largely overlooked and regarded as a field governed by commercial concerns and regulated by popular demand, rather than as an effort to advance the cultural level of the readership. As explored in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, although translations from western literature were discursively positioned at the centre of the literary polysystem, translations of popular literature were held exempt from this canonization process and condemned for being published for commercial purposes. However, during the present case study, a series of findings emerged that challenge the explanation that translated and indigenous popular literature was shaped only by commercial concerns and that they only met popular demand in the Turkish literary system of 1920s-1950s.

On the basis of the works of Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir, it can be suggested that popular literary texts were not exempt from culture planning. As argued in Chapter 1, Section 1.2.2, planning does not only consist of central planning, i.e. official planning activity carried out by power-holders. Any attempt to provide new options for an existing or developing repertoire can be considered as culture planning. All three writer-translators included in the present study were engaged in forms of “peripheral planning”. First and foremost, they appear to have an ideological agenda they imparted implicitly or explicitly level.

Nationalism were the leading ideological issues Yurdatap. Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir embedded in their works. These writers reflected their vision of the characteristics of a newly forming Turkish identity in their novels. Moreover, the various roles allocated to women in the novels written and translated by these writers made their ideological perspectives on the gender issue visible in their works. Readers, who bought their works, mainly prompted by the generic designations in their peritex, and consumed them for entertainment purposes, became exposed to their ideological discourse which may have been instrumental in their acquisition of a new cultural habitus. It would be a narrow-sighted approach to suggest that the system of popular literature was dictated by a simple supply and demand formula. This would have meant that an ossified literary and cultural habitus remained unchanged, in the Turkish system of popular translated literature, which was not the case. Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi introduced nationalist concerns to the popular works they produced and offered their version of the developing republican repertoire to the readership. This meant that they sided with the republican planning project in terms of the politics they maintained in their works. However, the way in which they offered their options, i.e. the format and style of their works, appeared to subscribe to a different poetics than that propagated at the centre of the literary polysystem. In my view, this located Selâm Münir Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi at the intersection of two literary and cultural habituses: the old and the new / the popular and the canonized. Kemal Tahir proved to be different than the other two writer-translators. The ideological background to his works is more sophisticated and programmatic. His anti-capitalist inclinations, which surface in his pseudotranslation *Ecel Saati*, are not present in Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi's works. His nationalist stance in *Eski Şehrin İnsanları* are far from the naïve and enthusiastic tone of

Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi in *Mehmetçik Çanakkaledede*, *Kazıklı Voyvoda* and *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*. Yet it should be borne in mind that *Esir Şehrin İnsanları* belonged to a different metonymic network than these works. It was not positioned as a popular work but was produced and received as a realist historical novel. Furthermore, Kemal Tahir was convicted for his Marxist ideas and as an oppositional intellectual, he spent most of his life subject to both critical debate and unconditional praise. He expressed himself not only on the textual level, like Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi, but also on the extratextual level, writing essays and giving lectures and interviews.

So far as the poetics of translated popular literature is concerned, the works included in this case study offer an alternative concept of authorship than that which is currently in circulation in Turkey. The alternative concept is demonstrated by the appropriation of foreign characters, the indifference towards the authorial provenance of works and the lack of a clear-cut distinction between translated and indigenous works spotted throughout the corpus in the case study. Furthermore, the findings of the case study indicate that two of the writer-translators, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap and Ali Rıza Seyfi, did not show concern for the unitary structure of their source texts and that they freely manipulated the integrity and fullness of these texts. This attitude also marked their indigenous writing where they combined a number of sources, both factual and fictional, without specifying them, and produced intergeneric texts. On the other hand, Kemal Tahir, whose 1954 translation *Kanun Benim* was described and analyzed above, preserved the integrity of the source text in his translation. *Kanun Benim* hints at a possible transformation in the poetics of translated popular literature in the 1950s towards giving more credit to the source author, an idea which was no doubt implanted and reinforced by the culture planners

associated with the Translation Bureau. Nevertheless, Kemal Tahir's readiness to appropriate Mickey Spillane's character Mike Hammer, and to produce four novels whose standing as indigenous or translated work was vague, illustrates that the translational habitus which blurred the boundaries between translation and original survived well into the 1950s.

The findings of the present case study challenge some of the conclusions John Milton formed based on his work on the translations published by the Brazilian Book Club (Clube do Livro). In his analysis of books published by the Brazilian Book Club through several decades of activity starting from the 1940s, Milton argues that translating for a mass market, as in the case of the translations of popular fiction, resulted in a "loss of sacredness", i.e. loss of concern for authorial provenance, caused by modern production techniques, teamwork and fragmentation of labour (Milton 2001: 57-58). In the case studies above, I argued that indifference towards the issue of authorial originality was due to the persistence of an old literary habitus, both in the translators and in the readers, which tolerated anonymity and lack of clear generic and authorial designations. While Milton connects his "loss of sacredness" to production conditions, I argue that there was no "loss" in the Turkish case, because that "sacredness" was never there in the first place. In the Turkish case the indifference towards authorship stemmed not from production conditions, but from reception and consumption patterns, defined by a particular literary habitus.

6.6 Summary

In Chapter 6, I carried out a case study on nine works by three writer-translators, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir. The case study included a descriptive analysis of their translations, pseudo/concealed translations and indigenous novels. It traced the similarities and divergences across the works of the same translator and across the three translators. The works were analyzed in terms of their plots, characters, styles and translation strategies, where applicable. The case study raised a series of questions about major concepts that marked the poetics within which the writer-translators operated, such as indifference to authorial originality and textual unity, and the nationalist ideology which surface to varying degrees in the discourse of the novels.

Chapter 7 will offer a case study on various translations of two famous novels, *Gulliver's Travels* and *Alice in Wonderland*, translated by the Translation Bureau and translators who worked for private publishing companies. Case Study II aims to shed light upon the diverging and converging concepts of translation which emerge in the translations and retranslations of both works.

Chapter 7

Case Study II:

Divergence and Convergence

Case Study I presented in Chapter 6 offered a series of findings that reveal clues about the political and poetological aspects of popular translated literature in the Turkish literary polysystem in the 1920s-1950s. The works of three writer-translators were described and analyzed for the purpose of exploring the translatorial habituses they represented and the concepts of translation they held. The three writer-translators displayed significant differences in terms of their style and the themes that they treated in their novels. Nevertheless, they shared several traits that hint at the presence of a common poetics underlying their works. These common traits consisted of an indifference towards the issue of authorial originality, the blurring of the distinction between translation and indigenous writing and the incorporation of a political agenda into their literary discourse.

In Chapter 7, I will set out to explore the poetics and politics underlying translations of two works that have been acknowledged as “classics” in their English source literary system: *Gulliver’s Travels* by Jonathan Swift and *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll.¹ The reason for my choice of these two works is that they have been translated by the Translation Bureau within the subseries of “English Classics” [“İngiliz Klasikleri”] and have therefore been positioned as classical, i.e. canonical literature. Therefore an analysis of the translations of these

¹ Both novels are incorporated into the academic curricula of many universities teaching English language and literature both within and outside of the Anglo-Saxon world. A simple indication of the status of *Gulliver’s Travels* and *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* as pervasive classical literature is the fact that they have been published by Penguin series of “popular classics”.

two novels by the Translation Bureau will offer clues about the poetics that governed the field of translated canonical literature as represented by the Bureau. Nevertheless, the novels have also been retranslated and published by other publishers than the Ministry of Education which proves that they were liked and appreciated by Turkish readers. Whether all retranslations positioned the novels as canonical literature remains to be explored. In the present chapter, these novels will be taken as constants against which the diverging concepts of translation held by various publishers and translators can be assessed. The case study will analyze each translation individually and will compare it to previous and subsequent translations of the same work. This will enable an enquiry into both the diachronic shifts that have taken place in the translation strategies employed by the various translators in the course of three decades and the synchronic differences and similarities among translations that share more or less the same time period. The translations by the Translation Bureau will be held under special focus in order to reveal possible overlaps and fissures between the poetics that they operated in and the poetics subscribed to by private publishers as it reflects through their translations. This will offer information on the “divergence” between the concepts of translation held by translators who were commissioned by the Translation Bureau and others, who worked for private publishers. The chapter will also point at possible points of “convergence” between the poetics subscribed to by the Translation Bureau and other publishers.

Both *Gulliver's Travels* and *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* have been translated into Turkish a number of times by different translators and have been published by various companies. In the present case study, I will offer a descriptive analysis of all their retranslations published during 1923-1960. The analysis will be carried out on the basis of the same criteria employed in Case Study I, namely by

exploring paratextual elements, matricial norms in the form of additions to and omissions from the source text and the treatment of proper names. In Case Study II, I introduce an additional parameter into the analysis of the translations: treatment of unfamiliar culture-specific elements, such as foodstuffs and measuring units foreign to the Turkish culture.

7.1 Retranslation

Both *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Gulliver's Travels* have been translated into Turkish several times within the course of three decades. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was translated into Turkish in 1932 for the first time, which was followed by its 1944, 1946, 1953, 1956 and 1960 translations. *Gulliver's Travels* was first introduced into the Turkish literary polysystem in 1872.² The novel was abridged and retranslated twice before the adoption of the Latin alphabet, in 1913/1914³ and in 1927 respectively. It appeared in the Latin alphabet in 1935 for the first time and was subsequently retranslated in 1941, 1943-1944, 1953, 1956 and 1960.

Before an analysis of the individual translations can be carried out, a number of questions need to be raised: Why did Turkish publishers decide to commission so many retranslations of the same books within such a short span of time? Was it

² Jonathan Swift: *Güliver Nam Müellifin Seyahatnamesi* [The Travelogue of the Author Named Gulliver], translated by Mahmud Nedim, Istanbul: Millet Kütüphanesi, 1872.

³ Jonathan Swift: *Devler Memleketinde* [In The Land of Giants], Çocuk Dünyası Neşriyatı, translator anonymous. Seyfettin Özege's bibliography does not give a date for this translation (1973: 271). However, it is known that the magazine *Çocuk Dünyası* [Children's World], which brought out the translation, was published in 1913-1914. *Devler Memleketinde* is the title of "A Voyage to Brobdingnag", the second chapter of Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* which makes it likely that it was only the translation of the second chapter. This translation is worthy of a separate analysis, since it was the first that introduced *Gulliver's Travels* as a children's book into the Turkish system. The format of the 1872 translation suggests that it addressed an adult audience as it was published in three separate volumes, of 144, 144 and 52 pages respectively.

because they discovered deficiencies in previous translations which they wished to correct? Was it because they wanted to re-position these novels in the Turkish literary polysystem in terms of their target audience and function? These and similar questions will guide the description and analysis of the translations included in this chapter.

In his *Method in Translation History*, Anthony Pym makes a distinction between two types of retranslations. “Passive retranslations” are those that are separated by geographical distance or time and that don’t have a bearing on one another (Pym 1998: 82). “Active retranslations” share the same cultural location and generation and are indicative of “disagreements over translation strategies” (Pym 1998: 82). The translations chosen for Case Study II can be considered “active retranslations” since they were published within the course of three decades, a short time period in the life of a literary polysystem. One exception to the “active” type in the corpus can be the 1935 retranslation of *Gulliver’s Travels* since the previous translations were published in Ottoman script and were, therefore, not available to the new generation. Even this retranslation can be considered “active”, since the publishers resolved to have the text translated again rather than publishing a re-edition of the existing translations by transliterating them into the Latin alphabet. Since the corpus in this chapter consists of “active retranslations”, can we assume as Pym suggests that there were disagreements over the translation strategies that they employed? This remains to be seen.

The survey carried out by Şebnem Susam-Sarajeva on literature on retranslations in translation studies reveals that researchers have largely regarded retranslations in terms of a linear concept of “progression”, each retranslation “succeeding” its antecedents (Susam-Sarajeva forthcoming). Anthony Pym likewise

suggests that “active” retranslations challenge the validity of previous translations (Pym 1998: 83). Gideon Toury maintains that each retranslation will have a novelty value in the target culture, since the resulting translation will set out to overcome a deficiency or fill a gap in the target system and bring in something that was not there before. Toury also states that a retranslation, as well as a translation, should be considered an act of planning because it “always entails some change on behalf of the receiving culture, be it ever so slight” (Toury in press: 8). Throughout this chapter I will test these assumptions and question whether the retranslations included in the case study appear to have a claim to supersede previous translations and introduce a change into the Turkish literary polysystem.

7.2 Translations of *Gulliver’s Travels*

Gulliver’s Travels was written by Jonathan Swift in 1726. It was originally published as *Travels to Several Remote Nations of the World* “by Captain Lemuel Gulliver”. The work was published so secretly that even its publisher did not know the identity of the author (“Introduction” in Swift 1900: xxviii).

The novel is set at the turn of the 18th century, and details four journeys made over the course of several years. Many of the events Swift describes in the book can be linked to contemporary events in Europe. *Gulliver’s Travels* details a sailor’s journey to four very different, and equally imaginary societies. The first, Lilliput, is populated by midgets. The second, Brobdingnag, is inhabited by giants who put Gulliver on display as a curiosity. The third consists of a kingdom governed by a king who lives on a floating island. The fourth is a society in which human-like creatures are made to serve their horse-like superiors, the Houyhnhnms. In his first

adventure, in Lilliput, Gulliver becomes a hero by destroying an enemy's fleet of ships. He is constantly under threat of execution by the little people of Lilliput. This part in the novel provides Swift a context where he could criticize the European tendency to fight over trivial issues. In Brobdingnag, Gulliver finds himself in the opposite situation, many times smaller than his hosts. He is made to see things up close, and notices flaws that would have escaped him had the people been his own size. Gulliver is treated poorly by the farmer who first discovers him, but is then rescued by the Queen, who turns him into a pet. The giants see him, and the society from which he comes, as tiny and insignificant. Next, Gulliver visits the floating island of Laputa, where the ruling group is concerned with useless scientific experiments, while the people of the kingdom suffer from poverty and hunger. Finally, Gulliver travels to a country populated by intelligent horses, the Houyhnhnms, and the brutish, human-like Yahoos who serve them. During his stay, he is treated like a Yahoo and comes to think of his own European society as being not that different from theirs.

In the following section, I will offer a descriptive analysis of *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, translated by İrfan Şahinbaş on the commission of the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education in 1943-1944. This will be followed by the analysis of other retranslations in chronological order.

7.2.1 *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II and III-IV* by İrfan Şahinbaş (1943-1944)

Gulliver's Travels was included in the list prepared by the Translation Committee convened at the First National Publishing Congress (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 281). The list was presented to the Congress as "the list of classical works

which essentially need to be translated into Turkish” [“Dilimize çevrilmesi lüzumlu görülen klâsik eserlerin listesi”] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 125). So *Gulliver’s Travels* had been recognized as part of the “canon” before its translation was completed, or even commissioned. The first issue of the translation journal *Tercüme* announced *Gulliver’s Travels* as one of nineteen western classics that would be given priority in terms of translation and publication (“Haberler” 1940: 113). The novel was commissioned to İrfan Şahinbaş and published three years later, in 1943, to be followed by its second volume consisting of Parts 3 and 4 in 1944.

Why did the Translation Bureau give priority to *Gulliver’s Travels*? After all, it had been translated and retranslated three times previously. The answer may lie with the fact that the script and the language of three of the translations which were printed in Ottoman, had become obsolete. The first translation was published in the 19th century, so it would no longer be accessible for the new generations in terms of its vocabulary even if the Bureau had chosen to transliterate the novel rather than to retranslate it. The first and second retranslations before the alphabet reform were partial: The first, *Devler Memleketinde* (In the Land of Giants) (1913-1914), included only Part 2 and *Cüceler Memleketinde* (In the Land of Dwarfs) (1927), the second retranslation which will be analyzed in the following sections, included only Part 1. The only translation in the Latin alphabet prior to Şahinbaş’s was *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* (In the Land of Dwarfs and Giants) by Ercüment Ekrem Talu published in 1935 which offered both of these parts but omitted Parts 3 and 4. So the Bureau’s decision to commission a translation of *Gulliver’s Travels* may have originated from the desire to produce a full translation of the novel for the first time in the Latin alphabet. This did not come as a surprise, since “fullness” was regarded

as a significant prerequisite for fidelity in translation as argued in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.1.

7.2.1.1 Paratextual Elements

*Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*⁴ was published in two separate volumes consisting of two parts each.⁵ Volume I, which was published in 1943, includes Part 1 titled “Liliput’a Seyahat” [“A Voyage to Liliput”] and Part 2 titled “Brobdingnag’a Seyahat” [“A Voyage to Brobdingnag”]. Volume II, which was published in 1944, includes Part 3, “Laputa, Balnibarbi, Glubbudrib, Luggnagg ve Japonya’ya Seyahat” [“A Voyage to Laputa, Balnibarbi, Glubbudrib, Luggnagg and Japan”] and Part 4, “Houyhnhnm’lar Memleketine Seyahat” [“A Voyage to The Country of Houyhnhnms”]. The titles are all literal translations of the titles in the source text.

Both volumes have the same cover layout. This cover, which was common to all books translated by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education, is rather plain, printed on white cardboard and featuring no illustration. The front cover of *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* carries the name of the author, the title of the book and the logo of the Ministry of Education. The back cover only shows the book’s price, and does not feature any advertisement or promotional elements. Both volumes have two title pages. The half-title page (Genette 1997: 32) indicates the

⁴ This translation was reprinted seven times. Some reprints included the whole translation while some only featured the first two parts:

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1945; *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1946; *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti, 1958; *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, Ankara: MEB Devlet Kitapları, 1966; *Gulliver'in Gezileri*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1979; *Güliverin Gezileri*, İstanbul: İnkılap, 1990; *Gulliver Cüceler Ülkesinde*, *Gulliver Devletler Ülkesinde*, İstanbul: Cumhuriyet, 1998.

⁵ Although the two volumes came out in two consecutive years, a printing error in Volume One informs us they were translated and printed at the same time. A part of Chapter 3, intended for Volume Two, was mistakenly printed inside Chapter 1 (Swift 1943: 49-64) and the same section was reprinted without any changes in the appropriate place the following year (Swift 1944: 49-64).

series in which the book appears: “Translations from World Literature”. This is accompanied by the mention of the sub-series, “English Classics”. The book title and the Ministry of Education’s logo are also on the half-title page. The translator’s name only appears on the title page (Genette 1997: 33) which follows the half-title page. On the title page, the author’s name is printed in the upper part followed by the title of the work. This is followed by a parenthesis carrying the work’s original title in smaller font and in lower case as opposed to the author and the Turkish title printed in large capital letters.

The translator’s name comes after the original title, in even smaller font. The wording introducing the translator follows a certain format: “Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Doçentlerinden İrfan ŞAHİNBAŞ tarafından tercüme edilmiştir [“Translated by İrfan ŞAHİNBAŞ, Associate Professor at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography”]. As argued in Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2, the mention of the non-translational profession of the translator may indicate that translation was regarded as a part-time and secondary activity. But it may also serve to elevate the status of the translation by indicating that it was done by an expert in English literature and language.

The second volume of *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri* features two illustrations on pages 20 and 38. These illustrations are taken from *Gulliver’s Travels*. They are exact replicas of the illustrations in the source text.

The first volume of *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri* carries two prefaces by the President of the Republic, İsmet İnönü and the Minister of Education, Hasan Âli Yücel. These prefaces were not specific to *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri*. They were included in all translations published by the Ministry of Education until 1946 and had the function of presenting the aim of the translation activity carried out by the

Translation Bureau. In his preface, President İnönü pointed out that “Translating the artistic and intellectual masterpieces created by various nations since the Ancient Greeks is the most valuable instrument for those who want to serve the culture of the Turkish nation” [“Eski Yunanlılardan beri milletlerin sanat ve fikir hayatında meydana getirdikleri şaheserleri dilimize çevirmek, Türk milletinin kültüründe yer tutmak ve hizmet etmek isteyenlere en kıymetli vasıtayı hazırlamaktır.”] (İnönü 1943). Minister Yücel stressed the importance of literature for humanism and for the intellectual development of a nation and wrote that the key to the civilized world lay in a national library enriched with translations (Yücel 1943). As cited in Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1, he pointed out: “when a nation repeats the literatures of other nations in its own tongue, or in its own conception, it develops, revives and re-creates its intellect and power of understanding. This is why we consider translation activity so important and influential for our mission” [“Bir milletin, diğer milletler edebiyatını kendi dilinde, daha doğrusu kendi idrakinde tekrar etmesi, zeka ve anlama kudretini o eserler nispetinde artırması, canlandırması ve yeniden yaratmasıdır. İşte tercüme faaliyetini, biz bu bakımdan ehemmiyetli ve medeniyet davamız için müessir bellemekteyiz.”] (Yücel 1943). *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri III-IV*, which was published in 1944 and designed as a sequel to the first volume published the year before, did not feature the same prefaces but offered another preface written by Minister Yücel. This preface accompanied all translations published by the Ministry of Education between 1944-1946 until Yücel’s resignation from his post. In his 1944 preface Yücel wrote about the success of the translation programme they had launched, declaring it would continue in the future with increased impetus (Yücel 1944).

These prefaces went beyond the aim of informing or presenting the text they accompanied: two functions prefaces are usually associated with (Genette 1997:

265). They introduced an ideological angle and placed the text within the general project of modernization. In that sense, they guided the reader's reception of the text and were intended to create an emotive effect on the reader, making him/her feel a part of the cultural modernization of the country. The references to humanism, Turkish culture and intellectual enrichment indicate the special role allocated to translation within the culture planning efforts of the single-party era under İnönü's presidency. Furthermore, they demonstrate the patronage structure underlying the Translation Bureau in clear terms, with İnönü and Yücel addressing the readers as the commissioners and patrons of the initiative behind the Translation Bureau. The cover, in combination with the prefaces, clearly positionS *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* as a classical work. The inclusion of the novel in the series "English Classics" is in fact enough to indicate that it was produced, marketed, and probably received, as a classic.

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II was accompanied by a third preface introducing Jonathan Swift and *Gulliver's Travels* to the readers. The anonymous preface is four pages long, offers the readers a short biography of Swift and informs them of how he wrote the novel. The preface places emphasis on Swift's cynical and satirical style of writing and the misfortunes he suffered throughout his personal and professional life. These misfortunes are shown as the leading cause of his misanthropy which, in turn, triggered *Gulliver's Travels*. A significant function served by the preface is to position the novel as a book for adults, rather than for children. This is the hallmark of *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* which distinguishes it from other retranslations published by private companies as I will illustrate in the following sections. The preface carefully underscores the intention that the translation was intended for adults and not for children:

This work is not written for children, as some assume. Even though the first two parts are full of events which will amuse children, Swift's aim is to mock the readers, to present his story as a true one and to slowly let out the venom which he has accumulated. The third, and especially the fourth parts cannot have been written for children; they are nothing but a satirical humiliation of the whole of humanity and its affairs ("Jonathan Swift ve Gulliver'in Seyahatleri" 1943: 3).]

[Bazılarının sandığı gibi, bu eser, çocuklar için yazılmış değildir. Tercümesini verdiğimiz ilk iki bölümü, çocukları eğlendirecek hadiselerle dolu ise de, Swift'in maksadı okuyucularla eğlenmek, hikâyesini gerçekmiş gibi göstermek, içinde birikmiş olan zehiri birden bire dökmektir. Üçüncü, ve hele dördüncü bölüm ise, çocuklar için yazılmış olması imkânı olmadığı gibi, bütün insanlığın, bütün insanlık işlerinin hicvinden, tahkirinden başka birşey değildir ("Jonathan Swift ve Gulliver'in Seyahatleri" 1943: 3).]

It can be safely assumed that the translator was also the author of the anonymous preface. İrfan Şahinbaş was an associate professor, and later professor of English literature at the Ankara University. He was a highly-regarded academic and played an important role in setting up the drama department at Ankara University. One of the theatres in Ankara was named after him. He was also among the members of the delegation which participated in the United Nations meetings held on 1-16 November 1945 in London, which resulted in the setting up of Unesco (see www.unesdoc.unesco.org). Şahinbaş was involved in the operation of the Translation Bureau soon after its establishment and produced nine translations.⁶ He not only translated books for the Bureau, but also wrote for *Tercüme* and offered his views on translation in two review articles (Şahinbaş 1942: 447-451; Şahinbaş and Korkut

⁶ These translations consist of the following: Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* (*Doktor Faust* – 1943); Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (*Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II, III-IV* – 1943/44); William Shakespeare, *King Lear* (*Kıral Lear* – 1958); Plato, *Alkibiades I* (1942); Plato, *Meneksenos* (1944); Plato, *Epistolai* (*Mektuplar* – 1943); J.B. Priestley, *An Inspector Calls* (*Bir Komiser Geldi* – 1962); Sean O'Casay, *Juno and the Paycock* (*Dünyanın Düzeni*).

1942: 527-529). Therefore, he presented a dramatically different profile than the translators of popular literature referred to in the previous chapter.

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri was also presented and promoted in an excerpt published in *Tercüme* (Swift 1943b: 134-143). The excerpt from the second part of the novel was printed parallel Jonathan Swift's source text. In my view, this format suggests that the editors wished to submit the translation to critical scrutiny and trigger a discussion on translation strategies. Nevertheless, the excerpt was not accompanied by an introduction justifying the decisions the translator took while translating or presenting the strategies he used while translating. In other words, Şahinbaş offered no extratextual comments which would in fact provide more information about his concept of translation. On the other hand, there are two review articles written by Şahinbaş for *Tercüme* where he expressed his views on how translation should be done. In his critique of the translation of Rudyard Kipling's *Jungle Book*, he focused on the "translation errors" ["tercüme yanlışları"] committed by Nurettin Artam, the translator. He identified various lexical and semantic errors in different parts of the target text and expressed his discontent at not seeing "an accurate translation" ["doğru bir tercüme"] (Şahinbaş 1942: 450-451). It is difficult to guess what his idea of an "accurate" translation is, based on this review. In another review he co-authored with his colleague at the university, Associate Professor and translator Saffet Korkut, İrfan Şahinbaş offered more detailed information about his expectations from a translated text. In their review of a translation of *Hamlet*, Şahinbaş and Korkut concentrated on questions of "manner" ["eda"] and choice of vocabulary in addition to translation errors. They suggested that success in translation can only be attained by re-creating the manner of the original text (Şahinbaş and Korkut 1942: 527). Furthermore, they criticized the vocabulary used

by the translators' team from Istanbul University, pointing out that their mixed use of old Ottoman words and neologisms resulted in a poor translational style. In this review, Şahinbaş and Korkut failed to explain what they mean by "manner" or "style" ["üslûp"] and did little else than name a few errors (Şahinbaş and Korkut 1942: 529). However, the errors that they pointed out serve to reveal that the authors largely held a source-oriented view of translation and that they were in favour of strict fidelity to the source text. In the following sections I will explore whether in his translation practice Şahinbaş conformed to the norms he discursively formulated.

7.2.1.2 Matricial Norms

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri is a full translation of *Gulliver's Travels*. Şahinbaş has not omitted any parts of the source text in either volumes. Nor has he made major additions. Some minor additions inserted within sentences serve to identify or qualify pronouns. There are also some footnotes but no additions in the form of commentary or additional information throughout the four parts. Şahinbaş left certain names or terms that could be foreign for the Turkish readers unexplained. For instance well-known historical figures such as Caesar, Brutus, Sir Thomas More, Socrates, Homer, Aristotle and Dionysius Halicarnassensis were assumed to be known by the readership (Swift 1944: 50-51; Swift 1943: 128). Specific terms like "cable's length" (Swift 1994: 11) which Şahinbaş translated as "gomine" (Swift 1943: 9) and "sorrel" (Swift 1994: 312), which he translated as "kula" (Swift 1944: 140), were not explained in the target text either. There are six footnotes in the target text. For instance the term "lusus naturae" (Swift 1994: 107) was kept the same in translation and explained with a footnote as "yaratılış garibesi" ["freak of nature"] (Swift 1943:

97). Likewise, “yeoman” (Swift 1994: 220), was retained in Şahinbaş’s translation and explained with a footnote as “Eskiden İngiltere’de küçük arazi sahiplerine verilen ad” [“Name given to small landowners in England in the past.”] (Swift 1944: 56). Other footnotes (1943: 100; 1944: 53,152,154) include translations of Latin phrases, except one which explains the two major political parties in England.

Over all, the translator seems to be involved in an effort not to disrupt the textual integrity of the source text. He has also shown an effort not to manipulate the syntax of the source text, as demonstrated by his use of long sentences connected with semicolons. He has preserved Swift’s long sentence structures in his translation even when they interrupted the flow of the Turkish text. Consider the following example:

Target Text:⁷

Benimki neyse ama, çok saydığım bir bayanın namus ve şerefiyle ilgili olmasaydı, bu meselenin üzerinde böyle uzun uzadıya durmazdım; hem sonra, şunu da söyleyeyim ki, ben, *Nardac* olmak şerefini kazanmıştım; Hazine Nazırı ise, herkesin de bildiği gibi, bir derece aşağı olan *Clumglum*’dan başka birşey değildi; yani, aramızda Marki ile Dük arasındaki fark vardı; fakat, Nazır olduğundan, protokolda benim önümde geldiğini de itiraf etmeliyim (Swift 1943: 58-59)

Source Text:

I should not have dwelt so long upon this particular, if it had not been a point wherein the reputation of a great lady is so nearly concerned, to say nothing of my own; though I then had the honour to be a *Nardac*, which the Treasurer himself is not; for all the world knows he is only a *Clumglum*, a title inferior by one degree, as that of a Marquis is to a Duke in England, although I allow he preceded me in right of his post (Swift 1994: 63).

Şahinbaş has retained the long sentence structure in the above example. He has connected what appear as independent sentences in Turkish with semicolons and created one long sentence which corresponded to the one Swift constructed in the

source text. There is a minor addition in the example. Where Swift wrote “he preceded me in right of his post”, Şahinbaş wrote “**Nazır olduğundan**, protokolde benim önümde geldiğini” [“Because he was the Treasurer, he preceded me in right of his post”]. This addition serves to complement “he” and to inform the readers about the reason for his right of post.

7.2.1.3 Treatment of Proper Names

Şahinbaş has retained the original orthography of all proper names in *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*. Names of people and places, both actual and imaginary, were spelled as they were spelled in the source text. The terms Swift has coined to describe characters (Glumdalclitch p. 97, Clustril p. 63, Dunrilo p. 63), places (Lilliput p. 9, Brobdingnag p. 83), or creatures (Houyhnhnm p. 241, Yahoo p. 241) in *Gulliver's Travels* were likewise retained in the translation. Şahinbaş thus conformed to one of the norms explicitly propagated by the founders of the Translation Bureau. The Bureau, at its first meeting, had resolved that all foreign names would be printed in their original spelling in the translations: “It was decided to follow the orthographical rules of nations using the Latin script in the spelling of proper names and to adopt transcription principles for other alphabets” [“Tercümelerde, Lâtin harfleri kullanan milletlerin has isimlerinin imlâsına riayet edilmesine, diğerleri için de bir *transcription* esası kabul olunmasına karar verildi.”] (“Haberler” 1940: 112). This norm was observed by all translators who were commissioned by the Bureau.

⁷ I have not supplied back-translations of excerpts taken from *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* since the target text is a close translation of the source.

7.2.1.4 Treatment of Foreign Cultural Elements

Şahinbaş domesticated some terms unique to English culture and replaced them with Turkish terms. For instance “pound” (Swift 1994: 9) was replaced by “lira” (Swift 1943: 8), “inch” (Swift 1994: 12) by “parmak” (Swift 1943: 12), “sausages” (Swift 1994: 173) by “sucuk” (Swift 1944: 11), “shoulder of mutton” (Swift 1994: 173) by “kuzu budu” [“leg of mutton”] (Swift 1944: 11). Nevertheless, this was not a consistent strategy. Şahinbaş retained many foreign cultural elements in their original form without any apparent reason. For instance he replaced “mile” (Swift 1943: 11) by “mil” (Swift 1943: 9) and “pudding” (Swift 1994: 173) by “pudding” (Swift 1944: 11), both equally unfamiliar to the Turkish readership. Furthermore, Şahinbaş did not adapt into Turkish any of the coinages by Swift and relayed them in their original forms. Terms such as “galbet” (1943: 33), “splacknuck” (1943: 89), “gnnays” (1944: 102), “struldbrug” (1944: 61) were printed in the Turkish text in their original spelling. Titles “Mr.,” “Miss” and “Mrs.” were also retained in their original forms.

7.2.1.5 Siting *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri*

In *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri I-II* and *III-IV* translator İrfan Şahinbaş adhered to the norms of the source text. He preserved the textual integrity of *Gulliver’s Travels* by not omitting passages from it and by not introducing radical additions in the form of extensive commentaries. His treatment of proper names and foreign cultural elements, save for a few exceptions, indicates that he strove to render Swift’s novel in a manner that preserved as many features as possible of the source text.

Furthermore, Şahinbaş kept the major features of Swift's syntax. This shows that he tried to recreate Swift's literary style in Turkish.

I argue that Şahinbaş's translation conformed to the major norms propagated by the translators associated with the Translation Bureau as they reflected in *Tercüme* and other publications. His translation appears to aim at "fidelity"⁸ to the source text on a number of levels: preserving the textual integrity of the source text, remaining faithful to the text in terms of content and form and recreating the "tone" of the original. These were certain aspects of fidelity discussed by translators and critics throughout the 1940s and it may be argued that Şahinbaş observed these fidelity-related norms to a large extent.

Gulliver'in Seyahatleri appears to address an adult readership. This was made explicit in the preface as mentioned in 7.2.1.1. The book's formal features, such as its solemn-looking cover and the small type-set used in the book, which was typical of translations of canonical literature, also reinforce its status as a "classic" for adults. Furthermore, the Translation Bureau's decision to commission the translation of the third and fourth parts of the book, hitherto deemed unsuitable for children, and Şahinbaş's decision to retain many foreign cultural elements in their original form, his rare use of footnotes, his treatment of proper names and his attention to the fullness of the text also point to the status of the translation as a work aimed at a group of adults who were acquainted with, or at least open to, western literature and culture. These readers must have had certain expectations from the translation in terms of its function and its relationship to the source text. In terms of function, the translation would familiarize the readers with the full content of Jonathan Swift's masterpiece of social satire, the author's thinking and style rather than provide them

⁸ For a detailed discussion of the elaboration of "fidelity" by translators and critics see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3.

with a retelling of a well-known adventure and travel story. I would argue that such were the expectations of the implied readers Şahinbaş and the Translation Bureau had in mind during the translation and publication of the two volumes of the novel. Whether or how the novel was received by the I intended readership, is unclear and difficult to find out. However, it can be suggested that the poetics governing *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, and the literary habitus addressed by the translation were dramatically different than those operating in the field of popular translated literature. *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* carefully stressed the prominence of the source text through its peritextual features such as the cover, the title page and its preface, its treatment of proper names and foreign cultural elements. Evidently, it also addressed a readership whose literary habitus cared about the provenance of literary texts and presumed a clear demarcation between translation and indigenous writing.

In a translation review published in *Tercüme*, Nihal Yalaza Taluy described in clear terms the differing aspects of the target audience of classics and that of translated popular literature and the respective literary habituses they had. In the review, Taluy, who was one of the Bureau's translators, offered a critique of *Müfettiş*, the translation of Gogol's *The Inspector*, by Avni Insel and Vecihi Görk, published in 1937 by Hilmi Kitabevi. The review harshly criticized the translation for its errors, arbitrary additions and claimed that it was too "free" ["serbest"] and did not reflect Gogol's style. In short, the translation was being criticized for diverging from the source text (Taluy 1943: 71). Taluy concluded the review as follows:

At least we should not do offhand translations of the classic works. For those who will read them are not the inattentive and tolerant readers of book series sold for 25 kurush which they read to kill their time when they are traveling by train or boat. The readers of classics are those who would like to learn about world literature. They include especially the young generation. It is our duty to

give them the best, the clearest and the most accurate of everything (Taluy 1943: 71).

[Hiç olmazsa klâsik eserlerin tercümesinde lâubali olmayalım. Çünkü onları okuyacak olanlar yalnız yolculuk esnasında trende ve vapurda vakit öldürmek veya bir şey okumuş olmak için alınan 25 kuruşluk kitap serilerinin dalgın ve müsamahakâr karii değil, dünya edebiyatını öğrenmek isteyenlerdir. Bunların arasında bilhassa da genç nesil vardır. Onlara, herşeyin en iyisini, en temizini ve en doğrusunu vermek borcumuzdur (Taluy 1943 : 71)]

The above lines make it clear that the intended audience for translated classics was that who read the books for literary and educational purposes rather than entertainment. Therefore, their expectations of quality and “accuracy” would be higher. On the other hand, readers of non-classics, i.e. popular literature, would be content with “offhand” translations according to Taluy. Taluy’s statement also implies that readers who read canonical literature would not read non-canonical literature and vice versa. This claim was also made by Vedat Günyol during my interview with him. He suggested that reading canonical or non-canonical literature was a “question of habit” [“bir alışkanlık sorunu”] and that in the 1940s and 1950s two separate groups of readers existed for the classics and popular literature (Interview with Vedat Günyol, 30.10.2001).

As a retranslation, *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri I-II* had an innovatory potential. It introduced a full translation of Swift’s novel in the Latin alphabet for the first time into the Turkish literary polysystem, firmly established its position as a classic of political satire, rather than a children’s adventure book.

Gulliver’in Seyahatleri I-II, Şahinbaş’s translation of the first two parts of *Gulliver’s Travels*, was reprinted by the Ministry of Education in 1945 within the series of “Okul Klasikleri” (School Classics). This reprint needs to be considered a

new edition of the translation since it introduced a number of changes to the initial translation published in 1943 and foresaw a different target audience.

7.2.2 *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II* as a “School Classic” (1945)

The “School Classics” series of the Ministry of Education was launched in 1945 and continued until 1947, publishing a total of seven books.⁹ *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II* appeared as number two in the series.¹⁰

7.2.2.1 Peritextual Elements

The peritextual features of the book were quite similar to Şahinbaş's 1943 translation. The only changes consisted of the title of the sub-series and the logo of the Ministry of Education. The cover carried the series title “Okul Klasikleri” and the logo of the Ministry of Education, which had been changed to reflect the new name of the Ministry: “Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı” (Ministry of National Education) instead of the previous “Maarif Vekâleti” (Education Ministry). This change was introduced as part of the language reform and the neologisms “Eğitim” and “Bakanlık” were adopted to replace “Maarif” and “Vekâlet”. Furthermore, the attribute “Millî” (national) was added in an obvious attempt to underscore the nationalist inclination of the general education project carried out in the country.

⁹ The series included the following translations: *L'avare* by Molière (tr. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, 1945); *Gulliver's Travels* by Jonathan Swift (tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, 1945); *Hamlet* by William Shakespeare (tr. Orhan Burian, 1945); *Michael Kohlhaas* by Heinrich von Kleist (tr. Necip Üçok, 1946); *Apologia* by Plato (tr. Niyazi Berkes, 1946); *The Inspector* by Nicolay Gogol (tr. Erol Güneş and Melih Cevdet Anday, 1946); *Discours de la méthode pour bien conduire sa raison et chercher la vérité dans les sciences* by René Descartes (tr. Mehmet Karasan, 1947). All of these were previously published as part of the series of “Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeleler” (Translations from World Literature).

¹⁰ In this section I shall make use of the second impression of the book, published in 1946.

The title page of the school classic *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, the way the title, the source title, the author and the translator were presented remained identical with the 1943-1944 translation. There were four prefaces preceding Part 1. Three were standard prefaces which accompanied all translations published by the Ministry of Education until 1946 by İnönü and Yücel: İnönü (1943) and Yücel (1943 and 1944) were reprinted in the book without any modifications. A preface introducing Jonathan Swift and *Gulliver's Travels* followed the standard prefaces and was composed of two parts: "Jonathan Swift" and "Gulliver'in Seyahatleri". Anonymous like the previous preface, the 1945 preface expanded on the previous one and offered more extensive biographical information on Swift ("Jonathan Swift" and "Gulliver'in Seyahatleri" 1946: I-X). Furthermore *Gulliver's Travels* was introduced within a more analytical framework and examined the novel in terms of its intertextual relationships to a number of texts which preceded and succeeded it, such as Thomas More's *Utopia*, Voltaire's *Micromegas* and Samuel Butler's *Erewhon*. The biographical section of the preface went into various details about Swift's life. Among these, information about his academic life indicates that the preface was specifically rewritten to address a student audience. The preface informs the reader that since Swift neglected to study his logic lessons, which were very important at the time, he failed at his university examinations and barely managed to take his degree (Swift 1946: II).

The school version of *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* was published in a single volume and only included Parts 1 and 2, "Liliput'a Seyahat" ["A Voyage to Liliput"] and "Brobdingnag'a Seyahat" ["A Voyage to Brobdingnag"]. The third and fourth parts were not reprinted as a school classic. This may appear contrary to the norm of preserving the textual integrity of the source text in translation which was carefully

emphasized by the critics and translators associated with the Translation Bureau and *Tercüme*. However, the 1943 version already included some information about why the second half of the book would be unsuitable for young people. It pointed out that Chapters 3 and 4 displayed a “satirical humiliation of humanity”, thus could not have been written for children. Likewise, the 1945 preface for students states that the first two parts of the book are full of adventures and events which can entertain children and make adults think (“Gulliver’in Seyahatleri 1946: IX) whereas the third part is “plain” [“yavan”] and the fourth part is “brutish” [“haşin”] (“Gulliver’in Seyahatleri 1946: VII). The preface thus justifies the reason why the second half of the book was not reprinted in the series of “School Classics”.

The preface also expresses the reason behind the selection of the novel as a school classic by stating that “We should benefit from Swift’s criticisms and the lessons that he teaches” [“Swift’in tenkid ettiği şeylerden, verdiği derslerden faydalanmalıyız.”] (“Gulliver’in Seyahatleri” 1946: X). This indicates that there were didactic and instructive motives behind the choice of the book as a work suitable for students. The peritextual elements of the book do not mention the age of the students or the classes targeted by *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri*. However, some exercises added to the translation indicate that it was probably aimed at students in secondary education.

7.2.2.2 Textual-Linguistic Alterations and Additions

The 1945 school edition of *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri I-II* adopted the initial translation carried out by Şahinbaş, with minor modifications on the lexical level. It is not clear who edited the text and decided on the changes to be made: it might have been Şahinbaş himself, or an editor, or a member of the Translation Bureau who acted as

editor. The lexical modifications consisted of replacing some words of Ottoman origin, used in the 1943 edition, with neologisms. For instance “muharrir” [“author”] (Swift 1943: 7) was replaced by “yazar” (Swift 1946: 3), “cenup” [“south”] (Swift 1943: 8) by “güney” (Swift 1946: 5), “ikinciteşrin” [“November”] (Swift 1943: 9) by “kasım” (Swift 1946: 5), “fevkalade” [“extraordinary”] (Swift 1943: 43) by “olağanüstü” (Swift 1946: 55). However, these modifications are not too numerous. Ottoman words such as “tafsilât”, “müteessir”, and “mahlûk” were not altered, although new equivalents existed. There is no explanation in the text regarding why the modifications were made. In my view, the language of the target text was thought to be too complex for the younger generation and the editing process aimed to make it more accessible for students.

The treatment of proper names remained the same in the 1945 edition. However, the treatment of foreign cultural elements was slightly modified. Measurement units like “gomine” (p. 6), “parmak” (p. 7), “kadem” (p. 15), “yarda” (p. 18) or terms that could be unfamiliar to the target readership such as “Bourgogne” (p. 11), “*Lingua Franca*” (p. 21), “çembalo” (p. 171) were explained in footnotes. There are 11 footnotes in the 1945 edition as opposed to only 2 in the 1943 edition. The target text still adopted a “foreignist”¹¹ approach towards the treatment of cultural elements, but unlike the 1943 version, made the meanings readily available for the readers.

The major difference between the 1943 and 1945 versions of *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II* is the addition of a series of exercises at the end of each chapter in the latter edition. These exercises were directly linked with the events related in the

¹¹ For a definition of “foreignization” as a translation strategy see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.4, footnote 18.

specific chapter and appear to aim at stimulating critical analysis of the work and its socio-political context. Below is an example taken from the end of Part 3:

[As we mentioned in Swift's biography, he had a firsthand view of political conspiracies, the events which took place at the royal court, sycophancies, and immoralities. Rather than providing a direct criticism of these, he ridicules them indirectly through his account of the customs at the Lilliput court. His satire is not confined to England. He implies that all European royalties are in the same situation.

1. What are your views on the qualifications and conditions required in order to become a high civil servant or to be awarded a decoration or an honorary title? In other words, what does the author imply? Is he not exaggerating? If he is, what are his reasons? (Swift 1946: 45)]

[Swift, hayatından söz ederken de söylediğimiz gibi, İngiltere'de , siyaset alanında çevrilen entrikaları, kiral sarayından olup bitenleri, dalkavuklukları, ahlâksızlıkları yakından görmüştü. Bunları, doğrudan doğruya tenkidetmeyip, Lilliput sarayındaki âdetlerden bahsederek dolaylı bir tarzda hicvediyor. Bu hicvini yalnız İngiltere'ye de yöneltmiyor. Bütün Avrupa kiralıklarında durumun böyle olduğunu ima ediyor.

1. Büyük memuriyetlere geçmek, nişan ve şeref ünvanlarını kazanmak için aranan vasıf ve şartlar hakkında neler düşünüyorsunuz? Yani yazarın kastedtiği nedir? Mübalâğa etmiyor mu? Ediyorsa, sebebi?¹² (Swift 1946: 45)]

Similar comments and questions printed at the end of each chapter indicate that the book was designed for classroom use as a teaching aid for literature teachers. The comments established link between the adventures recounted in the chapter and the general background against which Swift wrote them, while the questions formed points of departure for classroom discussion or essays. At the end of the book there are ten questions covering the whole of the two parts. They start with an introductory statement indicating that the book would be used in formal education: "Some of these questions should be topics for essays" ["Bu sorulardan bazıları kompozisyon konusu olmalıdır."] (Swift 1946: 212). The nature of these additional comments and questions, which are highly analytical and sophisticated, indicates that *Gulliver'in*

Seyahatleri I-II had an instructive function. Although the novel was published within the series of “School Classics”, it did not appear like a children’s book. This was also the case for other works published in the series which were also adult books (see Footnote 9). The principal aim of the translation appears to be that of triggering critical thinking about the social and political background to the novel, about issues which would well have been valid subjects for contemporary Turkish society and politics. The 1945 edition of *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II* embodies the significant role ascribed to translation by the Ministry of Education in terms of culture planning and educating the society. Furthermore, the comments and questions added to the translation guide its reception and offer us clues about the literary habitus culture planners wished to see developing in the younger generation. This habitus would regard the reading of literature as an educational activity rather than mere entertainment and would involve a view of reading as a questioning and analytical enterprise.

7.2.3 *Cüceler Memleketinde* (In the Land of Dwarfs) (1927)

Cüceler Memleketinde was published in Ottoman script by Resimli Ay Matbaası¹³ in 1927. It is an anonymous translation of 63 pages, of “A Voyage to Liliput”, the first part of *Gulliver's Travels*.

¹² Originally published in italics.

¹³ Resimli Ay was better known as a literary magazine which was published between 1924-1930 (Doğan 1997: 15-18). It was established by Sabiha and Zekeriya Sertel, two left-wing journalists who had been educated in the USA and returned to Turkey at the end of the War of Liberation. The magazine formed the focus of a series of literary debates and received a great deal of reaction from established poets and writers. Its publishing activity consisted of series of educational books, children’s books and popular novels.

7.2.3.1 Peritextual Elements

Cüceler Memleketinde was published as number seventeen within the series of “On Kuruşa Bir Kitap” (Books for Ten Kurush) in the size of a pocket book. Its front cover features no author’s or translator’s name but includes the title of the book, the name of the publishing company, the date and the price of the book. The price is repeated twice, once at the top of the page within the series title, and below the title of the book. The marketing of the book was evidently based on a low-price formula which was carefully underscored in the title and in advertising published inside the book. The translator is not indicated anywhere in the book, while Swift’s name is only appears in the preface. This makes both the translator and the author invisible on the cover. The low-price strategy and the fantastic title of the work appear to be the main peritextual strategies used to attract the readers.

There are no illustrations on the cover or anywhere else in the book. The cover is reprinted in the title page which is followed by a preface page. The preface is titled “Güliver Cüceler Memleketinde” [“Gulliver in the Land of Dwarfs”] and offers the reader some information about Jonathan Swift and *Gulliver’s Travels*. The anonymous preface has a two-fold function: to emphasize the reputation and quality of the novel as a children’s book and to explain the general background against which it was written. The preface starts as follows:

An author named “Swift” has a very famous work titled “Gulliver’s Travels”. This work is a children’s novel which has been translated into all languages of the world. In his novel, “Swift” has tried to explain that all human desires and efforts are meaningless and has also tried to portray contemporary people in a

strange position. No other work in the world has become so pervasive and popular (“Güliiver Cüceler Memleketinde” 1927: 3).¹⁴

[“Swift” isminde bir muharririn “Güliiverin Seyahatleri” isminde çok meşhur bir eseri vardır. Bu eser bütün dünya lisanlarına tercüme edilmiş bir çocuk romanıdır. Swift bu romanında insanların bütün emel ve gayelerinin manâsız olduğunu izaha ve bugünkü insanı garip bir mevkie düşürmeğe çalışmıştır. Dünyada hiçbir eser bunun kadar çok yayılmamış ve bunun kadar çok okunmamıştır (“Güliiver Cüceler Memleketinde” 1927: 3).]

In my view, the emphasis on the popularity of the book served to establish its status as a world-famous work, thus legitimizing its selection by the publishing company. The company thus gained prestige and presented itself as a publisher dealing with high quality literature. This complemented its marketing strategy and corrected an impression of Resimli Ay as a publisher of bargain books. The desired result appears to have been to create the impression of a quality publishing company involved in some kind of public service by offering books at low prices.

The preface does not inform the readers as to why it was decided to translate only the first part of the book. Nevertheless, it states that *Gulliver’s Travels* is composed of four parts which are all independent stories [“birbirinden tamamen ayrı ve müstakil”] and that what Resimli Ay offers is a translation of Part 1.

The back cover of the book includes an advertisement of Resimli Ay publishing company, informing the readers of its address and of the services offered by its printing house. There are five pages of advertisement following the end of the story on page 58. The first advertisement is on a translation of Jules Verne’s *De la Terre à la Lune*, *Aya Seyahat*. It informs the readers that the book, which will appear within “ten days” will cost “ten kurush” will aid the “intellectual development” [“fikri inkişafına”] of children (Swift 1927: 59). The next page features a list of the

¹⁴ All transliterations from the Ottoman are mine.

publications of Resimli Ay, which includes 15 popular informative books such as *Niçin Rüya Görürüz?* (Why do We Dream?), *Din Nedir?* (What is Religion?), *Telsiz Telefon Ahizesi Nasıl Ayar Edilir?* (How Does One Adjust the Wireless Telephone Receiver?) and two novels, *Vatansız Adam* (The Man without a Homeland) and *Cüceler Memleketinde* (In the Land of the Dwarfs). The next advertisement features *Çocuk Ansiklopedisi* (Children's Encyclopedia). Page 62 is allocated for an advertisement of *Vatansız Adam* and the last page includes a general advertisement for the series of "Books for Ten Kurush".

The peritextual elements in this version of *Gulliver's Travels* offer no information about the book's status as a retranslation. It does not refer to previous translations of the work. There is no explanation of the publisher's or the translator's reasons for translating the novel. Neither is there any indication of the source language for the translation. It is therefore impossible to assess the directness of the translation on the basis of its peritextual elements. The translation itself does not offer any clues about its directness.

7.2.3.2 Matricial Norms in *Cüceler Memleketinde*

Cüceler Memleketinde is composed of five chapters as opposed to Swift's eight. This indicates from the outset that the translator was involved in some form of matricial manipulation. Indeed, a close descriptive analysis of the target text reveals that s/he omitted large chunks of the source text but also made some additions. The omissions mainly consist of the contemplative and descriptive parts of the source text whereas adventure and action-related parts are largely retained.

The opening of the first chapter constitutes a good example of both omissions and additions encountered in the target text. The translator has written a separate introductory section under the title “Beş On Satırlık Bir Mukaddeme” (“An Introduction of Several Lines”) where s/he summed up the first two pages of *Gulliver’s Travels* in a single paragraph. Background information about Gulliver, his education, his medical career and his marriage are never mentioned in the target text. *Cüceler Memleketinde* begins with his journey which casts him away to a land inhabited by little people, Lilliput in the source text, The Land of Dwarfs in the target text. The translator’s style is different from Swift’s literary style. The sentences are shortened and simplified and the language is more conversational. The following example from the beginning of the target text will offer an impression of the simple language used by the translator as well as the additions s/he made:

Target Text:

Ben denizde hiç boş durmadım. Zaten rüzgâr ve akıntı beni karaya doğru itiyordu. Ben de kulaçlaya kulaçlaya yüzüyor ve karaya yaklaşarak yaklaşmadığımı anlamak için ikide birde bacaklarımı aşağıya doğru sarkıtıyordum. Lâkin ayaklarım dibi bulamadığı için elân denizlerde olduğumu anlıyor, yine can korkusuyla yüzmeye başlıyordum. O kadar yüzdüm ki artık kuvvetim kalmadı. Kollarım bacaklarım kesildi. Madem ki boğulacağım, dedim, bari sıkıntısız boğulayım. Fazla çabalamadan vaz geçtim. Derinlere inip ölmek için kendimi salıyordum. Derken ayaklarım kuma dokunmasın mı. Meğer ben yüze yüze kıyıya yanaşmışım, ve kendi boyumdan biraz daha derin suları bulmuşum (Swift 1927: 5).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

I did not keep still in the sea. The wind and the current were already pushing me toward the land. I swam in strokes and often let my legs drop to check whether I was close to land. Yet since my legs did not touch the ground I realized that I was still in high sea and began to swim in fear of death. I swam so much that I had no might left in me. My arms and legs were exhausted. I thought, if I am to drown, then I should drown without difficulty. I stopped trying hard. I was about to let myself go into the deep in order to die. Then, would you believe it, my feet touched the sand. After all, I had managed to near the shore while I swam and found myself in water that was slightly above my height (Swift 1927: 5).]

Source Text:

For my own part, I swam as fortune directed me, and was pushed forward by wind and tide. I often let my legs drop, and could feel no bottom: but when I was almost gone, and able to struggle no longer, I felt myself within my depth; and by this time the storm was much abated (Swift 1994: 11).

The above example illustrates that the translator expanded on some parts of the source text. S/he modified the syntax used by Swift, split up the sentences, added words and details that would make the text run more fluently in a conversational manner. An interesting shift in the above excerpt is the use of “current” [“akıntı”] to replace “tide”, which was a phenomenon unfamiliar to the majority of Turkish children, since there is no visible tide in the seas around Turkey. There are similar additions throughout the target text (Swift 1927: 14, 16, 32, 38, 40). Some of them have stylistic purposes and serve to turn comments or descriptions into dialogues (Swift 1927: 31, 33).

Omissions consist of cutting long descriptions or comments that are not relevant to the progression of the adventure plot. The introductory paragraphs at the beginning of each chapter are also absent in the translation. Alternatively, some omissions involve summary/simplification as exemplified by the following excerpt:

Target Text:

Serbest kalır kalmaz payitahtı gezmek için izin istedim, izin verildi (Swift 1927: 29).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

As soon as I obtained my liberty I asked permission to see the capital and I was granted the permission (Swift 1927: 29).]

Source Text:

The first request I made after I had obtained my liberty was, that I might have licence to see Mildendo, the metropolis; which the Emperor easily granted me,

but with a special charge to do no hurt either to the inhabitants or their houses. The people had noticed by proclamation of my design to visit the town (Swift 1994: 40).

An interesting aspect of the target text is the fact that the translator never omitted parts pertaining to Europe and those where Gulliver offered a criticism of the old continent (Swift 1927: 38, 41, 43). Nor did s/he omit parts where Gulliver gave a description of Lilliput's penal system (Swift 1994: 54-55) although they were lengthy and detailed enough to interfere with the plot (Swift 1927: 30-34). The translator made her/his reasons for retaining this part clear by adding a sentence at the end, which extracts the moral of the story for children: "Öyle ya, keşke hiç fena insan olmasa da herkes iyi olsa ve herkes mükâfat alsın" ["Indeed, if only there were no bad people and everyone was good and rewarded for it."] (Swift 1927: 34). The focus on the criticism of Europe and the discussion on the penal system, which included a number of additions, demonstrate that the publishers and the translator did not wish to reduce *Gulliver's Travels* entirely to an adventure story for children. I suggest that their intention was to guide the reception of the book not only as an entertaining story, but also an educational one. This is also evident from the preface which explained the general socio-political motives behind the writing of the book. This attitude was very much in line with the policies Resimli Ay which published educational books.

Apart from additions, omissions and the modification of syntax, the translator also reshuffled certain parts of the text and changed the order of paragraphs (Swift 1927: 39-56).

7.2.3.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements

Cüceler Memleketinde offered Ottoman transliterations of proper names such as “Gulliver” and “Van Diemen” (Swift 1994: 11). Proper names were given in brackets, according to the convention. Some names of places coined by Swift, such as Mildendo (Swift 1994: 40) and Lilliput (Swift 1994: 9) were omitted from the target text while “Blefuscus” (Swift 1994: 45) was retained as “Blefusku” (Swift 1927: 35). Lilliput was renamed as “Cüceler Memleketi” in an obvious attempt to make it more familiar to the intended readership of the book, i.e. children. Furthermore, both “feet” and “yard” were translated as “kadem” (Swift 1927: 15). “Yard” sometimes became “karış” (Swift 1994: 16). On the other hand, “brandy” (Swift 1994: 12) was rendered as “brandi” (Swift 1927: 6) assuming that children would not know its meaning. Likewise “mile” (Swift 1994: 11) was rendered as “mil” (Swift 1927: 5). There were no footnotes to explain these terms.

The translator of *Cüceler Memleketinde* did not use a constantly foreignizing or domesticating strategy regarding foreign names or terms. Nevertheless, the general strategy observed in the translation seems to be that of modifying Swift’s style in order to simplify the language and sentence structure. The addition of certain elements has created a text that is considerably more colloquial and conversational than *Gulliver’s Travels*, written in an idiom that is accessible to its target readership.

The reason for Resimli Ay’s selection of *Gulliver’s Travels* as a source text is not stated in the book. Nevertheless, it can be claimed that Resimli Ay was a pioneer in retranslating the book as a children’s story and that in this sense *Cüceler Memleketinde* does have a novelty value. The limited format of the series for books for ten kurush obviously dictated the translation strategy regarding textual integrity.

Resimli Ay referred to books in this series as “little books” [“küçük kitaplar”] (Swift 1927: 63) and the price strategy the publishers adopted must have compelled them to include short works in this series. As indicated earlier, in the preface, the publishers justified their inclusion of only Part 1 for translation in the preface by stating that the four parts were independent units. However, they did not mention why they had chosen to translate Part 1 out of four. This may have something to do with the fact that Part 2 was previously retranslated and published by Çocuk Dünyası and that Parts 3 and 4 were not suitable for children, as argued later by the Translation Bureau.

7.2.4 *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver’in Seyahatleri* (Gulliver’s Travels in the Land of Dwarfs and Giants) (1935)

Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver’in Seyahatleri was translated by Ercümen Ekrem Talû¹⁵ and published by Akşam Kitaphanesi in 1935 within their series of “Akşamın Faydalı Neşriyatı” (Useful Publications of Akşam). The translation must have been done from the French. Although the peritextual features of the text does not offer any information about the directness of the translation, the influence of French is visible in the treatment of proper names. Talû’s version turned out to be one of the most popular Turkish translations of *Gulliver’s Travels*. It was reprinted four times.¹⁶ As it will become evident in the following discussion, there were a number of retranslations of *Gulliver’s Travels* in the market in the 1950s, and the popularity of Talû’s translation may stem from his popularity as a novelist. The main

¹⁵ Ercümen Ekrem Talû (1888-1956) was a writer and translator. He was educated at Galatasaray, the French Lycée in Istanbul, and studied in Paris. He is better known for his humorous and realist novels than his translations.

novelty of his translation at the time of publication was the fact that it was the first translation of *Gulliver's Travels* into Turkish published in the Latin script. As a retranslation, it re-introduced the novel into the system of children's literature and made it available to the new generation of children who started school in the republican era and learned to read and write in the Latin alphabet.

7.2.4.1 Peritextual Elements

Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri has an illustrated front cover depicting a scene from the first chapter of the novel where Gulliver is tied to the ground by Lilliputians. The cover only features the title of the book. Swift's name, as J. Swift, and the translator's name appear on the title page. The back cover is empty except for the logo of the publishing company, the date of publication and the price of the book. There is a preface in the beginning of the book, signed only as F. S., presumably the editor. The preface titled "Birkaç Söz" ["A Few Words"] emphasizes the international popularity of *Gulliver's Travels*. It also informs the readers that Swift had originally written the book for adults but that children had enjoyed it more. F.S. also states that the book is a fictional work and that it has some satirical curiosities ["Swift'in iğnelediği tuhafıklar"], but s/he does not explain any further. The preface ends with a statement underscoring the popularity of the book and its educational value for children: "Even today, this work is read everywhere with great enjoyment and is regarded as a book which is very beneficial for the youth" ["Bugün bile bu eser her tarafta büyük bir zevk ile okunur ve gençlik için çok faydalı bir kıraat sayılır."] (F.S. 1935: 4-5).

¹⁶ *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, İstanbul: Kanaat Kitapevi, 1946; 1950; 1958; 1968.

The novel is illustrated and features a number of drawings depicting Gulliver in different situations. Some of the illustrations are accompanied by short captions taken from the target text. The illustrator is not named.

7.2.4.2 Matricial Norms

Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde includes only the first two parts of *Gulliver's Travels*. This is not mentioned in the preface or anywhere else in the book. The general strategy Talû adopted in his translation appears to be that of abridging the source text so as to create a text in Turkish that is accessible for children in terms of its vocabulary, style and ideas. Since the translation is mediated, an exact description of the norms observed by Talû can only be arrived at after an analysis of his French source text. Nevertheless, there are a number of omissions which are systematic and appear throughout the retranslations which will be explored in the following sections. This makes it likely that Talû's omissions stemmed from factors shaping the poetics of translated literature in Turkish rather than from the French source text.

The omissions in *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* take place on various levels. In individual sentences, Talû chose to omit some details. For instance, while translating Gulliver's marriage, he wrote, "Zengin bir esnafın kızıyla evlendim" ["I married the daughter of a rich merchant."] (Swift 1935: 10) and omitted the wife's name, Mary Burton, from the sentence (Swift 1994: 10). At the level of paragraphs, he omitted detailed accounts and chose to give summaries: where Swift described the size of a cat in Brobdingnag by the look of its paws and head and concluded that it seemed three times larger than an ox (Swift 1994: 92), Talû did not mention how Gulliver measured the cat and only wrote: "Benim için bu hayvan bizim memleketin

öküzlerinden üç defa daha büyük görünüyordu” [“To me, this animal seemed three times larger than my country’s oxen.”] (Swift 1935: 90). He also omitted many passages from the target text without giving a summary (see for example Swift 1994: 53, 111, 124). These omissions consist either of lengthy descriptions, Gulliver’s philosophical interventions, or comments relating to sexual affairs or such themes as death that may be considered inappropriate for children (Swift 1994: 124).

Talû also omitted several chapters from the target text: Chapters 4 and 5, and Chapter 7 are altogether excluded. Thus Talû’s second part consists of five chapters, as opposed to Swift’s eight. *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* consists of 132 pages printed in large font while the first two parts of *Gulliver’s Travels* consists of 161 pages printed in small font.

Talû did not make any additions to the source text. His sentences are much shorter compared to Swift’s syntax, and his style is much less sophisticated, and obviously designed for a young audience.

7.2.4.3 Treatment of Foreign Names and Foreign Cultural Elements

Talû’s treatment of foreign proper names reveals that his translation was done from the French. Furthermore, he made combined use of phonetic and original spellings. In the target text Leyden has become “Leyde” (p. 9), “John Nicholas” has become “Jean Nikola” (p. 77), “Molucca” has become “Moluques” (p. 81) which reveal the target text’s status as a mediated translation from the French. On the other hand, “Bates” was retained as in English (p. 9), “Van Diemen” was spelled “Van Diyemen” and “Tonquin” as “Tonkin”, both adapted to phonetic spelling. The inconsistency in the treatment of proper names can also be observed in the treatment

of foreign cultural elements. Talû has converted measurements into meters and centimeters, units familiar to the Turkish readership, and translated “brandy” (Swift 1994: 12) as “ispirto” (Swift 1935: 12) which would be a more accessible term for Turks. However, he translated “monsoon” (Swift 1994: 84) as “Mousson” in French (Swift 1935: 82), taking a strictly foreignizing approach. It can be suggested that Talû did not follow a consistent policy regarding the treatment of foreign cultural elements in the text.

7.2.4.4 *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* as a Retranslation

In terms of textual integrity, *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* adopted an approach similar to the 1927 translation. But unlike *Cüceler Memleketinde*, Talû added no passages to the source text but made extensive omissions and changed Swift’s style dramatically, simplifying the plot and leaving nothing of his satirical criticism. This was a policy largely adopted by the subsequent translators as I will illustrate in the following sections. The partial translation of the source text, the omissions inside the chapters and the indirectness of translation were all elements later on criticized and condemned by the Translation Bureau and the translators associated with it. Talû’s translation preceded the foundation of the Translation Bureau by five years, therefore it would not be fair to suggest that he was engaged in a “resistant” form of translation in 1935. Nevertheless, the translation was reprinted in 1946, after the Ministry of Education brought out Şahinbaş’s translation (1943-1944) and its “School Classics” version (1945). The 1946 reprint of Talû’s *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* did not introduce major changes to the translation but only made some alterations at the lexical level, replacing some Ottoman words with newly-introduced synonyms. Thus

“Doğu” (Swift 1946b: 2) replaced “Şark” (Swift 1935: 10), “gelgit” (Swift 1946b: 3) replaced “med ve cezir” (Swift 1935: 11), “bakan” (Swift 1946b: 25) replaced “nazır” (Swift 1935: 33) and “andlaşma” (Swift 1946b: 41) replaced “muahede” (Swift 1935: 41).

In my view it was the 1935 retranslation that challenged the validity of previous translations by introducing a translation of *Gulliver’s Travels* for the first time in Latin script. The fact that the translation was reprinted in 1946, may illustrate two things on the commercial and translational fronts. The motive behind this reprint may have been to capitalize on the publication of *Gulliver’s Travels* in Şahinbaş’s translation as a classic text and enjoy the prestige of having published a canonical work. Secondly, the reprint might also be sign of a disagreement with the norms Şahinbaş observed in his translation. Kanaat publishing house might have decided to reprint the book in an attempt to address a different literary habitus than that addressed by the Translation Bureau. The omissions, the simplicity of the syntax, the illustrations and the large type-set used in Talû’s version all served to position *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* as a children’s book while Şahinbaş’s translation appealed to an audience, including students, who were after more sophisticated reading material. The poetics within which Talû’s *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde* operated was apparently indifferent to textual integrity and the principle of directness in translation. I argue this was the poetics of children’s literature, which foresaw fluency of language, accessibility, entertainment and educational value as prerequisites. These prerequisites were largely fulfilled by *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde*.

7.2.5 *Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde* (Gulliver in the Land of Dwarfs) (1941)

Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde is not a retranslation in the formal sense of the word. It was presented as a “film romani” [“novel of a film”] and appears to be a written synopsis of the animated cartoon film produced by Paramount Pictures in 1939, titled *Gulliver’s Travels*. The book was published by Türkiye Yayınevi as a special issue of *Yavrutürk*, a children’s magazine, in 1941. The book which contained 42 pages also included a puzzle, a two-page cartoon summary of the film, information on Jonathan Swift and on Fleischer Brothers who produced the animated film. Rather than a translation of *Gulliver’s Travels*, *Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde* is a retelling of the film plot, which is considerably different than the original story.

Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde was marketed as a tie-in to the film. This is stated explicitly in different sections of the book. The cover includes an illustration featuring a scene from the film, accompanied by the title of the book. On the title page there is an introductory paragraph which reads as follows: “This novel which has been read for centuries by millions of children and adults of all nationalities was made into a film last year. The novel of this film in colour is accompanied by many pictures” [“Yüzyıllardan beri her milletten, büyük, küçük milyonlarca insanın seve seve okuduğu bu roman geçen yıl filme çekildi. Baştan başa renkli olan bu filmin romanı bol resimlerle süslenmiştir.”] (Swift 1941: 3). This statement underscores two facts about the book: its popularity and its links with a film. These two aspects seem to be the main tools used by the publishers in the production and marketing of the book. Furthermore, the use of the term “novel” may be interpreted as an attempt to benefit from the established literary prestige of this literary genre. Although the book

was not a “novel” by any standards, its presentation as one may have served to reinforce the position of *Gulliver’s Travels* as a western classic.

Rather than a novel, *Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde* appears as a short story for young children. There is at least one illustration accompanying each page of the story (Swift 1941:7-36). Furthermore, there is a cartoon version of the story at the end of the main text (Swift 1941: 38-39). Although the introductory statement claims that the “novel” was read both by children and adults alike. The illustrations and the puzzle following the story, as well as the fact that the publisher was a children’s magazine, are clear indications that this version was marketed as a children’s book.

The translator is truly invisible in both the peritextual and the textual elements of *Güliver Cüceler Memleketinde*. There is no translator’s name mentioned anywhere in the book. Swift is only mentioned at the end of the book where there is a one-page note which presents him as “Yonatan Svift” (Swift 1941: 40). This note contains some biographical information about Swift and *Gulliver’s Travels*. According to the note, *Gulliver’s Travels* consisted of two parts, Gulliver’s travels to the Land of Dwarfs and the Land of Giants. The note also mentions briefly that Swift’s novel aims “not only to entertain the reader but also to point out the good and bad side of people” [“O bu romanında, eğlence ile birlikte okuyana insanların iyi ve fena taraflarını göstermek istemiştir.”] (Swift 1941: 40). However, there is nothing in the main text that resembles Swift’s satirical tone: the story is reduced to an adventure.

As *Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde* is not a translation of *Gulliver’s Travels*, it is not possible to discuss the norms observed by its translator. The source text could have been the synopsis supplied by the film company. It is also possible that there was no translation involved in the production of the book and that the plot and some dialogues were “rewritten” by one who saw the film. In any case, *Güliver Cüceler*

Ülkesinde needs to be included in a study that explores retranslations, since it also played a role in the creation of the position occupied by *Gulliver's Travels* as a children's classic in the Turkish system of children's literature. It cannot be suggested that the target text emerged as a reaction to previous translations or that it indicates a disagreement over translation strategies as is the case in some "active retranslations". Its intentions and functions were probably different than other translations. It was clearly intended for use as entertainment material and used the source text in a selective manner, extracting the entertaining parts. The film, which formed a basis for the book, introduced several new characters to the story and added a romantic twist to the plot. Furthermore, there were songs composed for the film whose lyrics were translated for the Turkish book. The story was rewritten in a way that brought action and dialogue to the foreground and omitted all passages or elements that involved social critique. Clearly, this was one step forward in the positioning of *Gulliver's Travels* as an adventure book for small children in the Turkish system for children's literature.

7.2.6 Subsequent Retranslations

In this section I will explore three different retranslations of *Gulliver's Travels*, all for children, published in 1953, circa 1960¹⁷ and 1960 respectively. With these, I cover all the translations of *Gulliver's Travels* published until 1960.¹⁸ I decided to

¹⁷ This undated retanslation titled *Gülviver'in Maceraları* (Gulliver's Adventures) was published by İyigün Yayınları. A translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* dated 1960 includes an advertisement for *Gülviver'in Maceraları* which indicates that the translation was published around this date.

¹⁸ An exception is *Cüceler Diyarında* published by Rafet Zaimler in the mid-1950s. This book was advertised by Rafet Zaimler among its other children's books. However, the book is not registered in *Türkiye Bibliyografyası*. Furthermore, there are no records about the book in the National Library or the Istanbul Beyazıt State Library. Rafet Zaimler published another translation of *Gulliver's Travels* in 1965: *Gulliver Cüceler ve Devler Ülkesinde* translated by Hakkı Ercan, a teacher and writer of

analyze these retranslations in the same section since they display a number of similarities in terms of their peritextual and textual features. Many of these features were also shared by *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde*, translated by Ercümen Ekrem Talû, discussed above. The first retranslation which followed Talû's (1935) and Şahinbaş's (1943-1944) was *Gulliver'in Yolculukları* (Gulliver's Travels) translated by Azize Erten¹⁹ and published by Varlık Yayınevi in 1953 in its series of children's classics. As mentioned in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2, Varlık was one of the most prolific publishers of the 1950s, specializing in contemporary canonical literature. In 1953, it also launched a children's classics series of 27 books until 1957 including translations of such books as *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, *Jane Eyre*, *Robinson Crusoe* and *Heidi* ("Varlık Yayınları" 1957: 23). *Gulliver'in Yolculukları* became a popular success and was reprinted four times.²⁰ The translation was clearly positioned as a "children's classic", as the name of the series implied. A promotional statement published on the back cover of the book emphasizes the status of the book as an internationally famous work and furthermore, draws attention to the exciting aspects of the adventure story: "When one mentions Children's Classics ... what comes to one's mind is Swift's world-famous Gulliver. ... Have children ever been able to read this attractive and captivating story without holding their breath? Here

children's fiction. It is not clear whether this translation was an expanded version of the earlier retranslation. The 1965 retranslation shared many features with the earlier children's versions in terms of its approach to the integrity of the source text. The text was characterized by a number of large omissions. Furthermore, it was translated from the French, a fact illustrated by the use of French phonetics in the transcription of foreign proper names. This illustrates that the poetics governing the field of translated children's literature had not changed much in the 1960s. It also shows that despite Şahinbaş's translation which attempted to position *Gulliver's Travels* as a satirical political text targeting the well-read adult population, the most loyal readers of the novel continued to be children, a fact which is still valid today.

¹⁹ Azize Erten (Bergin) is a journalist and a translator. She was educated at the American College for Girls in Istanbul and started her career as a translator in 1951. Since then she has built herself a strong career as a translator of mainly popular books. The National Library catalogue has over 170 records under her name, including her translations and their reprints.

²⁰ *Gulliver'in Yolculukları*, tr. Azize Erten, Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları, 1956; 1960; 1973; Göl Yayınları, 1979.

we present a new translation of this work, beneficial and good as it is exciting, and hope that children will like it better than the previous ones” [“Çocuk Klâsikleri denilince ... akla gelen Swift’in ünü dünyayı tutmuş Gulliver’idir. ... Hangi çocuk bu güzel ve sürükleyici hikâyeyi meraktan soluğu kesilmeden okuyabilmiştir? Burada küçük okuyucularımıza, meraklı olduğu kadar da faydalı ve güzel olan bu eserin yeni bir çevirmesini sunuyor ve bunu önce çıkanlardan daha fazla beğeneceklerini umuyoruz.”] (Swift 1953). Apart from emphasizing the book’s international popularity, its status as a classic, its entertainment and educational value, the paragraph also draws attention to its status as a retranslation. Nevertheless, the reasons for retranslating the book are not mentioned. The text was translated directly from English (Telephone interview with Azize Erten Bergin on 18.10.2001).

The translations which followed Erten’s were both published in or around 1960: *Guliver Cüceler Ülkesinde* translated by Arif Gelen²¹, published by Köy ve Eğitim Yayınları and *Guliverin Maceraları* translated by M. Doğan Özbay²², published by İyigün Yayınları. Köy ve Eğitim Yayınları which published Gelen’s translation was initially a magazine addressing village children and teachers at rural primary schools. It also published a series of books that could be used as classroom material and some children’s fiction deemed “suitable” for village children (Telephone interview with Arif Gelen 21.10.2001). The promotional statement on the back cover of Gelen’s *Guliver Cüceler Ülkesinde* placed emphasis on the international popularity and the adventure aspects of *Gulliver’s Travels*. The first sentence reads: “Dear Children, you now have a good book in your hands which is

²¹ Arif Gelen is known as the translator of a series of classics including works by Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and V.I. Lenin. He also translated novels, plays and children’s books from German and English.

²² M. Doğan Özbay translated around 190 books mainly from French. His translations covered children’s classics such as works by Jules Verne and Louisa May Alcott in the 1950s and 1960s. He focused on translations of erotic fiction in the 1970s.

read by all children of the world with great eagerness and excitement” [“Sevgili çocuklar, şu anda bütün dünya çocuklarının âdeta yutarcasına ve büyük bir heyecanla okudukları güzel bir kitabı elinize geçirmiş bulunuyorsunuz.”] (Swift 1960a). The target text was a direct translation from English (Telephone interview with Arif Gelen 21.10.2001).

Özbay’s undated *Güliver’in Maceraları*, on the other hand, does not have any preface or promotional statements which offer information about the way the publishers and the translator wished to guide the text’s reception. İyigün Yayınları was a publishing company active in the field of children’s literature, launched in 1958. It published around 200 children’s novels and short stories until the early 1970s. Its publications included novels by Jules Verne, Alexandre Dumas, Daniel Defoe and Mark Twain. Özbay’s retranslation of *Gulliver’s Travels* was done from French, as his treatment of proper names in the target text reveals. Özbay’s *Güliver’in Maceraları* was reprinted five times.²³

7.2.6.1 Peritextual Elements

The three post-1950 retranslations mentioned above share similar peritextual features. Their cover design, the visibility they grant to the translator and writer, the illustrations they make use of are all similar. All three have illustrated front covers bearing only the title of the book and the name of the publisher. The illustrations depict various scenes from the novel: in Erten’s translation the cover shows a tiny Gulliver seated across the King of Brobdingnag. Gelen’s translation features a scene from Gulliver’s voyage to Lilliput where Gulliver is watching the enemy fleet with

²³ *Güliver’in Maceraları*, tr. M. Doğan Özbay, İstanbul: İyigün Yayınları, 1963; 1965; 1966; 1970; 1972.

his monocular. Özbay's translation has another scene from Gulliver's adventures in Lilliput with Gulliver lifting up a horrified Lilliputian in his hand against the background of the capital city. All three translations introduce the author, Jonathan Swift, and their respective translators on their title pages, positioning them equally and granting them an equal amount of visibility. This indicates that the main presentational element used in the marketing of the book was Gulliver's name and appearance, which relied on the familiarity of the Turkish readership with Gulliver as a popular hero.

The retranslations do not feature any biographical information about Jonathan Swift. Neither is there any background information about *Gulliver's Travels* informing the readers that it was initially written as a political satire aimed at an adult readership. Such information was given in all of the retranslations published before the 1950s, not only in Şahinbaş's translation published by the Ministry of Education, but also those published by private companies and even in the "film novel" of *Gulliver's Travels*. Furthermore, all three retranslations are partial; they include either only Part 1 (Swift 1960), or Parts 1 and 2 of the source text (Swift 1953; undated). Moreover, they do not offer any information on the full content of *Gulliver's Travels*. Nor do they attempt to justify their selection of only a part of the source text for their translations.

Like the 1935 and 1941 retranslations, all three translations after 1950 feature illustrations within the main text. These anonymous, hand-drawn illustrations depict various scenes from the novel.

the source text which are systematically omitted by both Erten, Gelen and Özbay. For instance, the passage which narrates a fire at the royal court in Lilliput (Swift 1994: 51-52) is omitted from two of the retranslations and drastically modified in the third. In this passage Gulliver rescues the Queen from a fire which breaks out at the palace. The blaze is too great to be extinguished using the tiny buckets of the Lilliputians, which compels Gulliver to extinguish it by urinating on the palace. This passage must have been considered indecent or at least inappropriate for the children, resulting in its omission (Swift 1953: 45; Swift 1960: 39). Özbay modified the text in such a way that Gulliver extinguished the fire with a mouthful of water taken from a near-by pool (Swift undated: 37). However, it is unclear whether the modification was made by Özbay himself, or the French translator whose translation he used as his source text.

Other evidence proving that some of the omissions were not at all arbitrary came from Arif Gelen who said that he had translated *Gulliver's Travels* in a way that would make the target text appropriate for village children. His main concern was to produce a text which would “address village children” [“köy çocuğuna hitap eden”], therefore he summarized and omitted some parts of the source text and adapted the style and idiom accordingly (Telephone interview with Arif Gelen 21.10.2001).

Apart from the need to present the translations as children's classics, the omissions made by the translators could also have their roots in format requirements. Azize Erten Bergin said that the omissions she made in *Gulliver'in Yolculukları* were due to the pocket format of the books published by that company. According to her account, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, the owner of Varlık Yayınları, told her how much she had to cut from the source text upon which she decided which parts she would omit

in order to meet his demands (Telephone interview with Azize Erten Bergin 18.10.2001).

7.2.6.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements

The three post-1950 retranslations adopted a similar approach to the treatment of proper names. Unlike the previous translations published by private companies and unlike the translations published in the field of popular literature, they retained the original spellings of proper names. This is also valid for Özbay's mediated translation which retains the French spellings of the names instead of giving their Turkish phonetic transcriptions. This may indicate that one of the norms introduced and reinforced by the Translation Bureau in the 1940s was adopted by private publishers and was perpetuated even in the field of translated children's literature. An exception to the adoption of original orthography was the spelling of the name "Gulliver". While Erten used "Gulliver" in its original form, Gelen and Özbay modified it as "Güliiver". This probably shows that Gulliver was already known as "Güliiver" and had established itself as a familiar hero in the eyes of the children before the publication of these retranslations.

It is difficult to pinpoint a similarly consistent approach towards the treatment of foreign cultural elements. The translators preferred to domesticate measures such as "yard" and "feet" into "kilometer" ["kilometre"], "meter" ["metre"] and "centimeter" ["santimetre"] (Swift 1953: 9, 34; Swift 1960: 12, 27; Swift undated: 7, 12). On the other hand, "mile" was translated as "mil" by Erten (Swift 1953: 7) and Gelen (Swift 1960: 5). There was no consistent strategy regarding the translation of foreign drinks. Gelen and Özbay omitted "brandy", while Erten translated it as

“brandi” (Erten 1953: 7). In turn, “Burgundy” (Swift 1994: 15) was translated as “şarap” [“wine”] (Swift 1953: 12; Swift undated: 10) and “Burgonya şarabına benzeyen bir içki” [“a drink that resembles Burgundy wine”] (Swift 1960: 9). The extent to which Gelen’s choice of “Burgundy wine” in the translation suits his general strategy of adapting the language for village children is further debatable.

7.2.6.4 The Decision to Retranslate

Erten, Gelen and Özbay did not introduce new strategies in their translations of *Gulliver’s Travels*. They followed in the path of Talû’s translation of 1935 and produced target texts characterized by heavy omissions which seemed suitable for presenting the book as a children’s classic. They turned away from the strategy propagated and implemented by the Translation Bureau as represented by Şahinbaş’s translation of 1943-1944. This strategy had prioritized the preservation of textual integrity and had brought the source text and its author to the foreground. In contrast, the retranslations discussed in this section disrupted the textual integrity of the source text, which resulted in the reinforcement of the position of *Gulliver’s Travels* as a children’s book. Furthermore, they ignored the context within which the novel was written and overlooked the work’s historical and satirical aspects. This was a tendency that already prevailed in some of the previous retranslations for children, notably in Ercümen Ekrem Talû’s 1935 *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde*. Then why were Erten, Gelen and Özbay commissioned to translate the novel? What do their translations indicate?

It might be easier to state what they do not indicate. First and foremost, they do not indicate a disagreement over translation strategies, since they observed the norms

followed by previous retranslations for children. In that sense, they do not challenge the validity of previous retranslations or appear to “succeed” them in any way. Secondly, they bring nothing new to the Turkish system of translated literature for children and therefore cannot really be considered as acts of planning. Nevertheless, they do indicate a certain resistance against some of the norms propagated by the Translation Bureau and the translators and critics associated with it. They serve to reveal the existence of a separate poetics in the field of children’s literature. Yet why did so many publishing companies decide to publish different translations of the same work after 1935? Arif Gelen has maintained that he chose to translate *Gulliver’s Travels* as one of the editors of Köy ve Eğitim Yayınları, because he found the language of existing translations too old and the plots too complicated for village children (Telephone interview 21.10.2001). However, a comparison of his translation with previous translations, except Şahinbaş’s, reveals that his translation was indeed very similar to those which preceded his.

According to Azize Erten Bergin, who translated *Gulliver’s Travels* and *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, both described and analyzed in this chapter, the answer to the question lies in the canonical status of *Gulliver’s Travels*. She claims that in the 1950s all publishers wanted to have more or less the same translated classics in their list of publications. This was necessary on two accounts: prestige and sales. Publishers gained prestige by bringing out new translations of well-known classics and benefited from the guaranteed sales of these works. Erten Bergin adds: “These classics were as indispensable for publishers as pots and pans are in a kitchen” [“Nasıl her mutfakta tencere, tava bulunuyorsa her yayınevinde de bu klâsiklerden bulunurdu.”] (Telephone interview, 18.10.2001). The interview with Azize Erten Bergin introduced a new angle to the status of the retranslations of *Gulliver’s Travels*

discussed so far. It seems quite plausible that some publishers decided to commission a translation of *Gulliver's Travels* in order to benefit from its present status, rather than to shake or modify this status in any way. In other words, what this case study has so far revealed regarding the phenomenon of retranslation is not the idea of a linear progression, each retranslation surpassing and bettering previous ones, but rather, the idea of preserving, and capitalizing on, the status quo. This is especially valid for the post-1950 translations.

7.2.7 Siting Translations of *Gulliver's Travels*

The analysis of the translations of *Gulliver's Travels* seems to confirm a familiar trend and verify a well-established idea: the translation by the Translation Bureau had markedly different features than the translations carried out by private publishers. As I argued in the above sections, Şahinbaş's translation appears to stand as an example to the various debates on "fidelity" discussed in Chapter 3. His translation conforms to the norm of preserving textual integrity. Furthermore, he apparently strove to reflect the "style" and the "tone" of the source text by preserving Swift's syntax and his sophisticated language use. The peritextual elements of the target text placed the source author and the source text to the foreground and carefully underlined the status of *Gulliver's Travels* as a "classic" work which mainly addressed a well-read adult readership.

Translations published by private companies reveal a different set of norms at work. Their translations are characterized by omissions on various levels and syntactic manipulation. The resulting target texts reduced the novel to its basic narrative elements, foregrounded action and subdued literary style. Furthermore, the

translators of these works were involved in acts of editing in order to shape the resulting product according to their target audience of children. Such omissions are also encountered in translations produced in different cultures in the fields of both popular and classic fiction and children's fiction.

Clem Robyn's examination of the translated detective fiction into French shows how translators produced "action" stories by trimming romance-related aspects and excessive dialogues present in the source text. His study also points at the significance of formal features, especially the size of the format, which resulted in a series of omissions to be made (Robyns 1990: 23-42). John Milton's study of classics translated and published by the Brazilian Book Club also shows that publishers often "eliminated stylistic elements of the original works, paring many works down to bare narratives. Scatological, sexual and religious and other references that might offend were cut. It was also necessary to hew the original down to the standard number of pages" (Milton 2001: 44). The findings of Robyns and Milton are rather similar to the findings about the translations of *Gulliver's Travels* published in Turkey. The translators of *Gulliver's Travels*, except İrfan Şahinbaş, also foregrounded elements related to "action" and omitted excessive dialogues and stylistic features. Furthermore, the format appeared to govern a considerable part of the strategies adopted by the translators. There may be a common poetics of popular translated literature valid across different cultures which gives rise to such similar translatorial behaviour. Needless to mention, more descriptive work is needed to confirm this hypothesis.

The findings of Case Study II so far, confirm my general hypothesis about the presence of two different poetics generated by two different literary and translatorial habituses in early republican Turkey. The Translation Bureau was governed by a

poetics that was in the process of being canonized in the discourse of the intellectuals. On the other hand, some publishers operating in the field of popular and children's literature subscribed to a different poetics that allowed for a more flexible concept of translation. These poetics depended on different translation strategies and addressed different literary habituses. The case of the translations of *Gulliver's Travels* laid bare a sharp divergence between these poetics.

However, we should not generalize these findings to the rest of the translations by the Translation Bureau too readily. Şahinbaş's translation might well have been influenced by his personal concept of translation, as a professor of English literature, rather than the general poetics adopted by the Translation Bureau. The next section consisting of an analysis of translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* will be instrumental in going deeper into the pattern observed in the translations of *Gulliver's Travels*.

7.3 Translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

Alice's Adventures in Wonderland was written by Lutwidge Dodgson (1832-1898), better known as Lewis Carroll who taught mathematics at Oxford. He delighted in logic puzzles and games and wrote thousands of inventive letters to his child-friends. Dodgson was very fond of the three daughters of the dean of Christ Church especially of the second daughter, Alice. He improvised many fairy stories to entertain them; the Alice books, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*, grew out of one of these stories, which Dodgson wrote down at Alice's request. The first of these, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, was published in 1865 under his pen-name, Lewis Carroll.

The novel starts on a summer's afternoon when Alice is sitting with her sister on the riverbank and is very bored. Suddenly she sees a white rabbit running by her which she follows down a hole. This turns out to be the beginning of her adventures in Wonderland where she grows and shrinks at will and meets a gallery of strange creatures: talking rabbits and mice, a giant mushroom, a smoking caterpillar, a Duchess who nurses a pig for a baby and a grinning cat. She visits a mad tea party and a game of croquet between the Duchess and the hot-tempered Queen of Hearts. She befriends a Gryphon who introduces her to an unhappy turtle. At the end of the story she is made to testify at the court where a Knave of Hearts is being accused of stealing the tarts baked by the Duchess. Alice wakes up as she struggles with the pack of cards, realizes that everything was a dream and tells her adventures to her sister. As Alice runs off for tea, her sister thinks about the dream and falls asleep herself, dreaming the same dream as Alice. She also dreams about how her little sister will eventually become a grown woman and how she will always keep the simple heart of her childhood.

Alice's Adventures in Wonderland is full of symbols which are open to interpretation on a number of levels. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that Dodgson did not step outside of his Victorian world and the novel has not been revealed to contain any allusions to the political context of the day. The work is best known for its puns and intricate references to mathematics and logics. Although it was intended for children, it was met with great interest from both children and adults, including Queen Victoria herself (Carroll 1994: 1).

In what follows, I will offer a descriptive analysis of all translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* published in 1932-1960. The titles will also be accompanied by their year of publication, because there are retranslations which

share the same title. The first descriptive study will be carried out on the translation by Kısmet Burian, published by the Ministry of Education in 1946. This will be followed by the analysis of other translations starting with the first translation published in 1932.

7.3.1 *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1946) (*Alice in Wonderland*)

Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde (1946)²⁴ was translated by Kısmet Burian²⁵ on a commission by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education in 1946. It appeared as number 51 in the sub-series of “English Classics” within the larger series of “Translations from World Literature” [“Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeleler”]. Unlike *Gulliver’s Travels*, the translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* was not identified as a priority by the Translation Committee at the National Publishing Congress (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 281-282). It was not selected among the first works to be commissioned for translation at the initial board meeting convened in 1940 (“Haberler” 1940a: 113-114). Neither did the book appear in the second list prepared by the Translation Bureau in 1943 (“Haberler” 1943: 441-444). Apparently, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* was not regarded at the time as an essentially canonical work by the Bureau. In my view, this had some consequences in terms of the selection of the translator, if not the translation strategies followed in *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1946). Kısmet Burian was not an expert on English literature unlike İrfan Şahinbaş. She did not have an

²⁴ The translation was reprinted four times:

Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde, tr. Kısmet Burian (Güvenç), Ankara: MEB, 1965; İstanbul: MEB 1990; 1993; İstanbul: Cumhuriyet 1998.

²⁵ Kısmet Burian was not a professional translator of literature. *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* is her only translation. According to the records of the National Library, she also wrote a book, *The Story of World Ballet*, which was published by Allan Wingate in London in 1963.

academic standing or another profession which was indicated on the title page of the target text. In fact, she did not have any other translations to her credit. Her contact person at the Translation Bureau was Orhan Burian, who was her uncle (Interviews with Vedat Günyol, 30.10.2001). He must have been instrumental in introducing her to the Bureau and obtain a translation assignment for her.

Although *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was not initially regarded as a highly important text for the newly forming literary canon in Turkey, it was included among the series of English classics. When its translation was finally published in 1946, it was presented as a "classic".

7.3.1.1 Peritextual Elements

The main peritextual elements of *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1946) are identical with those of *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*. The cover design, the half-title page and the title page are the same, so I will not offer a detailed description here. There are four prefaces in the book. Three are the standard prefaces printed in *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* by İsmet İnönü and Hasan Âli Yücel, which provide an ideological context for the reception of the work. The publication of these prefaces set *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1946) in the context of works making up the newly forming literary canon in Turkey and link it with the general culture planning project of the single party era under İnönü's presidency. There is a fourth preface published after these which introduces Lewis Carroll and *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* ("Kitaba Başlamadan" 1946: 1-2). The preface is anonymous and could have been written by the translator herself, or a member of the Translation Bureau who acted as the editor of the translation. The preface presents the work as a study in "nonsense"

which encourages the reader to question the routine of daily life. It also maintains that the novel introduces psychoanalytic themes to literature through the subconscious world of dreams it creates. The preface carefully positions *Alice's Adventures* as a children's book which is also enjoyed by adults ("Kitaba Başlamadan" 1946: 2).

Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde (1946) appears as a children's book apart from the front and back covers which were printed on white cardboard bearing the standard design of the books by the Ministry of Education. It has 19 illustrations which are reprints of the original illustrations by Sir John Tenniel that appeared in the first publication of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in 1865. The illustrations and the larger type-set used in the text imply that *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1946) was designed for a young readership.

7.3.1.2 Matricial Norms

There are no omissions in *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1946). Burian has rendered the source text into Turkish as fully as possible and did not leave out any elements in the target text. The verse sections, made up of various poems and song lyrics that are scattered in the source text, were also translated in full (Carroll 1946 17; 29; 47-48; 61-62; 74; 110; 114-117; 120). Burian not only tried to render the content of the poems and lyrics but also observed both rhyme and meter in her verse translations. Thus she translated "Twinkle, twinkle little bat!-How I wonder what you're at!-Up above the world you fly-Like a tea-tray in the sky." (Carroll 1994: 85-86) as "Pırlıl pırlıl yarasal!-Ne iştesin acaba?-Gökyüzünde uçarsın-Tepsilere konarsın." (Carroll 1946: 74).

There are three additions in the target text in the form of footnotes: These are introduced in order to explain a “banyo arabası” [“bathing machine”²⁶] (p. 19), a French phrase (p. 20), and “yalancı kaplumbağa çorbası” [“mock turtle soup”] (p. 99). These footnotes serve to inform the readers about foreign terms or concepts. However, Burian’s use of footnotes is not consistent, because she kept many foreign terms in her translation without explaining their meanings, as I will demonstrate in 7.3.1.4.

Kısmet Burian strove to preserve Carroll’s syntax in many instances and refrained from splitting up his sentences. Below is an example from Chapter 8 where Burian imitated Carroll’s style of connecting shorter sentences, with semicolons:

Target Text:²⁷

Alice için ilk günlük flâmanını kullanmak oldu, hayvanın vücudunu güzelce kolunun altına sıkıştırıp bacaklarını sallandırdı ama tam boynunu doğrultup kafası ile kirpiye vuracağı sırada, kuş başını kaldırıp suratına bakıyordu; hem bakışında öyle bir şaşkınlık vardı ki Alice kendini tutamıyor kahkahayı koparıyordu; kuşun boynunu tekrar düzelterip tam topa vuracağı zaman bu sefer de kirpinin yerinde tortop durmaktan vazgeçip sürüne sürüne uzaklaştığını görüyordu (Carroll 1946: 88).

Source Text:

The chief difficulty Alice found at first was in managing her flamingo: she succeeded in getting its body tucked away, comfortably enough, under her arm, with its legs hanging down, but generally, just as she had got its neck nicely straightened out, and was going to give the hedgehog a blow with its head, it *would* twist itself round and look up in her face, with such a puzzled expressions that she could not help bursting out laughing: and when she had got its head down, and was going to begin again, it was very provoking to find that the hedgehog had unrolled itself, and was in the act of crawling away ... (Carroll 1994: 98)

²⁶ In fact, Burian’s translation is the only one which kept the term. All other translators omitted it.

²⁷ I have not supplied a back-translation of this excerpt taken from *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* since the target text is a close translation of the source.

The sentence from the target text is made up of shorter units which could well stand independently in Turkish. In that sense, the structure appears unnecessarily long and quite unusual in Turkish, especially when we consider that *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1946) was designed as a children's novel. Furthermore, Burian has used the same formal features as those in the source text. For instance, she preserved the twisting, tail-like form of a poem in Chapter 3 (Carroll 1946: 29; Carroll 1994: 37). She also preserved the dividing asterisks within the chapters used by Carroll (Carroll 1946: 10, 50; Carroll 1994: 18, 61).

7.3.1.3 Treatment of Proper Names

Burian retained the original orthography of proper names in the target text. Names of people like Alice (p. 3), Ada (p. 16), Mabel (p. 16), Shakespeare (p. 27) and Lacie (p. 76) were spelled in their original form. This was also valid for names of places in England such as Northumbria (p. 24), Canterbury (p. 24) and Cheshire (p. 59) which would most likely sound foreign to the Turkish readership, adult or child. Kısmet Burian thus conformed to one of the principal translational norms adopted and propagated by the Translation Bureau. As indicated in Section 7.2.1.3, this norm recommended all proper names to be written in their original spelling ("Haberler" 1940: 112).

7.3.1.4 Treatment of Foreign Cultural Elements

Like İrfan Şahinbaş's *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* (1943-1944), *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* does not display a consistent approach towards the translation of foreign

cultural elements. Burian domesticated some measurement units and currencies and replaced “feet” by “metre” [“meter”] (p. 12), “inch” by “santimetre” [“centimeter”] (p. 13) and “shilling” by “lira” (p. 121). Nevertheless, she also preserved some units in their original form; for instance, she translated “feet” as “ayak” [“foot”] (p. 78) which was not a familiar measure for Turkish readers.

Burian replaced the names of certain creatures which would be foreign to the Turkish readership with the names of more common ones. For instance she called a “dodo” (Carroll 1994: 30) “kuğu” [“swan”] (Carroll 1946: 22), and “gryphon” (Carroll 1994: 110) “ejder” [“dragon”] (Carroll 1946: 100). However, it would not be correct to suggest that she used the same domesticating strategy throughout the translation. She retained many foreign terms without translating them. “Lory” (Carroll 1994: 31) was preserved as “Lory” (Carroll 1946: 24) instead of replacing it with the more familiar Turkish term “papağan” [“parrot”]. “Caucus” (Carroll 1994: 31) was also retained (Carroll 1946: 23), “flamingo” (Carroll 1994: 98) was translated as “flâman” (Carroll 1946: 88) and “Quadrille” (Carroll 1994: 117) was translated as “Kadril” (Carroll 1946: 106). There were no footnotes to explain these terms which would sound unfamiliar, especially to the young readership the book clearly aimed at.

7.3.1.5 *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* as a Retranslation

Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde (1946) was the third translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* to appear in Turkish. Therefore it is necessary to question the Bureau’s reasoning underlying the decision to retranslate the work.

The first translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Ahmet Cevat, published in 1932, was a partial translation. The target text contained only the first six chapters of the work. The 1944 translation by Muzaffer Beşli and Naime Halit Yaşaroğlu is also characterized by a number of omissions which will be explored in the next section. Furthermore, this translation, which was the first retranslation, displays a series of shifts which indicate a domesticating tendency on the part of the translators. It may be assumed that Burian's translation challenged the validity of the first two translations, published in 1932 and 1944 respectively, as those which disrupted the textual integrity of the source text. The deficiency of these two translations vis-à-vis the norms propagated by the Translation Bureau could have been the reason underlying Bureau's decision to retranslate *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*.

7.3.2 *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri* (Alice's Adventures)

*Alis'in Sergüzeşleri*²⁸ was translated by Ahmet Cevat and published by Muhit Mecmuası in 1932²⁹. The book, which was the first translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* into Turkish, carried the subtitle "Acayip Şeyler Memleketinde" ["In the Land of Strange Things"]. However, for some reason, only half of the source text was translated and the story ended abruptly at the end of Chapter 6 with the statement "The end of part one" ["Birinci kısmın sonu"] (Carroll 1932: 120).

²⁸ The translation was also published in a serialized form in the monthly magazine *Muhit* between August 1932 and May 1933, in numbers 46-55. The book is dated 1932. It can therefore be assumed that the novel was serialized after its publication in book form.

²⁹ *Muhit Mecmuası* was one of the prolific magazines of the day. It was founded by Ahmet Cevat and published in 1928-1933. It was defined as an "illustrated, monthly family magazine" ["resimli aylık aile mecmuası"] by its editors. The magazine, which had a clear westernist position, was instrumental in elaborating the concept of "Kemalism" in the early 1930s and functioned as a political magazine. *Muhit* allocated space in its pages for a large number of issues related to literature, music, women and child care (Ertan 1997: 17-34). It also had a publishing company which published children's literature.

Ahmet Cevat (Emre) (1876-1961) was a well-known linguist, politician and translator. He served as a member of the Turkish Grand National Assembly in 1935-1939, wrote several grammar books, and translated several Greek classics, including Homer's *Odyssey*³⁰ and Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*³¹. The motive behind his decision to translate *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is not clear. However, on the basis of its paratextual elements which serve to position the book as a "great work" it can be safely claimed that his translation introduced the novel into the Turkish literary polysystem as a canonical work.

7.3.2.1 Paratextual Elements

The front cover of *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri* clearly presents the work as a children's book. The larger part of the cover is occupied by a large illustration showing Alice conversing with the hookah-smoking caterpillar. The illustration is a reprint of one of Tenniel's originals. The title of the book is printed above the illustration, while its subtitle and the names of the author and the translator are printed below it. Carroll's and Ahmet Cevat's names are printed on the right and left lower corners of the cover using the same type-set. The translator's name on the cover of a book was (and still is) quite unusual and provided an exceptional degree of visibility to the translator. Furthermore, Carroll and Ahmet Cevat were not introduced with any attributes, which placed them on equal footing, almost as the co-authors of the book. The same visibility continued on the title page of *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri* where Ahmet Cevat was

³⁰ Homer, *Odüsseia*, tr. Ahmet Cevat Emre, Ankara: TDK, 1941-1942. A critique of this translation by Suat Sinanoğlu, published in *Tercüme*, presents Emre as a poor translator who strove in vain to create the "manner" ["eda"] of the source text. Sinanoğlu criticizes Emre for his archaic usages, his outdated mode of transcription and extreme cases of domestication (Sinanoğlu 1941: 344-353).

introduced as the translator, but with larger fonts than Lewis Carroll. Furthermore, he was introduced as a member of the First Language Committee (Birinci Dil Encümeni)³², which associated him with the an official body and made his status visible as a linguistic expert. It is also important that Ahmet Cevat regarded himself as a “planner” in the field of children’s literature, as formulated in one of his articles in *Muhit*: “The road which will lead to the classical literary education of our children will pass through bumpy and thorny lands; there is no doubt that those who want to be involved in the planning of such education will have to work hard. I, for one, am ready to undertake this hard work” [“Çocuklarımızın edebî klasik terbiyesine açılacak yol pek arızalı, pek dikenli yerlerden geçecektir; pılanını çizmek işleriyle meşgul olmak isteyenlerin fazla yorulacağına şüphe yoktur. Her halde biz yorgunluktan kaçanlardan değiliz.”] (Ahmet Cevat 1932: 3). This statement makes it evident that Ahmet Cevat set out to translate *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* for educational purposes in his self-appointed capacity as a culture planner.

The title page of *Alis’in Sergüzeştləri* included the title of the series within which the book appeared, “Büyük Eserler Kütüphanesi” [“The Library of Great Works”]. This title illustrates that *Alis’in Sergüzeştləri* was positioned as a canonical work. However, the illustrated cover and the large fonts used inside the book present the novel as a children’s book. Furthermore, the illustrations printed within the book, also by Tenniel, clearly associate it with children’s literature. Although the book was presented as a “great work”, there is no preface introducing the work or its author. Nevertheless, a full-page portrait of Lutwidge Dodgson printed after the title page

³¹ Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, tr. Ahmet Cevat Emre, Ankara: MEB, 1945. This translation was commissioned by the Translation Bureau and indicates the prestigious position held by Emre in the field of literature.

³² The Language Committee was set up in May 1928 by the Council of Ministers in order to plan a possible transition into the Latin alphabet. Its task was “to think about the manner and feasibility of

carefully emphasizes the authorial provenance of the work. The portrait is accompanied by a caption: “Eserin Muharriri *Lewis Carroll* (Levis Karol) (1832-1898)” [“The author of the work *Lewis Carroll* (Levis Karol) (1832-1898)”] (Carroll 1932: 3), with the author’s name in Turkish phonetic spelling in parenthesis.

An article accompanying the first episode of *Alis’in Sergüzeşleri* serialized in *Muhit*³³, announces that the work was published on the occasion of the 100th birthday of Lewis Carroll. The article introduces *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* as a “classic of English literature”. It further states that the novel was published into various European languages and that it achieved extraordinary popularity [“harikulâde bir rağbet kazandı”] (Seniha Sami 1932: 54). The fact that the serialized form of *Alis’in Sergüzeşleri* was published in a magazine of literary and political content mainly addressing adults, indicates that Ahmet Cevat also considered the work appropriate for an adult readership.

7.3.2.2 Matricial Norms

Alis’in Sergüzeşleri is an incomplete translation of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. As mentioned above, it includes only the first six chapters out of a total of twelve. The book ends with the statement “The end of part one” [“Birinci kısmın sonu”] (Carroll 1932: 120) which creates the expectation that it will be followed by the second part. However, the second part was never translated and/or published. There is no information in the book about why the novel was not published in full. This might have been due to some format requirements regarding the size of the book introduced by the publishers. As far as the published six chapters are

applying the Latin letters to our language” (Lewis 1999: 33). Ahmet Cevat’s responsibility in the Committee was to write the grammar of Turkish (Ertan 1997: 22).

concerned, the translation cannot be considered as complete either, for there are several omissions throughout the target text. These omissions are arbitrary and do not reveal a general pattern. In the example below Ahmet Cevat omitted a dialogue based on a pun:

Target Text:

Düşes kısık bir sesle:

“Herkes yalnız kendi işine baksaydı, dünya daha çabuk dönerdi.”

Alis bu dünyanın dönmesi lafından istifade ederek malûmat satmaya koyuldu:

“Bu da faydalı bir şey olmazdı. Düşününüz bir kere, gündüzle gece ne hale girerdi! Malûm ya, dünya yirmidört saatte mihveri etrafında...”

Düşes sözünü kesti:

“Kafa sıkma, canım! Benim rakamlarla başım hoş değil!” (Carroll 1946: 106)

[Target Text in Back-translation:

The Duchess said in a low voice:

“The world would go round much faster if everyone minded their own business.”

Alice took advantage of the statement about the world turning round and started to show off her knowledge:

“Which would not be a good thing. Just imagine what the day and the night would become like. You know the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis...”

The Duchess interrupted:

“Don’t bore me! I have never liked numbers!” (Carroll 1946: 106)]

Source Text:

‘If everybody minded their own business,’ the Duchess said in hoarse growl, ‘the world would go round a deal faster than it does.’

‘Which would *not* be an advantage,’ said Alice, who felt very glad to get an opportunity of showing off a little of her knowledge. ‘Just think of what work it would make with the day and night! You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis-’

‘Talking of axes,’ said the Duchess, ‘chop off her head!’

Alice glanced rather anxiously at the cook, to see if she meant to take the hint, but the cook was busily stirring the soup, and seemed not to be listening, so she went on again: ‘Twenty-four hours, I *think*; or is it twelve? I-’

‘Oh, don’t bother *me*,’ said the Duchess; ‘I never could abide figures!’ (Carroll 1994: 71-72).

³³ The texts of the book and the serialized form of *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri* are identical.

In the above passage, Ahmet Cevat omitted Carroll's pun which was based on the homonyms "axis" and "axes". His omission of the passage was clearly due to his reluctance or inability to create an equivalent pun in Turkish. However, Ahmet Cevat did not systematically omit all puns based on homonyms. For instance, he successfully translated a pun involving the couple "tail" and "tale", where he opted for a paraphrasing strategy (Carroll 1994: 36; Carroll 1932: 49). Most of the omissions in *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri* include individual sentences (Carroll 1932: 23, 26) or words within sentences (Carroll 1932: 33, 42, 47) rather than long passages. An exception is the passage above and part of a poem (Carroll 1932: 30). The omissions do not appear to be systematic; it is unlikely that Ahmet Cevat had a consistent strategy or a uniform motive when he decided on the omissions to be made.

7.3.2.3 Treatment of Proper Names

Ahmet Cevat did not have a consistent strategy for the treatment of proper names in *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri*. In some instances he adopted Turkish phonetic transcriptions, as exemplified by "Alis" for "Alice" and "Şekispir" (Carroll 1932: 46) for "Shakespeare" (Carroll 1932: 34). In other instances, he retained the original English spelling in the target as in "Cheshire" (Carroll 1932: 105; Carroll 1994: 70), "Mary Ann" (Carroll 1932: 56; Carroll 1994: 40), and Northumbria (Carroll 1932: 42; Carroll 1994: 32). But, "William the Conqueror" (Carroll 1994: 28) was translated as "Fatih Giyom" ("Guillaume the Conqueror") (Carroll 1932: 35), using French phonetics. There is no other French influence in the treatment of proper names in the target text. Therefore, it may be assumed that Ahmet Cevat used the better-known

name of William the Conquerer for the Turkish audience, which had clearly established itself through French texts.

7.3.2.4 Treatment of Foreign Cultural Elements

Ahmet Cevat domesticated a number of foreign concepts and objects for the Turkish audience. For instance, “Kayseri seccadesi” [“Kayseri rug”] (Carroll 1932: 225) replaced “hearthrug” (Carroll 1994: 22), “akide şekeri” [a special type of Turkish candy] (Carroll 1932: 46) replaced “comfit” (Carroll 1994: 34) and “altın lira” [“golden liras”] (Carroll 1932: 38) replaced “pound” (Carroll 1994: 30). Furthermore, Ahmet Cevat domesticated some measuring units like “feet” (“arşın” p. 31), and “inch” (“parmak” p. 87). However, it would not be right to suggest that he had an overall domesticating strategy for foreign cultural elements. Ahmet Cevat retained a number of foreign concepts in their English forms such as “Caucus”, “croquet” and “terrier”. While “Caucus” (Carroll 1994: 33) became “Kaukus” (Carroll 1932: 44) and “croquet” (Carroll 1994: 66) became “kroket” (Carroll 1932: 99), “terrier” was preserved in its original spelling (Carroll 1932: 37; Carroll 1994: 30). Furthermore, Ahmet Cevat kept a sentence originally written in French in the source text, without translating it: “Où est ma chatte?” (Carroll 1932: 36; Carroll 1994: 28). There was no footnote to explain this phrase. In fact, *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri* had only one footnote which served to explain one of the puns Ahmet Cevat translated (Carroll 1932: 10). Other foreign elements used in the target text remained unexplained.

Ahmet Cevat, who was also the publisher of *Alis'in Sergüzeşleri*, wished to position it as a canonical work for children. This is evident from his decision to

translate the book himself and from his inclusion of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in the series of "great works". The article published in *Muhit* also foregrounded the canonical status of the novel. Furthermore, the visibility granted to both the author and the translator and the careful emphasis on the status of the book as a translation were features which, as discussed in Chapter 6, were largely absent from the field of translated popular literature at the time. Nevertheless, the omissions made by Ahmet Cevat in the translation, including the six missing chapters of the book, damaged the textual integrity of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and marked the dividing line between *Alis'in Sergüzeştləri* and Burian's *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* published in 1946. This explains the reason behind the decision of the Translation Bureau to commission a retranslation of the work. However, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* had been retranslated once more, before it was published by the Ministry of Education. Yet, this first retranslation is also characterized by a number of omissions and cases of extreme domestication which brought it out of line with the norms upheld by the Translation Bureau.

7.3.3 *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1944) (Alice in Wonderland)

The first retranslation, *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1944) was published by Ahmet Halit Kitabevi³⁴. The title page identified its translator as Muzaffer Beşli³⁵. However, the preface informs the readers that the book was a joint translation and that the co-translator was Naime Halit Yaşaroğlu³⁶.

³⁴ Ahmet Halit Kitabevi was set up in 1928. It published Turkish and translated fiction in the fields of both canonical and popular literature as well as text books and informative books until 1966.

³⁵ According to the records of the National Library, Muzaffer Beşli's only translation is *Alis Harikalar Diyarında*.

³⁶ Naime Halit Yaşaroğlu translated various novels, including children's literature, from both English and French throughout the 1930s-1950s. She also wrote a number of textbooks for schoolchildren.

7.3.3.1 Peritextual Elements

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1944) was published as number seven within Ahmet Halit's "Children's Books Series" ["Çocuk Kitapları Serisi"] which continued until the early 1960s and featured over thirty books covering both translated and indigenous fiction for children.

The front cover of *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* which carries a large illustration, positions the novel as a children's book at first sight. The illustration shows Alice with some of the animals she met while in Wonderland. The preface informs the readers that the illustration, based on the cover of the French translation, was done by Muzaffer Beşli. Other illustrations published inside the novel are reprints of Tenniel's original pictures. The front cover includes the title of the book and the name of the publisher. The author's and the translator's names only appear on the title page. Beşli is presented as the "translator" ["tercüme eden"] of the work. The title page also includes the name of the series within which *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1944) was published, the title of the work, the name of the publisher and the year of publication. The back cover of the book is blank, while there is an advertising for two books published by Ahmet Halit on the last page of the book (Carroll 1944: 119). These are *Su Bebekleri* (The Water Babies) and *Fareli Köyün Kavalcısı* (The Piper of the Mice-Driven Village – translation of *The Pied Piper of Hamelin*), both translated by Naime Halit Yaşaroğlu and presented as "children's novel" ["çocuk romanı"].

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1944) features two prefaces. The first one is titled "How Was This Book Written?" ["Bu kitap nasıl meydana geldi!"] and is an extract from a work about less known aspects of famous personalities, *Meşhur Adamların*

Meçhul Tarafları. It offers information about Dodgson and his work (“Bu Kitap Nasıl Meydana Geldi” 1944: 3-4) and explains why he chose to write under a pseudonym. According to the preface, Dodgson was reluctant to have *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* published because “he was a professor of mathematics at Oxford University. What would everybody say when they found out he spent his time with such absurdities? ... There was no way this work could be published, because if it were, it would defame the master” [“Kendisi bir kere Oksford Üniversitesinde matematik Profesörüydü. Onun böyle saçmasapan şeylerle meşgul olmasına herkes ne derdi? ... O halde bu eserin neşrine imkân yoktu. Çünkü eser basılırsa üstadın şerefi iki paralık olurdu.”] (“Bu Kitap Nasıl Meydana Geldi” 1944: 4). However, the preface also adds that when the book was published it became an instant success and that “all English speakers read the book with great pleasure and bragged about the beauty of the work” [“İngilizce konuşan insanların hepsi, eseri seve seve okudular ve bu eserin güzelliğiyle böbürlendiler.”] (“Bu Kitap Nasıl Meydana Geldi” 1944: 4). Thus, the preface also states that *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* was translated into fourteen languages and that it became the most popular children’s book in the world. This first preface serves to underline the importance of the book for the English language and international children’s literature.

The second preface titled “Presenting the Work” [“Eseri Sunarken...”] is anonymous, although, it appears to have been written by the publishers. The preface explains that the reason for the decision to publish *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* was the incompleteness of the first translation (1932) and offers valuable hints about the strategies followed in the present translation (“Eseri Sunarken” 1944: 5). The preface explains how Muzaffer Beşli, who had passed away a few years before, had

translated the work from French. It also states that when the publishers decided to bring out the translation they compared it with the English source text and realized that the French translation diverged from the English original [“aslına uymadığını gördük”] and contained extensive omissions. Thus a revised version was commissioned to Naime Halit Yaşaroğlu who translated the omitted parts and checked and corrected Beşli’s translation in order to create a text that was “as close as possible to the original” [“aslına en yakın şekline getirildi”] (“Eseri Sunarken” 1944: 5). Thus, the second preface shows that Ahmet Halit Kitabevi had adopted two of the translational norms propagated by the Translation Bureau in the early 1940s, i.e. directness of translation and fullness. The publishing house revised a mediated translation done from French, clearly wishing to restore the fullness of the translation. Nevertheless, the preface informs the readers that the new translation too had some omissions due to the impossibility of translating some of the English puns into Turkish [“Yalnız İngilizce bazı kelime oyunlarını dilimize uymadıkları için kısastik.”] (“Eseri Sunarken” 1944: 5). The description below will illustrate that the omissions made by the translators were not limited to puns. I would suggest that the publishers and their translators conformed to the norms introduced by the Bureau partly at a discursive level.

7.3.3.2 Matricial Norms

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1944) is marked by a series of omissions and additions. The additions were introduced mainly in the form of footnotes. There are six footnotes in the translation which serve to explain unfamiliar words or concepts to the young readership such as “Fatih William” [“William the Conqueror”],

“kuğukuşu” [“dodo”], “kroke” [“croquet”] or “kış uykusu” [“hibernation”] (Carroll 1944: 7, 16, 21, 24, 51, 75, 85, 102). The omissions are much more frequent and diverse. As the second preface indicated, a number of puns were omitted from the target text. For instance, the whole conversation between the Duchess and Alice, cited in Section 7.3.2.2, including the pun based on the homonyms “axis” and “axes” was omitted (Carroll 1944: 56; Carroll 1994: 71-72). Likewise, several passages where Carroll related the conversation between Alice, Gryphon and Mock Turtle which is loaded with puns, are omitted from Beşli and Yaşaroğlu’s translation (Carroll 1944: 88-89; Carroll 1994: 112-116). However, the omissions are much more widespread. Some verses of poems or lyrics were also omitted (Carroll 1944: 93; Carroll 1994: 119-120). The translators also left out a series of passages which relate the details of Alice’s stay in Wonderland and do not have a crucial role for the progression of the general plot. For instance, Alice’s descent through the rabbit hole was shortened by two paragraphs (Carroll 1944: 8; Carroll 1994: 14). The translators omitted Alice’s observations about the cupboards decorating the walls and her comments on the possibility of falling through the earth and landing on the other side. Likewise, a major part of the conversation Alice had at the March Hare’s house with the Hatter, the Hare and the Dormouse is omitted from the target text (Carroll 1944: 67; Carroll 1994: 87-88).

7.3.3.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements

There is no uniform strategy regarding the treatment of proper names in *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1944). Both Turkish phonetic transcriptions and original English spelling are used. “Alice” was replaced by “Alis” while “Kanterbury”

(Carroll 1944: 21) replaced “Canterbury” (Carroll 1994: 32) and “Mari An” (Carroll 1944: 28) replaced “Mary Ann” (Carroll 1994: 40). On the other hand, “William”, “Northumbria” and “Mercia” were retained the same (Carroll 1994: 32; Carroll 1944: 20).

The same inconsistent approach is valid for the treatment of foreign cultural elements. Beşli and Yaşaroğlu preserved “gryphon” (Carroll 1994: 110) as “grayfon” (Carroll 1944: 85) and “quadrille” (Carroll 1994: 117) as “kadril” (Carroll 1944: 90). These terms were not explained inside the text or in a footnote. In the meantime, “croquet” (Carroll 1994: 66) was translated as “kroke” (Carroll 1944: 51), and “Mock” (Carroll 1994: 110) as “Mok” (Carroll 1944: 85). Both of these terms were explained with footnotes. Along with this foreignising strategy, extreme cases of domestication can also be observed: Alice’s cat “Dinah” (Carroll 1994: 38) became “Sarman” (a name given to ginger cats in Turkey) (Carroll 1944: 27), “Cheshire Cat” (Carroll 1994: 70) was translated as “Van kedisi” (a cat breed endemic to Van in Turkey) (Carroll 1944: 55) and “comfit” (Carroll 1994: 34) was translated as “badem şekeri” (a Turkish sweet consisting of candy coated almonds) (Carroll 1944: 23).

7.3.4 *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1953) (Alice in Wonderland)

Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde (1953)³⁷ was translated by Azize Erten and published by Varlık Yayınevi.³⁸ The book was published as number four in Varlık’s series of children’s classics, following their *Gulliver’in Yolculukları*, also translated by Azize Erten. *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1953), directly translated from English, was reprinted twice.

³⁷ The translation was reprinted twice in 1956 and 1961 by Varlık Yayınları.

³⁸ For information on Varlık Yayınları and Azize Erten see 7.2.6.

7.3.4.1 Peritextual Elements

Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde (1953) had the same peritextual features as *Gulliver'in Yolculukları*, described and analyzed in 7.2.6. The front cover features a portrait of Alice drawn by Güngör Kabakçioğlu, the title of the book and the name of the publisher. The title page features the name of the series, "Children's Classics" ["Çocuk Klâsikleri"], the title of the work, the names of the author and the translator, and the name of the publisher. The author's and the translator's names are printed in the same type-set, providing them with an equal amount of visibility. The book has a number of illustrations, all by Kabakçioğlu.

Like *Gulliver'in Yolculukları*, *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* has a promotional statement on its back cover which foregrounds the status of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* as a children's classic and also emphasizes the adventure-related features of the book:

What happened to Alice in Wonderland is a story that has fascinated children all over the world. Have children ever been able to read these incredible dream-like without holding their breath?

We are now presenting a new translation of this wonderful story by Lewis Carroll to our young readers. We would like to remind you once more that only world-famous popular, exciting and educational books are included in this series and that junk works will never appear among Children's Classics (Carroll 1953).

[Alis'in harikalar ülkesinde başına gelenler, dünyanın bütün çocuklarını büyülemiş bir hikâyedir. Rüya gibi birbirini kovalayan bir sürü olmayacak macerayı okurken hangi çocuk nefesini kesecek kadar meraklandığını duymamıştır?

Lewis Carroll'un bu nefis hikâyesinin yeni bir tercümesini küçük okuyucularımıza sunarken bu seride yalnız bütün dünyaca tanınmış ve sevilmiş, hem meraklı hem de öğretici kitapların yer aldığını, abur cubur eserlerin Çocuk Klâsikleri arasına karıştırılmayacağını bir kere daha hatırlatınız (Carroll 1953).]

The above statement firmly establishes the status of *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* as an international children's classic. It further implies that the book is both "exciting and educational". Although it introduces the book as a new translation, it does not specify any reasons underlying Varlık's decision to commission a retranslation. I will explore whether Erten challenged the validity of the three previous translations through her retranslation and introduced an innovatory strategy.

There is no information in the book about Lewis Carrol or how *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was written and published. Unlike the 1944 and 1946 retranslations, the publishers or translator of *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1953) did not set out to describe the background against which the work was written. On the basis of the statement on the back cover of the book it can be argued that the publishers intended to guide the reception of the novel simply as a children's classic, rather than a masterpiece of subversive logic written in witty English. This was probably due to the poetics governing canonical children's literature at the time. Reading material for children was expected to be both entertaining *and* edifying. The Committee for Youth and Children's Literature ["Gençlik ve Çocuk Edebiyatı Encümeni"] which convened during the First Publishing Congress resolved that children's literature "had to be both instructive and entertaining and to stimulate the will to learn" ["haz vererek tanıtıcı, öğrenme isteğini arttırıcı"] (*Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi* 1939: 81). The claim to "educate while entertaining" was a crucial aspect of the discourse formed in the field of children's literature, as demonstrated by retranslations of *Gulliver's Travels* discussed in the previous section. In my view, this discourse was part and parcel of the poetics formed in the field of translated canonical literature

which regarded literary works as means of socio-cultural development rather than a means of entertainment.

7.3.4.2 Matricial Norms

There are no omissions or additions in *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1953). Azize Erten produced a full translation and without tampering with the textual integrity of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. In that sense, it can be argued that she used a similar translation strategy to that adopted by Kısmet Burian in the 1946 retranslation. Furthermore, like Burian, Erten tried to recreate Carroll's syntax in Turkish, which resulted in the connection of independent sentences with the help of semicolons.

Azize Erten also translated the poems and lyrics in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* without any omissions. She tried to render the verse parts in full, preserving both the theme and the formal features of the poems. Consider the below example:

Target Text:³⁹

Nasıl da küçük timsah
Temizler kuyruğunu,
O altın pullarıyla
Çağlatır Nil suyunu...

Ne keyifli sırtıp
Pençelerini gerer.
Açar güler ağzını
Balıklara buyrun der! (Carroll 1953:
18)

Source Text :

How doth the little crocodile
Improve his shining tail,
And pour the waters of the Nile
On every golden scale!

How cheerfully he seems to grin,
How neatly spread his claws,
And welcome little fishes in
With gently smiling jaws! (Carroll 1994:
25)

³⁹ I have not supplied a back-translation for this excerpt since the target text is a close translation of its source.

In the above example Erten not only rendered the subject matter of the poem, but also tried to create an equivalent poetic effect in Turkish by using meter and rhyme.

7.3.4.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements

Azize Erten preserved the original spelling in proper names throughout the translation. This was also her practice in *Gulliver'in Yolculuklar*, a point which illustrates that Varlık Yayınları, as a company mainly involved in the translation of classics and contemporary canonical literature, had adopted another one of the norms propagated in the field of canonical literature.

The same consistency was not observed in the treatment of foreign cultural elements. Erten domesticated measuring units, translating “feet” (Carroll 1994: 22) as “metre” (Carroll 1953: 15) and “inch” (Carroll 1994: 22) as “santim” (Carroll 1953: 15). She also domesticated a number of foreign concepts and objects, such as “pound” (Carroll 1994: 39) which she translated as “altın lira” [“golden lira”] (Carroll 1953: 22), and “brandy” (Carroll 1994: 47) which she translated as “lokman ruhu” [“ether”] (Carroll 1944: 40). Furthermore “flamingo” (Carroll 1994: 98) was replaced by “telli turna” [“demoiselle crane”] (Carroll 1953: 87) and “gryphon” (Carroll 1994: 110) was replaced by “ejderha” (Carroll 1994: 99). On the other hand, she preserved “caucus” in its original form (Carroll 1994: 31; Carroll 1953: 24), “lory” and “dodo” (Carroll 1994: 30) as “lori” and “dodo” (Carroll 1953: 23) and “terrier” (Carroll 1994: 30) as “teriye” (Carroll 1953: 22). This shifting position between domestication and foreignization was also common to Burian’s translation.

As a retranslation *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1953) challenged some of the previous translations by adopting a different approach towards the issue of textual integrity. Azize Erten produced a full and direct translation which also followed the spelling rules recommended by the Translation Bureau. In that sense, it was different from the 1932 and 1944 translations. However, Azize Erten appears to have observed the same norms as Kismet Burian in her translation and imitated the strategies Burian used. If she did not oppose any of the strategies employed by Burian and adopted her norms fully, what was the reason which triggered Erten's retranslation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. The answer came from the translator herself, as mentioned in Section 7.2.6. Varlık Yayınevi must have aimed at achieving some prestige through publishing a new translation of the novel whose canonical status had also been endorsed by the Translation Bureau. There could also be commercial reasons underlying the retranslation. The publishing house would clearly get its share of profit from the public demand for the book and guarantee its sales.

Erten's translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* also offers interesting insight into the norms governing translations of canonical children's literature published by private companies. As illustrated in Section 7.2.6, Erten's translation of *Gulliver's Travels*, which had also appeared in 1953, was marked by extensive omissions. Erten personally admitted that she had to omit several passages from the source text mainly due to format requirements (Telephone interview with Azize Erten Bergin 18.10.2001). The series of "Children's Classics" was published in the pocket format which introduced some constraints in terms of the length of the books to be included in this series. *Gulliver's Travels*, even when the first two chapters were published, was too long to be included in the series in full. On the other hand, the fact that *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was shorter, which might have

enabled a complete translation to be published.⁴⁰ However, in my view, the decisive factor in determining the translation strategies used in both books was the fact that *Gulliver's Travels* was not a children's book. It included a range of ideas and events which apparently Azize Erten and/or Yaşar Nabi Nayır, the publisher, did not find suitable for children. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was originally written for children and included no references that could be considered shocking or immoral for children, a fact which removed all barriers before its translation in full.

7.3.5 *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1956) (Alice in Wonderland)

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1956)⁴¹ was translated by Nurettin Ardiç⁴² and published by Rafet Zaimler Yayınevi⁴³ within its "Series of Selected Children's Novels from World Literature" ["Dünya Edebiyatından Seçme Çocuk Romanları Serisi"]. The title page indicates that the novel was translated from French.

7.3.5.1 Peritextual Elements

Alis Harikalar Diyarında (1956) has an illustrated front cover showing Alice with the various characters in the story. The cover also includes the title of the book, the name of the publisher and the name of the translator. The author is not indicated on

⁴⁰ *Gulliver'in Yolculukları* was 128 pages long, while the first two chapters of *Gulliver's Travels*, in its 1994 Penguin edition, are 161 pages. *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde* (1953) is 136 pages long, while *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, in its 1994 Penguin edition, is 149 pages.

⁴¹ The book was reprinted by Rafet Zaimler in 1965.

⁴² Nurettin Ardiç also translated *Cadı Kadının Kızı* (The Witch's Daughter) published by Rafet Zaimler in 1956. He is also the author of four books on the history and politics of Southeastern Turkey, published between 1937 and 1966.

⁴³ Rafet Zaimler was set up in 1947 and published translated and indigenous fiction with special focus on children's literature until 1966. Between 1966 and 1970, it published foreign language teaching books.

the cover, which grants an unusual amount of visibility to the translator. The author's name is printed on the title page, which renders the author more visible than the translator, both in terms of its position on top of the page and its larger type-set. The title page identifies Nurettin Ardıç as "translator from French" ("Fransızcadan Çeviren"). This may be taken as a form of resistance to one of the major norms propagated by the Translation Bureau concerning the directness of translations. Nevertheless, it can also be argued that the publishers attached importance to the source text used in the translation and felt it was ethical to specify that the novel was not a direct translation.

The back cover of *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1956) included an advertisement for other books published within the same series. The list consisting of 26 works included such translated children's classics as *Pollyanna*, *Peter Pan*, *Little Women* and *Little Men* and Turkish children's books such as *Çalışkan Çocuklar* (Industrious Children), *Pamuk Sultan* and *Nasrettin Hoca*.

There were large anonymous illustrations printed inside the book, some of which illustrations occupied two full pages.

The peritextual features of *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1953) serves to position the work as a "selected children's novel". However, there is no information in the book about the author or the importance of the book for English and international children's literature.

7.3.5.2 Matricial Norms

Nurettin Ardıç did not make systematic omissions in the translation. However, since *Alice Harikalar Diyarında* (1956) is a mediated translation, it is not clear whether the

omissions and the additions were made by Ardiç himself or the intermediary French translator.

The target text appears to be a nearly full translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. This is the impression gained after a close reading of the target text which reveals that Ardiç translated many puns and even the verse parts in the source text in full. However a comparison of the target and source texts helps identify two larger omissions in the Turkish target text, each consisting of several sentences (Carroll 1956: 20, 41). The first omission consists of an allusion to Latin expressed by Alice who is trying to think of the right way to address a mouse (Carroll 1956: 20; Carroll 1994: 28). The second omission consists of a paragraph where Alice is running an errand for the White Rabbit and imagines how strange it would be to take orders from her cat Dinah (Carroll 1956: 34; Carroll 1994: 41). There does not seem to be an apparent reason for these omissions. The second omission contains no puns or untranslatable references, whereas the first one includes a reference to Latin, a language which would be utterly foreign to the Turkish readership. On the other hand, all of Carroll's puns were translated into Turkish, mainly in the form of paraphrases. Rather than omitting those puns, Ardiç made additions to the target text in order to be able to explain them. The puns based on the homonyms "tale/tail" (Carroll 1994: 37) and "axis/axes" (Carroll 1994: 71) were translated and explained with footnotes (Carroll 1956: 28, 58). Ardiç also translated the pun based on the word "tortoise" by replacing it with "Tiran" ["tyrant"] and modifying the joke behind the pun (Carroll 1956: 99; Carroll 1994: 113). Furthermore, the pun based on the characters March Hare and Hatter was translated with a small introductory note (Carroll 1956: 65; Carroll 1994: 80). Below is Ardiç's translation of the "axis/axes" pun:

Target Text:

Alis bilgisini göstermek için fırsat bulduğuna memnun:

“Bunun hiçbir faydası olamaz! dedi, gece-gündüz bambaşka türlü meydana gelir. Bilirsiniz ki dünya kendi mihveri etrafında yirmi dört saatte döner.”

Düşes: “Baltadan bahsediyor, (1) dedi, kafası kesilsin!”

(1) İngilizce balta kelimesile mihver kelimelerinin söylenişleri ve manaları birbirine karıştırılıyor (Carroll 1956: 58).

[Target Text in Back-translation:

Alice was happy to get an opportunity of showing off her knowledge:

“This would be no use! she said, the night and the day would be formed in a completely different way. You know that the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis.”

The Duccess said: “She is talking about axes, (1), chop off her head!”

(1) The English words “axe” and “axis” are confused with each other in terms of their meanings and pronunciation (Carroll 1956: 58).]

Source Text:

‘Which would *not* be an advantage,’ said Alice, who felt very glad to get an opportunity of showing off a little of her knowledge. ‘Just think of what work it would make with the day and night! You see the earth takes twenty-four hours to turn round on its axis-’

‘Talking of axes,’ said the Duchess, ‘chop off her head!’ (Carroll 1994: 71).

The additions indicate that the translator showed a general tendency to render Carroll’s text as fully as possible into Turkish. Ardiç’s decision to paraphrase the puns in a way which largely interfered with the fluency of the target text points at his wish to translate the content of the novel fully into Turkish, which he did at the expense of Carroll’s witty style.

7.3.5.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements

Nurettin Ardiç has not followed a uniform strategy in his treatment of proper names. He used Turkish spelling for Alice as “Alis” and “Shakespeare” (Carroll 1994: 34) as “Şekspir” (Carroll 1956: 27). The influence of French is visible in his treatment of some of the names: like Ahmet Cevat, Ardiç translated “William the Conqueror” (Carroll 1994: 28) as “Fatih Giyom” (“Guillaume the Conqueror”) (Carroll 1956: 20), transcribing the French pronunciation. Likewise, “Mary Ann” (Carroll 1994: 40) was spelled as “Marie-Ann” (Carroll 1956: 32), “earl of Mercia” (Carroll 1994: 32) became “Comte de Mercie” (Carroll 1956: 24). On the other hand, Ardiç preserved “Bill” (Carroll 1956: 33; Carroll 1994: 40) and “Dinah” (Carroll 1956: 5; Carroll 1994: 14) in their original spelling.

Ardiç domesticated measuring units such as mile, inch and feet and translated them respectively as “kilometre” (p. 4), “santim” [“centimeter”] (p. 7) and “metre” (p. 13). He also domesticated the names of animals which would be unfamiliar to the Turkish readership and replaced them with the names of better known animals. Thus “pelikan” and “karatavuk” (Carroll 1956: 22) replaced “dodo” and “lory” (Carroll 1994: 31), “balıkçıl kuşu” [“heron”] (Carroll 1956: 86) replaced “flamingo” (Carroll 1994: 98), and “akbaba” [“vulture”] (Carroll 1956: 96) replaced “gryphon” (Carroll 1956: 110). Furthermore “caucus” (Carroll 1994: 31), which had been preserved by some of the previous translations, was paraphrased as “halka halinde koşu” [“race in a ring”] (Carroll 1956: 23) and “quadrille” was simply translated as “dans” [“dance”] (Carroll 1956: 103). Nevertheless, a number of foreign terms were preserved in the target text such as “brandy” (Carroll 1956: 39; Carroll 1994: 47), which was explained with a footnote, and “croquet” (Carroll 1956: 54; Carroll 1994: 66).

The above description of Ardiç's translation reveals that he did not use a translation strategy which was radically different than other translators before him. It cannot be suggested that he attempted to challenge the previous translations on any grounds. The decision of the publishers to commission a retranslation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* appears to originate from a desire to include this famous children's classic within their series of children's literature and thus enjoy the prestige and commercial success it was likely to bring.

7.3.6 *Alice Harikalar Diyarında* (1960) (Alice in Wonderland)

Alice Harikalar Diyarında (1960)⁴⁴ was translated by Leylâ Soydaş and Bilge Atasagun⁴⁵ and published by İyigün Yayınları⁴⁶ in 1960. It is not clear whether they worked on the whole translation together or alternatively, divided the book into two. There is no information in the book about the source language used for the translation.

7.3.6.1 Peritextual Elements

Alice Harikalar Diyarında (1960) had the same front cover design as the previous translations except Burian's. The cover featured a large illustration showing Alice with her cat Dinah. The title of the novel is printed at the top of the cover and the names of the translators and the author are printed on the title page. The title page also features the title of the book which offers two alternative spellings of Alice:

⁴⁴ This translation was reprinted three times by İyigün Yayınları in 1964, 1965 and 1971.

⁴⁵ According to the National Library records, *Alice Harikalar Diyarında* is the only translation produced by both Soydaş and Atasagun.

⁴⁶ For information on İyigün Yayınları see Section 7.2.6.

“Alice” followed by its Turkish phonetic transcription “Alis” in brackets. In the text itself “Alis” is used.

The back cover features an advertisement for other books published by İyigün. There were fourteen advertised in a list which included children’s books such as *Robinson Crusoe*, *Tom Sawyer*, and *Heidi*. The last page of the book includes an advertisement for *Güliverin Maceraları*, which was analyzed in 7.2.6.

The peritextual elements of the book do not attempt to position *Alice Harikalar Diyarında* (1960) as a children’s classic. There is no series’ title, preface or promotional statement which indicates any effort on the part of the publishers to present the novel as a canonical work for children. It may be assumed that the five translations which had preceded this translation had already established the status of *Alice* as a well-known children’s classic and that the publishers felt no need to remind their target audience.

7.3.6.2 Matricial Norms

Soydaş and Atasagun omitted large parts of the source text during their translation. This is also evident from the formal features of the book: while *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* is 149 pages, *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1960) consists of 90 pages printed in large font. The target text is marked by various omissions which include poems and lyrics (Carroll 1960: 14, 24, 36, 45, 77) and some of the puns in the source text. For instance the puns based on the homonyms “axis/axes” (Carroll 1960: 45; Carroll 1994: 71) and “tortoise/taught us” (Carroll 1960: 71; Carroll 1994: 113) were omitted. Furthermore, the translators summarized certain parts of the source

text and shortened the work considerably. The passage below provides an example of their summarizing strategy:

Target Text:

Alis:

-Evdekiler beni ne cesur bulacaklar. Ama ben onlara evin tepesinden bile düşsem söylemem diye düşündü (Carroll 1960: 6).

[Target Text in Back-translation into English:

Alice thought:

-How brave they will all think me at home. I wouldn't tell them even if I fell off the top of the house (Carroll 1960: 6).]

Source Text:

'Well!', thought Alice to herself, 'after such a fall as this, I shall think nothing of tumbling down stairs! How brave they'll all think me at home! Why, I wouldn't say anything about it, even if I fell off the top of the house!' (Which was very likely true.) (Carroll 1994: 13)

The reasons for these omissions are not easy to identify. One possible reason is format requirements. İyigün's *Güliverin Maceraları* was 101 pages long, which points at a possible strategy adopted by the publishers in terms of the size of their books. The omission of verse parts and puns can be explained by problems entailed in their translation, which would require the translators to develop specific strategies demanding time, effort and skill. One final possibility could be the use of a mediating source text in French which had already made those omissions, instead of Carroll's original English. The treatment of foreign names offers some clues about the directness of the translation, hence about the last possibility. In any case, a mixture of all three possibilities might have played a role in shaping the omissions in Ardiç's translation.

7.3.6.3 Treatment of Proper Names and Foreign Cultural Elements

Soydaş and Atasagun have adopted a mixed strategy in their treatment of proper names. “Alice” was spelled in its original form on the title page once, and then transcribed as “Alis” according to Turkish phonetics in the rest of the book. “Mary Ann” (Carroll 1960: 27; Carroll 1994: 40) and “Cheshire” (Carroll 1960: 44; Carroll 1994: 70) were retained in their original spelling. On the other hand, “William” (Carroll 1994: 28) was translated as “Giyon” (Carroll 1960: 35), and “the earls of Mercia and Northumbria” (Carroll 1994: 32) was translated as “Kontes de Mercie ve Northumbrie” (Carroll 1960: 21). The translation of “dodo” as “pelikan” and “Tortoise” as “Tiran”, which were also encountered in Ardiç’s target text, a translation from French, further hints at the status of *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (1960) as a mediated translation.

The translators domesticated some foreign terms while translating them. These include “caucus” (Carroll 1994: 31), translated as “toplantı” [“meeting”] (Carroll 1960: 20), “lory” (Carroll 1994: 31), translated as “papağan” [“parrot”] (Carroll 1960: 22) and “flamingo” (Carroll 1994: 98), translated as “uzun bacaklı bir kuş” [“a long-legged bird”] (Carroll 1960: 63). However, they also used a number of foreignisms in the target text, such as “gryphon” (Carroll 1960: 69; Carroll 1994: 110) and “kriket” [“cricket”] (Carroll 1960: 41), which they used to translate “croquet” (Carroll 1994: 66). Furthermore, the French phrase “Où est ma chatte?” (Carroll 1960: 16; Carroll 1994: 28) was retained in French and no explanation in Turkish was offered about its meaning.

7.3.7 Siting Translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

The descriptive analysis of the six translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* published in Turkish in 1932-1960 complements, verifies and challenges some of the conclusions offered by the analysis of the translations of *Gulliver's Travels* carried out in 7.2.

The strategies followed in both translations (of *Gulliver's Travels* and *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*) by the Translation Bureau are similar. Burian's and Şahinbaş's translations display the same features in terms of a number of norms which were upheld by the Translation Bureau. To begin with, both *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde* and *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri* are direct translations from English. Secondly, both Burian and Şahinbaş observed the norm of fullness and did not interfere with the integrity of the source text. Moreover, they tried to preserve the style of the source authors by following their syntax. Their treatment of proper names was identical, and very much in line with the norm adopted and propagated by the Translation Bureau. Both translators failed to follow a consistent approach in their treatment of foreign cultural elements and switched back and forth between domesticating them and preserving them in their original, foreign forms. This makes it impossible to assess their translations as "acceptable" or "adequate", which are two problematic terms to which I will return in the next section.

The translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* published by private publishers challenge some of the findings discussed in the previous section. Unlike translations of *Gulliver's Travels* published by private publishers, not all translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by private publishers were characterized by heavy omissions. Unlike the 1932, 1944 and 1960 translations, the 1953 translation

by Azize Erten and the 1956 translation by Nurettin Ardiç do not display systematic omissions. This reveals that the norm of fullness was adopted by some publishing houses. In my previous discussion, I connected the underlying factor behind Erten's full translation with the size of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, which made it compatible with the format requirements of the publishers and with the fact that *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* was written as a children's book unlike *Gulliver's Travels* which had to be edited into one. Therefore, in my view, fullness in translation was observed when the resulting target text did not violate format requirements *and* when it served its proposed function vis-à-vis the habitus of the target audience.

One should not be misled into thinking that there was a sharp demarcation between the Translation Bureau and *all* private publishers in terms of their concepts and norms of translation. There might have been a range of reasons behind the adoption of the norms propagated at the centre of the literary polysystem by some private publishers. Political and personal reasons are not to be neglected. For instance, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, who was the founder and chief editor of Varlık Yayınları also translated for the Translation Bureau⁴⁷ and closely contributed to the planning of

⁴⁷ Yaşar Nabi Nayır translated 18 books mainly from French literature for the Bureau between 1943-1951. Below is a list of these translations: Alfred de Musset, *Contes (Hikâyeler - 1943)*; François Duc de La Rochefoucault, *Maximes (Özdeyişler - 1943)*; Alfred de Musset, *Carmosine Louison (1944)*; Alfred de Musset, *Bettine. On ne saurait penser à tout. (Bettine. Ummadık Taş Baş Yarar - 1944)*; Alfred de Musset, *La Confession d'un Enfant du Siècle (Bir Zamane Çocuğunun İtirafı - 1944)*; Honoré de Balzac, *Le Colonel Chabert (Albay Chabert - 1944)*; Prosper Mérimée, *Colomba (Colomba - 1944)*; Prosper Mérimée, *Les Âmes de Purgatoire - La Venus d'Ille (Âraftaki Ruhlar. Ille Venüsü - 1944)*; Prosper Mérimée, *Carmen (Karmen - 1945)*; Prosper Mérimée, *Contes (Hikâyeler - 1945)*; Maurice Maeterlinck, *Ariane et Barbe-Bleue (Ariane'la Mavi Sakal - 1945)*; Molière, *L'avare (Cimri - 1945)*; Dostoevsky, *Slaboe Serce. Velka i Svadba (İradesiz Adam. Noel Ağacı ve Düğün - with Erol Güneş, 1946)*; Molière, *Les Fâcheux (Münasebetsizler - 1946)*; Voltaire, *Zadig et Autres Contes (Zadig ve Başka Hikâyeler - 1946)*; François René de Châteaubriand, *Mémoires d'Outre-mer: Napoléon (Mezar Ötesinden Hâtıralar. Napoléon - 1946)*; Honoré de Balzac, *Une Ténébreuse Affaire (Esrarlı Bir Vaka - 1949)*; Honoré de Balzac, *Illusions Perdues (Sönmüş Hayaller - Volume I, 1949; Volume II, 1951)*.

Nayır's close connection with the Translation Bureau in the 1940s is even more interesting when we consider that he launched Varlık, his own publishing house in 1948, as mentioned in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2. His involvement with the classics published by the Ministry of Education even after

culture not only through his translations and publishing house, but also his literary magazine *Varlık*, still published today. It is difficult to suggest that Nayır, as a publisher, was completely consistent in terms of his conformity to the norms propagated by the Translation Bureau. In his work as a publisher, he sometimes required translators to make omissions, as in the case of *Gulliver'in Yolculukları*, or allowed for the observance of the fullness norm as in the case of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. However, his attention to the treatment of proper names and the norm of directness in translation indicates that he largely conformed to the norms propagated by the Translation Bureau.

It is impossible to maintain that all publishers followed the same norms as *Varlık*. The 1932, 1944 and 1960 translations heavily tampered with the textual integrity of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Furthermore, the 1956 and 1960 translations were done via French, which meant that yet another one of Translation Bureau's norms was ignored. The Bureau's norm about the treatment of proper names was also ignored. Among the translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* published by private companies, only Erten's remained loyal to original English spelling. The rest of the translations adopted an inconsistent approach, blending English or French orthography with Turkish phonetic transcriptions.

The translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by private publishers clearly distinguished themselves from the translations explored in Chapter 6. Most of them foregrounded the canonical status of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* as well as its educational function. Furthermore, the publishers all carefully emphasized the

he started translating for *Varlık* offers evidence for Vedat Günyol's claim that translating for the Translation Bureau was an "honour and a great prestige" for translators (Interview with Vedat Günyol, 30.10.2001).

status of their books as translation, offering the full name of the source author (in one instance combined with a biography) and presenting the translator with attributes (e.g. “translator”) that did not lead to any ambiguities regarding their status as the translator of the book.

In terms of the status of the translations of *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* as retranslations, it is not always possible to suggest that the translators had the objective of challenging the validity of the translations which preceded theirs, or that they disagreed with the norms observed in these translations. The 1944 and the 1946 translations *did* challenge the validity of the translations which preceded them, since the target texts of their predecessors were marked by omissions. However, the same cannot be suggested for the 1953, 1956 and 1960 translations. Burian’s translation published by the Ministry of Education was a full translation. Furthermore, unlike Şahinbaş’s *Gulliver’in Seyahatleri*, its language and style, as well as its illustrations and type-set, made it accessible for children. Therefore, subsequent translations could not have challenged its status as a children’s book. The most plausible explanation for the decision by publishers to retranslate *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* appears to be the book’s proven canonicity and the prestige and earnings the publishers hoped to gain by producing a new translation, as suggested by Azize Erten Bergin (Telephone interview, 18.10.2001).

7.4 “Fuzzy Logic Rules”

The description and analysis of various translations of *Gulliver’s Travels* and *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* offered in this chapter, and of the works of the three writer-translators I explored in Chapter 6, provide a background against which I can

discuss some of the arguments I formulated in Chapter 1. In Chapter 1, I criticized some of the contemporary research carried out on republican translation history, on the basis of three observations: their readiness to reduce translation history to a history of the Translation Bureau, their assessment of translation strategies within a polarized dichotomy and their failure to support their arguments with descriptive findings. Two case studies offered in Chapters 6 and 7 aimed to offer empirical/descriptive data to the reader so as to overcome the methodological problems and deficiencies caused by their absence in previous research. Case Study II focused on the translations published by both the Translation Bureau and private companies. Thus, it aimed to offer a balanced representation of translation activity during the period under study.

The case studies have revealed that certain translational phenomena existing in early republican Turkey escape a strict categorization in terms of the criteria of “adequacy” and “acceptability”. First and foremost, peritextual elements, which are the first points of contact with a translated text, could not be analyzed within the dichotomies of “acceptability” and “adequacy”. What does “adequacy” mean in the case of a book cover? Is it the cover’s adoption of the features present in the cover of the source text? How are we to judge what makes the cover “acceptable”? Is it its resemblance to the covers of translations or books by Turkish authors, or alternatively, its compatibility with its intended function?

Furthermore, the description of borderline phenomena, such as pseudo- and concealed translations could not be carried out through a polarized approach. Two pseudotranslations, *Hindistan Ormanlarında* and *Ecel Saati* analyzed in Chapter 6, could hardly be explored by using the binary opposition of “acceptability” versus “adequacy” since there were no source texts against which the “adequacy” of the

pseudotranslations could be assessed. The example of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* as a concealed translation also demonstrates the problems that may originate from a polarized approach. In *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, Ali Rıza Seyfi, who embedded *Dracula* within a domesticated universe, thus rendering many elements (such as names and religious and cultural elements) “acceptable” to the Turkish audience nevertheless used the western vampire myth as the core of his narrative construct. This was an “adequate” aspect of his translation. However, the concept of vampirism was so foreign to the Turkish readership that in his translation of *Dracula*, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap felt the need to rephrase it as “blood drinking”. This duality, i.e. the combination of an extreme domestication strategy with foreignism, inevitably places Ali Rıza Seyfi’s translation on a continuum between the poles of “adequacy” and “acceptability”. Likewise, the analysis of the translations of *Gulliver’s Travels* and *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* illustrated the ineffectiveness of the dichotomized relationship constructed between “adequate” versus “acceptable”. Although they appeared as the most “adequate” of all translations in terms of fullness, preservation of syntactic elements and proper names, the translations by the Translation Bureau contained cases of domestication on the lexical level thus hinting at the adoption of “acceptability” as an “initial” norm. These examples illustrate that even when “acceptability” and “adequacy” are used as explanatory tools to uncover norms observed by translators, they should not be used as binary opposites.

Gideon Toury himself has foreseen cases where descriptive results would indicate the lack of a strict adherence to either “adequacy” or “acceptability” and has suggested that “even if no clear macro-level tendency can be shown, any micro-level decision can still be accounted for in terms of adequacy vs. acceptability. On the other hand, in cases where an overall choice has been made, it is not necessary that

every single lower-level decision be made in full accord with it. We are still talking regularities, then, but not necessarily of any absolute type. It is unrealistic to expect absolute regularities anyway in any behavioral domain” (1995: 57).

However, I would like to argue that even if “adequacy” and “acceptability” are retained as flexible and explanatory tools rather than two oppositional poles followed by translators, they fall short of shedding light on understanding the whole process of the production and the reception of translations. The term “acceptable” appears particularly problematic. Toury defines “acceptability” as “subscription to norms originating in the target culture” (1995: 57). Yet the size and the identity of the target group that will define a translation’s acceptability may vary greatly. National or regional borders do not always correspond with the boundaries of individual target groups. I have been arguing throughout this thesis that there were at least two different poetics and cultural habituses which guided the production, marketing and reception of translated literature in Turkey in 1923-1960. The gap between the poetics of canonical and popular literature, as well as the gap between the literary habituses encompassing these poetics, made the attribute “acceptable” an inadequate term in describing a translation. Therefore claiming that a translation is “acceptable” will automatically bring up the question “acceptable according to whom and to which criteria?” While the Translation Bureau’s translation of *Gulliver’s Travels* was perfectly “acceptable” to the educated urban adult, it was clearly less so for a child in primary education. Likewise, while the diffuse line between translation and indigenous writing encountered in the field of popular literature was “unacceptable” to a reader of canonical literature, it was clearly acceptable to the specific readership targeted by popular literature.

Rather than judging translation strategies on the basis of an ambiguous, yet polarized approach, my case studies aimed to weave a network within which such strategies were chosen and functioned. The case studies set out to chart the various contexts and political and poetological orientations giving shape to translation strategies. Instead of compartmentalizing those strategies, I argue for the need to liberate them from the discursive “boxes”, labeled “acceptable versus adequate”, “free versus literal”, or “domesticated versus foreignized”. My ultimate goal is to be able to show that translation strategies are not developed in isolation according to some arbitrary initial decision to render a text close to its source, or alternatively, close to its recipient culture. As Maria Tymoczko suggests, “fuzzy logic rules” strategic decisions taken by translators (1999: 140).

The case studies reveal that at least some translators who worked in the Turkish literary polysystem in the 1920s-1950s did not have uniform concepts of translation. Some of the norms they observed were self-imposed, and governed by political or poetological factors they had incorporated into their habituses, such as Ali Rıza Seyfi’s and Kemal Tahir’s decision to insert political statements in their works, or Selâmi Münir’s and Kemal Tahir’s readiness to import and appropriate foreign characters. These writer-translators clearly showed a passive resistance or remained indifferent to the discourse formulated in the centre of the literary polysystem about the expected functions and norms of translation. On the other hand, some decisions by translators were dictated by external factors, such as the need to comply with the requirements of the private market in terms of the genres they translated or the speed with which they translated. On the other hand, market requirements were a part of the poetics within which these translators operated. Therefore it would not be right to suggest that they were forced to work against their translatorial habituses.

In my view, the decision to produce fictitious and concealed translations was not only governed by a commercial drive, but also by an implicit or explicit wish to resist translational norms upheld in the centre of the literary polysystem. The decision to omit elements in a source text could originate from format requirements or the need to translate fast to increase earnings. At the same time political and poetological concerns also played a role, as in the case of the omissions made in order to purge *Gulliver's Travels* of material not deemed suitable for children. Clearly, not all translation decisions can be interpreted as acts of planning or signs of resistance. Nevertheless, we should not be misled into thinking that they were all arbitrary or commercial choices.

Throughout Chapters 6 and 7, I focused not only on regularities of behaviour, which form the basis of translational norms (Toury 1995: 55), but also on irregularities. My findings showed that not all translators and publishers had the same approach towards the question of authorial provenance and the primacy of the source text in translation. In fact, they revealed that translators and publishers held divergent concepts of translation. Furthermore, some inconsistencies encountered in the translations explored Chapter 7 also pointed at the resistance, or reluctance, of some translators and publishers to comply with norms endorsed at the centre of the system of translated literature. Translational norms, even when they are clearly articulated and accepted by the majority, may take decades to establish themselves. The 1940s and the 1950s constitute a transitory period for the Turkish system of translated literature from a number of points. The emphasis on the source text and source author introduced and maintained in the field of canonical literature, the need to have direct translations, and the preservation of proper names in their original spelling were three norms propagated by the Translation Bureau, which appeared to

have been accepted when they were first proposed in the early 1940s. At least there was no clearly formulated objection, and hence, any active resistance against them. However the field of popular literature, as well as the practices of some private publishers remained indifferent to these norms throughout the 1940s and 1950s, indicating that it would take longer than two decades until all resistance died out, or rather, until the process of habituation was complete.

7.5 Summary

Chapter 7 offered a descriptive analysis of the translations of *Gulliver's Travels* and *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* into Turkish published in 1923-1960. The translations were analyzed in terms of their peritextual features, matricial norms, treatment of proper names and foreign culture-specific elements. The chapter mapped out the converging and diverging properties of the translations published by the Ministry of Education and private publishers. It further delved into the status of these translations as retranslations and searched for possible reasons for the decision to retranslate both works. The chapter ended with a discussion of the applicability of a polarized view of the “acceptability” and “adequacy” norms in a descriptive study.

Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to explore and discover the politics and poetics of translation in early republican Turkey, which was carried out on two levels. On the broad level, I investigated the implications of the political transformation experienced in Turkey after the proclamation of the Republic for the cultural and literary fields, including the field of translated literature. On a more specific level, I held translation under special focus, challenged views that had sole emphasis on the activities of the Translation Bureau at the expense of other publishers and set out to reveal the complex and diversified nature of the system of translated literature.

My study of the different dimensions of the systems of politics, culture, education, literature and translation showed that the fields of politics and poetics are in fact inseparable. The notions of culture planning and habitus, which formed the major pillars of my theoretical framework, helped me to reveal the bond between the politics and poetics of translation and placed translation within a wide ideological and poetological context.

In this final part of the thesis I will offer a summary of the findings of my research and present a series of conclusions I have reached. The findings will make it clear that the motives behind the planning, production and reception of translations in early republican Turkey did not only consist of political factors or poetological concerns, but were a combination of both. In the second part of the Conclusion, I will discuss the implications of this closely-knit relationship between politics and poetics for several concepts which have recently gained a pivotal position within Descriptive Translation Studies: “centre/periphery” opposition, “translation planning”, “readership” and “the translator’s habitus”.

Findings of the Study

I followed a pyramidal model in the shaping of the thesis, starting with the general context and going deeper into translation-related phenomena, finally concluding the study with case studies of specific translators and translated texts. This method has been useful in the constant grounding of findings in the political and cultural context.

I started the thesis with a survey of current literature on Turkish republican translation history and the presentation of the theoretical and methodological framework in **Chapter 1**. In Section 1.1, I surveyed contemporary research on Turkish translation history and revealed that such research tended to focus on the activities of the Translation Bureau, with special emphasis on the 1940-1946 period and seemed to reduce republican translation history in Turkey to a history of the Translation Bureau. An initial survey of the literature market in 1938-1948 offered in Section 1.1.4, illustrated that there was much more to be explored in the field of translated literature during this time and that the translations commissioned by the Translation Bureau and published by the Ministry of Education constituted only 9 per cent of the total number of novels and short stories translated from English and American literatures. These findings required the inclusion of the translations published by private publishers, the translators who worked outside of the Translation Bureau and the different groups of readers who consumed translated literature into the framework of the study. This led to the formulation of a series of questions such as: Who were the producers and readers of the books published in high numbers and great variety, written or translated by people whose names have been omitted from the pages of literary surveys, histories and dictionaries? What did

the people, whose cultural capital was limited in terms of formal schooling and literacy skills, read? What defined the conditions of production, marketing and reception of their reading material? As I delved further into the field of translated literature, these questions became more specific and detailed, covering such issues as the reasons for the decision to publish translations instead of indigenous books, selection of works for translation, the professional and literary status of translators, translation strategies employed in different types and genres of works, marketing strategies used by publishers, and the preferences of readers in terms of genres and translation strategies. I came to the conclusion that since such questions had never surfaced in Turkish translation studies, there was clearly a gap that needed to be filled, or at least bridged, between contemporary impressions of translation activity in early republican Turkey and the actual dynamics of the field as they unfold even through a preliminary survey.

My survey of contemporary historical research on translation activity in early republican Turkey revealed that there was also a significant information gap about the activities of the Translation Bureau, which had been held under special focus by various researchers. The products, the working conditions and the marketing network of the Bureau had not been comprehensively analyzed. Furthermore, the activities of the Bureau had not been properly contextualized. The few studies on the political aspects of the Bureau had remained cursory, neglecting its interaction with other republican institutions. Furthermore, conclusions about the translational norms observed by the Bureau had been based on secondary material, rather than a study of the translations themselves. In short, research done on the Translation Bureau also needed to be complemented.

In **Chapter 2**, I provided the general political and socio-cultural context against which translation, as activity and product, can be studied. I offered a general background of the republican reforms which I analyzed from a “culture planning” perspective. The concept of culture planning enabled a perspective of the Translation Bureau as part of the general westernization and modernization efforts of the republican regime and offered evidence as to how translation can be used as a tool of culture planning. In Sections 2.1 and 2.2, I linked the emergence of the Translation Bureau with the general importance attached to language, literature and reading as instruments of nation-building. Translation appeared as part and parcel of the republican education project, which aimed to transform the socio-cultural dispositions of the people, a phenomenon I explored by means of the concepts of “habitus”, and “habituation”. Section 2.1.4 focused on the emphasis placed on translation by state officials and intellectuals within the framework of the sophisticated cultural and educational network formed by the Republican People’s Party. This network included the Translation Bureau, the schools, the People’s Houses, the Village Institutes and the state radio. The multi-party era, and the ensuing changes in the production, policy and repertoire of the Translation Bureau, were examined in Section 2.2 from a culture planning perspective as the westernist-humanist paradigm gave way to a new form of nationalism while the function of translation as a tool for nation-building declined.

In **Chapter 3**, I studied extratextual discourse on translation, mainly based on the utterances of translators, publishers, critics and statesmen who offered their various, and often conflicting, views on translation in their speeches, interviews, articles and books. The majority of these agents operated within the field of canonical literature and wrote in such literary journals as *Resimli Ay*, *Ülkü*, *Tercüme*,

Varlık, İnsan, Yeni Adam and *Ufuklar*. Translators, writers or publishers who were involved in the production of non-canonical literature remained largely absent from the extratextual discourse and did not offer their views on the functions or definitions of translation. Therefore, the analysis of the extratextual discourse mainly offered information on the field of canonical translated literature, while the discovery of the field of non-canonical translations had to be carried out through a study of bibliographical lists and translated texts.

In Section 3.1.2, I explored the extratextual discourse on translation which regarded translation as a tool for the formation of a western-inspired literary canon in Turkey. The findings of the Section 3.1.2.1 revealed that this canon remained mainly discursive before the setting up of the Translation Bureau. Writers and statesmen complained about a lack of reading material appropriate for the citizens of the young republic. Although publishers such as Remzi and Vakit launched series of translated canonical literature during the 1930s, translation of western classics was deemed to be insufficient and arbitrary. Calls were extended for the setting up of a state-sponsored institution for carrying out translations from western literatures into Turkish. These ideas culminated in the setting up of the Translation Bureau following the First National Publishing Congress held in May 1939. Apart from the role of translation in literary canon making, the functions ascribed to translation before and during the operation of the Translation Bureau consisted of raising the educational, cultural and linguistic level of the nation and creating a humanist basis for intellectual development. After the Bureau started to function, and the discursive canon turned into an actual set of translated works, the discourse on translation assumed a positive tone, and writers began to emphasize the beneficial effects of translations observed in the new generation of writers and publishers.

The critical analysis of extratextual discourse on translation has further illustrated that the state emerged as a patron of translated canonical literature after 1939. The framework of this patronage status was laid out by the intellectuals who called for state involvement in translation throughout the 1930s. As I discussed in Section 3.2, by setting up the Bureau, the state proclaimed itself as the patron of translation in Turkey. It exercised both ideological and poetological control over the Bureau: it defined the ideological orientation of the Bureau by making sure that the Bureau placed an emphasis on the setting up of a humanist cultural background in Turkey through its selection of works. The Translation Bureau further defined the norms upheld by translators and publishers active in the field of translated literature, especially during its initial years. A survey of articles published in *Tercüme*, the official journal of the Bureau, and several other literary journals has revealed that extratextual discourse on translational norms was most intensive during the initial years of the Bureau's activities, which corresponded to the most productive period of the Translation Bureau in terms of the number of translations published.

In Section 3.3.2, I revealed that translators were quite visible in extratextual discourse on translation in terms of their professional status. Translation was largely presented as a creative activity, but its position was regarded as inferior to original writing. Translators were often mentioned and praised or criticized in reviews, while the qualities of an "ideal" translator were also discussed extensively. This led to the formation of a "model" translator who would be both a writer and a translator. My study of the covers and title pages of translations published in the 1920s-1950s revealed that translators were also visible in the translations themselves. Canonical translations, such as those commissioned by the Bureau, always included the name of the translator on its title page, which was also the case for translations by private

publishers. Nevertheless, the translator's name often appeared subordinate to the name of the author and rarely made it to book covers. In some books of popular literature, the translator's name was altogether absent. However, in such books the author's name was often absent too, and it was not unusual to have total anonymity, which hinted at the existence of a dramatically different set of concepts and rules governing the production and reception of popular literature. In short, I revealed that the fields of canonical and popular literature were governed by two different forms of poetics, i.e. different inventories of literary devices, genres and motifs, as well as different concepts of the role of literature.

As I discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.4, the discourse on translation attached special importance to issues such as directness of translation, fidelity to the source text and the need to use fluent Turkish in the translations. Translators and critics presented fidelity as a multifarious concept and discussed its various facets like fidelity to textual integrity, to content, to form and to the tone of the original. Section 3.4.4 outlined the different perspectives adopted toward the strategies of fluency and literalism and revealed that according to most critics, translators needed to strike the right balance between fluency and literalism. Nevertheless, there were also writers who favoured either of these strategies which they regarded as two distinct poles as exemplified by the approaches of Yusuf Kâzım Köni and Nâzım Hikmet discussed in Section 3.4.4.

In Chapters 4 and 5, I set out to explore the diversification of literary publishing activity in 1920s-1950s. I included a brief survey of publishing trends in **Chapter 4** with special focus on the series launched by various publishers. In Section 4.1, I offered an outline of the Turkish publishing market in 1923-1960 in terms of sales figures and state aid to translation. In Section 4.2, I revealed that the

trend in the field of translated and indigenous canonical literature involved the canonization of realism. This trend was not valid in the field of popular literature. The series published during the period under study did not only consist of the books published by the Ministry of Education or publishers active in the field of canonical literature discussed in Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.4.1 and 4.4.2. The research carried out in Sections 4.3.2.1 and 4.4.2.1 revealed that there were numerous publishers who launched series of popular novels, both domestic and translated, which did not appear to subscribe to the poetics created and maintained in the field of canonical literature. I illustrated that the poetics governing the production and reception of these works was largely affected by market forces, which in turn, were based on the endurance of a literary habitus which had close ties with folk literature and had its roots in the pre-republican era.

In **Chapter 5**, I explored the political and poetological factors underlying the production and reception of popular literature. In Section 5.1, I discussed the conceptualizations of “people” originating from the field of politics and explored the larger political and cultural network which gave rise to a discursive segmentation of readership. In Section 5.2, based on the books published in the early republican period, I showed that this segmentation also existed in practice. I further concluded that not only did the rural population, the youth and the urbanites with little formal education read different books than the segments of the population with higher cultural capital, but also were their books produced according to a different poetics. In Section 5.3, I revealed that the poetics which governed the field of popular literature largely ignored the realist trend, the clear division between translation and original, and the authorial provenance of literary works.

In **Chapter 6**, I offered a case study of three writer-translators who operated within the poetics of popular literature. In Sections 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4, I revealed that their indigenous works, translations, and pseudo- or concealed translations were produced according to principles which were largely criticized by writers and critics operating in the field of canonical literature. These writer-translators, Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir, all worked with genres which were denounced by the centre of the literary polysystem, such as the detective and adventure genres. Some of their works were marked by the appropriation of foreign characters and plots, and in their translations they observed norms which the Translation Bureau warned against, such as extensive omissions and additions to the source text, lack of fidelity to content, form and tone of the source text and an extreme focus on fluency. In the meantime, the works by the three writer-translators indicate that they did not merely act out of commercial concerns. They also had an ideological agenda which they inserted in their works to varying degrees. In Section 6.5, I illustrated that Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir also produced and offered options for a newly-forming literary repertoire in Turkey which made them culture planners in their own right. They resisted the repertoire being formed in the centre of the literary polysystem through their generic and stylistic choices which conformed to a different poetics. Nevertheless, their conformity did not make them instruments which facilitated an ossification of the poetics of popular literature. Instead, these writer-translators added new thematic and ideological elements to the poetics of popular literature, and became instrumental in modifying it.

The empirical descriptive study I offered in **Chapter 7** on retranslations of *Gulliver's Travels* and *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* revealed that the

Translation Bureau followed in practice principles and norms it propagated. In Sections 7.2.1 and 7.3.1, I revealed that İrfan Şahinbaş and Kısmet Burian, who translated *Gulliver's Travels* and *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* respectively, observed the main norms propagated by the Translation Bureau such as directness of translations, treatment of proper names, the focus on the original author, fidelity to textual integrity, and fidelity to form and content. As illustrated in Sections 7.2.2-7.2.6 and 7.3.2-7.3.6, translations published by private publishers showed some variation in terms of the observance of these norms. The works described and analyzed in Chapter 7 illustrated the diversification of the concepts of translation and translational norms among private publishers who translated and published canonical literature. It further illustrated that the marketing strategy often dominated translation strategies, which created inconsistencies in the translation practice of some publishers. For instance, one publisher, Varlık, and its translator, Azize Erten, appeared to carefully observe the norms propagated at the centre of the system of translated literature in one of Varlık's publications, *Alis Harikalar Diyarında* (Section 7.3.4), while they radically violated the norm of fidelity to textual integrity by omitting large parts of the source text in their version of *Gulliver's Travels* (Section 7.2.6). Private publishers did not place the same emphasis on the source text and the source author as the Translation Bureau and prioritized some other factors such as compatibility with the target readership, format requirements and marketing strategy over the preservation of the elements of the source text.

In Case Studies I and II carried out in Chapters 6 and 7, I used two new methodological tools to complement my descriptive approach. These tools were the study of the treatment of proper names and the paratextual elements in the translations. My study of the treatment of proper names by translators helped me

explore the directness of their translations. In various sections of Chapters 6 and 7, I identified the use of an intermediary source language in translations, which was French, by studying the orthography adopted by translators in the spelling of foreign proper names. The treatment of proper names further provided me with information about the translators' attitudes towards the readers and helped me to identify their intended readership.

The description and analysis of paratextual elements, which complemented my study of translational norms, enabled me to discover a range of factors which are not always accessible through the translated texts themselves. Peritextual and epitextual features of the books I studied offered invaluable information about the concepts of translation held by the translators and publishers, about the degree of translators' and authors' visibility, about the source languages used in translations and about the target readership.

The findings of the thesis have provided answers to some of the questions formulated initially in the Introduction. In the meantime, they have also led to new questions, regarding both republican translation history in Turkey, and some theoretical and methodological issues. These findings have enabled me to explore the validity of a series of concepts in circulation in current translation studies for historical translation studies, such as the "centre/periphery" dichotomy, the concept of "translation planning", the need for and possibility of integrating findings on the reception of translations within the historical descriptive paradigm and the "structuring" role of translators vis-à-vis their translatorial habitus.

Whose Centre, Whose Periphery?

I started my research with the aim of revealing the politics and poetics in Turkey in 1923-1960. As I delved into the different dimensions of the interaction between the field of translation and the socio-cultural dynamics of early republican Turkey, I realized that there was not only one, but at least two, and perhaps several types of poetics governing the production and reception of translated literature. During various stages of the research, I discovered that the early republican literary polysystem did not only consist of a single system of translated literature. Neither was there only one system of indigenous literature. I concluded that the system of translated literature was a polysystem in its own right, consisting of the systems of canonical translated literature, popular translated literature, children's literature, and of possible others which remained outside of the scope of this thesis. In this thesis, I only analyzed translated fiction in the form of novels and short stories, and excluded drama and poetry. There is little doubt that the systems of translated poetry and drama would also appear as polysystems with various sub-systems. On the other hand, polysystems and systems are stratified and feature various centre and periphery positions.

The various chapters of the present thesis lay bare the difficulty of describing a single centre and a single periphery in the system of translated literature in early republican Turkey. The study of the practices of political and literary institutions giving shape to translation activity, such as the Ministry of Education and the Translation Bureau discussed in Chapter 2, and the analysis of the discourses formed around and within translations offered in Chapter 3 revealed that periphery and centre positions within the literary polysystem had shifting grounds.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, Section 1.2.3, I have borrowed the concepts of “centre” and “periphery” from Itamar Even-Zohar who mainly used these terms to refer to positions occupied by texts within the literary polysystem. In this thesis, I have conceptualized and investigated these positions as sites occupied by *people* and by texts created by *people*. My research has shown that “centre” and “periphery” positions vary greatly depending on one’s perspective.

At the outset, the “discursive” and “actual” centre/periphery positions need to be differentiated. Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 and 3.4 revealed that translators and writers active in early republican Turkey placed an emphasis on certain texts, functions and norms at the expense of other texts, functions and norms existing in the literary polysystem. Thus, they gave rise to a “discursive” opposition which I interpret as a “centre” versus “periphery” opposition. This discursive division prevents us from forming a comprehensive view of translations and underlies the perspective of much of historical translation research carried out in Turkey so far.

The literature I reviewed in Chapter 1, Section 1.1 regarded the Translation Bureau as the “centre” of the Turkish system of translated literature since its conception in 1940. This view, which I particularly challenged throughout the thesis, was mainly based on the discourse formed by people associated with the Bureau and its products. Chapter 1, Section 1.2 insisted on the importance of exploring the “actual” landscape of the literary polysystem as a way to amend and complement impressions shaped by studies of secondary sources. The survey of the literary publishing activity offered in Chapter 4 and the descriptive-empirical case studies offered in Chapters 6 and 7 were geared towards identifying trends in the selection of works for translation and the norms observed by translators. The ultimate aim of

these chapters was to offer a view of the actual state of the system of translated literature.

The study has revealed that in the Turkish system of translated literature in 1923-1960, “actual” centre/periphery positions were multiple depending on one’s viewpoint. For a number of translators, publishers and readers, the Translation Bureau and its publications occupied a central position. The translators in question were those who were commissioned by the Bureau or wished to work for the Bureau due to its prestigious status. The publishers who identified the Bureau’s activities with the newly forming literary canon looked up to it as a model, thereby placing it in a central position. The readers who placed the Translation Bureau in the centre were those who had already been habituated into the poetics of canonical literature and who consumed literature mainly for educational and aesthetic purposes. However, in terms of market forces, the statistics I offered in Chapter 1, Section 1.1.4, revealed that the products of the Translation Bureau occupied a peripheral status within the total number of translations available in the market. In terms of the reading experience of a large group of readers, “people’s books” occupied a “central” position while books by the Translation Bureau and other publishers operating in the field of canonical literature held a “peripheral” position as works in “the field of restricted production” shaped only by artistic and literary concerns.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, Section 1.2.3, the polysystem theory makes room for the existence of multiple centre and periphery positions within the same system. Furthermore, Even-Zohar also argues that centre and periphery positions are not permanent and go through constant change as systems are “hierarchized within the polysystem”. In my view, there did not exist a standard hierarchy in the Turkish literary polysystem in the 1920s-1950s. Indeed, there was strong hierarchization in

the discourse of intellectuals who wished to position a specific kind of literature in the centre of the literary polysystem. Yet, it is unlikely that they were successful in imposing this hierarchy on all sections of the readership. The hierarchies were defined by the specific groups of readers and did not necessarily overlap.

While agents, i.e. readers, translators, critics, and publishers, may be said to position literary texts in various polysystemic locations, the translators and writers themselves could occupy different positions simultaneously. An example is Kemal Tahir, who both produced popular texts such as the Mike Hammer series, and wrote social realist novels which were regarded as central texts by critics (Chapter 6, Section 6.4). Likewise, Ali Rıza Seyfi, who translated and wrote popular fiction also wrote historical books which could be considered semi-canonical. On the other hand, he also translated for the Translation Bureau, which clearly occupied a central position for a number of critics (Chapter 6, Section 6.3). Therefore it is difficult to clearly position these writer-translators as peripheral and central. Not only did their various literary texts occupy shifting positions in the literary polysystem, mainly defined by their audience, but their personal standing within the polysystem varied according to the types of texts they produced.

Translation (as) Planning

As discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.2.2, translation can be used both as an object of planning, being subject to programmes which define the selection of source languages and translation strategies, *and* as an instrument of cultural change, leading to changes in other cultural and social fields. In the case of early republican Turkey, before translation was used as an instrument of culture planning, it itself went

through planning on the level of the selection of source languages, texts and translation strategies. The Translation Bureau and the role of the state and Turkish intellectuals prior to its establishment and during its operation, as explored in Chapters 2 and 3, constitute an excellent example of how translation can become an object and an instrument of planning. This example also epitomizes the way the politics and poetics of translation overlapped in early republican Turkey. The planning of translation governing the selection of titles, source literatures and translation strategies within the Translation Bureau was an attempt at defining the poetics of the field of translated literature, while the use of translation as an instrument of planning was a political act.

Chapter 3, Section 3.2 defined the Bureau as the embodiment of the state's efforts to set the course of translation activity in Turkey within a patronage structure. Through the Bureau, the state had an important say in *what* was going to be translated, *how* they would be translated, by *whom* and for *what purpose*. This constituted the planning of translation; however, the planning project did not end there. Chapter 3, Section 3.1 revealed that the planning of translation was carried out for a specific purpose: to create a new literary canon in Turkey. In turn, this literary canon would give rise to a new Turkish literature, which would serve to reinforce a new national identity as mentioned in Chapter 2, Section 2.1. Nevertheless, one should bear in mind that a sole focus on the state and the Translation Bureau runs the risk of reducing the concept of "culture planning" to "central planning" and obscures the planning efforts of other persons and institutions in the literary system.

In Chapters 6 and 7, I revealed that writers and translators who worked within the system of popular literature were also involved in translation planning. Chapter 6, Section 6.5 revealed that their planning also consisted of offering options for the

repertoire of translated literature, but their options were radically different from those offered in the field of canonical literature, in terms of their generic, thematic and stylistic features. These features reflected their vision of literature and what they wished to see flourish in their literary system. It is also true that these translators active in the field of popular literature did not have the “symbolic capital”, i.e. prestige and honour, possessed by those operating in the field of canonical literature. They lacked the economic and political means that enabled the state to disseminate its translation planning and culture planning project to different sections of the society through a formal network made up of schools, People’s Houses and the state radio discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.4.

Nevertheless, the options offered in the field of popular literature generated a considerable amount of socio-cultural energy. Chapter 4 demonstrated that they sold widely and thus, enabled market expansion in terms of product diversification and the quantity of books sold. Furthermore, they enabled the survival of a pre-republican literary habitus which was fostered and reproduced in popular literary works as concluded in Chapter 6. Chapter 3 showed that they also stimulated debate and functioned as landmarks against which writers and translators in the field of canonical literature defined themselves and the options that they introduced. But can one conclude that agents operating in the field of popular literature also attempted to use translation as a means of planning? In other words, did they attempt to use translation as an instrument of change, to affect other cultural and social fields? In my view, their translations served a double purpose: poetological resistance and ideological affirmation.

The descriptive analysis of the works by Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir undertaken in Chapter 6 concluded that their translations, as

works published in the field of popular literature, did not conform to the norms upheld in the field of canonical literature, especially in terms of the relationship foreseen between a translation and its source. The conclusions I reached about the politics and poetics within which Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir operated cannot be generalized to all translators who worked in the field of popular translated literature in early republican Turkey. Certainly, more empirical studies are needed before the full picture of the poetics governing the production of popular literary works can emerge. Nevertheless, the trends observed in the works of the three writer-translators included in my case study offer a series of clues about the possible differences between the poetics of popular and canonical literature.

In the case of Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir, I identified an indifference towards the identity of the source author, and at times, the translator. Moreover, the fuzziness of the line between original and translation, the unproblematic manipulation of the unitary structure of the source text and the abundance of borderline phenomena in the form of pseudo- and concealed translations characterizing their works indicate (deliberate or inadvertent) resistance shown towards the poetics of canonical literature. On the other hand, the ideological aspects of some of their works complemented the westernist/humanist paradigm dominant in the field of canonical literature, as concluded in Chapter 6, Sections 6.2.3.4, 6.3.2.4, 6.3.3.3. Although Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir did not explicitly draw attention to the transformative role that can be played by translation in the cultural development of a nation, unlike their colleagues who translated western classics, they offered options selected from western popular literature, thus indicating their intention to familiarize the readership with western literature, *and* western culture. Therefore, they created their version of the westernist

programme within the field of popular literature. Furthermore, they inserted explicit ideological statements in their works and also contributed towards the nation-building project which was carried out in a more refined and subtle manner in the field of canonical literature.

The Reception of Translations

The present thesis combined the patterns of production and reception of literature in order to arrive at a balanced view of the poetics which gave shape to translations. The production side was easier to explore. The bibliographical lists, library catalogues and actual books surveyed in Chapter 4 offered ample evidence as to what was produced. Moreover, the descriptive case studies offered in Chapters 6 and 7 included a view of the norms and strategies which dictated translations produced in the fields of popular and canonical literature. The investigation of reception patterns proved to be more problematic. First and foremost, statistics about sales figures in early republican Turkey were largely unavailable. There were some statements indicating rough figures mentioned in Chapter 4, Section 4.1, but these were informal and far from being precise. The repeated appearance of some works and writers in bibliographies pointed at their popularity among the readership, however, such popularity could not be quantified.

Chapter 5, Section 5.2.3 studied extratextual discourse consisting of statements by critics or writers formulated in the 1920s-1950s and revealed that these statements indicated a segmentation of readership for literature in early republican Turkey. This segmentation was based on a series of dichotomies such as rural/urban, uneducated/educated, and child/adult. Nevertheless, the lack of actual reception data

in the form of surveys or interviews made it difficult to identify who read exactly what, and in turn, rendered the segmentation located in extratextual discourse tentative. It may well have been the case that some books were read both by children and adults, or both by peasants and urbanites. Furthermore, various individuals within these groups might have been exposed to several types of literature. For instance, a student in a Village Institute could have read canonical fiction at school, and listened to oral renderings of popular battle stories or read detective fiction at home. Moreover, lack of information about the readers' response to the different norms employed in translations has led to some gaps in my descriptive study. Needless to say, this is a problem experienced by all translation researchers who carry out historical work but who have no sufficient access to historical reception data.

The lack of information about the reception of literature in early republican Turkey also has implications for our day. If we want to develop a fuller picture of translation as product and activity, we should make reception studies an integral part of research on current translational phenomena. Descriptive-analytical strands of translation studies focusing on translators, translated texts and their contexts should also include within their scope the readers of translated works. Reception data should not only include the reception by critics as expressed in articles published in literary or scholarly journals. It is now time to start exploring the reception patterns of all consumers of translated literature. This is essential if we want future researchers to form an accurate view of our cultural landscape.

The Acquisition of a New Habitus

The notion of habitus has been crucial in my exploration of the force behind the politics and poetics of translated literature in early republican Turkey. In Chapter 1, 1.2.3, I discussed how Pierre Bourdieu conceptualized habitus as a set of “structured” and “structuring” dispositions which generate practices and perceptions. In Chapter 2, I concluded that many of the cultural and political practices of early republican Turkey can be viewed as an effort to “habituate” people into a new set of perceptions and practices. The adoption of the Latin alphabet, the transition to western attire, and among others, the emphasis on western literature as expressed through the Translation Bureau launched within the Ministry of Education, can all be considered as steps leading towards a new cultural habitus. This meant that people were asked to leave their former dispositions behind, i.e. “dishabituate” themselves from them, to step into their new cultural habitus. This was a gradual practice, and those who already held a tendency for the new habitus became pioneers in this process. These pioneers were to be found among the sections of the society with higher economic, cultural and symbolic capital. This transition toward a new habitus was also observed in the field of translated literature.

While I concluded that the politics and poetics of translated literature in early republican Turkey were interconnected, I became aware that they had their roots in a common set of dispositions, i.e. a common habitus. When I identified gaps in the poetics governing the various fields of the literary polysystem, I associated them with differences of habitus. The case studies carried out in Chapters 6 and 7 revealed that there was extensive poetological variation in early republican Turkey in terms of both the selection of works for translation and the norms observed in translations.

Throughout Chapters 4 to 7, I discussed and explained this variation through the existence of at least two different literary habituses shaping the politics and poetics of the field of translated literature. This also meant that there were two different translatorial habituses in operation in the literary system.

The discourse formed around translation, which I explored in Chapter 3, provides extensive information on the principles of a new habitus proposed for the field of translated canonical literature. According to statements by officials and intellectuals, the new literary habitus offered to the people had a new canon, composed of western classics, and especially ancient Greek and Latin works. It furthermore attached new functions to translated literature: education, cultural advancement and the triggering of a new form of indigenous literature. Chapter 3, Section 3.4 revealed that the new literary habitus being proposed in the field of canonical literature would entail a different concept of translation: as an activity with an identified source text and strictly defined norms. The translators who worked for the Translation Bureau and several other publishers involved in canonical literature, became agents of change, and played a transformative role in the shaping of the new literary habitus. This might also have required them to modify their own translatorial habitus. These translators used their structuring power to change the current translation patterns. However, the lack of information on the reception of the works they translated prevents us from developing a clear picture of who had access to their works and used translation as a step into the new literary habitus.

The survey on publishing activity offered in Chapter 4 revealed that not all translations abided by the newly forming literary habitus. The wide availability of translated “people’s books”, and their repeated reprints, point at the persistence of the former (pre-republican) habitus among many readers. It may appear at first sight

that translators of these popular works used their structuring power to perpetuate the norms belonging to an older literary habitus. Nevertheless, I concluded in Chapter 6, Section 6.5 that these translators also played a role in the modification of the former literary habitus by integrating new options to it, such as the importation of characters and themes from western literature. Furthermore, the works by these translators offered the first exposure to written literature for a number of groups who learned to read and write after the alphabet reform and whose previous contact with literature had been through oral readings of indigenous folk stories. Thus, translators of popular literature also became instrumental in the transition to a new literary habitus which was to replace the old one in a gradual, but definitive way in later decades of the Republic.

References

- Afetinan, A. (1969) *Medeni Bilgiler ve M. Kemal Atatürk'ün El Yazıları*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Ağaoğlu, Ahmet (1972) *Üç Medeniyet*, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Agatha, Christie (1946) *Mezapotamya Cinayeti*, tr. İ. and T. Karamahmut, İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi.
- Ahmad, Feroz (1993) *The Making of Modern Turkey*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Ahmet Cevat (1932) "Edebî Klasik Terbiye", *Muhit*, 4:40, 1-3.
- Akan, Ali Rauf (1946) "Tercüme Dergisinin Özel Sayısı", *Tercüme*, 7:38, 85-86.
- Aksoy, Bülent (1995) "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Çeviri Anlayışları" in Mehmet Rifat (ed.), *Çeviri ve Çeviri Kavramı Üzerine Söylemler*, İstanbul: Düzlem Yayınları.
- Alangu, Tahir (1965) *Cumhuriyetten Sonra Hikâye ve Roman*, Vol. 3, İstanbul: İstanbul Matbaası.
- Ali Kemali (1933) *Tercüme Hakkındaki Düşünceler*, İstanbul: Resimli Ay Matbaası.
- Ali Rıza Seyfi (1900) *Çanakkale Boğazı*, İstanbul: Matbaa-i Tahir.
- Ali Rıza Seyfi (1900) *Hayat-ı Alude*, İstanbul: Tahirbey Matbaası.
- Ali Rıza Seyfi (1910) *Barbaros Hayrettin*, İstanbul: Şems Matbaası.
- Ali Rıza Seyfi (1932) *Turgut Reis*, İstanbul: Resimli Ay Matbaası.
- Ali Rıza Seyfi (1943) *Çeşme Deniz Muharebesi Faciası ve Akdenizde İlk Rus Donanması*, İstanbul: Deniz Matbaası.
- Ali Rıza Seyfi (1997) *Drakula İstanbul'da*. İstanbul: Kamer.
- Ali Rıza Seyfi and Fayrettin (1934) *1820-1827 Mora İsyanı*, İstanbul: Askeri Matbaa.

- Ali, Sabahattin (1941) "İkinci Dilden Tercüme Meselesi ve Bir Misal" *Tercüme*, 1:6, 581-585.
- Althusser, Louis (1971) "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus" in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, London: New Left Books.
- Anderson, Benedict (1991) *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.
- Apaydın, Talip (1967) *Karanlığın Kuvveti*, İstanbul: Ararat Yayınevi.
- Arıkan, Zeki (1999) "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Hümanizma Akımı" in *Bilanço 1*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Arısoy, Sunullah (1944) "Bize Bir Çocuk Edebiyatı Lâzım", *Ülkü*, 6: 61, 7.
- Ataç, Nurullah (1940) "Tercüme Dair Notlar" (originally published in *Ulus*, 4.10.1940) reprinted in *Tercüme*, 1: 4, 404-405.
- Ataç, Nurullah (1942) "Tercüme Dair", *Tercüme*, 1: 6, 505-507.
- Ataç, Nurullah (1948) "Çeviri Üzerine", *Ülkü*, 2: 13, 3-4.
- Ataç, Nurullah (1952) "Bir Mektup", *Ufuklar*, 1: 8, 229-233.
- Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri (1906-1938) – II (1952)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Atay, Falih Rıfki (1944) "105 Yeni Tercüme", *Tercüme*, 5: 27, 229.
- Atay, Neşet Halil (1944) "Klâsiklerle Başlayan Yeni Devir", *Tercüme*, 5: 27, 230.
- Ay, Lûtfi (1941a) "Jerminal", *Tercüme*, 2: 10, 354-358.
- Ay, Lûtfi (1941b) "Bir Perdelik Tercüme Piyesler", *Tercüme*, 2: 7, 85-91.
- Ay, Lûtfi (1942a) "Salavin'in Ruznamesi", *Tercüme*, 3: 14, 150-154.
- Ay, Lûtfi (1942b) "Angel Dayı", *Tercüme*, 2: 12, 536-541.
- Ay, Lûtfi (1943) "Değirmenimden Mektuplar Tercümeleri", *Tercüme*, 4: 19, 72-79.
- Ay, Lûtfi (1944) "Fransız Klâsikleri", *Tercüme*, 5: 28, 322-328.
- Aydoslu, Sait (1933) "Millet ve Milliyet", *Ülkü*. 2 : 10, İkinciteşrin 1933, 281-284.

- Banguoğlu, Tahsin (1945) "1945 Nüfus Sayımından İlk Rakamlar". *Ülkü*, 9 : 99, 11.
- Başaran, Mehmet (2001) *Sabattin Eyuboğlu ve Köy Enstitüleri*, İstanbul: Papirüs.
- Baykurt, Fakir (1997) "Türkiye Aydınlanması ve Köy Enstitüleri" in *Türkiye'de Aydınlanma Hareketi*, İstanbul: Adam.
- Baysal, Jale (1991) "Harf Devriminden Önce ve Sonra Türk Yayın Hayatı" in *Harf Devrimi'nin 50. Yılı Sempozyumu*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 60-72.
- Bengi-Öner, Işın (1999) "Türk Edebiyatında *La Dame aux Camélias* Çevirileri" in *Çeviri Bir Süreçtir... Ya Çeviribilim?*, İstanbul : Sel Yayıncılık.
- Bennett, Tony and Janet Woollacott (1987) *Bond and Beyond*, London: Macmillan Education.
- Berk, Özlem (1999) *Translation and Westernisation in Turkey (from the 1840s to the 1980s)*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis in Translation Studies submitted to the Centre for British & Comparative Cultural Studies, University of Warwick, June 1999.
- Berk, Özlem (2000) "Bir Türk kimliği yaratmada Tercüme Bürosu ve kültür politikaları: Çevirilerin yerleştirilmesi", *Toplum ve Bilim*, No. 85, 156-171.
- Birinci Türk Dili Kurultayı, Tezler, Müzakere Zabıtları* (1933) İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası.
- "Bize Bir Çocuk Edebiyatı Lâzım" (1944) *Ülkü*, 6: 61, p. 7.
- Boratav, Pertev Naili (1939) *Folklor ve Edebiyat*, İstanbul: Arkadaş Matbaası.
- Boratav, Pertev Naili (1988) *Halk Hikayeleri ve Halk Hikayeciliği*. (Originally published in 1946) İstanbul: Adam.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, tr. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *In Other Words: Essays toward a Reflexive Sociology*, tr. M. Adamson. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Bourdieu, Pierre (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. Randal Johnson. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1996) *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, tr. Richard Nice. London: Routledge.
- Brendemoen, Bernt (1990) "The Turkish Language Reform and Language Policy in Turkey" in György Hazai (ed.) *Handbuch der Türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- "Bu Kitap Nasıl Meydana Geldi!" (1944) anonymous preface to Lewis Carroll, *Alis Harikalar Diyarında*, tr. Muzaffer Beşli and Naime Halit Yaşaroğlu, Istanbul: Ahmet Halit Kitabevi.
- Burian, Orhan (1940b) "Humanizma ve Biz", *Yücel*, No. 64.
- Burian, Orhan (1936) "Shakespeare'i Türkçeleştirmek", *Yücel*, 4: 19, 24-27.
- Burian, Orhan (1940a) "Humanizma ve Biz", *Yücel*, No. 63.
- Burian, Orhan (1940c) "Humanizma ve Biz", *Yücel*, No. 65.
- Burian, Orhan (1944) "Tercüme ve Bizim İçin Mânası Üzerine", *Ülkü* 7: 75, 17-18.
- Burian, Orhan (1953) "Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nun Tercüme Yayınları Üzerine", *Yeni Ufuklar*, 2:1 (17), 130-131.
- Burian, Orhan (1974) "Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Klâsikleri Üzerine", *Yeni Ufuklar*, No. 247, 1-7.
- Calhoun, Craig (1995) *Critical Social Theory*, Oxford and Cambridge, Blackwell.
- Chateaubriand'dan İki Tercüme" (1941) *Tercüme*, 1: 5, 492-494.
- Chatman, Seymour (1989) *Story and Discourse*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Conan Doyle (1909a) *Dilenci* (translation of "The Man with the Twisted Lip" from *Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*), tr. Faik Sabri, Istanbul: Asır Kütüphanesi.

- Conan Doyle (1909b) *Mağaza Sarikleri* (translation of “The Red-headed League” from *Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*), tr. A. Enver, Istanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat.
- Conan Doyle (1958) *Kanlı Yolda Üç Erkek*, tr. Selami İzzet Sedes, Istanbul: Hâdis Yayinevi.
- Conan Doyle, Sir Arthur (1981) ‘His Last Bow’ in *The Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes*, London: Penguin Books.
- Conan Doyle, Sir Arthur (1981) *The Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes*, London and New York: Penguin.
- Cöntürk, Hüseyin (1956) “Şiir Çevirmesinde İzlenimcilik”, *Yeni Ufuklar*, 4: 32, 462-464.
- Çoruh, Selâh (1944) “Çocuklar İçin Yayınlar ve Önemi”, *Ülkü*, 5: 55, 7.
- Coşkun, Safa Nusret (1938) *Milli Bir Edebiyat Yaratabilir miyiz?*, Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Çelgin, Güler (1996) *Tanzimat’tan Günümüze Eski Yunan-Latin Dil ve Edebiyatlarına İlişkin Türkçe Yayınlar Bibliyografyası*, Istanbul: Ege Yayınları.
- Çelik Odanın Esrarı* (1944) Number 16 in the series “Meşhur İngiliz Polis Hafiyesi Şerlok Holmes”, Istanbul: Güven Yayinevi.
- Çetik, Mete (ed.) (1998) *Üniversitede Cadı Kazanı. 1948 DTCTF Tasfiyesi ve Pertev Naili Boratav’ın Müdafaası*, Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Çıkar, Mustafa (1997) *Hasan Âli Yücel ve Türk Kültür Reformu*, Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- “Çocuklarımız Neler Okuyor?” (1943) *Ülkü*, 5: 50, p. 7.
- “Çocuklar İçin Yayınlar ve Önemi” (1944) *Ülkü* 5: 55. p. 7.
- Delilbaşı, Ali Süha (1944) “Cimri Tercümesi Dolayısıyla” *Tercüme*, 4: 24, 461-468.

Demircan, Ömer (2000) *İletişim ve Dil Devrimi*, İstanbul.

Denizaltının Planı (1944) Number 48 in the series “Meşhur İngiliz Polis Hafiyesi Şerlok Holmes”, İstanbul: Güven Yayınevi.

Devellioğlu, Ferit (1998) *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat*, Ankara: Aydın Kitabevi Yayınları.

Devrim, İzzet Melih (1940) “Edebî Tercüme”, *Tercüme*, 1: 3, 275-277.

Dikici, Ali (1996) *Early Republican Reforms from the Perspective of Elite vs. the People with Particular Reference to the Alphabet and Language Reforms*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Institute for Atatürk’s Principles and the History of Turkish Renovation.

Dilmen, Güngör (1983) “Yazıda Devrim” in *Harf İnkılabı Sempozyumu*, İstanbul: İ.Ü.A.İ.İ.T.E.

Doğan, Erdal (1997) *Edebiyatımızda Dergiler*, İstanbul: Bağlam.

Dosdoğru, Hulûsi (1974) *Batı Aldatmacılığı ve Putlara Karşı Kemal Tahir*, İstanbul: Tel Yayınları.

Dünkü ve Bugünkü Edebiyatçılarımız Konuşuyor (1976) İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Dürer, Baha (1938) “Çift Tercüme”, *Kalem* No. 6, 269-270.

Ecevit, Yıldız (1999) “Türk Romanında Estetik Devrim” in *Bilanço 1923-1998 Vol. I*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 315-321.

Ediz, Hasan Âli (1939) “Tercüme ve Mütercime Dair”, *Oluş* No. 18, 279-280.

Ediz, Hasan Âli (1955) “Tercüme Çalışmalarımızın Onbeş Yıllık Bilânçosu”, *Yeditepe* No. 88, 3.

Edwards, Paul (ed.) (1967) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 4, New York: The Macmillan Company & The Free Press.

Erem, Turgut S. (1943) “Ölmiyen Aşk”, *Tercüme*, 3: 18, 426-430.

- Erhat, Azra (1940a) "Yunan Eserlerinin Almanyada Tercümesi", *Tercüme*, 1: 1, 83-90.
- Erhat, Azra (1940b) "Lâtinçe İlke Edebî Eser Bir Tercümedir", *Tercüme*, 1: 3, 270-274.
- Erhat, Azra (1942) "Herodot Tarihi", *Tercüme*, 2: 12, 523-526.
- Erhat, Azra (1944) "Yunan-Lâtin Klâsikleri", *Tercüme*, 5: 28, 317-319.
- Erhat, Azra (1974) "Tercüme Bürosu", *Yeni Ufuklar*, 21: 247, 8-16.
- Ersan Gözübüyük, Nevra (1999) *The Democrat Party and the State Radio*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Institute for Atatürk's Principles and the History of Turkish Renovation.
- Ersoy, Osman (1966) *Halk Kütüphaneleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*, Ankara: Güven Matbaası.
- Ertan, Temuçin F. (1997) "Ahmet Cevat Emre ve Kemalizm'de Öncü Bir Dergi: *Muhit*", *Kebikeç*, Nb. 5, 17-34.
- Ertop, Konur (1963) "Atatürk Devriminde Türk Dili", in *Atatürk ve Türk Dili*, Ankara: T.D.K. Yayınları.
- "Eseri Sunarken..." (1944) anonymous preface to Lewis Carroll, *Alis Harikalar Diyarında*, tr. Muzaffer Beşli and Naime Halit Yaşaroğlu, Istanbul: Ahmet Halit Kitabevi.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1986) "Language Conflict and National Identity" in Joseph Alpher (ed.) *Nationalism and Modernity: A Mediterranean Perspective*. New York: Praeger, 126-135.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990a) "Polysystem Theory", *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11 (1) 9-26.

- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990b) "The Literary System". *Polysystem Studies, Poetics Today* 11 (1) 27-51.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1994) "Culture Planning and the Market: Making and Maintaining Socio-Semiotic Entities", Paper delivered at the Darmouth Colloquium, "The Making of Culture", Dartmouth College, 22-27 July 1994.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1996) "The Role of Literature in the Making of the Nations of Europe: A Socio-semiotic Examination". *Applied Semiotics*, University of Toronto, No.1, February 1996. Also available from <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers>.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997a) "Culture Planning and Cultural Resistance in the Making and Maintaining of Entities". Paper delivered at the International Workshop "Relocation of Languages and Cultures," Duke University, May 6-11, 1997.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997b) "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer" in *Target* 9:2, 355-363.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997c) "Culture Repertoire and the Wealth of Collective Entities: Parameters for Contrastive Culture Analysis", available from <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers>.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997d). "Polysystem Theory and Culture Research." "<http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers/psth-cr.htm>"
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1997e) "Polysystem Theory" (Revised version of "Polysystem Theory which appeared in *Poetics Today* in 1990), available from <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers>.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1998) "Some Replies to Lambert and Pym", *Target* 10:2, 363-369.

- F.S. (1935) "Birkaç Söz", preface to Jonathan Swift, *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, tr. Ercümend Ekrem Talû, Istanbul: Akşam Kitapevi.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*, London and New York: Longman.
- Fevzi Muhip (1935) "Neo-humanisme ve Akıl" *Yücel*, 1: 3.
- Galanti, Avram (1996) *Arabî Harfleri Terakkimize Mâni Değildir*, (transliterated by) Fethi Kale, Istanbul: Bedir Yayınevi.
- Garan, Muvaffak İhsan (1949) "Serbest Tercüme ve Türk Edebiyatı", *Şadırvan*, No. 12.
- Genette, Gerard (1997) *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretaton*, tr. Jane E. Lewin, Cambridge University Press.
- Goldsmith, Oliver (1946) *Yanlışlıklar Gecesi*, tr. Ali Rıza Seyfi, Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc (1997) "Translation and the Shape of Things to Come", *The Translator*, 3: 2, 125-152, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Gökalp, Ziya (1986) *Türkçülüğün Esasları*, (revised by) Mehmet Kaplan, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Gökberk, Macit (1985) *Felsefe Tarihi*, Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- "Gulliver'in Seyahatleri" (1943) anonymous preface to Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti, VII-X.
- "Güliiver Cüceler Memleketinde" (1927) anonymous preface to Jonathan Swift, *Cüceler Memleketinde*, Istanbul: Resimli Ay.
- Güloğul, Faruk Rıza (1937) *Halk Kitaplarına Dair*, Istanbul: Bozkurt Matbaası.
- Güney, Erol (1942) "Budala", *Tercüme*, 2: 12, 530-535.

Güney, Erol (1942) "Edebî Eserlerin 'Film Diline' Tercümesi", *Tercüme*, 3: 14, 142-144.

Güngör, Erol (1998) R. Güler and E. Kılınç (eds.) *Aydınlar ve Sosyal Meseleler*, İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Güntekin, Reşat (1940) *Halkevlerinde Tiyatro Konuşmaları*, Ankara: CHP Halkevleri Neşriyatı.

Günyol, Vedat (1982) *Daldan Dala*, İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.

Günyol, Vedat (1983) "Türkiye'de Çeviri" in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* Vol. II, İstanbul: İletişim.

Günyol, Vedat (1997) "Hasan Âli Yücel" in Hasan Anamur (ed.) *Hasan Âli Yücel Anma Kitabı, Çeviri: Ekinler ve Zamanlar Kavşağı*, İstanbul: Yıldız Üniversitesi.

Günyol, Vedat (1998) "Klasikler Yeniden" in *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, No. 436.

Güvenç, Bozkurt (1997) *Türk Kimliği*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

"Haberler" (1940a) *Tercüme*, 1: 1, 112-114.

"Haberler" (1940b) *Tercüme*, Vol. 1, No. 2, p.209.

"Haberler" (1943) *Tercüme*, 3:18, 441-444.

"Haberler" (1947) *Tercüme*, 7: 41-42, 435-437.

"Haberler" (1949) *Tercüme*, 1: 2, 14-15.

Halil Nimetullah (1930) *Halkçılık ve Cumhuriyet ve Türk Halkçılığı ve Cumhuriyeti*, İstanbul: Orhaniye Matbaası.

Halkevleri (1963) İstanbul: CHP İstanbul İl Gençlik Kolu Yayını.

Halkevlerinin 1934 Senesi Faaliyet Raporları Hülâsası (1935) Ankara: Ulus Basımevi.

Halkevlerinin 1935 Senesi Faaliyet Raporları Hülâsası (1936) Ankara: Ulus Basımevi.

- Halman, Talat Sait (1973) "The Ancient and Ottoman Legacy" in Anne Paolucci and Talat Sait Halman (eds.) *Review of National Literatures. Turkey: From Empire to Nation*, Volume IV, No 1, St John's University.
- "Harf İnkılâbından Sonra Bizde Kitapçılığın Bugünkü Hali ve İstikbali" (1933) *Resimli Şark*, No. 25, 17-23.
- Hermans, Theo (1999) *Translation in Systems*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Heyd, Uriel (1954) *Language Reform in Modern Turkey*, Jerusalem: The Israel Oriental Society.
- Hızır, N. and N. (1941a) "Bir Shakespeare Tercümesi Münasebetiyle", *Tercüme*, 1: 5, 488-489.
- Hızır, N. and N. (1941c) "Bir Shakespeare Tercümesi Münasebetiyle", *Tercüme*, 2: 7, 76-80.
- Hızır, Nusret (1941b) "Tercüme Dair Yazılar Hakkında", *Tercüme*, 2: 9, 265-268.
- Hızır, Nusret (1943) "Bir Tenkid Münasebetiyle", *Tercüme*, 3: 18, 434-435.
- Hızır, Nusret (1943) "Eflâton Tercümeleri", *Tercüme*, 3: 17, 344-347.
- Honderich, Ted (Ed.) (1995) *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoyi, İbrahim (1948) "Son Çıkan Klâsikler", *Tercüme*, 8: 43-44, 158-159.
- Hulusi, Şerif (1941) "Bir Adaptasyon Çıraklığı, Telifi Tercüme Diye Yutturma Ve Saire...", *Varlık*, 11: 185, 394-396.
- İğdemir, Uluğ (1939) *Halkevleri Kütüphaneleri İçin Rehber*, İstanbul: CHP Yayını.
- İğdemir, Uluğ (1945) "1944 Kitap Hülâsa Etme Müsabakası", *Ülkü*, 7: 83, 22-23.
- İleri, Suphi Nuri (1998) *Yeni Edebiyat 1940-1941: Sosyalist Gerçekçilik*, İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık.
- İlgün, Süreyya (1942) "Nana", *Tercüme*, 3: 14, 145-149.

- İmer, Kâmile (1998) *Türkiye 'de Dil Planlaması: Türk Dil Devrimi*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- İnönü, İsmet (1943) preface to Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti (originally written in 1941).
- İskit, Server (1939) *Türkiye'de Neşriyat Hareketleri Tarihine Bir Bakış*, İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi.
- “Jonathan Swift ve Gulliver'in Seyahatleri” (1943) anonymous preface to Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti, 1-4.
- “Jonathan Swift” (1946) anonymous preface to Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti, I-VII.
- Jusdanis, Gregory (1991) *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture*, Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press.
- Kabacalı, Alpay (1981) *Türkiye 'de Yazarın Kazancı*, İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.
- Kabacalı, Alpay (1994) “Halk Kitapları”, *Müteferrika* No. 4.
- Kabacalı, Alpay (2000) *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiye 'de Matbaa Basın ve Yayın*. İstanbul: Literatür.
- Kaplan, Ramazan (1998) *Klâsikler Tartışması*, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- Karadağ, Nurhan (1998) *Halkevleri Tiyatro Çalışmaları (1932-1951)*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Karantay, Suat (1989) “Türkiye'de Oyun Çevirisi Tarihine Kısa Bir Bakış” in *Metis Çeviri*, No. 9, 87-91.
- Karantay, Suat (1991) “‘Tercüme Bürosu’: Normlar ve İşlevler”, *Metis Çeviri*, No. 16, 96-101.

- Karantay, Suat and Yurdanur Salman (1988) "Vedat Günyol'la Söyleşi", *Metis Çeviri*, No. 2, 11-19.
- Karliyan-Belleyir (1934) *Yutlant Muharebesi Bahriyesi*, tr. Ali Rıza Seyfi, Istanbul.
- Karpat, Kemal (1962) *Türk Edebiyatında Sosyal Konular*, Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Karpat, Kemal H. (1959) *Turkey's Politics, The Transition to a Multi-Party System*, Princeton and New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Katoğlu, Murat (1997) "Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinde Eğitim, Kültür, Sanat" in *Türkiye Tarihi 4: Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Kayaoğlu, Taceddin (1998) *Türkiye'de Tercüme Müesseseleri*, Istanbul: Kitabevi.
- Kaygı, Abdullah (1992) *Türk Düşüncesinde Çağdaşlaşma*, Ankara: Gündoğan.
- Kaynardağ, Arslan (1960) "Books in Turkey" *Middle Eastern Affairs*, 11: 10, 307-311.
- Kaynardağ, Arslan (1983) "Yayın Dünyası" in *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi Vol. 10*, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2824-2836.
- Kâzım Nami (1929) "Cehlimiz", *Resimli Uyanış*, 66-2: 1726-41.
- Kâzım Nami (1934) "Hümanisma", *Ülkü* No. 17, 332-336.
- Kâzım Nami (1934) "Türk Edebiyatına Bir Bakış", *Ülkü*, 3:14, 116-123.
- Kemal Tahir (1969) *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, Istanbul: Sander Yayınları.
- Keseroğlu, Hasan S. and Serdar Gökalp (1985) "Cumhuriyetten Günümüze Çeviri Üzerine Yazılar Kaynakçası", *Dün ve Bugün Çeviri*, Book 2, Istanbul: Bilim Sanat Felsefe Yayınları.
- Kırık Tabanca* (1944) Number 37 in the series "Meşhur İngiliz Polis Hafiyesi Şerlok Holmes", Istanbul: Güven Yayınevi.
- "Kitaba Başlamadan" (1946) anonymous preface to Lewis Carroll, *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde*, tr. Kısmet Burian, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Klâsikler Bibliyografyası 1940-1966 (1967) Ankara, Milli Kütüphane Yayınları.

“Klâsikler Listesi” (1947) *Tercüme* 7: 41-42, 438-504.

“Klâsiklerin Tercümesi” (1933) *Varlık*, 1: 2.

“Klâsiklerin Tercümesi” (1946) *Varlık*, 14: 315, 2.

Kocabaşoğlu, Uygur (1980) *Şirket Telsizinden Devlet Radyosuna TRT Öncesi Dönemde Radyonun Tarihsel Gelişimi ve Türk Siyasal Hayatı İçindeki Yeri*, Ankara : Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayını.

Kocagöz, Samim (1953) “Evet Halk İçin”, *Ufuklar*, 1:12, 360-361.

Kongar, Emre (1986) "Turkey's Cultural Transformation" in Günsel Renda and C. Max Kortepeter (eds.) *The Transformation of Turkish Culture, The Atatürk Legacy*, Princeton: The Kingston Press.

Köni, Yunus Kâzım (1940) “Tercüme Bürosu”, *Yeni Adam*, No. 273, 6, 19

Köni, Yusuf Kâzım (1944) “Tercüme Dair Düşünceler”, *Tercüme*, 5: 26, 157-159.

Köprülü, Fuat [Köprülüzade Mehmet Efendi] (1928) “Tercüme Meselesi”, *Hayat*, 3: 75, 445-446.

Korkmaz, Zeynep (1995) *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*, Volume One, Ankara: T.D.K. Yayınları.

Kortepeter, Carl Max (1986) "Introduction: Two Millennia of Turkish Preeminence in Asia and Europe" in Günsel Renda and C. Max Kortepeter (eds.) *The Transformation of Turkish Culture, The Atatürk Legacy*, Princeton: The Kingston Press.

Koz, Sabri (2000) “Jules Verne’in Türkçedeki Serüveni / Seçme Kaynakça”, *Kitaplık*, Nb. 44, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

- Kurultay, Turgay (1999) "Cumhuriyet Türkiyesinde Çevirinin Ağır Yükü ve Türk Hümanizması", *Alman Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi XI*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 13-36.
- Landau, Jacob M. (1990) "Language Policy and Political Development in Israel and Turkey" in Brian Weinstein (ed.) *Language Policy and Political Development*, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Leblanc, Maurice (1909) *L'Aiguille Creuse*, Paris: Lafitte.
- Lefevere, André (1992) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Levend, Agâh Sırrı (1949) *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Safhaları*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Lewis, Bernard (1961) *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, Geoffrey (1999) *The Turkish Language Reform, A Catastrophic Success*, Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, Geoffrey (1999) *The Turkish Language Reform, A Catastrophic Success*, Oxford University Press.
- Maarif Vekilliğince Bastırılacak veya Basılması Teşvik Edilecek Tercüme Eserlerin Ne Suretle İnceleneceği Hakkında Talimatname* (1944) Ankara: Maarif Matbaası.
- Macksey, Richard (1997) "Foreword" in Gerard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. tr. Jane E. Lewin, Cambridge University Press, xi-xxiii.
- Mann, Nicholas (1996) "The Origins of Humanism" in Jill Kraye (Ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Marja Jänis (1996) "What Translators of Plays Think About Their Work", *Target* 8:2. 341-364.
- Meriç, Cemil (1942) "Köy Hekimi", *Ayın Bibliyografyası*, No. 11-12, 23-26.
- Meriç, Cemil (1942) "Meyhane 'Assommoire'", *Ayın Bibliyografyası*, No. 9-10, 19-22.
- Meriç, Cemil (1942) "Tercüme Hataları", *Ayın Bibliyografyası*, No. 5, 14-15.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları Kataloğu* (1948) İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Milton, John (2001) "Translating Classic Fiction for Mass Markets", *The Translator*, 7: 1, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Moran, Berna (2001a) *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış 2*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Moran, Berna (2001b) *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış 2*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- N.S. (1942) "Tercüme Dair Notlar", *Tercüme*, 3: 16, 299-300.
- Nahid Sırrı (1941) "Bir Okuyucunun Notları – Tercüme ve Mütercimlere Dair", *Ülkü*, 17: 100, 374-376.
- Nahit Sırrı (1934) "Bir Tercüme Hey'etine İntizar", *Varlık*, 1: 13.
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1934) "Sanatın Himayesi Meselesi", *Varlık*, 1: 11.
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1935) "Klasikler Katliamı", *Varlık*, 2: 44, 305-306.
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1937) *Edebiyatımızın Bugünkü Meseleleri*, İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi.
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1941) "Edebî Hikâyelerin Tercümesi", *Tercüme*, 2: 7, 91-95.
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1943) "Tercüme Dair", *Tercüme*, 3: 18, 422-425.
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1971) *Edebiyat Dünyamız*, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Nayır, Yaşar Nabi (1971) *Yıllar Boyunca Edebiyat Dünyamız*, İstanbul: Varlık.

Nâzım Hikmet (1975) *Kemal Tahir'e Mapusaneden Mektuplar*, İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Necatigil, Behçet (1983) *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü* (11th edition), İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Necatigil, Behçet (1983) *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Norton, Ann (1988) *Reflections on Political Identity*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nusret Kemal (Köymen) (1934) *Halkçılık ve Köycülük*, Ankara: Tarık Edip ve Şeriki Kütüphanesi.

“Nüfus Sayımı” (1935) *Ülkü*, 6: 33.

Oktay, Ahmet (1986) *Toplumcu Gerçekçiliğin Kaynakları*, İstanbul: Bilim Felsefe Sanat Yayınları.

“Okuyucuların Beyendikleri” (1956) *Varlık*, No. 438, 18.

“Onuncu Yılda Maarifimiz Rehberi’nden” (1933) *Varlık*, 1: 8, 124-127.

Ozansoy, Halit Fahri (1943) “Tercüme Bolluğu”, *Son Posta*, 9.10.1943, 4.

Ozansoy, Halit Fahri (1944) “Tercüme”, *Son Posta*, 17.6.1944, p. 4.

Ozansoy, Halit Fahri (1946) “Edebiyat”, *Tercüme*, 7: 38, 94-95.

Örik, Nahid Sırrı (1940) “‘Le Lys Rouge’ Tercümesi” *Tercüme*, 1: 2, 202-205.

Ötüken, Adnan (1946) *Seçme Eserler Bibliyografyası 1942-1945 I*, İstanbul: Bir Yayınevi.

Özçelebi, Betül (1998a) *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Edebî Eleştiri 1923-1938*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Özçelebi, Hüseyin (1998b) *Cumhuriyet Döneminde Edebî Eleştiri 1938-1950*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

- Özdarendeli, M. Necmettin (1956) "Çeviri Edebiyatımızın Yetersizliği", *Türk Dili*, 5:58, 626-629.
- Özdenoğlu, Şinasi (1949) *Edebiyatımızın Beş Ana Meselesi*, İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Özege, Seyfettin (1971) *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Katalogu*, İstanbul: Fatih Yayınevi.
- Özerdim, Sami (1974) *Elli Yılda Kitap (1923-1973)*, Ankara: Sevinç Matbaası.
- Özön, Nihat (1985) *Türkçede Roman*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları (Originally published in 1936).
- Öztürkmen, Arzu (1994) "The Role of People's Houses in the Making of National Culture in Turkey", *New Perspectives in Turkey*, No. 11, 159-181.
- Paker, Saliha (1986a) "Changing Norms of the Target System: Turkish Translations of Greek Classics in Historical Perspective" in *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, Proceedings of the 7th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki, 12-14 May 1986.
- Paker, Saliha (1986b) "Hamlet in Turkey" in *New Comparison*, No. 2, 89-105.
- Paker, Saliha (1991) "The Age of Translation and Adaptation, 1850-1914: Turkey" in Robin Ostle (ed.) *Modern Literature in the Near and Middle East 1850-1970*, London: Routledge.
- Palmer, Jerry (1991) *Potboilers*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Parla, Taha (1995) *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmî Kaynakları Vol. 3: Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Ok'u*, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Pınar, Nedret (1987) *1900-1983 Yılları Arasında Türkçe'de Goethe ve 'Faust' Tercümeleleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.
- Pınar, Nedret (1988) "Türkiye'de Faust", *Metis Çeviri*, No. 4, 75-83.

- Pym, Anthony (1998) *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük* (1979) İstanbul: Çeltüt Matbaası.
- Remzi Kitabevi 1948 Kataloğu* (1948) İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Renan, Ernest (1990) "What is a nation?" tr. Martin Thom, printed in Homi K. Bhabha (ed.) *Nation and Narration*, Routledge: London.
- Resimli Şark* (1933) No. 25, 1.
- Roberts, Thomas J. (1990) *An Aesthetics of Junk Fiction*, Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press.
- Robinson Douglas (1998a) "Free Translation" in Mona Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge, 87-90.
- Robinson Douglas (1998b) "Literal Translation" in Mona Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge, 125-127.
- Robyns, Clem (1990) "The Normative Models of Twentieth Century *Belles Infidèles*: Detective Novels in French Translation", *Target*, 2:1, 23-42.
- Rohde, Georg (1941) "Tercümeyle Dair" *Tercüme*, 1; 5, 475-478.
- "Saffet Korkut" (1946) *Tercüme*, 7: 38, 97.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni (1998) "İstanbul, Vampirler ve Benzer Şeyler". *Albüm 1* (February 1998), 54-59.
- Selâmi Münir (Yurdatap) (1936) *Arzu İle Kanber*, İstanbul: Yusuf Ziya.
- Seniha Sami (1932) "Lewis Carroll'un Yüzüncü Yıldönümü. Peri Masalları Yazan Bir Riyaziyeci", *Muhit*, 4: 46, p. 54.
- Sertelli, İskender Fahrettin (1941) *Transatlantik Kundakçıları*, İstanbul: Güven Basımevi.

- Sevengil, Refik Ahmet (1933) *Bizim İsteddiğimiz Edebiyat*, İstanbul: Bürhaneddin Matbaası.
- Sevengil, Refik Ahmet: *Bizim İstedğimiz Edebiyat*, İstanbul: Bürhaneddin Matbaası.
- Sevük, İsmail Habib (1940a) *Avrupa Edebiyatı ve Biz*, Volume I, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Sevük, İsmail Habib (1940b) *Avrupa Edebiyatı ve Biz*, Volume II, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Seyda, Mehmet (1970) *Edebiyat Dostları*, İstanbul: Kıtış Yayınları.
- Sheffy, Rakefet (1997) "Models and Habituses: Problems in the Idea of Cultural Repertoires", *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 24:1, 35-47.
- Simeoni, Daniel (1998) "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus", *Target* 10:1. 1-39.
- Sinanoğlu, Suat (1941) "Ahmet Cevat Emrenin Odysseia Tercümesi Hakkında", *Tercüme*, 2: 10, 344-353
- Sinanoğlu, Suat (1941) "Protagoras'ın Tercümesi Hakkında", *Tercüme*, 1: 5, 485-487.
- Sinanoğlu, Suat (1980) *Türk Humanizmi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Sohár, Anikó (1998) "'Genuine' and 'Fictitious' Translations of Science Fiction & Fantasy in Hungary" in L. Bowker, M. Cronin, D. Kenny and J. Pearson (eds.) *Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Sönmez, Şinasi (2000) *Eğitim ve Siyasette Hasan Âli Yücel*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Söylevler 1932-1941* (1942) Ankara: Recep Ulusoğlu Basımevi.

- Stevenson, R.L. (1944) *Dr. Jekyll ile Mr. Hyde*, tr. Zarife Laçiner, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Stoker, Bram (1940) *Drakyola Kan İçen Adam*. tr. Selâmi Münir Yurdatap, İstanbul: Güven Basımevi.
- Strauss A. and J. Corbin (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Sungu, İhsan (1940) "Tercüme ve Renaissance", *Tercüme*, 1: 2, 115-119.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem (forthcoming) "Multiple-Entry Visa for Travelling Theory", *Target*.
- Swift, Jonathan (1900) *Gulliver's Travels*, T. Nelson and Sons.
- Swift, Jonathan (1943) "from Gulliver's Travels" tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, *Tercüme*, 4: 20-21, 134-143.
- Swift, Jonathan (1946) *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Şahinbaş, İrfan (1942) "Cengel Kitabı", *Tercüme*, 2: 11, 447-451.
- Şahinbaş, İrfan and Saffet Korkut (1942) "Hamlet Tercümesi", *Tercüme*, 2: 12, 527-529.
- Şardağ, Rüştü (1944) "Melodram Edebiyatı", *Ülkü*, 5: 55, 6.
- Şerif Hulûsi (1941) "Bir Adaptasyon Çıraklığı, Telifi Tercüme Diye Yutturma, Ve Saire", *Varlık*, 5: 185, 394-396.
- Şimşir, Bilal (1992) *Türk Yazı Devrimi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- T.D.K. (1962) *Dil Devriminin 30 Yılı*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Talu, Ercüment Ekrem (1944) "Maarifimizin 21inci Yıl Armağanı", *Tercüme*, 5: 27, 238.
- Taluy, Nihal Yalaza (1943) "Müfettiş Tercürnesi", *Tercüme*, 4: 19, 69-71.

- Tanpınar, Ahmet (1998) "Tercüme Meselesi" in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*.
Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 77-79.
- Teoman, Sabahattin (1946) "Yepyeni Bir Eser" (originally published in *Ulus*,
16.4.1946) reprinted in *Tercüme*, 7: 38, 90-93.
- "Tercümeler" (1938) *Ülkü*, 9: 66, 566.
- "Tercümesi Tavsiye Edilen Eserler" (1942) *Ayın Bibliyografyası*, No. 2, 12.
- Thomas Mann (1945) *Tonio Kröger*, tr. Mehmet Karasan, Ankara: Milli Eğitim
Basımevi.
- Todorov, Tzvetan (1995) *The Morals of History*, Minnesota: University of
Minnesota Press.
- Toprak, Zafer (1998) *Bir Yurttaş Yaratmak*, Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık.
- Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam:
John Benjamins.
- Toury, Gideon (in press a) "Culture Planning and Translation", Alvarez et al. (eds.)
Proceedings of the Vigo Conference "anovadores de nós - anosadores de vós".
Available from <http://spinoza.tau.ac.il/~tourney/works>.
- Toury, Gideon (in press b) "Translation as a Means of Planning and the Planning
of Translation: A Theoretical Framework and an Exemplary Case". Forthcoming
in Saliha Paker (ed.) *Proceedings the International Conference "Translations:
(Re)shaping of Literature and Culture"*, Istanbul: Bogaziçi University. Available
from <http://spinoza.tau.ac.il/~tourney/works>.
- Tucel, Bedrettin (1942) "Antigone Temsili" *Ülkü*, 1: 11, 20-21.
- Tunaya, Tarık Zafer (1999) *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri II*
Istanbul: Cumhuriyet Gazetesi.

- Tunçay, Mete (1997) "Siyasal Tarih (1950-1960) in *Türkiye Tarihi 4: Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Tuncel, Bedrettin (1940) "Tercüme Meselesi", *Tercüme*, 1: 1, 79-83.
- Tuncel, Bedrettin (1943) "Millî Edebiyat", *Ülkü*, 3: 32, 1-2.
- Tuncor, Ferit Ragıp (1989) *Milli Eğitim Yayınları Bibliyografyası*, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Tuncor, Ferit Ragıp (1989) *Milli Eğitim Yayınları Bibliyografyası 1923-1985*. İstanbul: MEB.
- Türkeş, Ömer (2001) "Polisiye Tarihimize Kısa Bir Yolculuk", *Radikal Kitap*, 1:21, 12-13.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1928-38* Vol. II (1939) Ankara: Maarif Vekaleti.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1939-1948* Vol. II (1950) Ankara: Maarif Vekilliği.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1949* (1949) İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1950* (1950) İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1951* (1951) İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1952* (1952) İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1953* (1953) Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1954* (1960) Ankara: Bereket Matbaası.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1955a* Vol. I (1956) İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1955b* Vol. II (1956) İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1956a* Vol. I (1956) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1956b* Vol. II (1956) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1956c* Vol. III (1956) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1956d* Vol. IV (1956) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1957a* Vol. I (1957) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1957b* Vol. II (1957) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1957c* Vol.III (1957) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1957d* Vol. IV (1957) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1958a* Vol. I (1958) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1958b* Vol. II (1958) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1958c* Vol. III (1958) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1958d* Vol. IV (1958) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1959a* Vol. I (1959) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1959b* Vol. II (1959) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1959c* Vol. III (1959) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1959d* Vol. IV (1959) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1960a* Vol. I (1960) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1960b* Vol. II (1960) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1960c* Vol. III (1960) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

- Türkiye Bibliyografyası 1960d* Vol. IV (1960) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Türkoğlu, Pakize (2000) *Tonguç ve Enstitüleri*, İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Tymoczko, Maria (1999) *Translation in a Postcolonial Context*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Uğursuz Gerdanlık* (1944) Number 34 in the series “Meşhur İngiliz Polis Hafiyesi Şerlok Holmes”, İstanbul: Güven Yayınevi.
- Ulunay, Refi Cevad (1946) “Klâsiklerimiz ve Maarifin Klâsikleri”, *Tercüme*, 7; 38, 190-192.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1938) “Memleketi Tanımak”, *İnsan*, 1: 5.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1938) “Yeni Edebiyat Tercümelere”, *İnsan*, No. 1, 77-78.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1938a) “Hangi Garb?” *İnsan*, 1: 3.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1938b) “Tanzimata Karşı”, *İnsan*, 1: 1.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1938c) “Maksad”, *İnsan*, 1: 1.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1938d) “Memleketi Tanımak”, *İnsan*, 1: 5.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1939) “Tanzimat ve Humanizma”, *İnsan*, 2: 9.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1942) “Eflâtun Tercümelere”, *Ayın Bibliyografyası*. No. 11-12, 16-17.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1948) *Millet ve Tarih Şuuru*, İstanbul: Pulhan Matbaası.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1994) *Türkiye’de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, Fourth Edition, İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (1997) [1935] *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü*, İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları.

- Ülkütaşır, M. Şakir (1973) *Atatürk ve Harf Devrimi*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Ünsel, Kemal Edip (1947) “Klâsiklerden Faydalanma Dâvası”, *Ülkü*, 1: 7, 9-10.
- Üyepazarcı, Erol (1997) *Korkmayınız Mr. Sherlock Holmes. Türkiye’de yayınlanmış çeviri ve telif polisiye romanlar üzerine bir inceleme, 1881-1928*, İstanbul: Göçebe Yayınları.
- Üyepazarcı, Erol (1999) “ ‘Yumruklarıyla Sevişen, Dudaklarıyla Döğüşen Hafiyesi Mike Hammer’ Yahut Kemal Tahir, Afif Yesari ve Diğerlerinin Yerli Mayk Hammerleri”, *Müteferrika* No. 16.
- Vakit* (1940) “Radyo”, 23: 7905, p. 6.
- “Varlık Yayınları” (1957) *Varlık*, Nb. 451, 23.
- Varoğlu, Hamdi (1947) *Aşk Uyanınca*. İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1994) “The Translator’s Invisibility: The Evidence of Reviews”, *In Other Words*, No. 4, 16-22.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator’s Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1998) “Strategies of Translation” in Mona Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 240-244.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The Scandals of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Weinstein, Brian (1990) “Language Policy and Political Development: An Overview” in Brian Weinstein (ed.) *Language Policy and Political Development*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Wells, H.G. (1938) *Görünmiyen Adam*, İstanbul: İnkılâb Kitabevi.

- Wodak, Ruth (1997) "Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction" in Britt-Louise Gunnarson, Per Linell and Bengt Nordberg (eds.) *The Construction of Professional Discourse*, London and New York.
- Wolf, Leonard (1975) *The Annotated Dracula*. New York: Clarkson and Potter.
- Yalçın, Murat (ed.) (2001) *Tanzimattan Bugüne Edebiyatçılar Ansiklopedisi*, 2 Volumes, Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık.
- Yamaner, Şerafettin (1998) *Atatürk Öncesinde ve Sonrasında Kültürel Gelişim*. Istanbul: Toplumsal Dönüşüm Yayınları.
- Yazoğlu, Cengiz (1993) *Kemal Tahir, Notlar/Mektuplar*, Istanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- "Yelkovan" (1948) *Tercüme*, 8: 43-44, 154.
- Yeşim, Ragıp Şevki (1948) "Klâsiklere Dair", *Tercüme*, 8: 43-44, 159-162.
- Yetkin, Suut Kemal (1941) "Bir Zamane Çocuğunun İtirafı", *Tercüme*, 2: 7, 81-83.
- Yetkin, Suut Kemal (1942) "Bir Kitap", *Ülkü*, 3; 28, 6-8.
- Yetkin, Suut Kemal (1944) "Tercüme Seferberliği", *Tercüme*, 5: 27, 239-240.
- Yücel, Hasan Âli (1932) *Türk Edebiyatına Toplu Bir Bakış Volume 1*, Istanbul: Remzi Kitaphanesi.
- Yücel, Hasan Âli (1935) "Niçin Az Okuyoruz?", *Varlık*, 2:39, 226-226.
- Yücel, Hasan Âli (1940) Preface to the first issue of *Tercüme*, 1: 1, 1-2.
- Yücel, Hasan Âli (1943) preface to Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.
- Yücel, Hasan Âli (1944) preface to Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri III-IV*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.
- Yücel, Hasan Âli (1945) "Yunan Özel Sayısına Önsöz", *Tercüme*, 5: 29-30, I-IV.
- Yücel, Hasan Ali (1961) "Klâsiklere Birinci Önsöz", *Tercüme*, 15: 75-76, 12.

Yücel, Hasan Âli (1989) *Edebiyat Tarihimizden*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yücel, Hasan Âli (1998) “Kitap ve Devlet” in *Pazartesi Konuşmaları*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, pp. 105-109.

Yurdatap, Selâmi Münir (1943) *Baytekin İle Tarzan Karşı Karşıya*, İstanbul: Güven.
1920-1989 T.C. Hükümet Programlarında Kültür Politikası (1990) Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Interviews:

Erten Bergin, Azize, telephone interview, 18.10.2001.

Gelen, Arif , telephone interview, 21.10.2001.

Gürçağlar, Hasan Sezai, 8.4.2001.

Günyol, Vedat, 30.11.2001.

Corpus (Case Study I):

Ali Rıza Seyfi (1928) *Kazıklı Voyvoda*. İstanbul: Resimli Ay Matbaası. [in Ottoman script]

Ali Rıza Seyfi (1940) *Türklük Demek Kahramanlık Demektir*, İstanbul: T.T. Kaptan ve Makinistler Neşriyatı.

Ali Rıza Seyfi (1946) *Kazıklı Voyvoda*. İstanbul: Çığır Kitabevi.

Ali Rıza Seyfi tr. (1935) *Tarzanın Canavarları*, İstanbul: Sinan Matbaası.

Burroughs, Edgar Rice (1920) *The Beasts of Tarzan*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd.

İkinci, F.M. (1954) *Ecel Saati*, İstanbul: Çağlayan Yayınevi.

Kemal Tahir (1956) *Esir Şehrin İnsanları*, İstanbul: Martı Yayınevi.

Selâmi Münir (nâkil) (1926) *Şarlok Holmes'in Arsen Lüpen ile Sergüzeştləri*:

Hindistan Ormanlarında, İstanbul: Cemiyet Kütüphanesi. [in Ottoman script]

Spillane, Mickey (1949) *I, The Jury*, New York: Signet Books.

Spillane, Mickey (1954) *Kanun Benim*, tr. F.M. İkinci, İstanbul: Çağlayan Yayınevi.

Stoker, Bram (1940) *Drakyola, Kan İçen Adam*, tr. Selami Münir Yurdatap. İstanbul:

Güven Basımevi.

Stoker, Bram (1993) *Dracula*, London: Penguin.

Yurdatap, Selâmi Münir, *Mehmetçik Çanakkaleden*, İstanbul:

Corpus (Case Study II):

Carroll, Lewis (1932) *Alisin Sergüzeştləri*, tr. Ahmet Cevat, İstanbul: Muhit Mecmuası.

Carroll, Lewis (1944) *Alis Harikalar Diyarında*, tr. Muzaffer Beşli and Naime Halit Yaşar, İstanbul: Ahmet Halit Kitabevi.

Carroll, Lewis (1946) *Alice Harikalar Ülkesinde*, tr. Kısmet Burian, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Carroll, Lewis (1953) *Alis Harikalar Ülkesinde*, tr. Azize Erten, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Carroll, Lewis (1956) *Alis Harikalar Diyarında*, tr. Nurettin Ardıç, İstanbul: Rafet Zaimler Kitabevi.

Carroll, Lewis (1960) *Alis Harikalar Diyarında*, tr. Leylâ Soydaş and Bige Atasagun, İstanbul: İyigün Yayınları.

- Carroll, Lewis (1994) *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, London: Penguin Books.
- Swift, Jonathan (1927) *Cüceler Memleketinde*, translator unknown, Istanbul: Resimli Ay Matbaası. [in Ottoman script]
- Swift, Jonathan (1935) *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, tr. Ercümend Ekrem Talû, Istanbul: Akşam Kitapevi.
- Swift, Jonathan (1941) *Güliver Cüceler Ülkesinde*, Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi.
- Swift, Jonathan (1943a) *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.
- Swift, Jonathan (1944) *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri III-IV*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.
- Swift, Jonathan (1946) *Gulliver'in Seyahatleri I-II*, tr. İrfan Şahinbaş, Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.
- Swift, Jonathan (1946b) *Cüceler ve Devler Memleketinde Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*, tr. Ercümend Ekrem Talû, Istanbul: Kanaat Kitapevi.
- Swift, Jonathan (1960) *Guliver Cüceler Ülkesinde*, tr. Arif Gelen, Ankara: Köy ve Eğitim Yayınları.
- Swift, Jonathan (1994) *Gulliver's Travels*, London: Penguin Books.
- Swift, Jonathan (undated) *Güliver'in Maceraları*, tr. M. Doğan Özbay, Istanbul: İyigün Yayınları.