

A CRITICAL STUDY ON PINAR KÜR AS AUTHOR-TRANSLATOR:  
AUTHORIAL AND TRANSLATORIAL STYLES IN INTERACTION

ELİF AKA

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2011

A CRITICAL STUDY ON PINAR KÜR AS AUTHOR-TRANSLATOR:  
AUTHORIAL AND TRANSLATORIAL STYLES IN INTERACTION

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  
Elif Aka

Boğaziçi University

2011

## Thesis Abstract

Elif Aka, “A Critical Study on Pınar Kür as Author-Translator:  
Authorial and Translatorial Styles in Interaction”

The present thesis has two main goals: to explore interactions between Pınar Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles and to test the extent to which corpus methodology can be employed in the stylistic analysis of literary texts. The quantitative and qualitative analyses of the texts in the corpus, which consists of *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (1989), *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz [Wide Sargasso Sea]* (1982), *Dörtlü [Quartet]* (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk [Voyage in the Dark]* (1989), and *Günaydın Geceyarısı [Goodmorning Midnight]* (1990), demonstrate that there are various interactions between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles. The study reveals that certain aspects of style would not be detected without a qualitative analysis despite the benefits provided by corpus software. The discourse analysis of the essays about author-translators in the journals *Tercüme*, *Yazko Çeviri*, and *Metis Çeviri* shows that author-translators were well-esteemed and expected to translate literary works into Turkish in stylistic similarity to the source texts particularly in the 1940s. The results of the investigation on Kür’s ‘habitus’ and the reception of her works in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation show that Pınar Kür has considerable symbolic capital as an author-translator. The thesis further explores the agency of the author-translator positioned in the intersection of the Turkish literary polysystem and the system of literature in Turkish translation and identifies influences of her authorial habitus on her translatorial habitus and vice versa.

## Tez Özeti

Elif Aka, “Yazar-Çevirmen Olarak Pınar Kür Üzerine Eleştirel Bir İnceleme:  
Yazar ve Çevirmen Biçemleri Arasındaki Etkileşimler”

Bu tezin iki temel amacı vardır: Bir yazar-çevirmen olarak Pınar Kür’ün yazdığı ve çevirdiği eserler arasındaki biçimsel etkileşimleri araştırmak ve edebi eserlerde biçimsel inceleme yaparken bütüncü yazılımlarının ne derece yararlı olabileceğini ortaya koymak. Sırasıyla *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (1989), *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] (1982), *Dörtlü* [*Quartet*] (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* [*Voyage in the Dark*] (1989) ve *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*] (1990) olmak üzere, bütüncedeki eserlerin niceliksel ve niteliksel incelemeleri Kür’ün yazar ve çevirmen olarak biçemleri arasında çeşitli etkileşimler olduğunu göstermiştir. Bütüncü yazılımı, araştırma sürecinde çeşitli yararlar sağlamış olsa da edebi metinlerin bazı önemli biçimsel özelliklerinin niteliksel inceleme olmaksızın tesbitinin mümkün olamayacağı sonucuna varılmıştır. *Tercüme*, *Yazko Çeviri* ve *Metis Çeviri* dergilerinde yazar-çevirmenlerle ilgili çıkan yazıların söylem çözümlemesi yazar-çevirmenlerin saygı duyulan ve özellikle 1940’larda yabancı edebi eserlerin Türkçe çevirilerinde kaynak metindekine benzer biçimsel özellikleri yakalayabileceği düşünülen kişiler olduğunu göstermiştir. Kür’ün ‘habitus’unun ve özgün yapıtlarıyla çevirilerinin alımlanmalarının incelenmesi sonucunda, Pınar Kür’ün yazar-çevirmen olarak önemli düzeyde simgesel sermayeye sahip olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Tezde Pınar Kür’ün hem Türk edebiyatı çoğul dizgesiyle Türkçe çeviri edebiyatın kesiştiği noktada duran yazar-çevirmen özneliği hem de yazar ve çevirmen habituslarının birbirlerine olan etkileri tesbit edilmiştir.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Elif Aka

PLACE OF BIRTH: Istanbul, Turkey

DATE OF BIRTH: 21 June 1977

### GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

MA in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Bilkent University, 2004.

BA in Western Languages and Literatures, Boğaziçi University, 2000.

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Instructor of English, School of Foreign Languages, Marmara University, Istanbul, 2001-2010.

Lecturer, Department of Translation and Interpreting, Marmara University, Istanbul, 2006-2008.

Translator, Proofreader & Tutor, Academic Writing Center, Marmara University, Istanbul, 2004-2007.

Researcher, Department of Communication, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, January-May 2001.

### AWARDS AND HONORS:

American Embassy, English Language Office, Ankara, Turkey, US Federal Assistance Award for presentation at the TESOL in Texas, USA, 2005.

Bilkent University, High Honors for graduation from the MA TEFL Program, 2004.

Boğaziçi University, Honors for graduation from the BA Program in Western Languages and Literatures, 2000.

#### GRANTS AND SCHOLARSHIPS:

BUVAK (Boğaziçi University Foundation), Scholarship for presenting at MATS (Methodological Advances in Corpus-based Translation Studies), University College Gent, Belgium, 2010.

BUVAK, Scholarship for presenting a research project at The Translation Research Summer School, London, UK, 2007.

Bilkent University, Full Tuition Scholarship, 2003-2004.

#### PUBLICATIONS:

Aka, Elif. 2009. "Sınıf Yönetimi Alanında Öz Yeterlilik." [Self-Efficacy for Classroom Management.] *Yaşadıkça Eğitim* 104: Oct-Nov-Dec 2009/4, 2-9.

Yılmaz, Elif. (with Tahsin Çulhaoğlu, Selin Erkul, Gökçe Metin, Senem Öner, Aslı Takanay). 2007. "Çevrilemez" Olanın Çevrilmesi Sorunsalı." [The Problematic of Translating the "Untranslatable".] *Journal of Turkish Studies. Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 31/ I: 219-223. Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.

Yılmaz, Elif. 2004. "The relationship between novice and experienced teachers' self-efficacy for classroom management and students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom management." MA thesis, Bilkent University.

Yılmaz, Elif, trans. 2001. *İlk Ansiklopedim [DK First Encyclopedia]*. Istanbul: Net Yayıncılık.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc Prof Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, who has helped me feel strong as a researcher with her knowledge, guidance, and empathy throughout the processes of conducting this study and writing the thesis. In addition to being a supervisor who gave invaluable feedback, Prof Tahir Gürçağlar has always kindly spared her precious time to listen to me personally and responded to my e-mails during the long periods of time I was out of the country. Similar to Prof Tahir Gürçağlar, Prof Saliha Paker and Prof Sibel Irzık, members of my thesis jury, have given positive constructive feedback. Prof Paker, who has a special role in my deciding to conduct this research, as she gave me the idea of doing a corpus study and recommended that I should attend the Translation Research Summer School in London, has always encouraged me in my studies and enhanced my understanding of various topics, including the analysis of style in literary translation. Prof Sibel Irzık, under whose supervision I wrote my BA thesis at Boğaziçi University, Department of Western Languages and Literatures and whose BA classes have had an important influence on my motivation to pursue academic career, honored me by accepting to be a member of my thesis jury. I extend my thanks to Prof Suat Karantay and Asst. Prof. Jonathan Maurice Ross, members of my dissertation committee. I am also grateful to Dr William Snyder, my MA thesis supervisor, who kindly read this thesis and provided me with editorial suggestions despite his busy schedule at Teachers College, Columbia University.

All the professors from whom I have taken courses at the PhD Program in Translation Studies have a share in my improving my knowledge and skills in the field, for which I am grateful. Among them is Prof Suat Karantay, who supported me to do a corpus-based study on two Turkish translations of Steinbeck's *The Pearl* and directed my attention to author-translators' work in his class on 'Research Methods in Translation Studies'. The traces of Prof Dilek Dizdar's class can also be seen in this thesis, as I had the chance to start to learn about Jacques Derrida's work on deconstruction from her.

Prof Theo Hermans, the course director of the 2007 Translation Summer School in London and all the other members of the school but most of all, Dr Marion Winters, who motivated me with her enthusiasm, have created an environment to learn about corpus-based translation studies. Although I made major changes in time, starting to work on my thesis during the school caused an early start for my research and saved me time. I would also like to thank the organizers and contributing scholars at Okan University translation studies colloquium, among whom are my dear friends and colleagues from the PhD program in Translation Studies at Boğaziçi University, in 2009 and MATS 2010 in Ghent, Belgium. I have benefited from discussing translation research with scholars, like Prof. Silvia Bernardini and Prof. Andrew Chesterman, and pondering about their suggestions and criticisms.

Thanks to the leaves of absence given by Marmara University to do research in the US for my thesis during the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 academic years, I have had the opportunity to focus on my work for three month periods. I owe special thanks to Prof Selahattin Güriş at Marmara University for the leaves, Dr Kimberly Trimble at California State University at Dominguez Hills and Assoc Prof Maria Gonzalez at University of Houston, Department of English, who have written invitation letters for me. Assoc Prof Maria Gonzalez kindly let me audit her classes, during which I became curious about the Turkish translations of Jean Rhys' novels.

Very special thanks to Pınar Kür, who kindly accepted me the week I called her for an interview at Bilgi University. Her responses to my questions have been very helpful in interpreting not only her views about her writing and translating but also her experiences in these fields and identity as an author-translator.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my family who made me feel lucky with their love, support, and belief in me. It has been a great opportunity to grow up in an environment where all the members of the family have cherished reading, writing, and discussing works, including those of literature. I would especially like to thank my mother, who has read some of the novels in the corpus of this study with interest and listened to me whenever I needed to think aloud, and my husband for supporting me in my studies and helping me in the exhausting processes of turning the books in the corpus into e-copies and formatting the thesis.

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1	
CHAPTER 1: A SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO AUTHOR-TRANSLATORS		
AS LITERARY AGENTS .....	17	
1.1.The Concept of Agency.....	18	
1.2.Agency in Translation Studies.....	28	
1.3.Author-Translators.....	40	
1.4.The Discourse on Author-Translators in Turkey.....	55	
Summary.....	71	
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE		
REVIEW .....	73	
2.1.Main Points Concerning the Methodology .....	74	
2.2.Stylistics .....	82	
2.3.Corpus-Based Methodology.....	91	
2.3.1.Introduction to Corpus Methodology.....	92	
2.3.2.Excursion into the Use of this Methodology in Translation Studies ..	94	
2.3.3.Critical Look at Corpus-Based Translation Studies.....	103	
Summary .....	114	
CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF EXTRATEXTUAL DATA .....		116
3.1.Pınar Kür's 'Habitus' .....	117	
3.2.Reception of Pınar Kür in the 'Field's of Turkish Literature and Literary Translation .....	127	
Summary .....	155	
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF PINAR KÜR'S NOVELS .....		156
<i>Bitmeyen Aşk</i> and <i>Bir Cinayet Romanı</i> .....	157	
Summary .....	189	

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF PINAR KÜR'S TRANSLATIONS .....	192
5.1.Pınar Kür's Translations of Jean Rhys' Novels.....	193
5.1.1. <i>Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz</i> [ <i>Wide Sargasso Sea</i> ] .....	220
5.1.2. <i>Dörtlü</i> [ <i>Quartet</i> ] .....	236
5.1.3. <i>Karanlıkta Yolculuk</i> [ <i>Voyage in the Dark</i> ].....	254
5.1.4. <i>Günaydın Geceyarısı</i> [ <i>Good Morning, Midnight</i> ].....	268
Summary .....	284
CONCLUSION.....	288
7.1.Interactions between Pınar Kür's Authorial and Translatorial Styles .....	289
7.2.Discourse Analysis of Extratextual Data .....	299
7.3.Methodological Implications .....	303
7.4.Future Research .....	307
APPENDIX .....	310
Pınar Kür'le Söyleşi [Interview with Pınar Kür].....	310
REFERENCES .....	321

## TABLES

1. Statistical Data for <i>Bitmeyen Aşk</i> and <i>Bir Cinayet Romanı</i> .....	157
2. Frequently Used Content Words in <i>Bitmeyen Aşk</i> and <i>Bir Cinayet Romanı</i> .....	161
3. Statistical Data Concerning Patterns in the Four Translations and Source Texts .....	195
4. Connecting Words in <i>Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz</i> and <i>Wide Sargasso Sea</i> .....	198
5. Use of Discourse Particles in Target Texts .....	204
6. Use of Discourse Particles in Source Texts.....	207
7. Derogatory Language Use and Related Words in <i>Dörtlü</i> and <i>Quartet</i> .....	249
8. Madness Related Language Use in <i>Karanlıkta Yolculuk</i> and <i>Voyage in the Dark</i> .....	260

## INTRODUCTION

The long journey in writing the current thesis started with the intention of doing a corpus-based study of translator style in literary texts. While reading about the Corpus Translation Studies methodology and conducting a preliminary corpus-based study, I decided that qualitative analysis needed to be used to complement the quantitative methodology. Corpus methodology was helpful throughout the various stages of my research. Nevertheless, considering the significance of style in literary texts, as “it is the style of a text which allows the text to function as literature” (Boase-Beier 2006, 114), I felt the need for meticulous qualitative analysis in the processes of gathering and interpreting data. Author-translators’ work appeared to be an interesting area to explore translator style because the work of author-translators<sup>1</sup> enables access to the distinguishing language features of the same individuals in their writing and translating. It is certainly possible to trace translators’ styles regardless of the identity of the translator, as each individual translator has the tendency to make certain choices in the act of translating. However, focus on an author-translator makes it possible to analyze authorial and translatorial styles of the same individual rather than focusing on solely the translations with a comparative look at target and source texts. As a result, I decided to conduct a study which has the following two aims: to explore whether there are any

---

<sup>1</sup> The fact that the word “author” comes before “translator” does not reflect a hierarchical order here but is a result of the established use in Turkish literary tradition. It is also possible to claim that “author” qualifies the translator. Thus, this use implies that translators who are also authors are in the focus of this thesis.

interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles and to test the extent to which corpus methodology can be employed in the stylistic analysis of literary texts. For this purpose, I chose to concentrate on Pınar Kür, a contemporary Turkish woman author-translator, her style in her own novels and translations of Jean Rhys' novels in a ten year period, that is, from 1982 until 1992. The works selected for analysis in the present thesis are the following: *Bitmeyen Aşk* [Unending Love] (1986), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* [A Novel of Murder] (1989), *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [Wide Sargasso Sea] (1982), *Dörtlü* [*Quartet* (first published as *Postures*)] (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* [*Voyage in the Dark*] (1989), and *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*] (1990). While the first question in this thesis is whether there are interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles, the second is how far corpus methodology can provide useful data for a thorough analysis and help further qualitative analysis of style in literary texts. In order to investigate if these assumptions could be made, I used both qualitative and quantitative data, which were gathered and analyzed through the use of corpus software.

There are several reasons why this was a research topic worth studying. First of all, there is, to my knowledge, no study which simultaneously investigates the works and translations of a Turkish author-translator with attention to her/his identity as an author-translator. There is, however, research on individuals who were both translators and authors or poets (Akbatır 2010; Bengi 1990; Çavuşoğlu 2007; Demircioğlu 2005). In her doctoral thesis entitled "A Re-evaluation of the Concept of Equivalence in the Literary Translations of Ahmed Midhat Efendi: A Linguistic Perspective", Işın Bengi (1990) explores the paratexts in Ahmed Midhat Efendi's translations, choosing his

translation of *La Dame aux camellias*, a novel written by Alexandre Dumas, fils, as her case study. One of the most important points is that Ahmed Midhat, who makes a variety of choices in his translation strategies, considers himself as the translator [mütercim] in some of his ‘translations’, while he signs some others as the author [muharrir]. Also, Cemal Demircioğlu (2005), in his PhD thesis on concepts of translation in the Late Ottoman literary translation, explores certain translations done by Ahmed Midhat Efendi for the purposes of exemplifying and discussing the variety in terms used in reference to his works at that specific place and period in time, which draws attention to the fact that these terms are time and culture-bound. The study underlines how diverse translation discourses and practices were in the Late Ottoman literary tradition and how intermingled the practices of writing and translating can be as the exemplary case of Ahmed Midhat Efendi’s summary translation, *Sid’in Hulâsası*, of Pierre Corneille’s *Le Cid* reveals. Thirdly, Özgür Çavuşoğlu (2007) wrote his master’s thesis on the Turkish translations of a poet-translator, Can Yücel, whose translations have been criticized due to “his idiosyncratic translation poetics, especially characterized by vocabulary and usages specific to Turkish language and culture” (iii). Drawing attention to Can Yücel’s use of “Türkçe söyleyen” in relation to his identity as the “the one who speaks or retells the source text in Turkish” (137), Çavuşoğlu explores four of Can Yücel’s poetry, drama, and prose fiction translations from English into Turkish and the use of the terms ‘translation proper’, ‘imitation’, ‘adaptation’, ‘version’, and ‘rewriting’ in reference to the works in the corpus of his study. Finally, Arzu Akbatur (2010), in her PhD thesis, entitled “Writing/Translating in/to English: The ‘Ambivalent’ Case of Elif Şafak”, investigates how Elif Şafak and her literary works have been received and represented in

the Anglo-American and Turkish contexts. Akbatur (2010) both analyzes the discourse in the extratextual data collected for the study and conducts two case studies on *The Flea Palace*, the English translation of *Bit Palas*, and *The Bastard of Istanbul*, which was first written in English and then translated into Turkish by Aslı Biçen and Şafak. Among significant findings of the study is that the ‘foreign’ is presented as “that which is more familiar, explicit, accessible, and intelligible for the target readers” in her writing and ‘self-translating’ (309) and that Şafak had an “‘interventionist’ position” in the translating of *The Bastard of Istanbul* (312). Due to the latter finding, Elif Şafak appears to have “rewritten” or “de-translated” *The Bastard of Istanbul* in/to Turkish (313). Despite the fact that the aim in these studies is not to focus on the identity of an author-translator and comparatively analyze her/his own works and translations, there are obviously significant discussions on the relationship between writing and translating of those who both write and translate.

There are also studies which place the translator in focus. While the role of the translator in international trade (Birkandan 2000) and in ideologically shaping literary and cultural systems (Karadağ 2003) have been explored in separate theses, Tunalı (2006) specifically investigated translator identities with a historical, systemic and critical approach. Another study obviously worth mentioning here is Ahu Selin Erkul’s master’s thesis (2005), which discusses discourses on translators as well as those on translation in Turkish fiction. It is significant that Erkul (2005) chose works by “translator-writers” (vi) in which fictional translators appear. Considering the role of the translator in the society and history and having explored 30 novels written from 1875 until 2003 in Turkish, she focuses on four novels written in the Late Ottoman period in

her case study. In her corpus, therefore, there are not any translated texts, but ‘original’ works in which translator characters appear. Last but not least, Saliha Paker’s (2011) chapter “*Translating ‘the shadow class (...) condemned to movement’ and the Very Otherness of the Other: Latife Tekin as Author-Translator of Swords of Ice*” in *Translation and Opposition* explores Latife Tekin’s short novel *Buzdan Kılıçlar* and the related extratextual material and discusses its English translation by Saliha Paker and Mel Kenne, *Swords of Ice*, in the conclusion. Although Latife Tekin appears to be the author of *Buzdan Kılıçlar*, she claims that she is not its author but translator, as she translated “the experiences of the ‘ragged’ individuals” (Paker 2011, 148) who are in “shadow” (149) or rather the “*shadow words*” of those individuals (153, emphasis original) in this work of hers. Tekin, therefore, considers herself the ‘translator’ of “the ‘source’ action of the book” (150) into “the universe of the settled and the affluent” (157). This, Paker reveals, is in line with Tekin’s “clarifying for herself the driving force of her writing as that of reacting to criticism about her self-declared ambivalence regarding her authorial status” (152). As a result, *Swords of Ice* appears to be the translation of a ‘translation’, in which Paker and Kenne aimed to preserve effects of the striking “difference”s of the source translation (157). In short, Paker’s chapter presents a different use of the term ‘author-translator’ with her examination of challenging writing and/or translating experiences.

Secondly, there are only two master’s theses written with a focus on Pınar Kür’s literary works in Turkey. The first thesis, focusing on Kür’s novels “in the light of Kate Millett’s sexual politics” (Türe 1993), as it says in the title, explores the novels Kür wrote until 1993, but not her translations. *Yarın Yarın* (1976), *Küçük Oyuncu* (1977),

*Asılacak Kadın* (1979), *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (1989) and *Sonuncu Sonbahar* (1992) are the novels analyzed. The second is quite a new study and investigates all the novels and short stories written by Pınar Kür with a focus on the problems experienced by woman characters (Çin 2010). There is in fact no study at MA or PhD level done on Pınar Kür's translations. The claims concerning the translations done by author-translators, which are discussed in the literature review section of this thesis, are the evidence for the relevance of selecting an author-translator, like Pınar Kür, to do research on. Another reason for the selection of a contemporary author-translator was the opportunity to contact Kür and do interviews with her concerning her authorial and translatorial practices. Moreover, her focus on social and feminist issues and the thematic links between her own and Rhys' writing made studying Kür further motivating.

A third reason why this research topic was worth studying is related to the fact that Rhys' "fiction is notable for its stylistic experimentation on multiple levels" (Simpson 2005, 1) and it would be interesting to see how this style is reflected in the Turkish translations of her novels. Diana Athill (1985) stresses Rhys' distinct style when she draws attention to catlike moves in Rhys' writing (vii). This is due to Rhys' language use with "elegance and economy which is perfectly natural and easy ... or rather, easy-seeming" (ibid.). Athill (1980, 5), also in her foreword to *Smile Please*, underlines Rhys' "perfectionism", as she states that Rhys would not present her writing before she felt it was complete. Athill exemplifies her "perfectionism" when she tells that Rhys once posed the question "Why did you let me publish [*Wide Sargasso Sea*]?" to her editor (ibid.). The reason why she asked that question was because she thought it

was not ready to be published. They should first have deleted two words: one ‘then’ and one ‘quite’ (ibid.). Despite such emphasis put on Rhys’ style, there has been little “discussion of technical matters in her fiction” (Alexander Malcolm and Malcolm 1996, xii). Considering that this study may shed light on the Turkish translations of Rhys’ work as well as the connection between Pınar Kür’s writing and translating, which have not been explored in depth, the results of the study can fill a gap in the literature.

Six texts were selected for the purposes of this study<sup>2</sup>: *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (1989), *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] (1982), *Dörtlülü* [*Quartet* (first published as *Postures*)] (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* [*Voyage in the Dark*] (1989), and *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*] (1990). While the first two are Pınar Kür’s own works, the latter four are her translations of Jean Rhys’ novels. Therefore, together with the source texts, there were ten texts to be analyzed. There were two reasons for choosing Kür’s translations of Rhys’ novels. To begin with, it is of vital importance to limit the number of variables in corpus-based studies. This is required to be able to gather reliable data and draw significant conclusions. Otherwise, the number of possible reasons for the results can be too great to handle and speculation becomes the ultimate guide in drawing conclusions. To begin with, because I had only the translations of the novels by Jean Rhys, I did not deal with features caused by the styles of different source text writers. The second noteworthy variable is the publication dates of the Rhys translations done by Pınar Kür, as they were considered in selecting the

---

<sup>2</sup> The editions used in this study are the following: *Bitmeyen Aşk* (2008), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (2007), *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* (1989), *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1985), *Dörtlülü* (2007), *Quartet* (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* (1989), *Voyage in the Dark* (1985), *Günaydın Geceyarısı* (1990), and *Goodmorning Midnight* (1985).

works to be in the corpus of this study. A ten-year-period was specified as has already been pointed out: 1982-1992. Due to the fact that Kür did not publish any books or translations of Rhys' books in 1991, it is in fact a nine-year-period, which does not cause methodological shortcomings about the corpus design, as it is relatively a short period of time. The selected novels written by Kür to be in the corpus were also published for the first time in this period of nine years: *Bitmeyen Aşk* in 1986 and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* in 1989. Another variable that needs to be referred to is the publishing house. Kür's short stories and novels were published by other publishing houses like Can, which continues to publish her translations of Rhys' works, but Kür's own works have appeared by publications made by Everest Publishing House since 2003. This, Kür explains, was a result of the interest of several publishing houses in publishing her earlier work. She points out that despite her asking for only advertising her works, not money, which was offered by other publishing companies, she had disputes with Erdal Öz at Can. Therefore, she reached an agreement with Everest Publishing House (Sever 2004). By selecting works that were published in a span of ten years (1982-1992) all by the same publishing house before the publications of her own work by Everest, attention has been paid to having a corpus of texts which went through presumably the same or a similar editing process in a period close in time. Kür, in the interview she did with Nazmiye Çin, clarifies that despite the fact that the publishing houses that published her work changed in time, there are only a few minor changes she herself did in the editing process of her works [... yayınevi değiştirdiğim zaman hepsinin yeni basımı yapılıyordu ve son tashihlerini ben yaptım. Dolayısıyla hepsini baştan sona okudum. Yani böyle bir iki deyim hatası ve bir iki kelime değişikliğine gitmişimdir. Öyle çok değişiklik

yapmadım.] (Çin 2010). In addition, at least in the case of translations, they are all being published by Can and all Pınar Kür novels are being published by Everest right now. Moreover, by choosing only the novels and not including the collections of short stories in the corpus, I also managed to limit one more variable: genre. Thus, the variables of source author, genre, publishing dates, and to a certain extent publishing house were kept constant in this study. The second reason for the selection of Rhys' novels was the fact that Kür has translated four of the five novels written by Rhys, which provided a considerable corpus.

Rhys' works have been translated into Turkish largely by Pınar Kür for two main reasons. Kür's preface to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, which is the only preface to be found in her translations to Rhys' works, shows how much Kür was impressed by Rhys' work, especially *Wide Sargasso Sea*. In this preface, Kür states that she decided to translate *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which she could not forget for years, when she experienced a period of "stagnation" in her writing so that she could start writing again. Below is the whole paragraph she wrote in the preface in order to explain the process she went through while deciding to translate the novel into Turkish:

Last winter, when I came to a point of stagnation in my own writing, I revisited this novel in a way to encourage myself. This is because, yes, there is deep affection, courage, and endurance besides that intense unhappiness in this novel just like all the other books by Jean Rhys –but most of all, in this one-. That was what I –as a reader and a writer- needed. Because it had been years since I last did translation, I had never thought of translating the novel into Turkish. That last time reading it, I suddenly made up my mind. Such work, I thought, would both help me gain personal strength and make it possible to introduce a very important writer to Turkish readership.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> All translations are mine if not indicated otherwise.

[Geçen kış, kendi çalışmalarım da bir duraklama noktasına geldiğimde bir bakıma kendi kendimi yüreklendirmek için yeniden elime aldım bu romanı.Çünkü, evet, Jean Rhys'in tüm kitaplarında olduğu gibi bunda da –en çok bunda- o yoğun mutsuzluğun yanısıra çok derin sevgi, yüreklilik, dayanıklılık vardı. Benim de gereksindiğim –okuyucu ve yazar olarak- buydu. Yıllardır çeviri yapmayı bıraktığımdan, romanı Türkçe'ye çevirmek hiç aklıma gelmemişti. Bu son okuyuşta birden karar verdim. Böylesi bir çalışma hem kişisel olarak benim güç toplamama yardım eder, hem de Türk okurları çok önemli bir yazarı tanımış olurlar diye düşündüm.] (Kür 1989b, 5).

The connection between Kür's translating *Wide Sargasso Sea* and the works she wrote along with or after it is implied in the preface. Working on Rhys' novel seems to have served like a therapy in overcoming the difficult stage she was experiencing in her own writing career. However, as is clear, this was not 'the' only reason why she undertook the task of translating this novel. She was also aware of the benefit of translating Rhys' work for the sake of Turkish readers.

It needs to be noted here that there are two other translators who have worked on Rhys' works. The results of the catalogue search I have done reveal that Nili Bilkur translated *Ayrılıktan Sonra* [*After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*] and it was published by Can Publishing in 1985, when Kür's translation of *Dörtlü* [*Quartet*] was published by the same publishing house. Interestingly, Pınar Kür thinks she has rendered *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie* into Turkish and actually recommended that I should check with the publishing house to make sure about the publication [Mackenzie'yi çevirdiğimi zannediyorum valla. Onu mutlaka sorun. Can Yayınları'na gidip bütün listeyi alabilirsiniz.] (Aka 2011). It appears that this is the only Rhys novel Kür did not translate. Nili Bilkur has translated one more book, *Hadrianus'un Anıları*, written by Marguerite Yourcenar and published by Helikopter Publishing in 2009. *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*] is the other Rhys novel translated into Turkish by

another translator, Nuray Kermen, who does not seem to have done any other published literary translations. Kermen's translation was published by Tel Publishing in 1972. Thus, Nuray Kermen seems to be the first translator to have introduced Jean Rhys to the Turkish readership. This is also interesting for two reasons. Firstly, *Goodmorning Midnight*, which is the first Rhys novel Kür read and was "very much impressed" by [ilk okuduğum kitabı benim, Günaydın Geceyarısı'ydı. Çok etkilenmiştim] (Aka 2011), was chosen to be translated for the first time into Turkish. Secondly, Pınar Kür underlines the fact that she is the one who first translated Jean Rhys into Turkish [Başkasının daha önce çevirmediği yazarları tercih ediyorum. Jean Rhys'i de öyle.] (Aka 2011). It is possible to argue that Nuray Kermen's translation was not known and probably is still not known to many, including Kür, who actually claims that Jean Rhys was almost unknown to the Turkish readers when she translated *Wide Sargasso Sea* into Turkish [ülkemizde hiç denilecek kadar az tanınıyor] (1989, 5). Thus it may be after Kür's Jean Rhys translations, which cover four of the five novels, that Rhys became more well-known to the Turkish readership.

In the preliminary analysis of the Turkish translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, that is *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, corpus software was used. Because this study is corpus driven, I did not identify the features to be searched at the beginning stages. Having done that, I had an idea about the translation and the 'original' and started to read first *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and then *Wide Sargasso Sea*. I analyzed the 'original' novel qualitatively and using the corpus software whenever I thought I might have found a pattern. In other words, I did not wait until I finished reading the whole book and kept taking notes

concerning those possible areas to be investigated. This has been the strategy followed in the reading of all the translations in the corpus of this study.

As mentioned above, I did not select the features to be explored prior to the study, but I had an assumption which is one of the driving forces for me to do this study. I personally believe in the importance of increasing working and future translators' awareness for their responsibility regarding the target text. Increasing this awareness is one of the potential contributions of this thesis to translation studies. However, I am only "guided" by this assumption and not "restricted", which is possible to avoid by "being led by data observation and keeping a receptive attitude to "unexpected" findings", as Winters points out (2005, 87). My claim is that fingerprints of translators can be traced through the study of target texts and this analysis can show that Pınar Kür's style in her translations of Jean Rhys' works is not "invisible" in Venuti's terms (1995). According to Venuti, "the illusory effect of transparency that simultaneously masks [the target text's] status as an illusion", presenting it as an "original" (1995, 5) is generally sought while translating works into English. Because there is no one single 'meaning' in any text and trying to follow 'meaning' is "relentless tracking through an always moving play of difference" (Davis 2001, 15), it is hard to understand how translation can be considered to be in a secondary position when compared with 'original' works (Hermans 1996, 3). As Bassnett points out, however, there are translators who perceive themselves as mere copyists (1994, 11). Examples can be seen in Turkey as well as other countries. Camcı (2006) refers to statements made by translators like Aslı Biçen, which reveal translators' giving "roles that are secondary and between existence and non-existence" to translation and translator [ikincil ve varla yok arası bu roller]. It is, therefore, possible

to argue that there are translators who attempt at “remain[ing] so discreet as to vanish altogether” (Hermans 1996, 4) not only in the target text but also when they talk about their translations. The fact that translators, when ‘visible’, often receive negative criticisms which result from reviewers’ focus on translators’ “shortcomings” (Olohan 2004, 5) may be a reason why some translators look for an escape from visibility. Whether translators are conscious or unconscious of the decision-making process they go through, they cannot be hidden behind the target texts they have produced (Bassnett 1994, 15). Translators are there in the text. This is one of the reasons why they cannot claim to be not responsible for the target text as if there is only one meaning which is what all the readers of the same text perceive and convey to other readers when they translate. Because “similarity in translation inevitably brings with it difference in translation” (Tymoczko 2004, 37), Tymoczko (2004), with a focus on ‘similarity’, highlights similar points that are critical:

(...) translation is a one-to-many process, determined in part by the choices of individual translators themselves. Translators make choices based on their perceptions and received cultural categories which are culturally shaped, but they also make conscious and autonomous choices based on their particular ideologies, their individual tastes and values, their conceptions of what is relevant to the particular moment, their specific life experiences, their personal readings of the source text, and so forth. As a result of these personal, individual, and idiosyncratic aspects of translation, attributable to the agents of translation, even translations of the same text produced in the context of the same culture and time will have only partially overlapping configurations with both the source text and with each other. That is, insofar as they are motivated by common cultural categories and values, such translations will be similar to the source text in some of the same ways, but they will show different types of similarity to the source text insofar as they reflect the individual priorities and choices of the translators themselves. (36)

In addition, because translators play a major role in presenting those with which the target culture is not familiar (Vermeer 1994, 13), the act of translating cannot be seen as “a mere linguistic transcoding of a text” (Vermeer 1994, 10). For this reason, translators with an awareness of the role they play in the process of interpreting a text and for the importance of openly stating this role are required to carry the responsibility for their product (Arrojo 1997, 18). As Dizdar (2006) stresses, the peril in being unaware of the fact that translating requires interpreting the source text cannot be ignored (6). An awakening concerning the role of reading and interpreting in the process of translation is required (ibid.). In brief, I strongly believe in the significance of increasing translators’ level of awareness of their presence in the text and their responsibility for the target text and the target reader. This kind of research may prove to be helpful in convincing translators that they are ‘visible’ and the target text is not a simple reproduction of the source text, which is, I assume, one of the main ideas shared by those who have participated in “the ‘shared ground’ debate of translation studies” (Olohan 2004, 8), whose details are provided later in this thesis.

The descriptive approach to this parallel corpus helped me bring out salient aspects of Kür’s distinct style in her translations of Rhys’ novels. The translator’s preferences are not just listed; the description of these preferences is accompanied by an effort to explain the motivation behind them. In that sense, the analysis of the results may also prove useful for translator training. The results of a parallel corpus study can illustrate “how translators overcome difficulties of translation in practice, and to use this evidence to provide realistic models for trainee translators” (Baker 1995, 231). Although

this was not among the aims of this study, it is another potential contribution of this thesis to translation studies.

The present thesis consists of seven chapters. Following the Introduction, Chapter 1 focused on the concept of agency. After the literature on agency was explored in general terms with a focus on Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of 'habitus', 'field', and 'symbolic capital', I investigated how the concept of agency has been used particularly in the field of translation studies. As the specific kind of agents in the production of texts that are studied in this thesis were author-translators, I then analyzed the discourse on author-translators in the Turkish context as well as outside the borders of Turkey.

Chapter 2 presents the methodology of the thesis including stylistics and corpus methodology. The chapter also comprises some extratextual material in the form of interviews with Pınar Kür which provided additional qualitative data. Other sources of extratextual data are the preface written by Kür to her Turkish translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the studies, criticisms, and news published about Kür and her work.

In Chapter 3, the audience of this thesis is provided with relevant information about Pınar Kür as an individual and an author-translator. Describing Pınar Kür's personal and professional life served to learn about her 'habitus'. Attention was also on the 'fields' of Turkish literature and Turkish literary translation in the discussion of the reception of Kür's work, as 'habitus' needed to be studied in relation to the 'fields' and considering sources of influence on the agent's work other than the individual.

The focus, in Chapter 4, is on the stylistic analyses of the two novels written by Pınar Kür: *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. The aim was to identify the recurrent features in the two novels so that they could be compared with the patterns in Pınar

Kür's Turkish translations of Jean Rhys' novels. The qualitative study of style in the novels were preceded and later supported by corpus-based data whenever necessary.

Chapter 5 explores the stylistic analysis of Pınar Kür's Turkish translations of four novels written by Jean Rhys: *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] (1982), *Dörtlü* [*Quartet* (first published as *Postures*)] (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* [*Voyage in the Dark*] (1989), and *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*] (1990). Although the preceding chapter focused on specifically Kür's own works and this chapter on her translations, there are references to one another in both chapters. This is due to the need to draw attention to the interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles, which are summarized at the end of the chapter.

**CHAPTER 1**  
**A SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO AUTHOR-TRANSLATORS**  
**AS LITERARY AGENTS**

In this chapter, I will present a brief literature review of the concept of agency first in general terms and then its use specifically in the field of translation studies. For the former purpose, after I briefly describe what and hows concerning agency, I will focus on Pierre Bourdieu's work, which offers fundamental concepts related to agency. Towards the end of the first part of this chapter, I will discuss not only Pierre Bourdieu's but also Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's works, which shed light on the roles carried out by translators as agents in different contexts. For the latter, I will provide a survey of agency related work in the field of translation studies through the writings of Gideon Toury, Itamar Even-Zohar and Andre Lefevere. Next, I will discuss the more recent studies benefiting from Bourdieu's concepts in the field of translation studies. Daniel Simeoni (1998) pioneered in this area by integrating Bourdieu's concept of habitus in the framework of a descriptive translation study. Following this part will be a discussion of the works on author-translators, who are the agents in the focus of this thesis. In the light of works on subjects related to authors written by Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud as well as those that specifically focus on literary translation and the interaction between writing and translating, the position of author-translators and the practices of author-translators will be studied. The last part of this chapter will be an exploration of the discourse on author-translators in the Turkish context. This will be

done through an analysis of the essays published in *Tercüme* from 1940 until 1966 and those in *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri*, published in the 1980s and early 1990s, during which the novels in the corpus of this study were published.

### **1.1. The Concept of Agency**

Human beings act. They have the capacity to act with a specific view of the result that action will bring. While some of those actions have minor effects, some others lead to major events in the life of the person or even history. Alex Callinicos (2004) starts *Making History: Agency, Structure, and Change in Social Theory* by referring to three kinds of making history offered by Perry Anderson. Callinicos presents the following categorization considering the reasons for the actions: individual, societal, and collective (2004, 1-2). An example to the first kind can be an individual's deciding what to study at university. It is worth mentioning that rational choice theory views individuals as those who make choices by evaluating the alternative actions in order to realize their aims in the best possible way (Barnes 2000, 17). The second kind can be seen in fields like politics because societies have common interests in such areas. Finally, collective aims are those that lead to a change for the whole society. While those who carry out the first kind of action are "individual agents", the other two kinds can exemplify acts of "collective agents" (Callinicos 2004, 152) such as a group of people coming together in "organisations" and believing in the importance of a shared aim (153). But what is agency? Barry Barnes (2000), in *Understanding Agency: Social Theory and Responsible Action*, explains agency as follows: "For an individual to possess agency is for her to

possess internal powers and capacities, which, through their exercise, make her an active entity constantly intervening in the course of events ongoing around her” (25).

Sociological theorists, such as Talcott Parsons and Anthony Giddens, have discussed issues concerning agency, one of which is the connection between norms in the society and how human beings act. On the one hand, Parsons underlines that people feel guilt if they do not conform to the norms and thus they seriously consider not only their personal motivations but also norms while making decisions concerning their actions (Barnes 2000, 22-23). On the other hand, Giddens draws attention to the power human beings have as they do not conform and bring a change in the society (27). It is also noteworthy that Giddens differentiates between “routine” and “non-routine, creative action” since the former leads to the continuation of the system, while the latter results in new options (ibid.). Although this approach has important aspects that deserve attention in a study on literary translation, it is unfortunate that binary oppositions are at play. This perspective forces the researcher to choose either one or the other despite the fact that the translator, for example, as the agent does not have to produce a translation which can simply be associated with the ‘routine’ or the ‘non-routine’.

Unlike this dualistic approach to action, Pierre Bourdieu stresses “the *primacy of relations*” between structure and action, system and actor, the collective and the individual (Wacquant 1992, 3, emphasis original). This is clear in the importance given to relations in Bourdieu’s concept of habitus (16). Due to Bourdieu’s aim to introduce an action theory, which is obvious in his giving the title *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* to one of his books, and his investigating the acts of agents (Gouanvic 2005, 147), Bourdieu’s key concepts need to be recalled here. It is not possible to pick only

one of these concepts and leave the rest out of a discussion on agency because they are interrelated (Gouanvic 2005, 148). Therefore, not only field but also habitus and symbolic capital deserve particular attention. First of all, fields can be described as “historically constituted areas of activity with their specific institutions and their own laws of functioning” (Bourdieu 1990, 87). To illustrate, one can talk about a scientific field, the field of advertising, politics or art. Bourdieu also discusses specifically the literary field, which he defines as “a force-field as well as a field of struggles which aim at transforming or maintaining the established relation of forces” (143). This seems to be due to the struggle between literary forms, themes, etc. in a literary field at a specific time and place. It is significant that Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) underline the relational aspect of the field rather than structures in a system (96-97) and state, “*the real is the relational*” (97, emphasis original).

Despite the possibility of acting in various ways in a certain field, regularity and patterns can easily be spotted. Wacquant (1992) explains that the concept of habitus presents a reason for this fact because it is “a *structuring mechanism* that operates from within agents, though it is neither strictly individual nor in itself fully determinative of conduct” (18). It is significant to note that Bourdieu’s views are opposed to those of the structuralists in that agents clearly have a more active role in the picture of the social world Bourdieu draws (Bourdieu 1990, 18-19). Bourdieu (1977) explains that “the structures constitutive of a particular type of environment (...) produce *habitus*, systems of durable, transposable *dispositions*, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures” (Bourdieu 1977, 72). There is, therefore, the idea of ‘structure’ in habitus, too. However, Bourdieu underlines not only the structured but also the

structuring aspects of structure. For this reason, there is a dynamic structure. In other words, habitus shows that “the subject of practice can be determined and yet be acting too” (Bouveresse 1999, 53). Bourdieu (1990, 91) elucidates the relationship between the field and the habitus, the source of the agent’s practice as well as what is influential on the forming of the habitus as follows:

The habitus, which is the generative principle of responses more or less well adapted to the demands of a certain field, is the product of an individual history, but also, through the formative experiences of earliest infancy, of the whole collective history of family and class; (...)

Webb et al. (2002, 36-37) also explain that individuals’ practices in a society can vary despite the “values and dispositions” they are well aware of in their cultures. The important point is that what they do is a mirror of who they are and this puts the agent’s identity, shaped by her/his ‘individual history’ and ‘collective history’ in focus. Nonetheless, it is not possible to deduce that scholars should rely solely on biographical data while interpreting the works of authors. Bourdieu (1990) plainly states that the theory of the field discards “the direct relating of individual biography to the work of literature” and “the internal analysis of an individual work or even of intertextual analysis” (147). This is in line with Bourdieu’s stress on relations. It is not one or the other that researchers need to focus on but all in relation to one another. My understanding of Bourdieu’s approach is that leaving biographical data out of research would be neglecting possible sources of influence on one’s writing or translating in a historical framework. However, this does not lead to an exclusive reliance on biographical data. For this reason, agents and their products need to be explored with an

awareness of the fact that agents' actions are directly influenced by their habitus in a certain field.

One of the main reasons for Bourdieu's attack against the structuralist approach seems to be the fact that they see "practice as simple execution", not as actions that can generate new practice (Bourdieu 1990, 13). Indeed, he draws attention to the fact that action cannot simply be treated at a "mechanical" level, considering merely the effect of the outside world. There is also "the conscious and deliberate intentions" of individuals in the formation of action (Bourdieu 1977, 73). I would like to stress that even when there is no innovative aspect of the agent's act, the practice could not be regarded 'simple'. This is due to the fact that even an act that can be considered a continuation of a tradition adds to the preservation of expectations concerning future acts. Theo Hermans (2002), in "The Production and Reproduction of Translation: System Theory and Historical Context", refers to the work of Niklas Luhmann, German sociologist, and maintains that Luhmann's work on social systems adds to the "existing empirical, sociological and historicizing approaches (polysystem theory, Bourdieu)" (179). Drawing from Luhmann's work, Hermans argues the existence of translations and statements about translation make it possible to translate and to make statements about translation. Their very existence provides "the necessary connectivity and a sufficient 'horizon of expectations' to produce further translations and statements about translation." (185). In brief, consideration of 'practice as simple execution' is certainly problematic. Not only novelties but also actions that are in line with the accustomed state deserve attention as Hermans reveals.

Having elucidated on the fact that those sharing similar backgrounds are brought up with ideas of similar practice as a result of common habitus (81) when compared with the practice of the members of a different class (85), Bourdieu (1977) points to “organic individuality” (86). In addition to socially recognized practice in accordance with the idea of collectivity, there are cases in which individuals exhibit their personality with the distinct moves they make. At this stage, it seems proper to discuss symbolic capital, which is another key term by Bourdieu, since it has a role in the agent’s finding the strength to appear with a practice which does not resemble others’. The symbolic capital that is “the recognition [agents] receive from a group” (Bourdieu 1991, 106) has an enormous effect on the result[s] their words, performances, and actions will bring. Bourdieu does not ignore “the symbolic struggles of everyday life” in the utterances made and draws attention to the “person’s position within the field, and the amount of capital she or he possesses” (Webb et al. 2002, 23) in exploring spoken and written discourse or actions. An individual’s speaking as “the authorized representative” (Bourdieu 1991, 111) of an institution, for instance, gives him such power that the influence of her/his words on the audience cannot be compared with that of an ordinary man, at all. It is clear that reception is directly linked to the symbolic capital of the speaker and the audience’s recognition of that capital (Bourdieu 1991, 116). In other words, not only what is said but also who said and who listened to the speaker are of vital importance. In addition, depending on the time and society, the fields of cultural production, such as the literary field, enjoy different levels of autonomy and authors in a literary field “are dominant, in so far as they hold the power and privileges conferred by the possession of cultural capital” (Bourdieu 1990, 145). Hence, the autonomy one has is

in relation to time, place, and that individual's power, which has to do with the symbolic capital s/he has gained as a result of the kind of cultural capital s/he has produced.

Authors can have considerable symbolic capital in the publishing world, but they are not the only ones with symbolic capital. In "The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas", Bourdieu (1999) undoubtedly shows his awareness of the role agents in the publishing world, including the translator, play. Stressing the processes of reading and interpreting, Bourdieu highlights different processes in the transformation of one text from the source to the target cultures.

(...) the sense and function of a foreign work is determined not simply by the field of origin, but in at least equal proportion by the field of reception. First, because the sense and function of the original field are often completely unknown, but also because the process of transfer from a domestic field to a foreign one is made up of a series of social operations. There is a process of selection (*what is to be translated*, what is to be published, *who it will be translated by*, who will publish it), a process of labeling and classification (often the placing of a label on a product that previously has no label at all) by the publishers, the question of the series in which it is to be inserted, *the choice of the translator and the writer of the preface* (who in presenting the work will take some sort of possession of it, and slant it with his own point of view, and explain how it fits into the field of reception, only rarely going so far as to explain where and how it fits into its field of origin, as the difficulties presented by such an enterprise are too large); and finally the reading process itself, as foreign readers are bound to perceive the text in different ways, since the issues which are of interest to them in the text inevitably are result of a different field of production. (Bourdieu 1999, 222, emphases mine)

It is obvious that Bourdieu underlines agency in the reproduction of texts and there are various people who act as agents at different stages. In addition, certain individuals may have power in not just one but several stages of the publication process. For example, the translator may be the agent who selects the work to be translated, renders it into the target language and writes a preface to the book. The "formidable misunderstandings" (221) like those Bourdieu exemplifies in the circulation of ideas are certainly striking

and they increase one's awareness of the fact that this is not a simple process of agency, at all. Nevertheless, I would like to maintain that there are several reasons why the translator's role in the process needs to be confirmed even when there are not such remarkable instances of misinterpretation. To begin with, the translator's writing the source text in the target language is an act that introduces a foreign work to a culture, which is an act worth investigating. Furthermore, these acts of translation may lead to the presentation of new ideas, styles, etc. to the target culture. Last but not least, those who introduce a foreign author to the target readership have "some ulterior motive" (222), which is a point Bourdieu makes in the same essay. The translator's introducing an author to the target audience merely because s/he admires that author's works is significant enough to be noted because, as Bourdieu explains, such acts help to fortify the translator's place in the field (*ibid.*). Thus, power relations are at the front in all these acts of agency, whether they result from misinterpretation or not.

It is not only Pierre Bourdieu but also Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, who has discussed the role of translation and the translator in power issues concerning agency. It is known that feminist critiques generally draw attention towards "many cultural discourses as impositions" and pose the question "Whose view is being constructed as though it were the only one?" (Holland et al. 1998, 25). They stress the fact that women who are not in a privileged position at all are devoid of a say in culture formation (*ibid.*). They are expected to follow 'the' norms of the culture. At times women find themselves in a position at which the dominant male, such as the colonizer translating texts concerning women and the translator who does not care much about the colonized woman author's voice, consciously or unconsciously push women to an even more

passive state. Translators, as powerful agents under such conditions, can follow practices that totally deprive women of the right to act as agents. In other words, translators can conceal or even attempt at erasing notable aspects of the experiences and/ or identity of the women. Spivak's articles entitled "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988) and "The Politics of Translation" (2000) deserve to be explored at this stage due to their focus on the interrelated area of agency, women and translation.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988), in "Can the Subaltern Speak?", puts emphasis on one's power to speak in her own voice, which is not very much possible for the oppressed. By discussing the undertakings of the British while codifying Hindu Law, particularly the rite concerning "widow-sacrifice" (281), which was seen in especially some parts of Bengal in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, Spivak reveals how this rite was misrepresented in multiple ways. On the one hand, British men in power prohibited women's "self-immolation on the husband's pyre" (305) and appeared as "White men saving brown women from brown men" (297). However, in police records, the names of the sacrificed widows were wrongly transcribed and not much attention seems to have been paid to other aspects of their identities, such as the castes they belong to, which were often referred to as tribes (*ibid.*). In addition, those writing about the British rule in India, such as Edward Thompson, presented even the names of the widows through appropriations (305) and thus turned those sacrificed widows' names into common nouns in their English translations (306). On the other hand, Indian nativist men claimed this act was those women's independent choice as a result of their faithful love (297) as though it had nothing to do with problems related to overpopulation, contempt of women, and the fact that widows at that time in Bengal had the right to take

over the property of the dead husband (300). In this discussion about issues related to female agency in India under British rule, Spivak openly expresses the almost impossible: “If, in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow” (287). This exemplary case reveals how men adopt an active position in shaping or averting the agency of women and thus the society. In her introduction to *Women out of Place*, Brackette F. Williams (1996) also draws attention to gendered agency. Referring to George Mosse’s claims in *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe*, Williams states that women in Europe have been considered “creatures of passion to be kept under control” (6). The task of constructing the society belonged to men, while women were expected to stay at home and protect the already established norms of the society (ibid.).

Just as certain aspects of the Hindu women’s identity are produced or rather misrepresented by the British men in their writings on the Hindu, language has always had an obvious effect on the presentation of identities through translation. For this reason, Spivak (2000, 397) underlines the significance of “the role played by language for the agent” in “The Politics of Translation”:

The task of the feminist translator is to consider language as a clue to the workings of gendered agency. The writer is written by her language, of course. But the writing of the writer writes agency in a way that might be different from that of the British woman/ citizen with the history of British feminism, focused on the task of freeing herself from Britain’s imperial past, its often racist present, as well as its “made in Britain” history of male domination. (397-398)

Considering “the linguistic rhetoricity of the original text” (405) crucial in translating, Spivak demonstrates how the translator can manage to let the voice of the woman writer

be heard or make her identity disappear by carelessly or consciously changing the rhetoricity of her language. To sum up, the agency of the translator plays an important role in reflecting the agency of the writer, especially when it is the subaltern, which seems to be an important reason why agency has attracted attention in the field of translation studies. However, it also needs to be noted that the agency of the translator deserves attention for its own sake because the ultimate goal is not to reflect the agency of the writer in all tasks of translation.

## **1.2. Agency in Translation Studies**

The theoretical works on social life written by Pierre Bourdieu have certainly influenced sociology, anthropology and education, but the influence of Bourdieu's work has also spread to various other fields such as political science, linguistics, and translation studies. The field of translation studies has benefited from Bourdieu's sociological work following its cultural turn since the late 1990s. Moira Inghilleri (2005) interprets the increase in the interest in Bourdieu's work not only as a testimony of this "paradigmatic shift within the discipline, toward more sociologically-and anthropologically-informed approaches to the study of translation processes and products" (125) but also as "part of the re-evaluation of descriptive and polysystems approaches" (126). It is therefore crucial to begin with the previous agency related work done in the field of translation studies and then discuss the more recent writings specifically influenced by Bourdieu. Starting with Anthony Pym's criticism of James S. Holmes' map of translation studies, the previous agency related work will be discussed through articles by Gideon Toury, Itamar Even-Zohar, and Andre Lefevere.

Awareness of the importance of agency has led to negative and positive criticisms of even early articles written in translation studies. An example is Anthony Pym's (1998) criticism of James S. Holmes' map of the field by referring to an earlier map drawn by Lawrence Humphrey. As is well known, James S. Holmes introduced the name and the map of the field of translation studies in "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" in 1988. The significance of Holmes' naming the field and thus once again drawing attention to the fact that translation studies is a field on its own as well as presenting the different areas in which research can be done in the field can certainly not be denied. Pym agrees with this fact and points out that it used to be a dependable instrument (2). The starting point of Pym's objection seems to be the two main goals of the field that Holmes underlines while drawing his map. Holmes (1988) states that these two goals are "to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience" and "to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted" (71). Although it is possible to argue that translation history can be considered a part of certain branches of translation studies, such as product-oriented descriptive studies, these goals and the categorization of the research areas lack a clear reference to "the historical study of translation" (Pym 1998, 1). Having made this point, Pym also criticizes the lack of reference to the translator in Holmes' map and compares it to Humphrey's sixteenth century map, which presents two main branches: translation and the translator (4). Due to this difference, Pym, who elucidates that "the activity of translators should be a privileged field for the study of how cultures interrelate" (2000, 2), advocates research with a focus on translators. In line with these approaches, Pym

(1998) seems to prefer Humphrey's map to Holmes' because the division in the latter relies on products only. Nevertheless, there are two points that need to be stressed in response to Pym's criticisms. First of all, Holmes (1988) does not seem to have totally forgotten translators. Under applied translation studies appears translator training. It is in specifically the branches of descriptive translation studies that one cannot see the translator. In addition, while describing translation policy, another area in applied translation studies, Holmes highlights one of the duties of the translation scholar: "to render informed advice to others in defining the place and role of translators, translating, and translations in society at large" (77-78). Second, considering the fact that Pym's emphasis is on the importance of agents as well as social actions in translation studies, Holmes' drawing attention to the possibility of "the development of a field of translation sociology" (72) is noteworthy. Though Holmes' focus is still on translations in function-oriented descriptive translation studies, his mentioning "translation sociology" demonstrates his awareness of the importance of individuals and societies as a whole in the translating or reading process.

The fact that the presence of the translator was not emphasized and the focus was rather on the translation process and the product in descriptive translation studies have also resulted in negative criticisms against Gideon Toury and Itamar Even-Zohar's works. However, both of the scholars have directed attention towards the agent and/or specifically the translator in certain publications, some of which have appeared after the criticisms. Among these is "The Translator as a Nonconformist-To Be or: How to Train Translators so as to Violate Translational Norms" (Toury 1980), "Translation as a Means of Planning and Planning of Translation: A Theoretical Framework and an

Exemplary Case” (Toury 2002), “The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer” (Even-Zohar 2002) and “Idea-Makers, Culture Entrepreneurs, Makers of Life Images, and The Prospects of Success” (Even-Zohar 2005).

Toury begins his paper entitled “The Translator as a Nonconformist-To Be” with reference to the fact that the concept of norm involves the idea that “translation is a socially contexted behavioural type of activity” (1980, 180). Toury clarifies that the translator is certainly under the influence of norms, but the translator does not have to conform to all the norms. This shows that the translator has her/his own free will in making translation decisions (180-181). He also highlights that these idiosyncratic acts can be accepted by other translators in time and lead to changes in norms, which is a clear indication of the power individual translators have (181). Toury believes that students of translation need to be taught translational norms so that they can make their own decisions with an awareness of the kind of translations they would like to produce (186). In “Translation as a Means of Planning and Planning of Translation: A Theoretical Framework and an Exemplary Case”, Toury (2002) again underlines the role of translation in bringing change, but this time not only a change in translational norms but also a change in a culture as part of the planning process. Similar to the questions Bourdieu (1999) poses in “The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas”, research on planning requires answers concerning texts chosen to be translated, languages of those texts and translational norms followed in target texts. What seems to be missing in Toury at first sight is the interest in the identity of the agents who make those choices. Nonetheless, Toury (2002) makes the following statement:

In each group, there is a small minority who act as producers on the level of the repertoire itself. Whether entrusted by the group with the task of doing so or whether self-appointed, it is mainly those persons who introduce new options, and hence act as AGENTS OF CHANGE. All the rest tend to be mere consumers of the repertoire: they are producers on the level of texts alone. (151)

As a result, the translator, the hidden agent in the previous statements on translation and translational norms, comes to the stage in the subject position. Although Toury emphasizes the role carried out by translators who introduce new options to the repertoire of the target culture, there is a lack of interest in the agents who do not bring a change by using the already existing options. I do not deny that cases in which agents deliberately or unintentionally introduce a source culture product to the target audience in a strikingly new way or cases in which agents introduce new options to the target culture deserve investigation. The point I would like to stress is that the seemingly ‘neutral’ translations are worth studying, too due to their exhibiting other facts concerning the nature of translation and the translator’s presence in the target text.

With an aim to describe target texts in a functional and systemic approach, Itamar Even-Zohar showed the dynamic structure of not only literature, which is a ‘polysystem’, “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” (Even-Zohar 1990, 11), but also translated literature, which is a system on its own. Although translated literature has not generally enjoyed attention in literary histories due to source-oriented points of view (Hermans 1985, 7-8), Even-Zohar (2000) regards “translated literature not only as an integral system within any literary polysystem, but as a most active system within it” (193). This is owing to the power translated literature has in shaping the literary

repertoire by introducing new elements through works of other literatures and thus the center of the polysystem (ibid.). One of the most important contributions of the polysystem theory seems to be its revealing the impossibility of defining and describing the position of translated literature universally (197). The connections between the systems of the polysystem and the positions of the polysystem as well as the systems, including the translated literature, need to be taken into consideration in any description. For instance, a young polysystem will be in need of support from translated literature and thus translated literature will position itself in the center and have the power to bring changes. However, when the translated literature is in the periphery, translators will mostly be conforming to the norms of the literary polysystem (Even-Zohar 2000, 193-195). Despite the fact that binary oppositions, such as center and periphery, seem to be in the front in the polysystem theory, Even-Zohar makes it clear that the translated literature should not be imagined at either the center or the periphery as a whole. This is because different sections of translated literature can have different positions (195).

Moving from this perspective of the polysystem theory, Even-Zohar (2002, 2005) brings the agents of ‘the making of culture repertoire’ into the picture in papers such as “The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer” and “Idea-Makers, Culture Entrepreneurs, Makers of Life Images, and The Prospects of Success”. He explains that there are two ways of making repertoire: ‘invention’ and ‘import’ (169), but not all options that are imported achieve to be part of the target repertoire. Even-Zohar uses the term ‘transfer’ when referring to the state in which the imported elements are accepted by the target culture (ibid.). Having made these points concerning the making of culture repertoire, he explicitly underlines the role of agents in the process.

Even-Zohar explains that the focus cannot be solely on the product because “what plays a role in the culture is the persons, agents themselves who are engaged in the business” (172). Even-Zohar’s (2005) article entitled “Idea-Makers, Culture Entrepreneurs, Makers of Life Images, and The Prospects of Success” is even more focused on those who initiate such processes of introducing new options to the repertoire. If the option introduced by an agent starts innovative processes (Even-Zohar 2005, 9) as a result of her/his actively producing and advocating its use in the culture, that agent is not only an “active idea-maker” but also a “*cultural entrepreneur*” (10, emphasis original). This is because “they are engaged in the creation of new or alternative ideas for the repertoires of culture” (ibid.). Drawing attention to the similarity between potential idea-makers, such as philosophers, and makers of life images, such as “writers, poets, painters, composers, film directors”, Even-Zohar maintains that poets and writers have carried out the role of cultural entrepreneurs at various times and places mostly thanks to the symbolic capital they have (14). Although Even-Zohar does not mention translators in this list of cultural entrepreneurs, an example of an idea-maker or cultural entrepreneur is Dr. Abdullah Cevdet, a poet-translator (Ayluçtarhan 2007, 174). This is due to the fact that Abdullah Cevdet aimed at offering alternative ideas to the Ottoman culture during the Second Constitutional period. Abdullah Cevdet, who did not only literary but also non-literary translations, attempted at “using his translations as cultural tools” (ibid.) and thus introducing and strongly advocating the use of “a Western-oriented materialist repertoire” (190). In short, “a special attention to the activity of the *makers of repertoire* who are at the same time *agents of transfer*” (Even-Zohar 2002, 173, emphases mine) is required. This statement of Even-Zohar’s illustrates the addition of stress on agents,

which was missing in the polysystem theory and which became even more obvious as a result of his proposing the use of the concepts of “idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur”.

Although there are important similarities between Even-Zohar and Andre Lefevere’s writings, Lefevere (1992) clearly showed his awareness of the necessity to give particular attention to agents in *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Lefevere (1992) deals with issues of “power, ideology, institution and manipulation” (2) through rewriting, a form of which is translation (vii). In addition to texts, those who act in the rewriting process are in the focus. Indeed, the very first question scholars doing research on rewriting should ask is “who rewrites”, while the reasons for rewriting, the conditions under which the task is done and readership need to be other areas of investigation (7). Having pointed out that writers and rewriters in a literary system can perform their tasks considering the constraints of the system or resist the poetics or ideology that is prevailing in the system (13), Lefevere draws attention to patronage, which refers to individuals, groups of people or institutions with a power to “further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature” (15). It is significant that Lefevere dwells on not only change (23) but also conservation of the poetics in a specific culture (20) and explains how patronage is influential in both cases. Although a definition of translation is not made, which makes it difficult to distinguish other forms of rewriting from translation in Lefevere, his elucidating the role agents play in the process of rewriting and aptly describing the hows and whys concerning patronage are highly important.

After these relatively early agency related work in the field of translation studies come studies that make use of specifically Pierre Bourdieu's writings. Among these is Daniel Simeoni's (1998) "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus", which attempts at integrating Bourdieu's concept of habitus into the framework of descriptive translation studies. It is important that Simeoni (1998) is especially interested in "the myriad determining choices made by translators in the course of translating" (1), stylistic differences between translators as well as those between the translator and the source author (2), and "the dynamics of the complex of inner/outer forces" powerful in the formation of the translator's style (3). Having criticized the studies done in the field of cognitive science with a focus on the human mind, Simeoni puts emphasis on the necessity of including the social world (3). After a discussion of Toury's writings on descriptive translation studies and mainly his notion of norms, Simeoni makes the following statement: "It is not so much the activity of translating, nor the translator himself, nor objective norms as such, but the internalized position of the translator in his field of practice which may turn out to be the single most determining factor." (12) Therefore, translation as product is the outcome of "diversely distributed social habituses or, specific habituses *governed by the rules pertaining to the field in which the translation takes place*" (19, emphasis original) and cannot be treated in isolation from other factors already mentioned. It is due to this link that translator style can be studied as "a case of mapping out" the differences between the agents' choices in comparison to the "differences between their cultural and socio-economic statuses" (19) in the field of translation or more particularly literary translation. It seems possible to do such a comparative study of style between different translators' translations of the same text or

compare the translator's style with that of the author's with an attentive look at differences between their cultural, social and economic lives. That is why Simeoni later in the article states, "a whole new area of research, contrasting the specificities of what we might call "authorial habitus" versus "translatorial habitus", is thereby open" (26). He does not touch upon the habitus of the author-translator, at all and I argue that the study of the author-translator's habitus might contribute to this research area with its more interlinked aspects. That is because in the case of an author-translator, it also becomes possible to compare the same individual's choices in her/his authorial and translatorial styles. Whether the minor change in the field causes any minor or major changes in the symbolic capital the author-translator has despite the fact that it is the same individual and thus the same habitus might prove to be a point researchers need to be careful about. Since there is an obvious lack in "modern sociographies of single translators' professional trajectories", doing interviews with the translator as part of the process of gathering biographical data can be useful (31).

Gouanvic (2005) criticizes Simeoni for ignoring specifically the concept of field in Bourdieu (148-149). I would like to point out that although Simeoni does not really introduce the concepts of field or capital separately, he uses these concepts in his discussion of habitus. Considering Bourdieu's claim that "such notions as habitus, field, and capital can be defined, but only within the theoretical system they constitute, not in isolation" (1992, 96) and the fact that Simeoni's statements on habitus show the unavoidable reference to the notion of field, I would argue that Simeoni does not deserve harsh criticism. Pointing to Simeoni's lack of describing these concepts in Bourdieu's theory is one thing; criticizing Simeoni as if he did not pay attention to these concepts is

another. Simeoni's lack of reference to Bourdieu's own works and his using only secondary sources has been another reason for Gouanvic's negative criticisms (149). Although Bourdieu's writings can be seen in the list of references, Gouanvic seems to be right in that Simeoni, in this article, does not generally refer to specific pages in Bourdieu's papers or books. Simeoni rather appears to discuss Bourdieu's points without quoting or paraphrasing specific sentences, but it needs to be noted that there are exceptions to that.

Due to the increase in translation scholars' use of Bourdieu's concepts following particularly Simeoni's article, *The Translator* published a special issue entitled "Bourdieu and the Sociology of Translation and Interpreting" in 2005. The guest editor of the volume, Moira Inghilleri (2005) has written on "The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies". Inghilleri (2005, 126) states that the agents of the tasks of translating and interpreting, i.e. the translator and the interpreter, have been further in the focus of translation research together with the use of Bourdieu's concepts. Jean-Marc Gouanvic (2005), in "*A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances: Field, 'Habitus', Capital and 'Illusio'*", presents the studies done in the field of translation sociology and stresses that the external that is the literary field and the internal sociologies, which include the text, agent and habitus, need to be woven together in research. After his discussion of "the emergence of an autonomous French literary field" (154) in the nineteenth century through the use of Bourdieu's concepts, Gouanvic (2005) makes the following statement in his discussion of the translator's habitus:

If a translator imposes a rhythm upon the text, a lexicon or a syntax that does not originate in the source text and thus substitutes his or her voice for that of the author, this is essentially not a conscious strategic choice but an effect of his or her specific *habitus*, as acquired in the literary field. (158, emphasis original)

It is reasonable to claim that the translator's *habitus* is very much influential on her/his decision to make her/his translatorial style apparent in the translation, but to argue that it is certainly not the result of a conscious decision seems problematic. The translator's *habitus* may help to draw conclusions as to whether the decision might be consciously or unconsciously made, but additional sources of information, such as interviews with the translator, could prove a deeper insight in order to draw such clear-cut conclusions.

Interviews are in the focus of Jan Blommaert's (2005) article entitled "Bourdieu the Ethnographer. The Ethnographic Grounding of *Habitus* and Voice". This is because Blommaert (2005) investigates "problems of voice" (219) in the transformation of an interview made with a refugee applying for the Belgian asylum into a letter written by the asylum authorities. Pointing out that "a sense of lived and experienced reality", thus ethnographic work is in the essence of Bourdieu's writings (224), Blommaert studies his case using Bourdieu's concepts and depicts how the applicant's voice is not heard as a result of all the "misunderstandings", "absences", and loss of noteworthy details in the letter of the authorities (232). Blommaert effectively demonstrates the relationship between power and voice and argues *habitus* shows the "not necessarily innocent nature of routinized behaviour, (...) that routines may be the points where patterns of inequality enter into our everyday behaviour, and that these patterns of inequality lead to patterning in our routines as well" (233). Thus, Blommaert once again draws attention to both the 'structured' and 'structuring' aspects of the *habitus* and attempts at awakening those

who are blind to the power of regular acts, which cunningly might not attract much attention.

To conclude, the first two sections of this chapter have shown that whenever a case is profoundly explored in the literary field, the focus is often on the author or the translator but not the author-translator. The investigation of the author-translator's habitus in the literary field may reveal a kind of a shared habitus between the author's and the translator's or the dominance of one over the other. However, it is also possible that the interactions between the authorial and translatorial styles in writing show that the two cannot easily be distinguished. This is important due to various reasons, one of which is the long prevalent assumption concerning the universals of translated language versus the non-translated. All these questions await answers.

### **1.3. Author-Translators**

Agency is very much related to the identity of the person or persons. Dorothy Holland and the co-authors of *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*, assert that identities can provide channels to be agents (1998, 4-5). Power has definitely an important effect on agency. In other words, those holding power may feel freer to be creative and start that which is considered uncommon compared with the norm at a certain time and place. As a result, they may bring out changes in various areas of life. In order not to "participate in the silencing of those who lack privilege and power" (Holland et al. 1998, 25) in the field of literature and translation studies, it is important to be aware of the identity of authors, translators and author-translators. In this section, first the etymology of 'author' in English and the changing position of the author at different times and places are

emphasized. Then Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud's writings on the relationship between authors and their texts, including the death of the author as a consequence of writing, control of 'meaning' as well as Barthes and Freud's uses of the terms 'author' and 'writer' are discussed. Having questioned the position of the translator and the author-translator, the relatively high status of literary translation and literary translator is described. Next is an attempt at responding to claims concerning the importance of being a poet or an author in translating literary works. Finally, information on a number of studies done on topics related to author-translators is given.

The word 'author' in English was derived from the Latin 'auctor', which is etymologically linked to four terms. Three of those do not convey the idea of "textual mastery" or creativity (Burke 1995: xviii). They can be listed as "[a]gere, 'to act or perform'", "augere, 'to grow'", and "auro, 'to tie'" (ibid.). However, the fourth one, *autentim*, refers to authority and therefore it is associated with authorship but not autonomy. This, Burke explains, is due to the fact that in antiquity, authority depended on the author's connection with the tradition and God's authority in letting the author be inspired (ibid.). In short, it is not as a result of the definitions of the words from which 'author' was derived that authors have been considered to load their texts with 'the' 'meaning' in their minds. Authors have not enjoyed an enormous amount of power at all times, however. To illustrate, in Plato's Republic, poets are not very much esteemed:

(...) we must love and salute [poets] as doing the best they can, and concede to them that Homer is the most poetic of poets and the first of tragedians, but we must know the truth, that we can admit no poetry into our city save only hymns to the gods and the praises of good men. (Plato 1995, 20)

As is obvious, poets are not condemned simply because writing poetry is all they can do. In line with this belittling, poets are clearly devoid of a say in *The Republic*. Plato considers poetry as a threat to the wellbeing of the state. This is due to the fact that “pleasure and pain” start to rule the city instead of “law” (21) when the public reads poetry.

Plato’s approach to poets did not designate the idea of authorship forever. The idea of authorship evolved in time, especially during Romanticism, that is, beginning with the end of the eighteenth century. It needs to be noted that Romanticism did not influence all cultures during the same period of time in the same way. Synchronic and diachronic studies have revealed a number of differences. For instance, *romantic* literary works were first written towards the end of the eighteenth century in England and Germany but in the nineteenth century in other European countries like France and Spain (Barberis-Grasser 1994, 86). The important point here is that there are two main characteristics of Romanticism, which makes it a landmark in the changing conception of the ‘author’. To begin with, the individual’s experiences were in the focus of Romantics (Hauser 1973, 171). Second, imagination played an important role in the search for “the remote, the exotic, and the unknown” (Hauser 1973, 164). As a result, the author’s perceptions and creativity in writing attracted attention. At this stage, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud’s writings concerning the relationship between authors and their texts need to be discussed. This is owing to the fact that all three scholars have essays on the connection between the author as an individual and the interpretation of the text or the role of the reader as well as the use of the terms ‘author’ and/or ‘writer’. I have two arguments in relation to the discussion of

these writings. First of all, I argue that the identity of the speaker or the writer needs to be taken into consideration in order not to neglect power issues. Second, in a discussion of the terms ‘author’ and/or ‘writer’, the ‘translator’ deserves to be included. It is unfortunate that the translator is indiscernible in the discussions made by Barthes and Foucault.

Sean Burke (1995, xxiii) explains that the study of the link between the literary text and the author’s personality was prevalent in the second half of the nineteenth century literary criticism. This view was contested by the impersonalist theory, which maintains that literary texts cannot be regarded as an illumination of the author’s character. Sean Burke refers to T. S. Eliot’s motto that “poetry ‘is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality’” (ibid.). Roland Barthes’ (1995) “The Death of the Author” can be considered a continuation of this confrontation (Burke 1995, xxiv). This is due to the fact that Barthes exhibits how the author disappears the moment the act of writing begins and criticizes classic criticism in that authors are studied through their biographies, diaries, and interviews in relation to their texts. Critics then come to conclusions concerning literary works in the light of the information gathered about the authors. Michel Foucault (1972), in “What is an Author?”, also discusses the relationship between the author and death or rather “the sacrifice of life” (206). While drawing attention to the question concerning what constitutes a ‘work’, Foucault first states, it is well known that the main aim in literary criticism is not to demonstrate the relationship between the author and the text. The focus in literary criticism is rather on the work itself, that is, “its structure, its architecture, its intrinsic form, and the play of its internal relationships” (207). Foucault then poses the question whether the work is not

that which “an author has written” (ibid.). This is a reason why it is difficult not to include the author as an individual while interpreting the literary work. However, there are also “ideological” reasons Foucault underlines (221):

The question then becomes: How can one reduce the great peril, the great danger with which fiction threatens our world? The answer is: One can reduce it with the author. The author allows a limitation of the cancerous and dangerous proliferation of significations within a world where one is thrifty not only with one's resources and riches but also with one's discourses and their significations. The author is the principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning. (...) We are used to thinking that the author is so different from all other men, and so transcendent with regard to all languages that, as soon as he speaks, meaning begins to proliferate, to proliferate indefinitely.

The truth is quite the contrary: the author is not an indefinite source of significations that fill a work: the author does not precede the works; (...) In fact, if we are accustomed to presenting the author as a genius, as a perpetual surging of invention, it is because, in reality, we make him function in exactly the opposite fashion. (Foucault 1972, 221)

Foucault (1972) apparently criticizes the assumption that there is one single ‘meaning’ of anything and the ‘creator’ of that ‘meaning’ can only be the author of the text. Human beings want to be in control and seem to be stingy in letting others go through their own reading processes as if it is possible to avoid that. Therefore, there are ideological reasons lying behind interpreting literary works by regarding the author's life and personality as the main guide.

In agreement with Foucault, Barthes asserts, “it is language which speaks, not the author; to write is, through a prerequisite impersonality” (1995, 126). Texts await their readers who might be considered to give birth to various ‘meanings’ of the text, thus making it explicit that the author is already dead. For this reason, “a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination” (Barthes 1995, 129). However, I would argue that taking the author, her identity into consideration while studying literary texts does not

mean that the researcher is merely interested in the identity of the speaker or writer. If this is only one of the aspects of the research and if the identity of the speaker or writer does not become the ultimate channel through which conclusions are drawn, asking this question does not have to produce negative results. On the contrary, disinterest in the speaker or the writer can bring out a study lacking in certain ways. This may even lead to major problems if one is dealing with a translated text. To be unaware of the presence of the translator in the writing process can blind the researcher to various aspects of the text, which may indeed result in ignoring the effect of ideology in text production. An example can be the postcolonial text Samia Mehrez (1992) investigates in "Translation and the Postcolonial Experience: The Francophone North African Text". Mehrez (1992) discusses how "hybrid" (121) texts written by North African authors display the authors' bilingualism and the existence of two distinct cultures at their homeland. Mehrez (1992) explains that the main aim of the postcolonial author in producing these texts is "to subvert hierarchies by bringing together the 'dominant' and the 'underdeveloped,' by exploding and confounding different symbolic worlds and separate systems of signification in order to create a mutual interdependence and intersignification" (122). Ideology is obviously at play as some North African authors make their choices concerning the language in which they write and use language as an instrument to fight for their own sovereignty in the postcolonial world. Therefore, it is not possible to generalize and suggest that who is speaking is a superfluous question to ask in any context. Identities certainly make a difference, but this certainly does not mean that the signified is "present in and of itself, in a sufficient presence that would refer only to itself" (Derrida 1982b, 12). There is an endless referencing between ideas and the author

cannot draw the borders of that referencing. Having discussed “the process of “saving the text”” (56), Sibel Irzik (1990), in *Deconstruction and the Politics of Criticism*, argues as follows:

The question of the speaker’s control over the meaning of his utterance is one of degree, not of absolute presence or absence. It is true that words have unintended connotations and they can be interpreted in contexts not controlled by the original speaker or author. But this does not obliterate the distinction between the word “brot” and the word “bastard” in any specific context. (Irzik 1990, 62)

Thus, exaggeration of the fact that the intention of the author cannot be an absolute source of ‘origin’ that determines the readings of the text needs to be avoided, as well.

In addition to the discussion related to the death of the author and the study of the author’s life in the interpretation of literary works in Barthes and Foucault, Barthes and Freud’s uses of the terms ‘author’ and/ or ‘writer’ deserve attention. Having described the superior position of the author from the sixteenth until the nineteenth centuries in France, Barthes (1972), in “Authors and Writers”, first differentiates authors from writers. The former “lose[s] his own structure and that of the world in the structure of language” since he produces literary works and does not seek truth as the ultimate object (145). The writer, on the other hand, has a practical aim in producing texts like articles or essays on scholarly subjects, politics, etc. Unlike Barthes, Freud (1995) first of all reveals the connection between the identity of the creativity of the writer and her/his works. In addition, Freud uses the word ‘writer’ when referring to Barthes’ ‘author’, but Freud adds the adjective ‘creative’ to clarify that the kind of the writer he discusses is the one who writes literary works. It is significant that Freud (1995, 55) sees similarities between “the creative writer” and “the child at play” and draws attention to the emotional aspects of writing a literary work in “Creative Writers and Day-

Dreaming”. Interestingly, Freud distinguishes “the ancient writers of epics and tragedies [who] take over their material ready-made, from writers who seem to originate their own material” (58). Thus, he excludes writers of texts other than literary works in his discussion of the link between creative writing and daydreaming to ensure that there is creativity involved in the writing process. Although Freud does not even mention translators, the point he makes here helps to deduce that translators are different than creative writers in his understanding. This is because the former works on texts that have already been written and thus there is no need to be creative for the translator in his reading and writing process. Nevertheless, Freud demonstrates his awareness concerning the idea of ‘original’ by using a hedging device and says those writers “seem to” write ‘original’ literary texts. This point is openly stated by Barthes in “The Death of the Author” since he stressed the fact that “the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original” (128). Then how can it be possible to claim that the (creative) writer or the author and the translator do not share common ground and to leave translators out of this discussion?

Besides ‘authors’ or ‘creative writers’ and ‘writers’ in general, Barthes (1972) states that there is also “a bastard type: the author-writer” (149), but he does not mention the ‘translator’ at all. Those that Barthes names as author-writers are intellectuals who do both. They can be the authors of creative works and at the same time write scholarly papers. So where does the translator stand in this description of authors, writers and author-writers that Barthes (1972) has presented in this essay? Barthes, similar to Foucault, does not even refer to the presence of the translator and thus ignores the fact that there is translated literature. He seems to assume literature is read only in the

language it is written and focuses on ‘authors’, ‘writers’ and ‘author-writers’. For this reason, I will attempt at finding the position of the translator in this picture through Barthes’ lenses, but first several points concerning the task of the translator need to be made. The literary translator renders the already produced literary text into another language and thus produces that creative work anew for the target culture. Translators can identify themselves so much with the literary work that they may feel as lost in its language as the target authors. However, they may also have goals like instructing the reader by making the source text available to the target readership and thus have an aspect of the writer’s identity as described by Barthes. Although Barthes seems not to share the view that authors may as well have one or more aims in creating a literary work, it is a fact that not all authors merely write as a result of inspiration. Therefore, even in the single act of producing a literary work or translating a literary work into another language, one can carry the roles of both an author and a writer in Barthes’ terms.

When one says ‘author-translator’, s/he seems to consider ‘translating’ in similar terms to ‘writing’ in that authors, as creative beings, produce their own works and translators have more practical aims in producing other authors’ works in a different language than the source language. I would like to clarify that the intention in using the term ‘author-translator’ in this thesis is to underline the presence of the two roles carried by these individuals and the link between the two activities. The fact that the word “author” comes before “translator” does not reflect a hierarchical order here but is a result of the established use in Turkish literary tradition. It is also possible to claim that “author” qualifies the translator. Thus, this use implies that translators who are also

authors are in the focus of this thesis and has no implications concerning the existence or non-existence of the creative aspect in these practices. The question Freud asks at the beginning of his essay may be helpful at this stage, as it inquires about where “that strange being, the creative writer,” finds “his material, and how he manages to make such an impression on us with it and to arouse in us emotions of which, perhaps, we had not even thought ourselves capable” (1995, 54). Apparently, the material of the literary text in translating is not brought together by the target author but the source author. This is a fact that can certainly not be denied, but it is not possible to claim that the source material is totally ‘original’, either. In addition, other potentials of the creative work can only be realized as a result of the translator’s work for the target readership. It is also noteworthy that it is literary translators but not the translators of other kinds of texts that can be considered ‘authors’ according to this definition, which appears to place literary translators in a superior position.

‘Literary translation’ seems to have one single definition, but the definitions made by two people may differ from one another. Gideon Toury (1995), in *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, highlights the distinction between the two uses of ‘literary translation’. ‘Literary translation’ has come to be used while referring to the rendering of texts considered literary by source readership as well as those translations considered literary by target readership (168). Therefore, two different systems may be the source of the assessment of a translation as literary. Nonetheless, it is possible to argue that there are cases in which both the source text is considered to be literary by the source culture and the target text is considered to be literary by the target culture regardless of the perceptions of the source culture about the source text (ibid.). It is

significant to note that literary translation has been treated to be nonexistent in histories of literature (Hermans 1985, 7). Theo Hermans (1985), in his introduction to *The Manipulation of Literature*, draws attention to the fact that whenever a translated literary work is criticized, the focus is usually on the qualities of the ‘original’ and the lacking aspects of the translation when compared with the target text (8). Thus, translated literature has mostly been studied with source-oriented approaches and rarely as a system in a language (ibid.). Having told the old story, which still has influences on critics evaluating literary translations, Hermans continues with the new era that opened with descriptive translation studies, which has a target-oriented approach and deals with the functions of the translation in its system, in the 1970s. The systematic, descriptive study of translated literary works started with Gideon Toury and Itamar Even-Zohar, who considered literature as a polysystem and translated literature as a separate system in relation with the other systems in that polysystem. For this reason, in Toury’s (1995) remarks concerning the definitions of literary translation, possible differences between two different cultures’ perceptions concerning a text as literary are significant. There are no such major differences between cultural perceptions concerning the literary translations in this thesis, but it is worth stating that ‘literary translation’ here is used to address translations considered literary by target readership unless indicated otherwise.

Literary translation seems to have occupied a position ‘higher’ than other kinds of text translation. The essays in *Translating Selves: Experience and Identity between Languages and Literatures* vary in their focus, but who translates, how s/he translates and the effects of translating on reading as well as the identity of languages, which is open to change, are among the main questions for which answers are sought. Nikolaou

and Kyritsi (2008), in their introduction to the book, make the following comment on literary translation:

Together with the crux of subjectivity that we especially identify when language becomes literary language, and translation, literary translation, we encounter a persistent virus that keeps unraveling preconceptions: the adjective ‘literary’ begins by designating what one participates in, illuminating the intricacies of a practice in dialogue with and shaping the consciousness of the practitioner. (3)

The main reason for the different status given to literary translation appears to be its being considered to be similar to creative writing. This may be the cause leading to the fact that writers and poets have been regarded ‘better’ translators of literary works.

Josephine Balmer (2006), in her article entitled “What Comes Next? Reconstructing the Classics?”, narrows down the area of literary translation even further and concentrates on specifically the translation of classics when she points to the similarity between the translation of classics and creative writing (184). Lauren G. Leighton (1991), however, addresses the translation of classics from a different perspective and points out that translating classics has been regarded a scholarly work. Thus, the view that one must be a poet in order to translate poetry has been shaken by some scholars including Matthew Arnold in the case of translating classics (Leighton 1991, 153). The reason why Balmer relates translating classics to creative writing is that she sees it a requirement for the translator of classics to consider the audience of the time and make translation decisions accordingly (ibid.). Furthermore, it is impossible to be in contact with the author of the source text and to gather detailed information about the context of the time and place in which it is written (185), which necessarily frees the translator (186). Thus, translators become “innovator[s]” (184) whose thumbprint can be seen on the classic when compared with the previous renderings of the same text. After presenting how she

journeyed through the translation of Greek texts to her creation of her own poems in an interaction with those Greek texts, Balmer, a poet-translator, states that translation of classical texts and writing ‘original’ poetry are “interlinked and interdependent art forms” (194). Referring to poets such as Balmer, Leighton shows how they stress the importance of being a poet in translating poetry and the freedom poet-translators need in fulfilling the task (151-154).

Scholars may underline the relationship between writing and translating even when they have not asserted the requirement or at least the significance of being a writer or a poet in translating fiction or poetry. Clive Scott (2000, 251), who wrote *Translating Baudelaire*, asks, “Do we use translation to get to our own creativity, or do we use our creativity to get to the source text’s best translational advantage?” The fact that Scott sees this as an ‘either-or’ situation is problematic. It is certainly possible to talk about a ‘both-and’ or a ‘neither-nor’ case. What Scott stresses is the fact that the translator’s role in the process is not merely at a linguistic level, as s/he is involved as a “whole” (ibid.) in the task of translating. After stressing that the literary translator does not have to be a poet, Bonnefoy (1992, 189) adds, “if he is himself a writer he will be unable to keep his translating separate from his own work”. Scott (2000, 2) also states that those who believe only poets have the capability to translate poems think poets are freer than others in their translation decisions. This may be related to the expectation of the translator’s “suppress[ing] subjectivity” in translating an ‘original’ work, to which Nikolaou and Kyritsi (2008, 9) refers while explaining the different assertions related to writing and translating. How can one ignore the presence of ‘subjectivity’ when even the task of selecting the text to be translated can be the starting point of “an act of assisted self-

expression” and when the translation stands as “a confession of connections and influence” (Nikolaou 2008, 57)? This impossible task expected to be completed by a translator seems to be loosened when the translator is also a writer. This might be because writers, as ‘subjects’ with their ‘original’ works, have secured a place that gives them the freedom to translate in their own voice.

An investigation of studies on the concept of ‘author-translator’ or ‘translator-author’ reveals that there is remarkably small number of scholars who have done research in this area. There is research on individuals who were both translators and authors with a focus on demonstrating the relationship between those individuals’ translating and writing. An example is Cockerill (2006), who puts an author-translator at the forefront: Futabatei Shimei, a prominent figure of Japanese literature. She studies the novels written and translated by Futabatei Shimei from Russian into Japanese. It is important that Cockerill not only focuses on the written and translated texts but also informs her readers about the influence of Futabatei Shimei’s translations from Russian literature on the field of Japanese literature. However, Cockerill’s main aim seems to investigate Futabatei’s style in his major translations and identify the influence of those translations on his writing (11). That is why Cockerill examines features such as the Japanese verb forms the writer preferred. As it says in the blurb of the book, Cockerill shows how Futabatei’s authorial and translatorial styles emerged under the influence of Turgenev and Gogol. Thus, Cockerill’s is a study that illustrates interactions between authorial and translatorial styles of an author-translator, but the major sources of influence appear to have been the novels Futabatei Shimei translated, not vice versa.

There are also studies that explore self-translating, i.e. translating one's own work. While self-translating can happen anywhere, in certain contexts, such as the Canadian, self-translating may attract more attention than it usually does. This is due to the reason for and result of self-translating in bilingual contexts. In *Translating Identity and the Identity of Translation*, Daniel Gagnon's article on "cross-writing and self-translating" discusses the appearance of "innovative bilingual translating/ writing experiences" (2006, 47) in the Canadian context. Gagnon (2006) elucidates that Canadian writers produce their works in the 'other' language, and then render them into their mother tongue or rather "mix writing and translation as cultural practices" (ibid.). Focusing on his own writing and translating experiences, Gagnon states the novels he wrote in English were received as translations, while his translations of his own novels were received as 'originals'. This, Gagnon explains, resulted from the fact that Gagnon's mother tongue is French and the French translations were published before the English novels he wrote. It is also important that Gagnon refers to the freedom writers are considered to have in translating while giving details about his translating *The Marriagable Daughter*. He clarifies that he preferred not to render some English words into French in the translation and added some words that did not appear in the 'original'. For this reason, Gagnon believes while self-translating, he has "taken considerable liberties as a writer/ translator" (50). Gagnon's reminding his identity as an author-translator in this explanation concerning the translation implies the idea that if it were another translator who undertook the task of translating Gagnon's novel, s/he would not be considered to have as much freedom as Gagnon. It is Gagnon's own novel, so he has the right to make any changes he likes. It is interesting that there is no questioning about

the source text when it is the author self-translating, which seems to mean that the author carries much more significance than the source text.

In brief, the relationship between translating and writing and/or advantages poets or authors have enjoyed in translating literary texts are mentioned if not stressed in these works. While Balmer (2006), Bonnefoy (1992) and Cockerill (2006) definitely throw light on the link between writing and translating practices of author-translators, Scott (2000) directs attention to the fact that translation is not a simple linguistic activity and that the involvement of the translator as an individual in the act of literary translation cannot be avoided. Considering the fact that the author is also involved as an individual in her/his practice, it is reasonable to expect interactions between the two practices of the same individual. The important point here is that there is no theoretical framework in the works of author-translators, but this is in line with the nature of these writings. The significance of these writings comes from the fact that they provide insight into the author-translators' view of their own experiences and others' similar to theirs. An exception is Cockerill's (2006) work, as it is a result of serious research. Her study reveals the influence of the source authors' style on the author-translators' own writing as a result of his translating practice. A question proper to ask here is whether the author-translator's authorial style can also be distinguished easily in her/his translating, which could show that the influence is bidirectional.

#### **1.4. The Discourse on Author-Translators in Turkey**

To my knowledge, there is no study which simultaneously investigates the works and translations of a Turkish author-translator with attention to their identity as an author-

translator. The discourse on author-translators in Turkey has not been in the focus of any study, either. However, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar's (2001) PhD thesis, the book version of which was published in 2008 as *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*, needs to be discussed here for several reasons. First of all, Tahir Gürçağlar (2001) analyzes the discourse on translation and translators while exploring the role played by private publishing houses in addition to the role of the Translation Bureau in this period. Secondly, she discusses the politics of the period with reference to the publications and thus provides a historical framework. Thirdly, her first case study in the dissertation focuses on three author-translators' pseudotranslations, 'indigenous' works, and translations. The corpora consist of three publications of each one of the author-translators: Selami Münir Yurdatop, Ali Rıza Seyfi and Kemal Tahir. As a result, Tahir Gürçağlar sheds light upon the discourse on author-translators in this period.

In *Kapılar. Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar*, Tahir Gürçağlar (2005) investigates the discourse on translation and translators over a longer period, that is the 1940s, 1960s and 2000s. Her study reveals that "translation was considered a tool for modernization and canon formation in the 1940s" [1940'larda, çeviriye bir çağdaşlaşma ve kanon oluşturma aracı olarak bakılmıştır] (2005, 88) and thus translators were 'visible' actors in the process (90). The examples of author-translators speaking or writing about translation and translators provided by Tahir Gürçağlar demonstrate that translation was generally regarded as a secondary activity and that the requirement to be "successful" [başarılı] at translating was to have the ability and the experience of writing (92-97). Translators, therefore, were not seen equal to writers and obviously this requirement was an "idealization" [idealize edilmesi] of the concept of author-translator (93). Tahir

Gürçağlar then shows that the 2000s brought certain important changes concerning the discourse on translation and translators. First of all, translators themselves, rather than authors or critics, began to draw attention to issues concerning translation. Secondly, translating began to be considered a profession as a result of the effort made by translators. Thirdly, it is now agreed that translation studies is an independent academic field (114). However, there is a similarity between the 1940s and 2000s that Tahir Gürçağlar puts emphasis on. This is related to the fact that almost all the translators who played vital roles in establishing (Turkish) Literary Translators [Kitap Çevirmenleri], such as Tuncay Birkan, Gürol Koca, Aslı Biçen and Işık Ergüden, are not only translators but also writers and work with publishing houses which can be claimed to be at the center of the Turkish literary system (ibid.).

For the purpose of investigating the discourse on author-translators in Turkey in a historical framework, I have searched the volumes of the journal entitled *Tercüme* [Translation], which was published from 1940 until 1966, *Yazko Çeviri* (1981-1985) and *Metis Çeviri*, published in the 1980s and early 1990s, during which the novels in the corpus of this study were published. *Tercüme*, published by the Translation Bureau, aimed at “introducing the best” of the works written in mostly European languages to Turkish readership [Başlıca gayemiz Türk okurlarına, başka dillerde yazan muharrirlerin, bilhassa Avrupa'nın irfanları her tarafa yayılmış muharrirlerinin en iyilerini tanıtmaktı] (Ataç 1941b, 1). In *Tercüme* appear not only translations from foreign languages but also criticisms on published translations and essays on translating. My reading the first five volumes revealed that there is either no or only a passing reference to author-translators in a high number of criticisms. Therefore, particularly the

essays on translating have been chosen for the exploration of the change or changes in the discourse on author-translators in this period of 26 years. The 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s will be discussed with a focus on views concerning author-translators. The findings of this analysis will be compared to the findings related to the discourse on author-translators in *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri*. As a result, it will be possible to see whether the discourse was different in the period Pınar Kür's novels and translations in the corpus of this study were published when compared with the discourse in *Tercüme*.

It is here important to provide information concerning the amount of data gathered during these periods. There are plenty of examples that can be quoted from the 1940s, whereas the 1950s and 1960s fail to provide that much information in quantity. This seems to be due to three main reasons. To begin with, essays on the issues concerning translation, including the question who should translate literary works into Turkish, were more common in the 1940s, since the journal was in its early period and needed to explain its expectations. In addition, the intention was to supplement translations and criticisms of translations in the later period. In the 1950s, Bedrettin Tuncel (1955), for example, states that the primary reason why they were publishing this journal was not to “discuss issues of translation” and come to clear conclusions about translating [Dergimizin bellibaşlı vazifesinin tercüme meselelerini münakaşa edip formüllere bağlamak olduğunu da kabul etmek güçtür.] (134). He adds that these issues were mostly discussed during the first years of the journal and that their primary goal in the 1950s was to publish translations of “good examples” of works from foreign languages [Bilhassa ilk çıktığı yıllarda, sonradan da zaman zaman, sırası geldikçe bu meseleler üzerinde durulmuştur. Bugün için asıl vazifemizin yabancı dillerdeki fikir ve

edebiyat mahsullerinden iyi örnekler vererek okur yazarlarımıza hizmet olduğu kanaatindeyiz.] (135). Another reason is the fact that certain issues of the journal could not have been published in 1954. Last but not least, the journal was published for only six years during the 1960s. However, the essays that appeared in the volumes during all those twenty-six years provide sufficient amount of information to make an analysis and synthesis of the discourse on author-translators. In relation to the emphasis on the role to be carried out by the poets and authors of the period in translating literary works into Turkish, the similarity between writing and translating, the relationship between the selected source work and the author/poet-translator, and stylistic features that have to be taken into consideration in translating literary works were underlined. I will begin each point related to this discourse with the 1940s and then make remarks concerning the later period whenever possible.

Starting with the very first volume of the journal, it is possible to see how intertwined the above-mentioned ideas are. Bedrettin Tuncel (1940), in the first volume of *Tercüme*, has an essay entitled “Tercüme Meselesi” [The Issue of Translating], which delves into the required characteristics of translators while pointing to these ideas. Tuncel first refers to Ahmet Haşim’s and then Andre Gide’s remarks. This is important because he aims at reinforcing his ideas by sharing the views of two famous names, one Turkish, the other French. Tuncel, as a result, makes it clear that it is not only him but also established names in Turkey and abroad that are concerned with the same issues in the same or a similar fashion. Through Ahmet Haşim, Tuncel stresses that assuming that anyone who knows a foreign language can translate is a clear indication of that person’s

“ignorance” [cehalettir] (79). His reporting Andre Gide’s words shows the importance he attaches to the fact that literary translation needs to be done by authors.

According to Andre Gide, not everyone can translate and indeed should not. This task needs to be left for writers who have the taste. An author of the country who is known and who is competent in a foreign language should try to translate a work that matches her/his tastes and soul, a work that almost shares a kind of a kernel with his own soul. Only under such conditions can translations that will enrich a language be done. To know a language is a prerequisite, but that is not enough. This task requires craftsmanship. The task cannot be completed by blindly reporting the sentences of the original work. Those words and sentences have to be understood and written in our own language. To be the slaves of sentences means to overlook the idea and excitement in those sentences. The translator has to preserve particularly the tone of the original work. Unless the tone is preserved, the translation cannot be considered successful.

[Andre Gide’e göre, tercüme işini herkes yapamaz ve yapmamalıdır. Bu işi zevk ve kalem sahibi kimselere bırakmalı. Memleketin tanınmış ve yabancı bir dile vakıf olan bir muharriri, kendi zevkine, ruhuna uygun gelen, tercüme edeceği eserle kendi ruhu arasında adeta bir nevi cevher iştiraki bulunan bir eseri tercümeyle kalkışmalıdır. Ancak bu şartlar dahilinde bir dili zenginleştirecek tercüme yapılabilmeye kabil olur. Dil bilmek, lüzumlu bir şart, fakat kafi bir şart değildir. Bu iş san’atkarlık ister. Orijinal metnin cümlelerini körü körüne nakletmekle iş bitmiş olmaz. O kelimeleri, o cümleleri, kendi dilimizin imkanları içinde düşünmek, yazmak icabeder. Cümlelere esir kalmak, o cümlelerdeki fikir ve heyecanı ihmal etmek demektir. Mütercim, orijinal metnin tonunu bilhassa temin etmek mecburiyetindedir. Bu ton verilemediği takdirde, tercüme muvaffak olmuş sayılamaz.] (Tuncel 1940, 80)

Having made his points clear by referring to Ahmet Haşim and then Andre Gide, he also provides examples of authors like Falih Rıfkı Atay and Reşat Nuri Güntekin, who have the knowledge to use Turkish well and required skills to produce literary translations [Türkçeyi güzel ve temiz bir şekilde kullanan muharrirlerimiz yok değil. Falih Rıfkı Atay’ın nefis nesri içinde Fransız edebiyatı şaheserlerden birini okumanın ne demek olduğunu benim gibi herkes te bilir. Reşat Nuri Güntekin’in tercüme meydanda; bunlar dilimiz için birer kazançtır.] (80). As is obvious, Tuncel’s essay is a good example because it involves all the significant points made by various other writers in

different volumes of the journal in the 1940s. In other words, this is certainly not one of the few examples which draw attention to the identity of the translator for the best of translating literary works into Turkish. In addition to Tuncel (1940), various others, such as Nurullah Ataç (1941a; 1941b, 2), showed their belief in the positive outcomes authors' translating prose and poets' translating poetry into Turkish would bring. There are also translations of essays that highlight similar points. Bedrettin Tuncel's translation of Wladimir Weidle's (1940, 386-387) essay entitled "Tercüme Sanatı" [The Art of Translation] and Erol Güney's translation of A.F.Tytler's (1941, 173) "Tercümenin Prensipleri Hakkında Bir Deneme" [An Essay on the Principles of Translating] can be given as examples of such renderings published in the journal. It is noteworthy that there is particular attention on the 'difficulty' of translating poetry, which can be overcome only by poet-translators in 'the best possible way'. Tuncel, in the same essay, discusses poetry translation and claims if "great" poets translate poetry, poetry can be translated in verse [(...) memlekette büyük bir şair bu işi eline almadıkça manzum tercümelerden vazgeçmek mecburiyetindeyiz.] (82). Thus, he implies that others cannot tackle poetry translation and if they do, the result will not be poetry, at least not in verse. Devrim (1940) also asserts that "it is in vain to attempt at translating poetry and verse, in which there is harmony and rhythm" [(...) ahenk ve musikinin hakim bulunduğu şiir ve nazmı tercümeğe teşebbüs etmek beyhudedir.] (276). Devrim then refers to examples of poetry translation done by poets, such as Mallarme's translation of Edgar Poe's poems, which are "perfect" [mükemmel] (ibid.). However, Devrim claims these are "exceptional cases" [istisnalardır], which is why poetry cannot really be translated in his view.

The journal in its introduction to the fifty-ninth issue in 1955 and Prof Melahat Özgü's (1960) essay on a newly published translation of Faust reveal that it was still writers who were particularly expected to contribute to the journal with their translations of literary works in the 1950s and 1960s. It is stated that the task of publishing this journal can be accomplished "with the help of writers who work in the field of translation" [Tercüme alanında çalışan yazarlarımızın da yardımlarıyla böyle bir işi devam ettirebileceğimizi umuyoruz.] (1955, 1). In the next issue in 1955 also appears an essay that makes the same point clear:

(...) it is natural that we benefit from the contributions of our writers who know foreign languages well. As has been stated at the beginning of the previous issue, the **Translation** journal can enjoy the esteem of its readers only if there is such collaboration.

[(...) yabancı dilleri iyi bilen yazarlarımızın yardımlarından faydalanacağımız tabiidir. Geçen sayımızın başında da belirttiğimiz gibi, **Tercüme** dergisi ancak böyle bir işbirliğiyle okuyucularının itimadını kazanabilir.] (Tuncel 1955, 130, emphasis original).

Hence, the idea is that writers already have a symbolic capital which leads to a belief in the success of their literary translations. In addition to the fact that the required traits of literary translators are found in writers, the journal takes that positive outcome on the readers into consideration and continues to expect the contributions of Turkish writers. Özgü (1960) also mentions this issue in specifically the case of poetry translation and states that it is not possible to translate poetry in verse unless the translator is a poet [(...) tercüme edenin (...) şiiri şiirle karşılayabilecek kudrette, yani şair olması gerekmektedir.] (159).

It is of vital importance that there is usually an emphasis on the similarity between the natures of writing and translating, which is a reason why authors and poets

are considered to translate well. This is again clear in Tuncel's (1940, 80) stating that the Turkish authors who are competent in foreign languages should do translations due to the fact that translating resembles writing original works [Tercüme davasının halledilmesini istiyorsak, yabancı dillere aşına muharrirlerimizi seferber etmekten başka çare yoktur. Çünkü, tercümenin bir nevi telif olduğunu unutmamak lazım.]. Likewise, Ataç (1941a) states, "The translator is also a poet, a writer" [Mütercim de bir şairdir, bir muharrirdir] (505). Even the fact that there is a need to explain that translating is not a simple task to be undertaken by anyone who knows foreign languages exhibits the widespread view concerning the relatively low status of translating or the translator. Obviously Tuncel and Ataç remind their readers of this fact due to the existence of views in contrast to theirs. Another example is Devrim (1940), who points out that Goethe's high expectations of the translator lead to the translator's "ascending to the position of a creative artist" [Goethe bir mütercimde öyle yüksek bilgi, zevk ve üslup meziyetleri arar ki onu tam yaratıcı bir san'atkar mertebesine çıkarır.] (18). Although at first sight this statement appears to bring the writer and the translator close to one another almost in equal terms, it is the translator who needs to rise up to the writer's position. This is a clear indication of the translator's lower status in comparison to that of the writer.

A significant aspect of this stress on the authors' and poets' translating literary works is the nature of the relationship between the author or the poet who will carry out the task of translating and the selected source text. Andre Gide, to which Tuncel refers, for example, clearly claims that the author needs to select a source text that fits her/his own tastes and spirit. Otherwise, the result will not contribute to Turkish language and

the target text will not be a pleasure to read. The reason for this is the need for harmony between the tastes of the writer and the translator. To illustrate, Nurullah Ataç (1941b, 2) states that they expect Turkish authors to translate invaluable literary works “they have read and enjoyed in other languages” [Türk muharrirlerinin başka dillerden okuyup ta sevdikleri, kıymetleri zamanın da tasdiki ile anlaşılmış yazıları dilimize çevirmelerini istiyoruz.]. Only if author-translators translate works that they have enjoyed reading, can they produce translations that match the expectations.

The 1950s also show this tendency as is obvious in Tuncel’s (1955) stating that the task of choosing the authors whose works the translator wants to render into Turkish is of vital importance [(...) tercüme işinde asıl mesele, mütercimim kendi ruhuna, mizacına uygun muharrirleri seçebilmesidir.] (135). Tuncel strongly expresses his belief that when translators attempt at translating the works of writers whom they do not share much in terms of spirit, the result is not positive, at all [(...) ruhu ruhuna uymayan muharrirleri tercümeyle kalkışmak iyi netice vermiyor.] (ibid.). An essay written by Edmond Cary (1960) is evidence for the continuation of the special interest in poetry translation and the relationship between the source text or the author and the author/poet-translator in the 1960s. In his essay entitled “Şiir Çevirisi” [Poetry Translation], Cary claims, the reason for the success of certain translations of poems is that their translators are poets [Rusçaya çevrilen Goethe veya Heine’nin bazı şiirlerinin ve daha yakın bir tarihte Cecil Day Lewis’in İngilizceye çevirdiği “Le Cimetiere Marin”in sağladığı sürekli başarı nasıl izah edilebilir? Şüphesiz ki, sadece, çevirenlerin şair olmalarıyla.] (108). Nonetheless, he also states the fact that the translator is a poet does not necessarily result in good translation [Şiirleri en iyi çevirenler her zaman büyük

şairler değildir.] (ibid.). This is because of the importance of the connection between the translator and the source text, in the absence of which the result cannot be as good as the expected [(...) çevirenle eser ve yazı arasında sıkı bir ruhi anlaşma zaururidir.] (ibid.).

In the 1940s, the stylistic features in each work of literature were considered essential. As a result, the ideas that these features need to be created in translations and that the goal to create the same or similar artistic effects on the target reader can be fulfilled only by an author who has written stylistically similar works were prevalent. In relation to this significance given to style, there is an emphasis on the fact that not words but sentences carry importance in transmitting the feel of the text. This is obvious in Nusret Hızır's (1941) maintaining that literary translation requires the transmission of the feel of the work, its meaning rather than a word-for-word translation [*Edebi tercümede (burada yalnız o mevzuubahistir!) asıl metin, kelime kelime değil, umumi eda ve mana gözönünde tutularak nakledilecek.*] (266, emphasis original). Following are two other examples of the discussion on this point:

(...) it is certainly impossible to translate literary works in which the beauty of style has an invaluable degree of importance word for word; even translating sentence for sentence does not usually work. Even if we leave aside the particular grammar and dialects of a language, (...), every writer who deserves to be described as a man of letters has her/his own manner of expression and rhythm in language.

[(...) üslubun güzelliği fevkalade mühim bir yer tutan edebi eserleri kelime kelime tercüme etmek tabii imkansızdır; ekseriya cümle cümle tercüme bile doğru olmuyor: her lisanın kendine has nahiv ve şivesini, (...) bir tarafa bırakalım, edip sıfatına layık her yazıcının öz edası ve öz ahengi vardır.] (Devrim 1940, 276)

Translating is not simply looking up and finding the equivalents of words. A good translator has to first and foremost search for ways to defer to the soul of the author, i.e. her/his thoughts and expressions- by penetrating into it.

[Tercüme yalnız kelimelerin karşılığını arayıp bulmaktan ibaret değildir. İyi bir mütercim müellifin ruhuna –yani fikirlerine ve bunları ifade tarzına- nüfuz ederek, her şeyden önce ona riayet ve onu muhafaza etmek imkanlarını aramalıdır.] (Sinanoğlu 1941, 485)

Tuncel (1955) underlines this point once again in his essay entitled “Kısa Notlar” [Brief Notes] by referring to Prof Sabri Esat Siyavuşgil’s essay that was published in *Yeni Sabah* in the same year. Different from the previous examples which depict the importance given to style, there is additional emphasis on the possible influences of the translator’s style on the translation of the source text. Asserting that “the primary requirement is fidelity to the spirit of the original text” [(...) ilk kaide, asıl metnin ruhuna sadık olmaktır.], Siyavuşgil (in Tuncel 1955) argues “the style in translated text is not the style of the translator” [Tercümede üslup, mütercimin üslubu değildir.] (134). If the translator does not conform to this requirement, Siyavuşgil claims that the translated text cannot survive [(...) aslın üslubu aktarılmazsa, tercüme havasızlıktan ölür.] (ibid.). This is one of the very few places where the possible interactions between the styles of the source text or rather the author and the translator are touched upon. Apparently, the ‘spirit’ of the source text is believed to be conveyed to the target reader mainly through style. Thus, the translator was almost considered to commit a crime if s/he does not pay enough attention to the style of the source text in the 1950s, too. Similarly, Melahat Özgü’s (1960) statement concerning this point seems to prove that the same idea was prevalent in the 1960s. Özgü (1960) asserts that the focus in translating needs to be on the “spirit” of the original text [Tercümede esas olan ruh ve espiridir.] (159).

In addition to prose, the stylistic features in poetry and thus poetry translation were definitely of interest in the 1940s. *Tercüme* published a special issue on poetry translation, which attracted so much attention that the journal published several essays concerning their special issue in the following issue. In some of those essays, there is direct reference to poets whose translations of famous poets writing in other languages were published in the journal. One of these poets is Orhan Veli, whose translations seem to have been generally celebrated since he managed to preserve the individual characteristics of the poems [Orhan Veli Fransızca şiirleri dilimize çevirirken Türkçenin hakkını vermenin sırrını yakalamış, her şairin hususiyetini ve şahsiyetini dilimize aksettirebilmiştir.] (Akan 1946, 85). However, this should not lead to a generalization that if the translator is a poet-translator, those who critiqued these translations always praised them. Zahir Güvemli (1946), for instance, first writes highly of a translation by Orhan Veli, but then claims that another translation of his, Aragon's *Les yeux d'Elsa*, is a 'disaster' [Derginin en güzel şiirlerinden biri Orhan Veli'nin Cros'dan mülhem olarak yazdığı "Çirozname"dir. Kanatımce, aslından güzel bir eser. (...) Orhan Veli'nin böyle başarılı eseri yanında Aragon gibi bir şairin en güzel eserlerinden olan, hatta pek kısa bir zamanda klasik bir güzellik örneği diye kabul edilen "Les yeux d'Elsa" isimi şiirini tercüme ediyorum diye perişan etmesine nasıl müsaade olunmuş?] (89). Similarly, Ali Rauf Akan, refers to another poet-translator, Cahit Sıtkı, whose translations of Baudelaire were a source of disappointment for him. This is interesting because Cahit Sıtkı loved and knew Baudelaire well [Cahit Sıtkı'nın tercümeleri ise şekil ve kafiye düşüklüğünün kurbanı olmuştur. Cahid, en çok sevdiği, bildiği, tanıdığı sanat sırrına erdiği Baudelaire'in en güzel mısralarından birini Sanırım ciğerimde kanının kokusu var

diye çevirecek ve aslını bilmeyip de sırf Baudelaire’i tercümesinden tanımak isteyen Baudelaire’den nefret ettirecek kadar, kendisinden bekleneni verememiştir.] (ibid.).

Therefore, there are cases in which poet-translators’ work was not acclaimed much and the idea that even when the poet-translator has read and enjoyed the work, s/he may not create a translation which resembles the source is discussed. Nevertheless, the expressions used in the criticisms show the high expectations for the poet-translators due to the fact that negative outcomes in their views cause disappointment.

In conclusion, the survey of the essays on topics concerning the task of translating, published in *Tercüme* from 1940 until 1966, demonstrates that there are patterns in ideas about author-translators. Although the concept of ‘author-translator’ does not appear in the essays, author-translators and poet-translators are in the forefront throughout the years during which the journal was published. In addition to the view that author/poet-translators are the only ones who can achieve translating literary works from other languages into Turkish, there are two other points that need to be highlighted in this period of twenty-six years. Firstly, the relationship between the source text and the author/poet-translator is regarded as a key to ‘success’ in literary translation. Secondly, there is stress on the significance of creating a target text which is stylistically similar to the source text. This is related to the idea that author/poet-translators cannot translate as is expected of them if they do not enjoy reading the source author’s works and if their own writing does not resemble that of the source author in terms of style. Thus, the analysis of the data gathered demonstrates that author-translators had a much higher position when compared with translators for those twenty-six years.

The discourse analysis on author-translators, mostly conducted through the exploration of interviews done with Turkish (author-)translators, published in the journals *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri* provides information about the discourse in the 1980s particularly and also the early 1990s. While *Yazko Çeviri* started to be published in 1981 and the last issue of the journal was published in 1984, *Metis Çeviri* was published from 1987 until 1993. The findings of the discourse analysis of the interviews in these two journals show that there are mostly similarities but also differences in the underlined views when they are compared with those in *Tercüme*.

Several points need to be highlighted in the comparative analysis of the discourse on author-translators in *Tercüme* and that in *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri*. Firstly, the stress on the importance of translations done by author/poet-translators in the 1980s and the early 1990s is not as apparent as that in especially the 1940s and the later period in which *Tercüme* was published. There are still references to the ‘success’ of author/poet-translators in translating literary texts into Turkish by well-known figures like Barış Pirhasan and Memet Fuat (Yazko Çeviri 1982a, 187; Yazko Çeviri 1982b, 146). Not unrelated to that, similarities between translating and writing (Kasap 1988, 124; Yazko Çeviri 1982a, 187), particularly creativity in translating, in the interviews with Talat Halman, Melahat Togar, Ataul Behramoğlu, and Akşit Göktürk (Karantay 1990, 13; Kurultay 1988, 18; Yazko Çeviri 1982a, 185-186; Yazko Çeviri 1982b, 149), are described as done in essays published in *Tercüme*. However, there is also the idea that poets can “rarely” translate “well” [(...) ozanların aynı zamanda iyi çevirmen olabildikleri enderdir.] (Paz 1981, 169) and that the translator “does not have to be a poet, but s/he needs to have an aptitude for poetry”, as pointed out by Melahat Togar

[Şair olması şart değil, ama şiire yatkın olması gerek.] (Kurultay 1988, 18). While the importance attached to the identity of the author-translator in translating foreign works into Turkish does not attract as much attention as the earlier periods, the significance of the relationship between the translator and the source text and the style of the source text is underlined in various interviews. Examples for the former point can be given from the interviews with Nermin Menemencioğlu (Paker 1988, 14), Bertan Onaran (Metis Çeviri 1990a, 13), Ülkü Tamer (Metis Çeviri 1990a, 14), Teoman Aktürel (Metis Çeviri 1990b, 11), and Cevat Çapan (Metis Çeviri 1990b, 11), all of whom point to the influence of their attraction to or love for the source literary work on their decision to translate. The attention that needs to be paid to the particular style of the source text or source author so that the translator can choose those s/he can translate more ‘successfully’ is emphasized. As a result of a careful selection process, the translator can present the distinct styles of source literary texts or authors to the target reader in the translations (İleri 1983, 106; Metis Çeviri 1990, 14; Paker 1988, 20; Yazko Çeviri 1982b, 145; Salman & Gürsoy 1988, 11). Thus, the interviews published in *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri* demonstrate that the points raised by well-known literary figures in the field of Turkish literary translation during the 1980s and early 1990s bear major similarities to the patterns identified in the discourse analysis of the essays published in *Tercüme* from 1940 until 1966. The only striking difference appears to be the fact that to be an author or a poet is not considered essential in translating literary works despite references to the subject in certain interviews. Although the focus here is on the discourse on author-translators, it needs to be mentioned that there are additional topics, such as the goals of the publishing houses which can be related to the quantity rather than the quality of

translations (Yazko Çeviri 1982b, 150; Yazko Çeviri 1982c, 172), the need to publish translations done by translators who are competent in both the source and target languages, not by those who know only a foreign language (İnce 1988, 36-37), and education in the field of translation (Cemal 1983, 8-11; Yazko Çeviri 1982b, 147-151), discussed in this period.

### **Summary**

In Chapter 1, I presented a review of theoretical writings on the concept of agency in fields like sociology and related works specifically in the field of translation studies. These parts of Chapter 1 reveal the theoretical framework of this thesis, which involves not only Even-Zohar's polysystem theory but also Bourdieu's emphasis on agents through the concepts of habitus and symbolic capital in a certain field.

A study on an author-translator means a study of two fields that are interrelated. The author-translator, in this case, Pınar Kür, stands in the intersection of the literary polysystem and the system of translated literature, as a member of both. As a result, it becomes significant to benefit from Even-Zohar's theory, which offers an approach to tackle the interactions between systems in a polysystem. The binary oppositions in the polysystem theory, however, will not be part of the discussion in this study. In addition, because the focus in the current thesis is directly on an author-translator, the missing perspective concerning agency in the polysystem theory is made up through Bourdieu, as suggested by Simeoni (1998) and Tahir-Gürçağlar (2001). After discussing the positions of authors, (literary) translators, and author-translators through a survey of the work concerning (creative) writers and author-translators, I offered an analysis of the

discourse on author-translators through the investigation of essays published in *Tercüme*, *Yazko Çeviri*, and *Metis Çeviri*. A crucially important reason why I discussed the discourse on author-translators is that Bourdieu's mentioned concepts are all related. Thus, while I investigate Pınar Kür's agency in her own writing and translating through her authorial and translatorial styles, I certainly need to be informed about not only Pınar Kür as an individual and her works but also Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial habituses in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation. The symbolic capital she owns, for instance, can be interpreted with an understanding of the position of author-translators specifically in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation. Following this path of thinking, I can explore whether there are interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles. In Chapter 2, I will introduce the methodology of this thesis, which consists of qualitative analysis of style and corpus methodology, and the related literature review.

## CHAPTER 2

### METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

"Critical" means not taking things for granted, opening up complexity, challenging reductionism, dogmatism and dichotomies, being self-reflective in my research, and through these processes, making opaque structures of power relations and ideologies manifest. "Critical", thus, does not imply the common sense meaning of "being negative"—rather "skeptical". Proposing alternatives is also part of being "critical". (Wodak in Kendall 2007, 3)

In this chapter, I will present the methodology of this thesis, which involves qualitative analysis of style and corpus methodology and the related literature review. As a response to the past debate over whether style needs to be investigated by using qualitative or quantitative methods (Butler 2008, 3), qualitative and quantitative exploration of the texts will make a dual analysis possible. Due to the fact that my research questions can be grouped in three main areas, that is, Pınar Kür's novels and translations of novels by Jean Rhys, published between 1982 and 1992 as well as statements on her writing and translating, I will explain the methodology concerning the gathering and analysis of both textual and extratextual data separately (Toury 1995, 65). For the former kind of data, there will be an electronic analysis of texts in addition to the qualitative analysis. Therefore, after I explore stylistics, I will offer a review of research done using corpus-based methodology in the field of translation studies. Moreover, I aim at providing a critical look at corpus-based methodology. As can be seen in the above quotation, Wodak's definition of 'critical' in Critical Discourse Analysis does not involve disapproval. Similar to her approach, I aim at being 'skeptical' and benefiting from different sources of data as well as different kinds of analyses in my methodology. In the

last section of this chapter, I will elucidate on the hows and whys of the interviews that will be among the sources of extratextual data.

### **2.1. Main Points Concerning the Methodology**

The analysis of the novels in the corpus will serve to explore whether an assumption concerning interactions between Pınar Kür's writing and translating can be made. For this purpose, I will answer questions in three main research areas: Pınar Kür's novels, translations, and statements on her writing and translating. Therefore, not only textual but also extratextual (Toury 1995, 65) data will be provided. This will be done through a study of Kür's novels and translations of Rhys' novels in addition to the reception of her work. The exploration of the texts in the corpus will begin with the analysis of the quantitative data and continue with the qualitative analysis, but Wordsmith results will also be used at the interpretation stage of qualitative data when there is a need. As a result of the quantitative data analysis, it will be possible to respond to the second question about the use of corpus-based methodology in the analysis of style in literary texts. The following are my research questions:

1. Are there interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles?
  - a. What are the stylistic patterns in the novels Pınar Kür has written and translated in the corpus of this study?
  - b. How does Pınar Kür's authorial style manifest itself in relation to her translatorial style and vice versa?
  - c. What does the discourse analysis of Pınar Kür's remarks in interviews and the criticisms written by critics as well as her readership show about

Pınar Kür's 'visibility' as a translator and her identity as an 'author-translator'?

2. At what stages and to what extent is corpus-based methodology helpful and/or limited in the analysis of style in literary texts?

With a focus on an author-translator, the methodological approach adopted in this study is based not solely on texts but also on those who produce the texts, that is, in this case, Pınar Kür. As a result, the biographical approach will be of crucial importance, but this will be done with attention to the relations between Pınar Kür's identity as an individual and an author-translator and the 'field', as explained in the previous chapter. In other words, the fact that actual individuals produce target and source texts is brought into focus and Kür's 'habitus' in relation to the 'field' in Bourdieu's terms will be taken into account in the discussion on the literary works in the corpus.

Stories have a clear role in constructing identities (Andrews 2000, 77) and by studying the life stories of authors and (author-) translators through (auto) biographies as well as interviews, it is possible to enhance our understanding of their identities. The biographical turn, a "turn towards the study of individuals" (Rustin 2000, 34), in the social sciences has come after long discussions on the problems of "reliability, subjectivity and representativeness" in the fields of history and sociology, both of which study causes of individual agency (Chamberlayne et al. 2000, 3). Rustin (2000) explains that T. S. Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, published in 1962, shook the view that scientific studies are 'objective', as Kuhn increased the awareness about the researchers' presence as individuals in scientific studies (40). This cultural turn in the social sciences brought the biographical turn in the 1990s, during which individuals

were depicted “as historically formed actors whose biographies are necessary” for the description of “historical action in context” (Chamberlayne et al. 2000, 8). Therefore, the analysis of individual life stories can very well improve the descriptions of a certain aspect of or group in the society unless the macro context is overlooked. Studies on single cases, like Kür’s in this research, illuminate the investigation of “self-reflection, decision and action in human lives” (Rustin 2000, 49).

The main guiding principle in the selection of methodological tools in this study is to gather useful data for the analysis from not merely qualitative or quantitative data sources but both. The reason for the use of quantitative data is not to claim for this study to be ‘scientific’ and totally ‘objective’, but rather to benefit from the existing sources of data to bring insight into the research. Texts, therefore, will be investigated both qualitatively and electronically, that is, on computer. For the latter purpose, corpus methodology is included. Wordsmith Tools (Scott 1998) is the software used in conducting the computerized analysis of this research.

In addition to the main corpus of the study, the aim was originally to have a sub-corpus, that is, a corpus of texts whose analysis would add to the analysis of the actual texts in the corpus of the study to determine whether certain features are specific to certain translations or not. A sub-corpus consisting of other works translated by Pınar Kür in the same ten-year-period would be established. The use of such a corpus would be beneficial in the process of interpreting the results gathered from the evaluation of the main corpus, specifically in comprehending whether the identified patterns were valid for the specific works in the corpus or they were features generally found in Kür’s translations regardless of the author of the source text. In other words, having a sub-

corpus of Pınar Kür's translations from different authors could assist to see if there is a certain connection between Pınar Kür's own works and translations particularly from Jean Rhys, which is totally or in some way different from the relation between her writing and translating from other authors. However, it was impossible to build a representative sub-corpus due to the fact that Kür's translations of other novels were not published in the selected ten year period: 1982-1992. Even if there were novels published in the same period, the role of different publishing houses would necessarily be considered because there is not a single work published by Can, which is the publishing house of the four Rhys novels, in this ten year period. There is one, for instance, by Remzi, published in 1990. Nevertheless, this translation of Kür's belongs to a different genre. *Aç Sınıfın Laneti [Curse of the Starving Class]*, a drama written by Sam Shephard, could not be included in a sub-corpus due to the difference in genre. Therefore, building a sub-corpus by neglecting the variables that were kept constant in the building of the main corpus would result in unrepresentativeness and would not help in drawing reliable conclusions. Another kind of sub-corpus that could be used in this research would be one that included other Turkish authors' novels. Such a sub-corpus could help to see whether certain language patterns are observed particularly in Kür's authorial and/or translatorial style or can generally be observed in Turkish literary works. However, to my knowledge, there are no corpora of Turkish literary texts that could be used for this purpose at the moment. It is noteworthy that there is a Turkish National Corpus project being carried out by Mersin University linguists and funded by

Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey<sup>4</sup>. Although the plan was to have provided researchers and all other internet users with access to the corpus by the end of October 2011, it is not ready yet and the research team of the project is aiming for January 2012 (Taner Sezer, e-mail message to author, October 17, 2011). After the completion of the project, it will be possible to have access to a corpus of contemporary, spoken and written Turkish from various genres.

This study has several methodological claims. First of all, I will explore features that were not selected in Pınar Kür's novels and her translations of the four Jean Rhys novels prior to the study. The features were identified only after the preliminary analysis of the texts in electronic form. Thus, this is a data-driven study. Secondly, the variables of author, source language and publishing house are kept constant in all four cases of translation. As a result, the differences that are identified will not result from differences between the languages or authors of the source texts. A related point is that Pınar Kür's own novels in addition to her translations from Jean Rhys published in the same period are included in the study. It is pivotal to note that novels written and translated by a single author-translator, to my knowledge, have not been investigated with an eye on the influences of being an author-translator and specifically stylistic features in the selected texts. Thirdly, the fact that this research design gives the opportunity to study four target texts, whose source texts are written by the same author, Jean Rhys, needs to be noted. Therefore, with this relatively small corpus of two novels written by the author-translator in addition to the four source texts and four target texts, it may be possible to

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.tnc.org.tr/>

see areas of similarity and/or difference in translation decisions and also interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles. Explaining the negative aspects of using corpus methodology in a study with a focus on one text, Van Doorslaer (1995) claims, "a broader perspective" can be provided "only (...) by large-scale research programmes" (246). Although this corpus is not as small as those Van Doorslaer seems to refer to, his criticism deserves attention because of the focus not on a single text but a single author-translator in this study. It needs to be highlighted that this kind of small-scale study can provide more in-depth analysis and the results of similar studies can be read looking from a broader perspective. In addition, because I will be able to explore the source texts in all four of the cases and thus have a bilingual parallel corpus, "the question of the potential influence of the same language and/ or author style" (Baker 2000, 255) will be answered in this study. It is also noteworthy that my aim in referring to the source texts is not to spot areas that may be referred to as 'errors' or even 'shifts', described as "all that appears as new with respect to the original, or fails to appear where it might have been expected," (Popovic 1970, 79), as Munday (1998) does in his investigation of "Seventeen Poisoned Englishmen", Gabriel Garcia Marquez's short story, translated into English by Edith Grossman. My aim is to see the influence of the source text on the translational behavior of the translator (Winters 2005, 83). This is important because the ideas of 'shift', which points to the stylistic differences between the 'original' and the translation due to the roles played by "the two languages, the two authors, and the two literary situations" (Popovic 1970, 79), and 'adequate translation' have been overemphasized in translation studies (Toury 1995, 84). Chronologically, the source text comes first without a doubt and thus sets the beginning of the target text

production. For this reason, while studying the target text and target author style, ignoring the presence of the source text and source author would be a weakness.

However, with an aim to describe the target text, target author style and the relationship between the translations and ‘originals’ written by the same author-translator, I do not start this research with the idea of a hierarchical priority of the source text. The source texts and the source author will only help to interpret the findings.

Considering that corpus-based methodology is not “a free-standing methodology that does not need to be complemented by other methods of research” (Baker 2004, 184), additional sources of qualitative data may be needed. Interviews, for instance, may prove to be beneficial, as it is sometimes required to contact the translators themselves to gain an insight as to whether they consciously make certain decisions (Winters 2005, 158). Thus, in addition to the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the author-translator’s style in the corpus of the study, the exploration of the statements made by/about Pınar Kür will enhance the sources of qualitative data. As a result of the information gathered by the discourse analysis of the interview<sup>5</sup> with the author-translator, sources of motivation for the translator’s decisions can be better assessed. Besides the investigation of interviews with Pınar Kür, the preface she wrote to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz [Wide Sargasso Sea]*, the studies, criticisms, news, published about Kür

---

<sup>5</sup> My first attempt to contact Pınar Kür was by e-mail in the summer of 2009. However, this proved to be useless, so I phoned her in the fall of 2009 and gave information about my study. I asked not only for her permission to scan her works but also if I could interview her. Having received positive answers, I kept working on my research, which was also a period of noting the possible questions I could ask Pınar Kür during the interview. I did the face-to-face interview with her in the spring of 2011. After I transcribed the interview, I sent it to Kür by e-mail. She read and approved the text with some corrections.

as an author, translator, or author-translator and her work will all contribute to the analysis of the extratextual data.

In this study, I use the concept of discourse to refer to any use of language. The analysis of discourse requires foremost an investigation of the “external factors”, which are all those outside the text itself and which are causes of the linguistic choices in the text (Wodak & Meyer 2009, 24). Thus, there is certainly a connection between the text and the external factors that need to be taken into consideration in interpreting the discourse used in the interviews done with Pınar Kür. It is important to note that language use is “a form of ‘social practice’” (Fairclough & Wodak 1997, 258) and related to that is the power of texts in bringing out “social action” (Fairclough 1999, 204). Language has a manifest role in “producing, reproducing or transforming social structures, relations and identities”, which is a fact neglected in considerable amount of social science studies (ibid.). Therefore, a study which endeavors to scrutinize Pınar Kür’s ‘visibility’ as a translator and her identity as an ‘author-translator’ through a study of interviews done with Pınar Kür cannot assume that language is “transparent” (ibid.). It is necessary to do a discourse analysis of the interviews with a meticulous eye on both the form and the content, which cannot be dealt with in isolation from one another (184). Such discourse analysis can help to better understand not only certain aspects of Kür’s identity as an author-translator but also her views concerning author-translators’ works and the interactions between Kür’s own writing and translating.

## **2.2. Stylistics**

In this section, after providing definitions and aspects of style and narrative, guided by works by scholars, like Seymour Chatman (1971, 1978, 1990), Geoffrey N. Leech and Michael H. Short (1981), and Paul Simpson (1993, 2004), specific attention is paid to one of the elements of narrative fiction, that is, point of view. Next is an explanation of the metonymic character of ‘rewritings’, including translation with reference to Maria Tymoczko (1999). Underlining the importance of the reader’s role in text interpretation and choices in the creation of style, Jean Boase-Beier’s (2006) approach to the stylistic analysis of source and target texts is presented. Definition and discussion of the elements of ‘foregrounding’ in Willie Van Peer’s (1986) work is followed by Nil Özçelik’s (2009) investigation of ‘foregrounded’ elements in the Turkish translations of three science fiction works through a study of the target text effects on the reader. Finally, my definition of style and how I will analyze style in source and target texts are unveiled.

It is common to see references to the fact that ‘style’ has been defined in various ways. Seymour Chatman (1971), for instance, lists several of its uses, two of which are “idiosyncratic manner of an individual or group” and “a kind of extra or heightened expressiveness” (xi). Despite the differences in use of the term, it is possible to state that the study of style, that is, stylistics, places language use in its focus with importance attached to textual function. That is mainly because linguistic features lead to the manifestation of textual function, which is influential in interpreting the text (Simpson 2004, 2). Leech and Short state that style is especially explored in written literary works (1981, 11). Thus, the function of literary texts through stylistic elements has attracted researchers’ interest. Related to that is the question whether style in literary texts or

rather individual writers' styles can be studied with the tools of linguistics. This has been a question for which scholars, including those in the symposium entitled "Literary Style" in 1971, have sought answers. In the editor's introduction, Seymour reports the scholars' response in one word: "No" (xiv). Therefore, although stylistics "normally refers to the practice of using linguistics for the study of literature" (Simpson 1993, 3), there is a "story" which needs to be taken into account when the text is narrative fiction.

In line with structuralist thinking, Chatman (1978) sees narrative as unison of "story" and its "discourse" (9). While the events, characters, and setting are all parts of the "story", "discourse", of which point of view is an element, is how the story is told (21). Simpson (1993) asserts that point of view in narrative fiction establishes "the very essence of a story's style, what it gives it its 'feel' and 'colour'" (5). It is also noteworthy that Chatman (1990), having referred to the criticisms concerning the use of the term 'point of view' and suggestions for the use of terms such as 'focalization' instead of 'point of view', dwells on the importance of the distinction between the narrator and any other character when using these terms (139). Chatman explains that the narrator, unlike the characters, needs to be regarded as "a reporter, not an "observer" of the story world in the sense of literally witnessing it" (142). Then, he proposes the use of the term "slant" for the narrator's and "filter" for the characters' "point of view" (143). Aware of the role carried by the narrator while presenting or reporting the story, which differentiates her/him/it from the characters who appear to experience events and have thoughts and feelings about what takes place in the story, I prefer to stick to the use of the term 'point of view' while referring to both 'slant' and 'filter'. However, I will

pay particular attention to similarities and/or differences between the stylistic effects of ‘point of view’ of the narrator and the characters.

Regardless of whether the translator is also an author or not, it is possible to study the style of the translator. However, especially when the translator is an author and the translation is a literary work, attention seems to be even more on how an idea is expressed. Reminding readers of the fact that “every telling is a retelling”, Tymoczko (1999) draws attention to the link between all literary works that have been written and are being written (41). Thus, stressing the importance of intertextuality in literary works, she states that one of the main characteristics of all rewritings is their metonymic nature (42). Metonymy is defined as “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” (ibid.). Because “[translation] is a form of representation in which parts or aspects of the source text come to stand for the whole” (Tymoczko 1999, 55) and the translator is the one responsible for the target text (Tymoczko 1999, 47), metonymic aspects of translations need to be explored.

Mary Cross (1993), in *Henry James: The Contingencies of Style*, discusses the negative criticisms stylistics have suffered from and refers to Stanley Fish’s stating that the reader’s role in the process of interpreting the text has been neglected in style analyses, which is due to the fact that stylistics has been methodologically deficient (16). To overcome the obstacle of doing shallow analysis as a result of methodological problems, following the approach suggested by Boase-Beier (2006) can prove to be useful. Underlining that both the source and target texts have their styles (Boase-Beier 2006, 4), Boase-Beier (2006) highlights the translator’s responsibility just like

Tymoczko (1999) and states that “style is the outcome of choice” (1). In order to be aware of the stylistic features of the target text, it is of vital importance to explore that which is “unique to the text and its choices” in addition to “patterns in the text” and “the essential nature and function of the text” (ibid.). Underlining the significance of not “choices in isolation” but “a pattern of choices” in a specific text, Leech and Short (1981) also point out that stylisticians need to study features of language use “against the background of the pervasive tendency of preferences in the text” (42). I will attempt at studying the style of the Turkish translations of the novels in the corpus from the following perspectives:

- i) the style of the source text as an expression of its author’s choices
- ii) the style of the source text in its effects on the reader (and on the translator as reader)
- iii) the style of the target text as an expression of choices made by its author (who is the translator)
- iv) the style of the target text in its effects on the reader. (Boase-Beier 2006, 5)

In brief, in line with Boase-Beier’s suggestions in studying style in translation, I will benefit from both the target and source texts. Furthermore, I will not leave out effects of the text on readers while exploring the writers’ choices. Pointing to the variety in definitions of style (11), Leech and Short (1981) narrow down their focus in *Style in Fiction* and state that they will study “language as used in literary texts, with the aim of relating it to its artistic functions” (15). Aware of not only the relationship between “linguistic form and literary function” (4) but also the role of the reader in the process of

interpretation, Leech and Short (1981) avoid presenting stylistics as a path to “mechanical objectivity” (3) through making merely quantitative analysis. For this reason, they appear to connect the roles of a careful reader of a literary text and a linguistics scholar for the benefit of studying literary stylistics (5). It might be possible to argue that while doing the first and third analyses in Boase-Beier’s approach, I will mainly be studying the language, but for the second and fourth areas, the artistic function will be in focus.

It needs to be highlighted that Boase-Beier’s order of texts in this list will not be considered as a guide. In other words, I will not read the source texts first but the target texts. Otherwise, in line with the old traditional view concerning translation, I would first be learning about the style of the ‘original’ and then aiming at spotting ‘mistakes’ in the translation. The order in my reading and interpreting the styles of the two texts will be as follows: (iii), (iv), (i), (ii).

What we say is not unrelated to how we say it. Even the sum of what and how something is said does not lead to ‘the’ meaning, as “no straightforward relationship between the style of the source text and what the text means” (Boase-Beier 2006, 4) can be identified. This is due to the role of the reader in the production of meaning. In the case of a translated text, then, there is an additional stage of meaning production before text is published. That is why the handling of translated texts in style analysis needs awareness for this presence. It is noteworthy that the author and the translator are not ‘the’ only people in the wording process of the text. There are even other people who take part, such as the editor(s). Although the presence of the editor in the translated text

is not in the focus of this study, this fact certainly needs to be borne in mind for a better evaluation of the findings.

Boase-Beier (2006) explains that neither the source nor the target text styles can be neglected and that both texts and authors need to be taken into account due to their role prior to or in the reading of the text (5). As she states, however, “different types of study will focus on different aspects” (ibid.). I choose to focus on (iii) and (iv) in this study, but aiming to spot reasons for the choices made by the translator, which have an effect on my reading of the target text, I also take (i) and (ii) into consideration while interpreting the results. Therefore, although the style of the source texts or the effects of the source texts on the reader will not be discussed separately, there will be references to these points in the conclusions drawn whenever necessary.

Willie Van Peer (1986), the author of *Stylistics and Psychology: Investigations of Foregrounding*, presents a discussion of the previous work on foregrounding, starting with the pioneering work by Russian Formalists. Obviously linguistic “deviation” from the common language use (22) and “parallelism”, which is “a pattern of equivalences and/or contrasts that are superimposed on the normal patterns of language organization” (23), are the two main devices explored in texts by foregrounding scholars. While the author’s disregarding a linguistic norm established by the text or the outside world in his writing would be ‘deviation’ (22), the apparent repetition of certain or similar items despite the expected “variation in selection” would be ‘parallelism’ (23). In addition to the use of these devices, which can be explored in the text as the product, it is important that foregrounding theory direct attention to the writing and reading processes, too. The author’s goals concerning the effects on the reader as well as the “interaction process

between author and reader(s)” (21) are highlighted. This point underlines not only the fact that the author has a certain level of (potential) influence(s) but also that s/he cannot fully determine the reading of the text due to the individuality of each reading process. Here there is no mention of the translated text, which brings an additional character to the fore of the writing process next to the source author. Nevertheless, considering the fact that the translator is first a reader, it can be stated that there is an ‘interaction process between author and translator’ before that between *author + translator* and reader. Therefore, I claim that in translated literature, it is hard to argue for the presence of a *direct* interaction between either the author and the target reader or the translator and the target reader. In other words, the target reader cannot be in direct contact with the source author and is influenced by the totality of the author and the translator’s work, which manifests itself in the target text. Besides these points concerning the author’s endeavors and the ‘interaction’, the description Van Peer makes of “what is foregrounded” in a literary text is noticeable with the following adjectives he uses: “de-familiarized or de-automatized”, “striking, unexpected, surprising, unusual” (29). In short, the foregrounded elements are somehow “strange” (ibid.) and attract the reader’s attention, which is in line with the two devices used for foregrounding.

Nil Özçelik (2009), in her PhD thesis, “Translation and Reception of Feminist Speculative Fiction in Turkey: A Multiple-Foregrounding Analysis”, investigates the Turkish translations of three works of science fiction: *Handmaid’s Tale* by Margaret Atwood, *Woman on the Edge of Time* by Marge Piercy and *Female Man* by Joanna Russ with a focus on their themes and narrative technique. Özçelik’s study is similar to Van Peer’s (1986), which explores whether readers later remember the foregrounded

elements or parts of the texts much better than what is in the background, in that both conduct ‘empirical’ research with actual participants who read poems (in Van Peer’s case) or parts of novels (in Özçelik’s case) and respond to questions about the texts. There are some important differences between the two, however, and one of the main differences is the fact that Özçelik brings the role carried out by the translator and the target text into attention. She does a comparative study by examining the effects of the translated text on the target and the source text on the source readership. Özçelik discovers that the target text readers who were in the experimental group differed from the source readers in that they “had a more partial and fragmented reception of the text fragments” (222). Thus, target readers had a different reception of the ‘strange’ worlds depicted in these novels, which manifests that the various translator decisions in the process of translating ‘strange’ elements in feminist speculative novels may lead to major differences in readers’ understanding of the novel when compared with the source readers’.

Having discussed significant points concerning style in literary narratives, I will now present my approach to the study of literary style. To begin with, my assumption is that if textual function is part of stylistic analysis, narrative point of view, in addition to the distinct language use of the source or target author requires meticulous attention in the study of style in narrative fiction. Moreover, I strongly advocate an approach that does not neglect the content while dealing with the form. In other words, the story needs to be kept in sight while interpreting the style of a text or an individual author. Unlike poetry translation, which has apparently attracted more researchers’ interest than prose (Bassnett 1991, 109), it has cunningly seemed that the translation of literary prose does

not require the translator's consideration of the form together with the content as if they were discrete and unrelated (Bassnett 1991, 110). Despite the fact that the story seems to be less important in exploring the style of the target author, it needs to be recalled that the form has an undeniable effect on content. Authors, like Flaubert, on the other hand, aim for "a devaluation of content" by never making explicit what the story is about or rather why it was ever written, which is a result of the use of techniques such as changing points of view in narration (Culler 2006, xiii). Nevertheless, this fact need not lead to the scholar's ignoring the content since "the resistance to meaning and the resistance to unity" (xix) absolutely deserve stress in literary criticism. While reading a novel by Flaubert and attempting to interpret the text to identify patterns of themes and symbols (xxii), the literary scholar's "demystification of the interpretive process" (236) cannot be left unsaid in a study. I will therefore be considering the 'story' even when dealing with linguistic features of the target texts. In line with the assumption underlined above, my analysis of literary style in Pınar Kür's novels and translations of Jean Rhys' novels in the corpus of this study involves search for noticeable linguistic features chosen and 'foregrounded' by the source and/or target authors not in isolation from but in direct relation to the function of the text or rather 'story', which may become apparent through the effects on me as a reader. This set of features covers not only linguistic elements related to the syntax and lexis but also narrative point of view. I am against the presupposition that there is always a clear distinction between writing and translating, i.e. the 'original' and the 'translation'. For this reason, I would rather not separate my methodology in analyzing the styles of the written and translated novels. However, asserting that there is not a single difference between the two would be overlooking

certain facts. Obviously there are at least two authors who take part in the production of any translation at different stages if the source author does not translate the source text. This fact requires the particular attention of the researcher due to the fact that the “translator’s voice” (Hermans 1996) may become apparent in the translator’s preface, footnotes, blurb, and so on. That is why in analyzing the translations, the researcher needs to have an open eye on the emergence of not only the translator’s style in the translated text but also the translator’s ‘voice’ in the texts that remain outside the translation but are still parts of the book in the hands of the reader.

### **2.3. Corpus-Based Methodology**

It is not until the 1990s that translation scholars began using corpora in the studies they conducted. Among the reasons why corpus methodology is preferred by translation scholars is the motivation to describe target texts rather than prescribe about translations, to explore what is common and uncommon in translations and the possible reasons for these, and to bring together quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis (Olohan 2004, 16). Unlike analyzing manually, analyzing texts in electronic form provides the opportunity to run the same or similar inquiries repeatedly without spending enormous amounts of time and carrying the risk of making mistakes due to limited human attention. It is also important that the software used in corpus-based studies presents a broader view with detailed pieces of information than analyzing texts in *Microsoft Word*. I will start this section with definitions of ‘corpus’, an introduction to corpus methodology and the use of this methodology in studying translations. Next will be a chronological investigation of corpus-based research done in the field of translation

studies. Last but not least, I will dwell on certain assumptions and approaches to findings in corpus-based methodology which have been reacted against in critical translation studies. While the first is about the idea of ‘original’ and ‘translation’, the second is related to generalizations. Last, the discussion will be related to an approach towards ‘signs’ in the findings.

### **2.3.1. Introduction to Corpus Methodology**

The definition of ‘corpus’ seems to have evolved in time due to the use of computers and other methodological concerns in the field of linguistics. First of all, broadly speaking, it is “simply a body of text” (Bowker & Pearson 2002, 9). Bosseaux (2007) mentions a similar definition: “any collection of writings, in processed or unprocessed form, usually originating from a single author” (71). Nevertheless, in the context of linguistics, new characteristics are added to this general definition (ibid.): “a large collection of authentic texts that have been gathered in electronic form according to a specific set of criteria” (Bowker & Pearson 2002, 9, emphases mine). Bowker and Pearson (2002) list the underlined features as those that distinguish corpora from other bodies of texts. Having presented a variety of definitions of ‘corpus’, McEnery, Xiao, and Tono (2006) also state that it is possible in the field of modern linguistics to interpret ‘corpus’ as “a body of naturally occurring language” (4). They, therefore, stress the fact that the selected texts are ‘authentic’. Considering the features of the corpora used today, McEnery, Xiao, and Tono (2006) underline that a ‘corpus’ is generally regarded “a collection of (1) machine-readable (2) authentic texts (including transcripts of spoken data) which is (3) sampled to be (4) representative of a particular language or

language variety” (2006, 5). The last feature is emphasized by many others like Sinclair (2005, 1), who refers to ‘corpus’ as “a remarkable thing” due to the key features that need to be present in its design, including representativeness.

In order to benefit from the advantages of the kind of software preferred in corpus-based studies, it is first required to use a scanner and an optical character recognition (OCR) program so that the printed text can be ported to the electronic environment. Only after this process is completed, can the researcher export the texts to *Microsoft Word* and save them as *Word* documents. Because especially certain combinations of letters can be misscanned, it is also necessary to check whether there are such problems. An example can be the appearance of ‘m’ in the electronic version after the scanning of ‘rn’ in the hardcopy. After this process, software, like Wordsmith Tools (Scott 1998), which will be the tool in conducting the computerized analysis of this research, can be used. Wordsmith Tools helps to explore the target texts and source texts with its wordlists and monolingual concordancer. After choosing a text or text(s) to be explored, one can see all the words that appear in the text(s) in order of frequency or alphabetical order by using wordlist. In addition, this program gives the opportunity to learn about the number of types, tokens, sentences used in a text as well as mean word length with one click on statistics. The monolingual concordancer gives more specific information concerning the use of each search word. Searching a word in a text results in a list of all the instances in which the search word is used. The researcher can choose where the search word should appear in the sentence. In other words, the researcher can choose the number of words that should appear before and after the search word in a line. For instance, the search word can appear in the center of the lines. It is also possible

to gather other kinds of information about the search word, such as its collocates and clusters. As a third program, this software provides the researcher with keywords. However, this program is of no benefit until a reference corpus is designed.

### **2.3.2. Excursion into the Use of this Methodology in Translation Studies**

The literature in corpus-based translation studies includes a search for ‘universals’, i.e. the characteristic features of translations, as ‘opposed to’ non-translations, and those that explore translators’ style. At the beginning stages of doing corpus-based research in the field, Baker (1995) highlighted that it is not a requirement to compare source and target texts to study translation. She also suggested three kinds of research that were to be conducted in the field: parallel, multilingual, and comparable corpora (1995, 230). The research that follows these suggestions mainly focuses on “investigat[ing] phenomena assumed to be characteristic of translator behaviour” (Winters 2005, 24). Baker summarizes the differences that have been found between translated and non-translated texts as the tendency to produce more ‘conservative’, ‘standard’, ‘formal’, ‘sanitized’, and ‘uniform’ texts (2004, 172). Two examples of research using comparable corpora are those done by Sara Laviosa and Tiina Puurtinen. While Laviosa (1998) explores “core patterns of lexical use in a comparable corpus of English”, Puurtinen (1998) examines “syntax, readability and ideology in children’s literature” by using not only comparable corpora but also parallel corpora. It is also noteworthy that such research does not consist of linguistic analyses only. Translations can also be investigated ideologically as in the example of Puurtinen’s study.

After Baker attracted attention to the lack of research on translator's style and pointed to possible future research in this area (2000, 244), studies which reveal that stylistic differences can be observed between individual translators appeared. However, before referring to these studies, it is necessary to point to the importance of Hermans' work on 'voice'. Underlining the fact that "the translator's intervention (...) cannot simply be neutralized or erased" (1996, 3), Hermans argues that the translator's voice in the target text cannot be ignored. Illustrating his point, he demonstrates how readers are in fact exposed to the translator's voice whether they notice it or not.

The concept of 'voice' is included in the definition of 'style' (Baker 2000, 245), but "Baker's definition of style reaches beyond Hermans' open interventions" (Winters 2005, 23) as can be seen below:

I understand style as a kind of thumb-print that is expressed in a range of linguistic –as well as non-linguistic- features. (...) In terms of translation, rather than original writing, the notion of style might include the (literary) translator's choice of the type of material to translate, where applicable, and his or her consistent use of specific strategies, including the use of prefaces or afterwords, footnotes, glossing in the body of the text, etc. More crucially, a study of a translator's style must focus on the manner of expression that is typical of a translator, rather than simply instances of open intervention. It must attempt to capture the translator's characteristic use of language, his or her individual profile of linguistic habits, compared to other translators. Which means that style, as applied in this study, is a matter of patterning: it involves describing preferred or recurring patterns of linguistic behavior, rather than individual or one-off instances of intervention. (Baker 2000, 245)

Aware of the traditional use of "the style of individual creative writers in literary studies" and "the style of social groups of language users" in linguistics (Baker 2000, 243) as well as different uses of 'style' in the field of translation studies, Baker explains that the focus has not been on the translator in previous studies of style (244). According to Baker (2000), this is due to the 'secondary' position attached to translation (ibid.).

Referring to Leech and Short, Baker (2000) states that when she studies “translator’s style”, it is not “literary stylistics” but “forensic stylistics”, which forms the basis of the discussion (246). In other words, her focus is on features that seem to be inconspicuous as a result of the possibly unconscious preferences of the translator, unlike the linguistic preferences related to the literary aspect of the text (ibid.). Examples of features to be studied are “lexical items, syntactic patterns, cohesive devices, or even style of punctuation” (248).

Studies on translator style are different from the previous in that there is a focus on particular authors, translators or author-translators rather than a general outlook at translations versus ‘originals’ or source and target texts in a given language pair. Five studies can be given as examples of research on translator style. First of all, Baker (2000) investigates whether translators of literary works “use distinctive styles of their own” (248). Using the Translational English Corpus, she examines Peter Bush and Peter Clark’s translations. The results reveal that there are noteworthy differences between the two translators, such as the overall type/token ratio and the frequency of using the verb ‘say’.

Another study that deserves to be noted here was done by Marion Winters (2005). Winters compares two translations of *The Beautiful and Damned* into German, those by Hans-Christian Oeser and Renate Orth-Guttmann, both published in 1998. At the beginning of her research, Winters notices that the two translators differ in their use of loan words, code switches and speech-act report verbs. The main difference concerning these uses seems to be that Oeser gives priority to the style of the source text while making his translational decisions. On the other hand, Orth-Guttmann gives

priority to the German language norms. Oeser's tendency to use English words in the German translation at certain places is noticed, while Orth-Guttman strictly uses German words. This decision of Oeser's, Winters (2005, 102) asserts, results in Oeser's readers' awareness of the foreignness of the source culture with the loan words and code switches. The source text is brought closer to Orth-Guttman's readers through the "germanize[d]" (ibid.) translation, but as a result of the end notes which explain certain cultural or historical aspects the translator considers important, Orth-Guttman's readers are made aware of the distance between the source and target cultures, too. Exploring the speech-act report verbs, Winters finds that Oeser translates the source text by using fewer verbs than Orth-Guttman. The latter is again found to consider German language norms concerning repetition and thus ignore the repetition of speech-act report verbs in his translation. Oeser, in contrast, is found to use repetition of speech-act report verbs more in line with Fitzgerald in order to preserve the author's style (114). At the later stages of the research, Winters observes that features, like modal particles, also point to translators' distinct styles (27). There are important differences between the frequencies of the translators' use of specific modal particles. When Oeser prefers to use a modal particle in a sentence, Orth-Guttman mostly chooses either to use another modal particle or not to use any modal particle (124). A detailed analysis is done on *wohl*, which expresses "a more casual or immediate tone" and causes the speaker to sound a bit uncertain (150). Interestingly, Orth-Guttman uses *wohl* when her purpose is to change the point of view from narrator to one of the characters. As a result, the focus changes. In addition, the relationship between characters is made clearer through Orth-Guttman's use of *wohl*. An important point is that the speech-act report verbs used by

Orth-Guttman underline the speaker's intention in producing an utterance and thus certain aspects of the character's personality (151). Winters explains how these decisions affect "the narrative point of view and how that affects the macrostructure of the novel, confirming the hypothesis that one translator focuses on the characters while the other presents a societal study" (ix). Thus, an important conclusion that Winters draws is related to not only the translators' styles but also the effect of those styles on the reader. In brief, Winters claims that those who read Orth-Guttman's text may feel that they are more familiar with the characters than those who read Oeser's text, which is clearly more source-text oriented in all the aspects explored in the study (152).

The third study that certainly deserves to be reviewed is Charlotte Bosseaux's (2007) *How does it Feel? Point of View in Translation: The Case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Although the researcher does not present the study as a study on style, it can be discussed here due to its focus on the translator's presence or voice in fictional texts as well as use of forensic stylistics while exploring point of view in her corpus. Having referred to scholars like Giuliana Schiavi and Theo Hermans, Bosseaux points out that the translator is present in the translated text, which is a reason why the translation is different than the 'original' (19). Bosseaux's case study is on translations of two Virginia Woolf novels into French. She examines *The Waves* and its two translations as well as *To the Lighthouse* and its three translations with a meticulous eye on how narrative structures in the English source texts are conveyed to the translated texts. For this purpose, she focuses on "deixis, free indirect discourse, modality and transitivity" (26). Although Bosseaux appears to move from the source to the target texts in her investigation of the translations, it is important that she takes the macro structure of the

texts into consideration after spotting the author's and the translators' preferences at the linguistic level and comments on possible reasons for certain results. One of her main conclusions is that the feel of the 'original' cannot be assumed to be preserved in the translation due to the difference linguistic changes make in the feel of the text, which is a result of the distinct presences of the translators in the texts (225). Through a study on the above mentioned four categories, Bosseaux reveals that the later the translation was done, the closer it was to the 'original' in terms of narrative structure (228). However, time was not the only factor shaping the feel of the translations. Another factor is the translator's background. For instance, while Françoise Pellar, a scholar on Virginia Woolf, is found to stick to narrative structure of the source texts, Marguerite Yourcenar, an author-translator, is found to consider herself "more entitled to rewrite the text according to her own standards" (ibid.). This is a finding that led Bosseaux to suggest further studies on "a corpus of originals and translations by well-established writers to see if their translations are loaded with their own 'styles'" (ibid.). Thus, the current study can be regarded as a partial response to Bosseaux's suggestion.

There is also one corpus-based study particularly on author-translators' style. Hilikka Pekkanen's (2010) study entitled "The Duet between the Author and the Translator: An Analysis of Style through Shifts in Literary Translation" explores translatorial style through an examination of different author-translators' distinct preferences in language use at the level of 'shifts' in translating the same English literary works into Finnish. To illustrate, Joyce and Hemingway translations done by four Finnish author-translators appear in the main corpus. Pekkanen adds three other translations of works by different authors so that she can clarify whether the stylistic

patterns were evident independent of the source author (53). It is noteworthy that the researcher studies only 30 selected pages of each one of the translations of narrative passages (57). In addition, a focus on shifts requires a source-oriented view. This is because the identified uses can be referred to as 'shifts' only if the source text is the starting point of the investigation. However, it should be added that Pekkanen does not aim at solely "measuring quantifiable distance from the source text on the basis of identifiable shifts at the formal linguistic level" (14). Instead, she brings quantitative search together with a qualitative investigation, as she does "a description of the nature of the manifestations of this distance in the target text" (ibid.). "Translator profiles", a term used by Pekkanen to depict a "translator's personal style as manifested in frequent use of certain types of shifts", demonstrate that the translators' language use does not vary in the different parts of the selected 30 pages (60). Nevertheless, there are major differences between different translators' use of "optional shifts" (69). Furthermore, Pekkanen found out that the four translators' styles were distinct despite the source authors' styles (147). The study ends with the conclusion that "the metaphor of the translator singing in duet with the author seems appropriate in the sense that different translators with different voices apparently end up producing differently interpreted duets with their authors" (170).

Last but not least is a study that connects style to ideology in translations. In *Style and Ideology in Translation: Latin American Writing in English*, Jeremy Munday (2008) explains that the main point of departure in his study is the search for reasons for distinct translator styles (6). However, it should be noted that this study is quite different from the previous examples in that it is not totally corpus-based. Munday states that the

qualitative analysis is “computer-assisted” since a reference corpus is used for the analysis of markedness and whether certain words, phrases, etc. are frequently used in the selected texts. After the investigation of translators’ individual language uses comes that of the link between style and “the macro-contexts of ideology and cultural production” (ibid.). For the analysis of this link, Munday uses critical discourse analysis. Munday’s corpus is comprised of English translations of Latin American works written in the twentieth century. There are case studies of both “one author, many voices” (95) and “one translator, many authors” (125). Munday points out that translators, such as Gregory Rabassa, who rendered dozens of works including Julio Cortazar’s *Hopscotch* and Gabriel Garcia Marquez’s *One Hundred Years of Solitude* into English, are faced with “very many different ‘styles’ from a range of authors” (125). Then, he delineates how Rabassa’s translatorial style reflects “an image of a continent”, as it goes beyond the source author’s style (150). Despite his directing attention to stylistic patterns, especially in the form of phrases, which are possibly a result of translators’ “idiolects or lexical primings”, Munday concludes that there is an “inherent inconsistency” in each translator’s style (227). An important characteristic of Munday’s research is that his analysis is “within the socio-cultural, historical, and ideological framework” (ibid.) while considering the translator’s background. Thus, Munday definitely pays attention to the macro-context in his investigation of the translators’ linguistic choices.

This overview reveals how corpus-based translation studies has gone through a kind of ‘growth’. However, this does not mean that studies on translator style, for instance, have completely taken the place of studies on the so-called translation ‘universals’. The papers presented in the MATS 2010, which was a two-day-symposium

on Methodological Advances in Corpus-Based Translation Studies in January 2010, reveal that researchers continue conducting various studies. Language use differences between ‘translated’ and ‘non-translated’ texts in the target language and/or translations and their ‘original’s (Cappelle 2010; Frankenberg Garcia 2010; Van de Velde & De Sutter 2010; Zangeneh Bar 2010) is a popular area of research. A considerable number of studies are still done on translation ‘universals’ such as explicitation (Becher 2010; Borillo 2010; Denturck & Niemegeers 2010; Huotari 2010; Jimenez-Crespo 2010; Martinez-Llenas 2010), which is an example of claimed differences between the source and target texts. While the link between ideology and translation activity was investigated in relation to Franco’s dictatorship in Spain in Gomez Castro’s (2010) poster presentation, the idea that translators have their own styles is examined by Jun Miao (2010) in her study entitled “The Syntactic Skeleton of the Translator’s Style: Statistical Measures of Categorical Usage in Parallel Translations.” For this purpose, Miao (2010) explores the translator’s choices at the lexical and syntactical levels in the three Chinese translations of *Jean-Christophe*, written by Romain Rolland. Aware of the fact that the results rely solely on statistical analysis of the texts on computer, Miao concludes, several patterns of language use can point to these translators’ distinct styles. In brief, the previous kinds of research continue to be conducted, but new kinds are added like those on translator style, which deserve particular attention. This is due to the fact that they can exhibit the individual aspects of translating and thus bring alternative views in contrast to the ‘belief’ in translation ‘universals’ with the results of differences between translator styles.

### 2.3.3. Critical Look at Corpus-Based Translation Studies

Sara Laviosa, the author of *Corpus-Based Translation Studies*, one of the most comprehensively informative works on this field of research, points to the change in the kinds of research done in corpus-based translation studies (2002, 1) and notes that corpus is a ‘paradigm’ rather than a methodology today:

Not only has the study of corpora become fully integrated into Translation Studies since the early 90s, but, most importantly, corpus research has grown so rapidly and has influenced so significantly the way we conceptualise, study and teach translation, that we can no longer restrict its importance to the sphere of methodological research, nor can we limit the impact of this new area of study to the linguistic approaches to translation because of its links with corpus linguistics. (Laviosa 2002, 1)

Despite Laviosa’s positive approach to corpus-based studies, as Olohan (2004) makes clear, there are different views concerning the use of corpora in the field of translation studies (22) and the negative criticisms are generally based on the critical perspective. The use of binary oppositions, making generalizations, and the approach to signs in the context of corpus-based translation studies are criticized.

One of the discussion topics at the ‘Vic Forum on Training Translators and Interpreters: New Directions for the Millenium’, a conference organized at the University of Vic in Spain in May 1999, was related to the different points of view postmodernists and descriptivists have in the field. The discussion led to an article written by Andrew Chesterman and Rosemary Arrojo (2000), which was followed by other scholars’ responses that appeared in the same journal. It is, first of all, apparent that there are important similarities between the stances of the two scholars, who are considered by some as defending a rather ‘essentialist’ and a ‘non-essentialist’ view, respectively. However, it is significant that their article is an example of the fact that

such binary oppositions cannot be used. This is simply due to the fact that they demonstrate their ‘shared ground’. Reactions against the idea of such oppositions have been strongly expressed by scholars, like Sandra Halverson (2000) and Kirsten Malmkjaer (2000), who have investigated the use of corpora in translation studies. To begin with, Sandra Halverson (2000), regarding this view problematic, addresses the issue as follows:

(...) the belief in a ‘world out there’ necessarily leads to an empirical approach to describing it. However, not all forms of realism entail a commitment to essentialist or objectivist metaphysics or objectivist theories of cognition and language. (...) Similarly, belief in empirical research does not necessarily imply a belief in the observer-independence of all aspects of the world, or the ultimate objectivity of description. (357)

Thus, Halverson stresses the impossibility in separating empiricism from descriptivism and discussing them as opposite ends. Second, Malmkjaer refers to the issue, claiming that this is an example of “endlessly reinventing the wheel” (2000, 341). Moreover, she states that considering essentialism and non-essentialism as opposite ends moves translation scholars back to a point where scholars in some disciplines discussed the issue ten years ago and others 250 years ago. Her emphasis is on the fact that a scholar can certainly be a “non-essentialist empiricist” (ibid.).

Similar to “[p]ostmodern cultural studies [which] has drawn its concepts and methods, more or less directly, from Derrida’s work” (Simeoni 2000, 339), I will now attempt at showing how two ideas that are or have been present in corpus-based translation studies deconstruct themselves or are deconstructed. As “[d]econstruction takes place, it is an event that does not await the deliberation, consciousness, or

organization of a subject, or even of modernity” (Derrida 1985, 2). These ideas are the concepts of ‘original’ and ‘translation’.

Scholars doing research in the field of corpus-based translation studies seem to be very much aware of the possible problems to be experienced due to various reasons, such as lack of representativeness of the corpora, and the fact that it is not possible to claim absolute objectivity just because they will be relying on ‘empirical’ data.

However, they do not seem to make much effort to increase the awareness of their readers in relation to the use of concepts, like ‘original’ and ‘translation’. Maeve Olohan, whose work is very well known in the field and her high level of awareness concerning various issues, like objectivity, is obvious in her writing and research, explains that “[t]he study of textual aspects often involves a comparison between source and target texts, or between translated and original language” (2000, 3) while describing the research methods that have been preferred in such studies. Referring to “[t]he discussion of how to identify or label something as a translation”, Olohan states that “Gideon Toury’s (1995, 31-5) suggestion that we focus our research on anything that is assumed to be a translation” is the most common approach (Olohan 2004, 17). However, an investigation of corpus-based studies shows that such information is not often given. In other words, researchers refer to certain texts as ‘translations’ and ‘non-translations’ or ‘originals’ without providing any definitions, which reveals that they do not feel the need to problematize these concepts. An example can be the presentation of the two kinds of texts in the form of ‘oppositions’ by referring to them as ‘translated versus original’. This may be a result of the view that Gutt (2000) points to when he states,

Perhaps we can leave behind us some of the tedious and unfruitful issues of the past which were often terminological or typological, like discussions about what constitutes translation, i.e. to what kinds of texts one could/should apply the term 'translation', as opposed to 'paraphrase' or other modes of interlingual communication. (161)

But how can these issues be 'left behind' as if they have no influence on the present?

Would what we conceive or associate with 'translation' be 'the' same as that which we would if all those "tedious and unfruitful issues of the past" had not taken place?

Pym (1998), for instance, referring to this issue of determining "the explicit criteria used to select items for a corpus" and thus "ways of defining translations", mentions "borderline cases" (55), which he later in the book discusses in detail. Related to the so-called distinction Gutt touches upon between 'translation' and 'paraphrase', Pym asks, "[e]xactly what degree of 'imitation', 'adaptation', 'rewriting', 'version' or whatever is to be included as a translation? Should there be any radical distinction between intralingual and interlingual translation?" (ibid.). Although Pym is aware of the problems concerning the definitions of these concepts, he claims, "[a]t some point a distinction will have to be made between translations and nontranslations" (57). This is because quantitative research requires the scholar "to apply some kind of definition just to break (...) lists down to manageable sizes" (58). Otherwise, the result, Pym supposes, will be giving up conducting quantitative research, which will prevent scholars from doing "worthwhile work" and asking "important questions" (ibid.). It is significant to note that Pym does not regard these definitions "eternally fixed truth but as a strictly operative set of distinctions considered suitable for a particular question, applicable to a particular corpus, and particularly changeable if they turn out to be unsuitable" (57). Therefore, he is not in favor of a definition that will be "fixed" in time and place.

Can one assume the presence of “a borderline between original writing and translation” (Toury 1995, 132)? That which is ‘original’ is not supposed to have appeared before and is considered to have paved the way for its followers, such as the ‘copies’ of the ‘original’. These seem to be the main ideas for those who utter the word ‘original’ without any questioning of ‘originality’. For this reason, those who describe ‘original’ as explained above are obviously “constrained by “logocentric” presuppositions and constraints” (Evans 1991, xiv). “Derrida’s deconstruction of pure ‘origin’”, however, has shown the absence of an ‘origin’” (Davis 2001, 42). In certain definitions, like the one provided by Webster - “that from which a copy, reproduction, or translation is made”-, ‘original’ is defined relying on the presence of what comes ‘after’ it, not ‘before’. Therefore, the emphasis is interestingly not on the ‘origin’, but the ‘secondary’ products that follow the ‘original’. In line with Derrida’s stress on the fact that “the signified concept is never present in and of itself, in a sufficient presence that would refer only to itself” (1982b, 12), it is possible to interpret this as a manifestation of the reliance of one on the other. But what if then a poem, for example, is not translated? This definition seems to take it for granted that all ‘originals’ are copied, reproduced, or translated. It needs to be noted that “if the original calls for a complement, it is because at the origin it was not there without fault, full, complete, total, identical to itself” (Derrida 1985, 188). Then does this mean that “if the original [does not call] for a complement” and is not translated, it is “without fault, full, complete, total, identical to itself” (ibid.)? The answer is no. It still does not have “an absolute point of departure” (Derrida 1982a, 7). This is only to highlight the fact that ‘translation’ cannot be considered ‘secondary’ or ‘derivative’ to the ‘original’. Davis

also underlines that although there is a use of such binary oppositions like ‘original’ and ‘translation’ in Walter Benjamin’s preface to “Tableaux Parisien”, Benjamin’s translation of Baudelaire’s “Les Fleurs du Mal”, namely “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers”, these discussions definitely “disturb this dichotomy” (2001, 36). According to Benjamin, it is the ‘original’ which needs the translation to continue its existence, not vice versa (Davis 2001, 40). While seeking for the translation of the ‘inessential’ results in ‘bad translations’, producing an almost exact copy of the essence of the original is considered impossible by Benjamin. Derrida (1985) maintains that the reason why the ‘original’ is not copied by the translator is that “the original lives on and transforms itself” (188). The translation is included “in the growth of the original” (ibid.), which is connected to the “idea that a text has ‘life’” (Davis 2001, 40).

As I have already explained when presenting a brief overview of corpus-based methodology, computerized corpora help researchers to come to conclusions concerning various signs, including not only words but also punctuation marks. Using corpus-processing tools, researchers can obviously reach various quantitative results. However, there are certain characteristics of this kind of research that may seem to be problematic. I will now briefly discuss two points, the first of which is related to making generalizations.

First of all, categorizing the texts in her corpora as ‘translational’ and ‘non-translational’, rather than ‘original’, though she uses the concept ‘original’ at other places in the article, such as the abstract and the conclusion, Sara Laviosa (1998) investigates the lexical density, proportion of high frequency words, mean sentence length and so on in both ‘categories’. She states that “[f]urther evidence on a much

larger and varied corpus is necessary before any plausible explanation can be put forward for” certain findings, but summarizing her results, she claims, features such as low lexical density in translational texts seem to be characteristic of newspapers and narrative texts written in English language (564). It is noteworthy that she pays attention not to make strict statements and uses hedging devices, but she does not avoid making generalizations, relying on the results of the study. Even if the results are considered to be relying on ‘empirical’ data, as Arrojo states, the researcher “is inevitably speaking from a certain viewpoint informed by certain circumstances” (Chesterman & Arrojo 2000, 159). How can we, as researchers, come to conclusions as to the nature of ‘all’ newspaper and narrative texts in English? This seems to be in the nature of quantitative studies, but even the definition of ‘narrative’ might be problematic. These definitions can only be ‘working definitions, in Pym’s (1998) terms, in the context of the study conducted, but not definitions that can ‘generally’ be used. The fact that even a seemingly simple term like ‘original’ or ‘fiction’ is culture and time bound needs to be taken into consideration. Laviosa notes “[t]he collection of translated narrative comprises 14 published works in total; two are biographies, the rest is fiction” (1998, 558) and then neatly continues with a full list of all the works included in the study. All the information provided by Laviosa (1998), in this case, shows what she refers to when she uses the term ‘narrative’ or ‘fiction’ as the reference information of each work is given. Nevertheless, there is no explanation as to the reason or reasons why ‘narrative’ includes ‘biography’ and ‘fiction’. Considering the fact that there is reference to a previous study done on the “linguistic patterns discovered in translated newspaper articles” (557), it needs to be noted that newspaper articles are also in this group of

'narratives'. So, does 'narrative' here refer to "a story or an account of a series of events" and "the description of a series of events, usually in a novel" (948) as in Collins Cobuild? Another generalization is related to the fact that she states, "[t]he majority of publishers are British" (ibid.) and for this reason, she restricts the results of her study to English translated text. Thus she seems to consider culture-specificity, which deserves attention, but isn't there an important difference between 'British' and 'English'? Is it possible to generalize 'British' to the English language?

Even more striking than these relatively minor generalizations is the search for translation 'universals' by conducting corpus-based studies despite the fact that exploration of 'universal' patterns has been regarded problematic since the 1970s due to the avoidance of "context and historical contingency" (Meister et al. 2005, ix). Researchers explored translation 'universals' in various terms, such as lexical 'simplification' (Paloposki 2001) and 'sanitization', which is "the suspected adaptation of a source text reality to make it more palatable for target audiences" (Kenny 1998). There are, however, studies which avoid using the term 'universal' as in the example of the paper entitled "Core Patterns of Lexical Use in a Comparable Corpus of English Narrative Prose", written by Sara Laviosa (1998). In this study, Laviosa (1998) tries to spot "the distinguishing features of translational English" (557) while comparing translational and 'original' English language use. Discussing 'patterns' or 'regularities' is certainly different from discussing 'universals'. This is due to the fact that when one claims a regularity is a translation 'universal', s/he maintains that "the observed regularities are there *because* it is a translation" (Toury 2004, 17, emphasis original). Although Laviosa (1998) refers to the idea of translation 'universals' in her remarks on

suggestions for further research with caution, she is aware of various factors, such as the influence of the source author style, translators' gender and the language pairs (565). This is of crucial importance because the individuality of not only the source but also the target text author and the specificity of the cultures, periods in time and language pairs as well as the texts themselves cannot be forgotten. Claiming that there are translation 'universals' that hold true for all cultures, times, places, language pairs, texts, authors and translators results in over simplified results far from the reality. This fact seems to be why Andrew Chesterman (2004), who underlines the beneficial aspects of drawing general conclusions from a number of cases for the progress of any discipline including translation studies (33), opts for the use of the term 'universal' only if the claim in focus is "actually hypothesized to be universal, not specific to some subset of translations" (43). Despite the fact that translation scholars doing corpus-based studies may claim that this area of research stemmed from "the descriptive praxis developed by Gideon Toury (1980, 1995) in search of universal laws in translation" (Paloposki 2001, 265), Toury (2004) himself explains that he did use the term 'universal' in his dissertation dated 1976, but avoided the term as he preferred 'laws' in his following work (29). The reason for this renounce is "the possibility of *exception* built into" the term 'law' (ibid, emphasis original). Considering that it is very difficult to work on a corpus that represents all the translations that have been done, are being done, and will ever be done, that there are significant differences even between the definitions of 'translation' in different cultures (Chesterman 2004, 43) and that there can be exceptions (Toury 2004), asserting that a certain feature is a translation 'universal' does not seem to propose logical results, at all.

The second point is related to the approach towards the sign in corpus-based studies. As has already been pointed out, lists of words, sentences or collocates with certain numbers are presented by corpus-processing tools. To illustrate, one can learn the total number of words (token) in a certain novel and also the number of different words (type). Here we seem to be talking about representing signs by other signs. In other words, the signs in the form of numbers carry information concerning the use of other signs in the form of words. Thus, the signifiers, i.e. the form of the signs, appear to be different, but while comparing the numbers, the researcher is actually regarding the use of words. Relying on the information gathered from those numbers, the researcher continues with other kinds of search and aims at finding possible reasons for those quantitative results. It is noteworthy that using these tools, researchers might run into the risk of treating signifiers ‘at face value’ and of not paying attention to the signified, i.e. the impression or the mental image one has of the uttered or written sounds. Thus, the fact that the sign is a combination of both the signifier and the signified and that the same signifier can represent a different signified depending on the context might not always be taken into consideration. Derrida, pointing to the positive aspects of “a semiology of the Saussurean type”, states, “it has marked, against the tradition, that the signified is inseparable from the signifier, that the signified and signifier are the two sides of one and the same production” (1982c, 18). So, would the approach to the sign in corpus-based studies imply the separation of the two? As long as the researcher stays away from drawing conclusions by merely studying the lists of words, etc. in isolation, checks the use of the word(s) in their ‘context’ and has an awareness of the wholeness of

the work, this methodology does not have to have such an implication. At this point Derrida's remark needs to be kept in mind:

(...) translation practices the difference between signified and signifier. But if this difference is never pure, no more is translation, and for the notion of translation we would have to substitute a notion of transformation: a regulated transformation of one language by another, of one text by another. We will never have, and in fact have never had, to do with some "transport" of pure signifieds from one language to another, or within one and the same language, that the signifying instrument would leave virgin and untouched. (Derrida 1982c, 20)

Derrida's aim here seems to refer to the assumed separation of the signifier from the signified. Such assumption implies the production of 'pure' texts as a result of translating despite the fact that signs unavoidably signify other signs, which is one of the most obvious reasons for the absence of exactly 'equivalent' words in the same language or in different languages. It is here of utmost importance to consider the relationship between the use of words and the 'context' in which those words are uttered as well as the cultures in focus in corpus-based studies just as it needs to be done in any translation analysis. Otherwise, the results may be misleading.

Claiming that corpus-based studies, with their quantitative analyses, are free from subjectivity would obviously not be a view that can be supported. This is due to the fact that "intuition and value or human judgment" is present at different stages of the research (Bosseaux 2007, 91), including the points at which the researcher labels a text simply as 'original' or 'translation' and draws conclusions. It is undeniable that the corpus processing tools provide the researcher with extra time to do in-depth qualitative analysis after the completion of the quantitative analysis, which cannot be considered "an end in itself" (ibid.). Having referred to the criticisms and warnings made in relation to the use of corpora, Olohan (2004) sums up as follows: "The need to contextualize and

co-textualize translation and our study of it means that purely quantitative studies of corpus data are regarded limited in their usefulness” (22). The ongoing research which brings together quantitative and qualitative analyses in corpus-based studies shows the growing awareness of scholars. Because “deconstruction is not something one does, it is something one can become aware of” (Evans 1991, xvii), I suppose that these discussions may contribute to the process of increasing awareness concerning possible logocentric views in research methodology. This certainly does not mean that corpus-based studies should be avoided, but it is of vital importance to be critical of the assumptions that might be made while using these concepts and in our approach to findings. As Nietzsche points out, “truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they *are* illusions;” (in Derrida 1982a: 217). Taking this responsibility can be considered a key to ‘at least’ reminding of “illusions”.

### **Summary**

This chapter describes the methodology of this study. While explaining how the qualitative analysis of style and corpus methodology contributes to the research, a survey of the literature in these fields is presented. Attention has also been drawn to the fact that interviews, one of which is the one done with Pınar Kür specifically for this study, studies, criticisms, and news on topics related to her identity as an author, translator or author-translator as well as her writing and/or translating are explored with an eye on the discourse in them. Furthermore, with a ‘critical’ approach towards corpus-based studies, several points have been made concerning research particularly searching for translation ‘universals’ and problems that can be experienced if this methodology

alone is used and/or a meticulous analysis of the data is not done. Chapter 3 will present the analysis of the extratextual data, sources of which have already been mentioned, so that Pınar Kür's habitus as an individual and author-translator and the reception of her works can be described in relation to the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation.

### CHAPTER 3

#### ANALYSIS OF EXTRATEXTUAL DATA

This chapter aims at presenting the analysis of extratextual material, constituted by interviews with Pınar Kür, one of which I have done, and the preface she wrote to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz [Wide Sargasso Sea]*, the studies, criticisms, news, published about Kür as an author, translator, or author-translator and her work. Considering the fact that the methodological approach in this study directs attention to both the texts in the corpus and the producer of the texts, Pınar Kür's experiences in her private and professional life, education and works are taken into account in the discussion of her identity as an author-translator. This is due to the significance of the relations between Pınar Kür's 'habitus' and the 'field' in Bourdieu's terms. While details related to her life, including her childhood and youth, shed light on her "authorial habitus" and "translatorial habitus" (Simeoni 1998, 26), the criticisms that her work has received not only tell about her reception as an author-translator but also give clues about the 'fields' of Turkish literature and literary translation. This sociological approach to the study of an author-translator's authorial and translatorial style in literary texts is the reason why Pınar Kür's biography has an important place in this thesis. After the presentation of Pınar Kür's biography with a focus on the points that have specifically influenced her identity, the reception of Pınar Kür as an author-translator will be investigated. As a result, the texts in the corpus can be explored by taking Kür's habitus and the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation into consideration at relevant points in the discussions in the next

two chapters and the background on which the decisions Kür makes in her writing and translating can be better interpreted.

### **3.1. Pınar Kür's 'Habitus'**

Due to the relation between individuals' practice in a society and experiences in the family from the early days of life (Bourdieu 1990, 91; Webb et al. 2002, 36-37), describing Pınar Kür's 'habitus' requires the presentation of her family and her education, which have been influential on her professional career. After describing her family and education, her opinions concerning different aspects of life, including poverty, freedom, politics, and particularly the politics of literature will be discussed.

Pınar Kür, born in Bursa, Turkey in 1945, lived in various cities, such as Ankara, Zonguldak, London, New York, Paris, and Istanbul. As the daughter of a Turkish language and literature teacher and poet-author, İsmet Kür, and a mathematics teacher, Behram Kür, who studied in France and wrote a mathematics course book, Pınar Kür lived in an environment which supported her education and the development of her talents. İsmet and Behram Kür were both "idealist teachers" of the Turkish Republic in that "they chose to work in Anatolia" [Annem de babam da o sıralar Cumhuriyet kuşağı, idealist öğretmenler. Anadolu'da çalışmayı tercih etmişler] (Söğüt 2006, 5) and parents concerned with their children's education. For instance, Kür learned to read before she went to primary school and she started school early (Söğüt 2006, 16). Her father also wanted to teach his daughters English, but he did not because of their lack of interest (Söğüt 2006, 33). Having such parents, Kür also had the opportunity to live in a house with a library. She considers the books in their library, particularly the classics published

by the Turkish Ministry of Education of the time, influential on her writing and translating:

Among these classics, I read especially the old Greek tragedies and I later understood how much I was influenced by them. How did I understand that later? I was at university. I took Greek classics as a required course. ‘Oh, I know this story. How do I know it?’ I know it because I read it a long time ago when I was at primary school. Just like today’s children influenced by violence on TV, I was so influenced by the violence in those old Greek classics –well, Greek classics are very much full of violence- that I always tackled with murders and death when I became a writer.

[Bunlardan ben özellikle eski Yunan tragedyalarını okumuştum ve ne kadar etkilendiğimi çok sonra anladım. Nasıl çok sonra anladım? Üniversiteye geldim. Üniversitede bana bu Yunan klasikleri karşıma ders olarak çıktı. ‘Aaa ben bu hikayeyi biliyorum. Nereden biliyorum?’ Çünkü daha ilkokuldayken okumuşum. Ama nasıl şimdiki çocuklar televizyondaki şiddetten etkileniyorlarsa, ben de o eski Yunan klasiklerinden –Yunan klasikleri de bayağ şiddet doludur yani- ben de o şiddetten etkilenmişim ki sonradan yazar olduğumda hep cinayetler ve ölümlerle uğraştım.] (Aka 2011)

As is obvious, it is not only being exposed to parents who enjoy reading and writing but also the specific books in their library that have had powerful effects on the author-translator as a child. In addition to the effect Kür points to on her authorial habitus, as she has written such works of literature, there is a similar effect of the books in their library on her translatorial habitus. *Roger Ackroyd Cinayeti*, her Turkish translation of *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*, written by Agatha Christie, can be considered an example of this effect and/or the relationship between her authorial and translatorial habituses. While pointing to such effects particularly on her writing, Pınar Kür’s other family members deserve to be noted, too. In *Aşkın Sonu Cinayettir*, a book of interviews done with Pınar Kür by Mine Söğüt (2006), Kür tells about her family in detail, including her grandmother, aunt and cousin. First, she refers to the tales told by her grandmother. Kür stresses her love for all the tales her grandmother told [Bütün

masallarına bayılırdım] (31) and says that she and her sister, Işlar Kür, were both imaginative children, whose imagination was supported by those tales [Çok hayal kuran çocuklardık. Nennem de çok güzel masallar anlatır, hayal gücümüzü beslerdi.] (Söğüt 2006, 10). Another noteworthy figure is Kür's aunt, Halide Nusret Zorlutuna, whom İsmet Kür "adored and still adores" [Ona tapardı annem, hala tapar.] (20). "One of the first working women in Turkey" [Türkiye'de ilk çalışan kadınlardan biri] (ibid.), Halide Nusret Zorlutuna, is also a teacher and a well-known poet-author. Upon Söğüt's drawing attention to the fact that daughters of the two poet-author sisters, Pınar Kür and Emine İşınsu, are both authors, Kür states that they have been "encouraged to write" since childhood [Bizi küçük yaşlardan itibaren yazmaya özendirdiler, hep yüreklendirdiler.] (ibid.). In addition, having a poet-author mother and an aunt resulted in being in an environment where there was the possibility of meeting important literary figures of the time and listening to their conversations, including those on literature, as they were either colleagues or friends. An important example is her mother's friend, Muhsin Ertuğrul, who visited the family in New York upon İsmet Kür's invitation. At the age of sixteen, Pınar Kür found the opportunity to discuss drama and related subjects with Muhsin Ertuğrul and listened to plenty of advice from him (55). Another impressive example is Halide Nusret Zorlutuna's friend, Nazım Hikmet (31). Although Pınar Kür might not have had the chance to meet all or most of these women and men of letters, her mother's guidance in her daughters' reading works by poets/authors, such as Nazım Hikmet, Sait Faik and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (54), must have also had a role in Pınar Kür's interest in literature.

Another direct source of influence on Pınar Kür as an individual and author-translator has been her parents' decisions to go to England and the US and then her own decision to go to France. First, her mother applied for a program at the Ministry of Education to work in a foreign country because she wanted her daughters to learn English (Söğüt 2006, 34). After studying at English schools for about a year, Kür came back to Turkey. Due to the fact that she knew English well, she got accepted to Ankara Koleji [College] without the requirement to study at English preparatory class (45). Following was their stay in the US, which was a result of her father's visits to European countries and the US during his work at UNESCO. It was again her mother, however, who found a position in New York through the Ministry of Education. Thus, after three years in Ankara, they went to New York. Although she was only fourteen, she was accepted as a sophomore at Forest Hills High School. This was because of the difference between the Turkish and US high school curricula (50). Having graduated from secondary school, she studied at Queens College in NY. After their return to Turkey, she continued her university education at Robert College, which is today's Boğaziçi University in Istanbul. Despite the fact that she was interested in acting, drama, and writing drama (56), she studied English language and literature, which was the closest option she had to her favorite fields of interest. After getting married to Can Kolukısa, they went to Paris and she did her PhD in Comparative Literature at Sorbonne University in the Paris of the 1960s. The title of her PhD thesis is "Realism and Illusion in Twentieth Century Drama: Pirandello, O'Neill and Their Influences" [Yirminci Yüzyıl Tiyatrosunda Gerçekçilik ve Yanılsama: Pirandello, O'Neill ve Etkileri]. In short, having lived in England, the US, and France had significant effects on her

education and world view. For instance, the fact that she learned two foreign languages in the early years of her life made it possible for her to read the classics written in English and French in the fields of literature and politics in their source languages without feeling the need to refer to their translations, which, she thinks, “has been very useful” [Çocukken iki yabancı dil öğrendim ve tüm temel yapıtları –yalnızca edebiyat değil, politik yapıtları da- asıllarından okuyabilmek fırsatını buldum böylece. Bence çok yararlı oldu.] (Kür 1976 in Özkırımlı 1987, 788). Her life in Paris, Kür claims, has also been influential on her “political awakening” [Paris yaşantımı politik uyanışım bakımından da çok önemli sayarım ayrıca.] (ibid.). There seem to be two main reasons for this influence of Paris on her. First of all, as a person who loves reading, a considerable number of bookshops, found “at every corner” of the city, attracted her and she enjoyed spending time going into those bookshops [Fransa’da her köşe başında kahve vardı ve her köşe başında kitapçı... St. Michel Bulvarı boyunca sayısız kitapçı vardı; birinden çıkıyorsun birine giriyorsun, orda karıştırıyorsun, okuyorsun.] (Söğüt 2006, 85). Marx, Lenin, and Trotsky were among the ones she read with utmost interest at the time. Secondly, the 1960s was an exciting era due to the decolonization of numerous African countries, demands for more freedom, antiwar protests, and the appearance of the young revolting against certain norms of the time, including materialism. Although Pınar Kür could not participate in the major protests due to her pregnancy, there were protests where she could. An example is one of the protests against the Vietnam War (86), started by the US, whose culture, she claims, is “founded upon plundering” [Amerikan kültürü başlı başına yağma üzerine kurulmuş.] (83).

Kür's concerns about political and social events or states, which seem to have started in the sixties of Paris, can easily be seen in her remarks today, too. Appearing on NTV, a television channel known for its frequent news coverage as well as its programs tackling with political, social, and cultural issues, Pınar Kür, together with three other famous woman figures from different backgrounds, with different viewpoints, openly expressed her opinions while discussing hot topics of the week before and during the interviews done with other popular people from various fields. It is possible to claim that her 'symbolic capital', "the recognition [agents] receive from a group" (Bourdieu 1991, 106), has increased even more as a result of her appearances on NTV. This is because large audiences had the opportunity to listen to her speeches and learn more about her. Her sensitivity to problems resulting from and/or in poverty, lack of education, and freedom can be observed by watching several episodes. Among the eighty episodes of the program, titled "Haydi Gel Bizimle Ol" [Hey Come and Join Us], is the one done with Prof. Hasan Bülent Kahraman, author and critic, in February 2008. As Çiğdem Anad, a journalist, read the results of a survey on the reasons for a high number of young women's not studying at university, they started to discuss why this 1 percent, who cannot study at university because they are wearing turban, attracts attention but not the 20 percent, who cannot because they suffer economically. Kür underlines certain issues related to these results:

(...) Besides, women do not have a place in the society. They have already been treated as the second-class. They are either married just after high school or shut in the house. Now, these are also what turban symbolizes. The turban is the symbol of shutting women in. Not freedom, I repeat. This is a way of obliterating women. Well, you shut her in, hit her, do not hire her, do not let her go [to school/work], cover her hair, and when it comes to those who are to study at university... Poverty is actually what needs to be fought against. 20 percent [of

those who cannot study at university] cannot because of poverty. (...) We cannot hear the voice of that 1 percent. We only hear the voice of men. (...) Even if they are speaking, they are not raising their voices high enough.

[(...) zaten kadınlar sosyal toplum içinde yeri olan kişiler değil. Zaten ikinci sınıf muamelesi görüyor. Zaten liseden sonra langirt evlendiriliyorlar veya eve kapatılıyorlar. Şimdi türban bunların da simgesi aslında. Türban, kadını kapatma simgesi. Özgürlük değil, tekrar söylüyorum. Kadını yok etmenin bir yoludur bu. İşte eve kapatırsın, döversin, işe almazsın, göndermezsin, başını örtersin üniversiteye gidecek durumda olanları da. (...) Asıl yoksullukla savaşılmaması gerekiyor. Yüzde 20'si yoksulluktan dolayı gidemiyor.( ...) O yüzde 1'in de sesini duyamıyoruz. Biz sadece erkeklerin sesini duyuyoruz. (...) Konuşuyorlarsa da pek yükseltmiyorlar seslerini.] (Kür 2008)

Pınar Kür is obviously against those that, she believes, turban is a symbol of. Although some claim that wearing turban is a right of women and that they cannot be deprived of this right, all the acts, Kür considers the turban a symbol of above, result from or bring confinement, not freedom, to women's lives. While discussing 'turban', Kür digs into the use of turban as a symbol of other problems in the life of women and the necessity of the fight against poverty, which, according to her, appears as a fundamental issue lying at the root of the mentioned problem.

Another example of Pınar Kür's criticisms on subjects related to politics can be given from the same year. After an invitation from the current President of Turkish Republic, Abdullah Gül, to well-known figures in the field of Turkish literature, Kür's view concerning accepting this invitation and attending the dinner at Çankaya is asked by journalists. She states that "literary figures should not be in close contact with those in power", as she thinks, in that case, she "loses the right to criticize him at ease and react against his acts" [edebiyatçı iktidarla yakın ilişkiler içinde olmamalıdır. Eğer ben onun yemeğine gidersem, o zaman onu rahat rahat eleştirmek ve yaptıklarına karşı çıkmak hakkını kaybederim, diye düşünüyorum] (Arpa 2008). Upon this expression of

her negative view, Hilmi Yavuz, a poet who preferred to join the dinner, asks if “she got married with every single man she had dinner with” [Her yemek yediği adamlarla nikah masasına oturdu mu?], as he believes it is not possible to “sell” one’s right to oppose those in power (ibid.). In her response to this “obscene” question, she first negates the question posed by Yavuz and states that he is not in the opposition, at all and adds, “he himself knows whether he has sold his pride or not” [Hilmi Yavuz, ‘muhalefetimi satmam’ diyor ama, zaten kendisi muhalif değil ki! Gururunu satıp satmadığını da kendi bilir.] (ibid.). Obviously, Pınar Kür prefers to protect her rights to oppose those in power and express her criticisms against all the acts and speeches she considers improper. This actually is a characteristic, she believes, almost necessary for someone who wants to be a writer. In *Aşkın Sonu Cinayettir*, after pointing to the significance of “lack of harmony” [uyumsuzluk] between the reality and the desired conditions the characters of her novels would like to live in, she underlines her continuous feel of being an “outsider” [yabancı] and asks “why would someone who does not have any objections concerning life or the world be a writer?” [hayata, dünyaya dair itirazı olmayan biri neden yazar olsun ki?] (Söğüt 2006, 173). At another point in the book, *Aşkın Sonu Cinayettir*, she highlights this view of hers once again. She maintains that “if you have an objection to an aspect of life one way or the other -it does not have to do with politics-, then you have the chance to write good literature” [İlla ki politik olması gerekmez, hayata şu ya da bu şekilde itirazın varsa o zaman iyi edebiyat yazma ihtimalin de var.] (221).

Kür has objections to the politics of literature, too. An example is her response to the Nobel literature prize given to Orhan Pamuk in 2006. After Orhan Pamuk received

the Nobel in 2006, Kür's comments concerning Pamuk's winning the prize appeared in *Times*. It is possible to assert that her 'symbolic capital' in the field played a role in the reporter's choosing Kür for a comment on the subject, which is the only one published. Owing to the fact that the speaker's symbolic capital affects the reception of the uttered view depending on the degree to which the audience is aware of that capital (Bourdieu 1991, 116), the reporter first informs readers about Kür's position in the field of Turkish literature:

Pinar Kur, a leading female Turkish novelist said: "For years, everybody has wished someone from Turkey would win the Nobel. But it is also known, both in Turkey and abroad, that this prize is much more related to politics than to literature, it is given more for political reasons. It is very unfortunate that this prize announcement was made on the same day as the [Armenian genocide] Bill in France." (McLaren et al. 2006)

Although the fact that a Turkish novelist won the Nobel literature prize definitely appears as happy news, Kür did not refrain from stressing other aspects of Pamuk's winning the prize, which she considers "unfortunate", after his clear cut remarks to a Swiss newspaper concerning an almost one-hundred-year-old subject that would be expected to be debated by historians. Kür's expressing her negative criticisms concerning various subjects, whether political or not, both in and outside Turkey seems like evidence for how seriously she believes in the importance of questioning acts and states, disapproving them, and having objections when necessary, which, Kür appears to suggest, is a requirement for being a 'good' author. Another reason why this seems to be a requirement is that she considers happiness a state about which people are interested in neither writing nor reading [Zaten çok mutlu olduğun anda roman yazmak da, okumak da aklına gelmez.] (Söğüt 2006, 220). Therefore, according to Kür, if authors are pleased

with all around them and in the world, then not much reason appears to be left for them to feel the need to write.

On her return to Turkey, Pınar Kür worked at several places, including the television program described above. While writing her own work and translating numerous books, she worked as a dramaturge, drama critic, and also at teaching positions. First, she started working as a dramaturge at Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosu [Ankara State Theater] in 1971. Hers was officially the first dramaturge position in Turkey (Söğüt 2006, 135). However, she “got weary of living in the Ankara of March 12” [12 Mart Ankara’sından çok sıkıldım.] (141), as it was a time of martial law. Moreover, she saw that the conditions at the theater did not match her expectations, at all, and had problems in her private life with her husband, Can Kolukısa (ibid.), from whom she later got divorced. As a result, she decided to quit her job at the theater and moved to Istanbul. There, she started working as an instructor of English at a private language school where she continued working for quite a long period of time. In 1979, she started to work as an instructor of English at Istanbul University School of Foreign Languages. Although it was before going to Paris that she started writing drama criticisms at a newspaper, *Cumhuriyet*, she again worked as an interviewer and writer for newspapers and magazines in the 1980s. After working at Istanbul University for about fifteen years, she continued her teaching career at Istanbul Bilgi University. She has been teaching in the Program in Media and Communication Systems, Faculty of Communication since 1996.

### **3.2. Reception of Pınar Kür in the ‘Field’s of Turkish Literature and Literary**

#### **Translation**

Pınar Kür has not only written poetry, drama, short stories and novels but also translated a considerable number of books written especially in the field of literature. Although she does not seem to continue writing works in the former two genres, her short stories and novels reach a wide audience and her literary translations continue to be published. After briefly describing her early work in poetry and drama, the reception of her collections of short stories and novels as well as her views concerning translation and her translations will be discussed through interviews, news, and criticisms. In this discussion, there will also be explications concerning the (lack of) response(s) from critics about Kür’s published work in relation to the ‘fields’ of Turkish literature and literary translation whenever possible, including Kür’s own reactions against readers and critics’ approach to literature and the practices of publishing houses regarding translations in the field.

It seems appropriate to start with Pınar Kür’s writing before translating owing to the chronological order of these two acts of hers. Nevertheless, the increase in her ‘symbolic capital’ after the publication of her translations deserves to be noted, as they played an obvious role in her recognition by the publishing houses. Although she published her well-known short stories and novels after the publication of her translations, Kür starts writing poetry when she was a child and drama in her youth:

In terms of publication dates, translations come first, but I have been writing since I was little. When I was a child, a poem of mine was published in Doğan Kardeş, but it was my mom who sent it to the magazine. Of course I knew nothing about it. When I didn’t know how to read and write, my mom wrote something I said and she sent it. Other than that, I wrote drama. I was involved with drama for many years. I wrote short stories and so on, but I published these at places that I got acquainted with as a translator. For instance, I had done

translations for Bilgi Publishing House, let's say. I had done translations for E Publishing. Upon writing my own novel, I took my novel to them. They knew me as a translator, they didn't know me as an author.

[Yayınlanma açısından önce çeviri yayınlandı fakat ben kendimi bildim bileli yazı yazıyorum. Çocukken Doğan Kardeş'te şiirim çıkmıştı... ama annem göndermiş. Benim tabii haberim bile yok. Benim okuma yazmam yokken, söylediğim bir şeyi yazmış ve göndermiş. Onu saymazsak eğer, yazdım, piyes yazdım. Tiyatroyla uğraştım uzun yıllar. Kısa öyküler yazdım, vesaire fakat bunları çevirmen olarak tanıştığım yerlere götürüp yayınladım. Bilgi Yayınevi'ne daha önceden çeviri yapmıştım diyelim, E Yayınları'na çeviri yapmıştım. Kendi romanımı yazınca, kalktım, onlara götürdüm. Çevirmen olduğumdan dolayı tanıyorlardı beni, yazar olarak tanımıyorlardı.] (Aka 2011)

The poem sent by İsmet Kür to be published in Doğan Kardeş is Pınar Kür's first published work. Another poem of hers that got not only published but also awarded is *Leylekler* [Storks]. This poem was translated into English by a friend of her father's, who also sent it to a competition organized by *Shankar's Weekly*, a journal in India. Unfortunately, her creative imagination was not spurred much during her primary school years, when she lost the inclination to write poetry that she used to have [(...) ilkokul beni daha önce var olan hayal dünyasından uzaklaştırdı ve böylece şiir de ikinci plana gitti.] (Söğüt 2006, 25).

As the daughter of a mother and a father who were involved with literature, Pınar Kür was obviously first interested in poetry and then drama, short story, and novel. Drama was the genre she mostly studied and she wrote only drama for quite a long period of time. Her first work of drama was 'Cowards All', written in English while she was studying at a university in the US (Söğüt 2006, 56). Interested in acting and writing drama, she continued writing drama after she came back to Turkey. While studying at Robert College, she wrote 'İki Başlı Adamın Tek Eli' [The Single Hand of the Double – Headed Man], which was produced "under the influence of Ionesco, Beckett, the absurd

theater” [Koleji bitirmeden İki Başlı Adamın Tek Eli diye bir piyes yazdım. Ionesco, Beckett, absürd tiyatro etkisinde kalınarak yazılmış bir oyundu.] (69). It was put on stage in Ankara. While in Paris, she wrote ‘Kuru Kuru Kurbanın Olam’, translated into French as ‘Amour d’Os’ [Love of Bones]. This work of hers, which was a love story between a woman and a skeleton, was also put on stage at the theater of Montparnasse-Gaston Baty (90). Pınar Kür, who loves theater so much that she “feels like crying whenever she sees a well-staged play” [Güzel bir tiyatro eseri gördüğüm zaman, ... , ağlamaklı olurum ben, tiyatroyu çok severim.] (189), explains how much she was interested in theater and why she does not continue writing drama as follows:

Half theater, half literature, I studied theater most. Because I was from a family of literary figures, I was interested in theater at very early ages and this interest of mine continued until recently. For a long period of time I wrote solely drama, I did my PhD in drama in France and I worked at Ankara State Theater for some time. Finally, I saw that drama was not enough for me as a narrative tool and I continued with fiction.

[Yarı tiyatro yarı edebiyat, daha çok tiyatro eğitimi gördüm. Edebiyatçı bir aileden geldiğim için çok küçük yaşta ilgilenmeye başladım ve birkaç yıl öncesine değin de sürdü bu ilgi. Uzun süre yalnızca tiyatro için yazdım, Fransa’da doktoramı tiyatro üstüne yaptım, bir süre Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosunda çalıştım. Sonunda tiyatronun anlatım aracı olarak bana yetmediğini gördüm ve düzyazıya geçtim.] (Kür 1976 in Özkırımlı 1987).

Although she has seen restrictive aspects of drama, felt the need to leave drama aside and continued her writing career with short stories and novels, she sometimes thinks about writing drama (Söğüt 2006, 189). In addition, there is the influence of this long time interest and work in theater and drama on her short stories and novels, written later in her career. She states that drama has been the genre she kept reading for quite a long period of time and these works of drama have been “the most influential” in her awareness of the importance of “staging, visuality, [and] the smooth flow of dialogues”

[İlk zamanlar ben çok tiyatro eseri okurdum. En büyük etki o tiyatro eserleridir. Sahneyi kurmak, görsellik, diyalogların rahatlığı...] (188). Kür underlines the influence concerning setting when she elucidates the importance of setting in the short stories published in *Bir Deli Ağaç*: “All the stories in the book take place in this apartment. I like this place. You might have noticed that I describe the setting in detail. I want the picture to be seen by the reader. This is an influence of the theater on me.” [Kitaptaki bütün öyküler bu apartmanda geçer. Bu mekanı seviyorum. Romanda filan da dikkar edersen mekanı çok uzun tarif ederim. Bir resim olarak gelsin okuyucunun gözüne isterim. Bu da tiyatrodan aldığım bir etki.] (248). The vivid description of the setting in her short stories and novels, Kür explains, is due to her aim at creating a theatrical effect on the reader. This is a direct result of the theatre background on Kür’s authorial habitus. Therefore, although she does not write drama any more, its influence appears in Kür’s fiction. In addition, the importance she attaches to “the smooth flow of dialogues” [diyalogların rahatlığı] (Söğüt 2006, 188) can easily be noticed in her translations. For this reason, this can be considered as an influence of her theatre background on not only her authorial but also translatorial habituses.

The fact that she spared time to write short stories, two of which were published in ‘Dost’, a journal of short stories, even while working at the theater as a dramaturge can be considered as evidence for her estrangement from writing drama and motivation for writing short stories. A significant reason for this appears to be her “critical” look at the theater, which resulted in her understanding that she would not continue working in this field [O dönem tiyatroyla ilişkim eleştirel bir açı kazandı. ... Ve bu işle fazla ilgim olmayacağını anladım. Emin değilim ama bu nedenlerle galiba, oyun yazmadım o

sırada. Ama kısa kısa birtakım öyküler yazıyordum.] (Söğüt 2006, 138). The two published in ‘Dost’ are Kür’s first published short stories. In addition to those published in journals, Kür has three collections of short stories. Kür’s short stories, considered by Füsün Akatlı to be highly “better” than her novels [Pınar Kür’ün öykücülüğü romancılığından –beklenmeyecek kadar demeyeyim ama- birkaç kat daha iyi.] (Akatlı 1998 in Işık 2006, 2362), are similar in that they present the conflicts between the individual and the society as well as the internal conflicts [Pınar Kür, öykülerinde de bireyden hareket ederek, birey-toplum ve bireyin kendi kendisiyle çelişmelerini veren yazarların özelliklerini gösterir.] (Önertoy 1984, 322). It is here noteworthy that Pınar Kür, who reflects her awareness of political and social problems in her speeches and writing, generally regards men and women as differing in their thoughts and emotions (Türe 1993, 243). This is due to the kind of education they are subjected to, rather than their own natures from birth. This seems to be one of the main points Kür considers in creating characters. She does not ignore the influences of the patriarchal society on individuals, thus, her characters (249). As a result, male domination (247) and the subversion of women (243) become apparent in the novels. However, she also includes male characters who do not share the patriarchal viewpoint. This is a result of the ‘western’ education they have had (ibid.). For this reason, Türe claims, Kür is “objective” in her descriptions and manages to be “realistic” in narrating her stories (244).

The three collections of short stories written by Pınar Kür are *Bir Deli Ağaç* [The Mad Tree] (1981), *Akışı Olmayan Sular* [Still Waters] (1983), and *Hayalet Hikayeleri* [Ghostly Stories] (2004). *Bir Deli Ağaç* was written during the coup d’état of the

September 12, 1980 that came after the clash between groups from the right and left wings in the 1970s. Kür wrote these stories as she observed the residents of the apartment she still lives in. This seems to be a reason why the stories in *Bir Deli Ağaç* are linked to one another in terms of theme and subject [Pınar Kür, birbirine yakın temaları işlediği ve konuları bakımından da birbirini tamamlayan ilk öykülerini Bir Deli Ağaç'ta toplamıştır.] (Önertoy 1984, 321). Akatlı (1998) asserts that although Kür is “faithful to the norms of the genre”, she shows her “mastery” in this genre and thus the reader does not feel the slightest “boredom” [Öyküye yenilik getirdiği söylenemez. Türün düzgülerine norm sadık yani. Yine de kendine özgü öyküleme ustalıklarıyla tekdüzelikten hemen her yerde sıyrılmayı bilmiş. Bilegeldiklerinizin yinelendiği sıkıntısını duyurmuyor.] (in Işık 2006, 2362). Despite the fact that *Bir Deli Ağaç* did not receive any prizes, it is noteworthy that there were, Kür explicates, negative criticisms against the fact that the Sait Faik prize was not given to any work in the year such a collection of short stories was published [*Bir Deli Ağaç*'ın çıktığı yıl Sait Faik Ödülü verilmedi ve pek çok kişi buna itiraz etti. Hatta, *Bir Deli Ağaç* gibi bir kitabın yayımlandığı yılda nasıl oluyor da ödüle değer bir eser bulunamıyor, diyenler oldu.] (Söğüt 2006, 261).

*Akışı Olmayan Sular* received the Sait Faik prize, one of the most “prestigious prizes” in the field of literature in Turkey [bayağı prestijli ödüllerd] (Söğüt 2006, 261), in 1984, a year later it was published. Although Kür could have done her own application for the prize, she did not want to, as she has objections to the idea of presenting her work for the evaluation of a jury for a certain prize (ibid.). Because the presentation of a literary work for the prize by the members of the jury was also in line

with the regulations at the time, *Akışı Olmayan Sular* received the prize not as a result of Pınar Kür's application, but Hilmi Yavuz and Tahsin Yücel's, well-known men of letters in the jury. Kür claims, the prize had positive effects on the good reviews about the stories in the book [Ödül alınca hikayeler hakkında çok iyi yazılar da çıktı...] (262). However, even before the prize, there were positive criticisms, which is, according to Kür, due to the fact that critics thought she "became well-behaved" and more "mature" as there was a lack of obscenity in these short stories and "emotional" aspects were highlighted [duygusal yanı ağırlıkta olan] (Önertoy 1984, 322), unlike her novels published earlier [uslandım diye düşündüler! (...) *Asılacak Kadın*'daki o cinsellik minsellik yok tabii, "duygu dünyasına doğru eğildi" diye düşünüp herhalde bir uslanma, bir olgunlaşma gördüler bende...] (Söğüt 2006, 262). Another reason for the critics' interest in *Akışı Olmayan Sular* is the fact that three of the five short stories in the collection are narrated by male characters. After touching upon this fact, Önertoy quotes from Kür, who explains that her narrating from the viewpoint of a male character was regarded by some as "inappropriate or an immoderate act of courage" [(...) erkek ağzından yazmanın pek yakışık almadığı ya da aşırı bir cesaret olduğu söylendi.] (in Önertoy 1984, 322). In response to the criticisms about the personalities or positions of the male characters in the society, she underlines that in both collections of short stories it is not only male but also female characters who "cannot conform to the norms of the society" and are "unwilling" to do so [Her iki öykü kitabındaki kişilerin belirgin ortak özelliği, bugünkü topluma uyamamak, daha da ötesi uymak istememektir.] (ibid.). What appears to be of vital importance here is that Kür as a woman author-translator presents a rather new option to the literary "repertoire" (Tourey 2002, 151) in the field of Turkish

literature by writing from the viewpoints of male characters. In other words, the author-translator, as an agent, is not concerned about acting against the prevalent “norms” (Toury 1995, 53) of the field, which is in line with her stress on her feeling like an “outsider” [yabancı] everywhere (Söğüt 2006, 173) and interest in creating characters who do not conform to the society.

*Hayalet Hikayeleri* is her last published collection of short stories, some of which she wrote as a result of the visit of a ghost while she was in Paris [Bir hayaletin refakatinde Paris'te dolaşım.] and some she wrote because “she felt like a ghost in this society” that seeks for the high up positions effortlessly [Belki biraz hayalet gibi görüyorum kendimi demin tarif ettiğim toplumun içinde. Yani bu kolaycılığın, kolay yoldan köşeyi dönmenin moda olduğu toplumda ben biraz hayalet gibi kalıyorum!] (Sever 2004). Having enjoyed reading the collection very much, Atilla Dorsay (2004) recommends *Hayalet Hikayeleri* and compares it to Paul Auster’s *Oracle Night*, as he claims they both have “complicated, intense, almost surprising structures and mastery in narrative” [karmaşık, yoğun, neredeyse şaşırtıcı yapıları ve anlatım ustalıkları]. This collection, in which the short stories, Nazan Aksoy believes, may be regarded as “one huge question about the mystery of the mind” [hikayelerin hepsi zihnin esrarı üzerine sorulmuş kocaman bir soru belki de] (quoted by Işık 2006, 2362), came after a twelve year break in Pınar Kür’s writing career. This period of twelve years (1993-2004) between the publications of *Sonuncu Sonbahar*, one of her novels, and *Hayalet Hikayeleri* has attracted attention. In an interview, Kür explains that there is “not one single reason” for this break and adds that despite her feeling “sullen”, she continued writing as well as doing other kinds of work [Bunu tek bir sebebe bağlayamam. 12 yıl

ara verdim ama yazmaya ara vermiş değilim; (...) 12 yılda beş tane hikaye de yazmadım. Başka çalışmalarım oldu ama genel olarak küskünlük gibi bir şey yaşadım.] (Sever 2004). Her feeling uneasiness in publishing new works was due to the lack of reaction shown to *Sonuncu Sonbahar*, which was an unfortunate surprise to Kür. This is easy to understand when the debates caused by her previous works are recalled. In this interview, Kür directs attention to the debates over all the works she has written except *Sonuncu Sonbahar*. These works include *Yarın Yarın*, a book whose author was known to noone at the time. She states that after the publication of this book, her first novel, more than 40 articles were published, but none after *Sonuncu Sonbahar*, published in 1992 [92'de yayınladığım Sonuncu Sonbahar'la ilgili tek bir gazete ya da dergide değerlendirme çıkmadı. Düşünün ki, Yarın Yarın isimli ilk kitabım çıktığında, adı sanı bilinmeyen bir yazar olmama rağmen, bir ay içinde hakkımda 40'ın üzerinde yazı çıkmıştı.] (ibid.). She also comments on her interpretation of this lack of reaction, underlying the politics of the day: “The reader’s profile changed incredibly in the 1990s, most probably due to the fact that the destruction of the coup in 1980 became evident in the 1990s” [80 darbesinin tahribatını 90'larda gördüğümüz için olsa gerek; 90'lı yıllarda okur profili müthiş değişti] (ibid.). Füsun Akatlı (2004), also concerned about the reader profile, considers Kür’s publishing a new book as a “light of hope” [umudun ışığı]. This is because Akatlı hopes the consumerism of the last one or two decades in the field of Turkish literature will come to an end and literary works will no longer be treated like items belonging to the popular culture whose term of life is limited [Bizimki gibi (ya da, haksızlık etmeyelim, son on-on beş yılın Türkiye'sindeki gibi) değerler karşısında kayıtsız, iz süremeyen, kültürel varlığını zenginleştirmek gibi bir derdi olmayan

toplumlarda ise, sanatsal deęer taşıyan ürünler de pop ürünlerin kaderini paylaşmak durumunda kalıyor;].

At this point attention needs to be paid to two views of Kür's about literary criticism in the field of Turkish literature. Concerning the decline in the number of reviews published in newspapers and journals, Kür reacts against not only readers but also literary critics: "The current critics have recently established such a system. They write about the books that they like. They don't write about those they dislike. Well, a critic will both like and dislike books. There'll be debates" [Varolan eleştirmenler de şöyle bir system kurdular son zamanlarda. Beğendikleri kitapları yazıyorlar, beğenmedikleri kitapları yazmıyorlar. Şimdi eleştirmen dediğin, hem beğenecek hem beğenmeyecek. Tartışma çıkacak.] (Kür 2008). Kür made this comment at the television program 'Haydi Gel Bizimle Ol' in 2008 before pointing to the above mentioned decline in criticisms about her most recently published books. Besides, she is displeased with the source of some negative criticisms. In other words, she has objections to the subject matter of some criticisms:

The issue is doing your job right. A shoemaker is obliged to do his job right, to do it well. Why he did it black or brown cannot be questioned. He can do it brown, he can do it black. If he feels like doing it blue, he does it blue. What matters is its being done well and right.

[İşini doğru yapmak meselesidir mesele. Bir ayakkabıcı işini doğru yapmakla, sağlam yapmakla mükelleftir. Yoksa neden siyah ya da kahverengi yaptığı sorgulanamaz. Kahverengi de yapar, siyah da yapar, canı isterse mavi de yapar. Aslolan bunun iyi yapılmış olması, doğru yapılmış olamasıdır.] (Söğüt 2006, 224)

Kür expresses her negative reaction to the fact that literary critics sometimes prefer to criticize what the author has written rather than how. She underlines the view that she is

free to choose whatever she wants to write about. The issue in literary criticism, according to Kür, needs to be whether the language use and structure are ‘good’, not “why she has written” that specific subject. She writes what she writes simply because she “feels like writing it” [Bir yazara sorulmaz ki neden bunu yazdın. İçinden gelen odur, yazar. Önemli olan yaptığını doğru mu yaptı, dili güzel mi, yapısı güzel mi...] (172).

Pınar Kür has written seven novels: *Yarın Yarın* [Tomorrow Tomorrow] (1976), *Küçük Oyuncu* [Small-time Actor] (1977), *Asılacak Kadın* [A Woman to Hang] (1979), *Bitmeyen Aşk* [Unending Love] (1986), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* [A Novel of Murder] (1989), *Sonuncu Sonbahar* [Final Fall] (1993) and *Cinayet Fakültesi* [Faculty of Murder] (2006). There are also two other novels that need to be referred to. Firstly, there is *Nazlı Hanım’ın Kızları* [The Daughters of Nazlı Hanım], a novel she started writing but then left unfinished. Kür decided not to continue writing *Nazlı Hanım’ın Kızları*, which she planned as a historical novel about Turkish women (Söğüt 2006, 236), due to the fact that she wanted to be just “inspired” [esinlenerek] (235), not completely led by the data she gathered from her aunt as she told about the past. Having worked on the novel for about a year, she published certain parts of it in journals. Especially after her mother’s reaction to the published sections of her novel, she saw that she was expected to write it like an autobiographical novel of the family with all ‘correct’ pieces of ‘information’, which is why she chose to forget about writing it (240-241). Another novel that needs to be mentioned is *Beşpeşe* [Five in a Row] (2004). It is an experimental novel, whose five chapters are written by five different authors, including Murathan Mungan, Faruk Ulay, Elif Şafak, Celil Oker and Pınar Kür. While Murathan

Mungan starts the novel and the following chapters are continued by the other authors, Pınar Kür finishes the novel by writing the final chapter.

There seem to be two main points made in the reception of Pınar Kür's novels in the field of Turkish literature. These are related to the different characteristics of her novels when compared with one another and sexuality in her novels. One of the most obvious characteristics in her writing is that Kür has always been in a quest as a novelist, searching for new subjects and techniques in narration. Kür, nevertheless, complains about the fact that her search for style as the novelist of *Küçük Oyuncu* was not even mentioned by literary critics [Biçim arayışının değerlendirilmesi hiç yapılmadı] as they had very negative views about the book and did not have the slightest idea that she did what she did on purpose (Söğüt 2006, 194). Although it might not have been understood at the time of this novel, there are references to her writing "distinct novels in terms of subject matter and narration technique" later after the publication of *Asılacak Kadın* with a comparative look at her first three novels [Kür, *Küçük Oyuncu*, *Asılacak Kadın* ve *Yarın Yarın* romanlarının yazarıdır. Romanlarının üçünün de, konuları ve yazılış biçimleri yönünden birbirlerinden ayrı oluşları dikkati çeker.] (Önertoy 1984, 212). While she has a novel on a specific historical period during which there was political clash in Turkey, she has another on love, regarded as 'postmodern' and there is also a crime novel, *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, which became the first of a trilogy. At this point, taking Kür's Turkish translation of *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* [*Roger Ackroyd Cinayeti*], written by Agatha Christie, and the positive comments made specifically about this Turkish translation of the author-translator (Üster 2003) into account can also help to see a connection between the author-translator's authorial and translatorial

habitus. Certain elements in the Agatha Christie novel she translated or the Greek tragedies she read, however, are not used similarly in the novels of the trilogy. Due to the fact that Kür does not write a typical crime novel, she opens a new place for the genre in the field of Turkish literature. Making an obvious difference in the “repertoire” (Toury 2002, 151) by writing the mentioned works of literature in particularly crime fiction and thus affecting the field with her own authorial habitus, which has already been related to her translatorial habitus, Pınar Kür appears as an “AGENT OF CHANGE” (ibid., emphasis original) or an “active idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur” in Even-Zohar’s (2005, 10) terms.

Secondly, sexuality in Kür’s novels have generally attracted attention. Nevertheless, it does not seem surprising that there is the expression of sexuality as part of the lives of characters in her novels. This is owing to the fact that Kür is a novelist who has been interested in ‘realism’ even in her PhD thesis and in whose “stylistically competent” novels, Atilla Özkırımlı (1987) asserts, “individual reality” and “social reality” are presented in relation to one another [Bireysel gerçeklikle toplumsal gerçekliğin birlikte kavranmaya çalışıldığı romanları biçim olarak da yetkinlik taşır] (788). As quoted by Refika Taner and Asım Bezirci (1990) in *Seçme Romanlar* [A Collection of Novels], Kür, rejecting the claim that sexuality is overemphasized in her novels, states that she “believes she is a realist author”, which is why there is sexuality “only where needed in the story” [(...) gerçekçi bir yazar olduğuma inanıyorum. (...) benim yapıtlarımda cinsellik yoğun biçimde yer almaz. (...) Ben yalnızca öykünün gerektiği yerde cinselliğe yer veriyorum.] (408). Thus, she does not disregard the presence of sexuality in the lives of the characters she creates but explains that scenes of

sexual intercourse are presented in the natural flow of the plot in accordance with real life.

Among all the novels Kür has written, *Yarın Yarın* and *Asılacak Kadın*, both of which have also been cinematized, seem to have attracted most attention. While the former motion picture was directed by Sami Güçlü in 1987, the latter was directed by Başar Sabuncu in 1986. However, as a result of these experiences and her “observations” [gözlem] in life, she believes the chances for a well-written literary work to be adapted well for the cinema are low [Sadece Türk sinemasında değil dünyada iyi bir kitabın iyi bir filme dönüştüğü her zaman görülüyor.] (Mithat Alam Film Merkezi 2006, 392). Another similarity between *Yarın Yarın* and *Asılacak Kadın* is that both have been banned, but later acquitted just like *Bitmeyen Aşk*.

Listed as one of “the 100 Turkish novels of the century” in *Yüzyılın 100 Türk Romanı* by Fethi Naci (2002), *Yarın Yarın*, similar to other “novels of March 12” [12 Mart Romanı], describes both the inner conflicts of “the young and the intellectuals” and their external conflicts with those who “interrogate or arrest” and “torture” them [(...) sorgulanan ya da tutuklanan gençlerin ve aydınların yaşantılarını, iç hesaplaşmalarını, sorgulama sırasında onlara uygulanan insanlık dışı muameleyi ve işkenceleri anlatır.] (Aksoy 2008, 28). *Yarın Yarın*, which is the very first novel Kür wrote while she was working as a dramaturge, as she had plenty of time at the theater and worked in a room without company for a few months (Söğüt 2006, 140), is “a novel read in one breath” [bir solukta okunan romanlardan] according to Fethi Naci (2002, 607). Kür, in *Yarın Yarın*, aptly presents not the life of the exploited but the exploiter, which is rarely seen in Turkish literature [Pınar Kür, sömürülenlerin pek bol ama sömürenlerin pek az olduğu

edebiyatımıza bir sömürücü çevresini büyük bir başarıyla sokuyor.] (ibid.). The main negative criticism in the reviews, however, seems to be about how Kür reflects the life of “the young revolutionists or workers” although she is powerful in describing the life of the bourgeois vividly, which is a point underlined by Fethi Naci [Pınar Kür burjuva çevrelerini büyük bir başarıyla anlatıyor. Ama devrimci gençleri ya da işçi çevrelerini anlatırken aynı başarı düzeyine ulaşamıyor;] (610). Fethi Naci claims the reason for this lack is her dependence on her creativity rather than real life in her description of the former [Pınar Kür, işçileri, işçi hareketlerini anlatırken toplumsal ve tarihsel gerçeklikten çok düş gücüne yaslanıyor.] (611). In response to this criticism, Kür points to the falsity of the comment about those characters, as her source of inspiration in creating them was totally from her own real life experiences with a worker [Gerçek hayattan birebir aldığım tek karakter oydu, onun yapay olduğu, gerçekçi olmadığı söylendi!] (Söğüt 2006, 175).

*Asılacak Kadın*, which was claimed to make use of obscenity just like *Bitmeyen Aşk*, is a novel which seems to have the biggest role in attracting attention to Kür’s identity as an author who gives utmost importance to women’s issues after the publication of her first three novels [Pınar Kür bu üç romanıyla ağırlığı kadınların sorunlarına veren yazar arasına girer.] (Önertoy 1984, 213). Indeed, Çin (2010) underlines that female characters in Kür’s fiction generally suffer from “unhappiness and loneliness” [(...) kadın kahramanların genelde, mutsuz ve yalnız kadınlar olduğu dikkatlerden kaçmaz] (264), which results from terrible experiences, such as “insult, beating, torture, harassment, and rape” [hakaret, dayak, işkence, taciz ve tecavüz] (272). Upon Mine Söğüt’s question concerning whether she loves writing short stories or

novels most, Pınar Kür stresses the place *Asılacak Kadın* has in not only her writing but also Turkish literature by giving the following response:

There is no such thing like I love that most. I should like the last one I wrote most because it shows the progress. But I can say that if an evaluation is made considering the Turkish novel, my biggest contribution to the literature, as I've already said, seems to have been *Asılacak Kadın*. This does not mean that I love it most, but considering its difference, strikingness, narrative techniques, the long stream of consciousness it has, technical impressiveness, etc., I believe, it needs to be noted as one of the most important works of Turkish literature.

[En çok şunu seviyorum diye bir şey yok; en son yazdığımı en çok sevmem gerekir, çünkü o günkü ilerlemeyi yansıtır. Ama şunu söyleyebilirim, Türk romanı açısından bir değerlendirme yapılırsa, benim edebiyata en büyük katkım daha önce de söyledim, *Asılacak Kadın*'la olmuştur herhalde. Bu onu en çok sevdiğim anlamına gelmesin, ama farklılığı, çarpıcılığı, anlatım özellikleri, çok uzun bilinç akımı bölümü olması, teknik etkileyicilikler vs. açısından bence tarihe Türk edebiyatının en önemli eserlerinden biri olarak geçmeli.] (Söğüt 2006, 264)

Inspired from a true story, Pınar Kür, in *Asılacak Kadın*, highlights the ill use of “woman as a tool of sexual exploitation” [(...) kadının bir cinsel sömürü aracı olarak yansıtıldığı görülür.] (ibid.) and tells the ‘same’ story from three different points of view: the judge of the court, the exploited woman who is sentenced to death, and the young man who murders the sexually powerless but economically powerful, old man, as he wants to save the exploited woman. The novel, composed of three chapters, each depicting one of the viewpoints, powerfully presents not only the events that took place before and after the exploitation and the murder but also the inner worlds of these three characters. The use of stream of consciousness in narration contributes to the presentation of the inner worlds. What also needs to be underlined in the narration of the novel is that each one of the characters can be recognized by their distinct language uses.

This adds to the vivid description in the novel, while revealing the meticulous care the author has shown in creating the characters.

Kür, who is well-known not only as an author but also as a translator, has translated a high number of well-known works of literature (Işık 2006, 2361), including those by Agatha Christie, Vincent Van Gogh, Vladimir Nabokov, Jeanette Winterson, and Jean Rhys. In fact, it is not her authorship, but translations which introduced her to the publishing field in Turkey. Considering the fact that the publishing houses that she was in contact with as a translator published her own works [Çevirmen olduğumdan dolayı tanıyorlardı beni, yazar olarak tanımıyorlardı.] (Aka 2011) and thus her symbolic capital as a translator paved the way for publishing her fiction and recognition in the field of Turkish literature, it is possible to highlight the positive influences of her translatorial habitus on her authorial habitus. After presenting when and why Kür started translating, her views concerning translation will be explored in relation to her translation practice, specifically translations of Rhys' novels. Explaining the reason for starting to do translations when she came back to Turkey, she states that she did it to earn money, but she tried to do it as meticulously as possible. She was aware of the positive effects of translating on one's use of language [Bunu para için yapıyorum, ama düzgün yapmaya çalışıyorum. Çeviri her zaman için insanın diline yardımcı olur.] (152). In response to my question concerning how she started translating, Kür gave this detailed response:

I came back from Paris. I did my PhD and I was unemployed. My child was very young. What shall I do, what shall I do?... At least as a job that I can do at home and take care of my child... A friend of my mother from school, Ramazan Gökalp Arkin... He passed away a short while ago. He had a publishing house and he was publishing an encyclopedia entitled Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi

[Encyclopedia of the Republic]. There I started working by getting pieces of texts on selected subjects. Rasih Güran was the head of this encyclopedia. He liked my translations very much. He first gave me a text and said, “go and write it”. I translated it, he checked the translation. He said, “Well, you’ve learned English in the US, French in France. Where did you learn Turkish?” He was so amazed. There I started translating. Encyclopedia of the Republic... By getting pieces of texts and translating them. Then, Ergin Telci, who is Ramazan Gökalp Arkın’s son-in-law, and his friend, Ercan Arıklı, decided to publish the first sex encyclopedia in Turkey. I continued working with them as the editor of that encyclopedia. Then I went to Ankara. There I translated novels and such. In other words, I started translating because I had to earn money and I could not get out of the house.

[Paris’ten döndüm. Doktoramı yaptım ve işsizdim. Çocuğum da çok ufaktı. N’apayım, n’apayım?... Bari hem çocuğuma bakacağım hem de evde yapabileceğim iş olarak... Annemin okuldan arkadaşı Ramazan Gökalp Arkın... Daha geçenlerde öldü. Onun bir yayınevi vardı ve Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi diye bir ansiklopedi yayınlıyordu. Orada işte parça parça konuları alarak başladım. Rasih Güran başındaydı bu ansiklopedinin. O çok beğendi. Önce bir parça verdi, ‘git, bunu yaz’ dedi. Çevirdim, baktı. ‘Aaa’ dedi, ‘İngilizce’yi Amerika’da öğrenmişsiniz, Fransızca’yı Fransa’da öğrenmişsiniz. Türkçe’yi nerede öğrendiniz?’ dedi. O kadar şaşırdı. Orada başladım. Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi... Parça parça alıp çevirerek... Ondan sonra gene Ramazan Gökalp Arkın’ın damadı olan Ergin Telci ve onun arkadaşı Ercan Arıklı, Türkiye’nin ilk seks ansiklopedisini çıkarmaya karar verdiler. Orada da onların editörlüğünü yaparak devam ettim. Sonra Ankara’ya gittim. Orada roman filan çevirdim. Yani para kazanmak zorunda olduğumdan ve evden çıkamadığım için başladım çevirmenliğe.] (Aka 2011)

Therefore, it was mostly as a result of the conditions in her private life that she started translating texts for first Encyclopedia of the Republic and then an encyclopedia on sexuality, for which she worked as the editor. After these experiences, she started translating fiction, the first of which, as far as Kür remembers, is her translation of *Moll Flanders*, written by Daniel Defoe [İlk yaptığım çeviri Daniel Defoe’nun *Moll Flanders* adlı kitabıydı galiba.] (Söğüt 2006, 139).

The first point worth underlining about Kür’s views concerning translation or her identity as a translator is related to the similarities she sees between writing and

translating and the importance she attaches to the characteristics of the source text that need to be preserved in translation. As an author-translator who is aware of the similarities between writing and translating, Kür (2011), in the interview I did with her for this study, explains that there is “creativity” at different “levels” in both acts [Şimdi ikisinde de belli ölçüde yaratıcılık var... Tabii yani, yazar olarak daha yaratıcısın ama çevirmenlik de yaratıcılık gerektiriyor, derece farkıyla.] She dwells on the fact that “creativity” is expected from the translator at times when “source expressions, discourses, differences in style” cannot be similarly translated into the target language [(...) yaratıcılık niye gerekebiliyor çevirmen için? Çünkü kaynak dildeki bir takım deyimler, söylemler, üslup farklılıkları, erek dilde her zaman tam karşılığı olmayan şeyler. Dolayısıyla bunun tam karşılığını, gerçek karşılığını bulmak zorunda ve bunun için de belli bir yaratıcı çaba gerekiyor.]. Although she seems to have the idea that some source words or expressions have “the exact correspondent” in the target language, it is worth underlining that she refers to translations like ‘istersen üstümü ara’ [if you want, search me] for the source expression ‘search me’, which, in the context it is used, ‘means’ ‘how should I know’ and could be translated into Turkish as ‘ne bileyim ben’ [‘Search me’ İngilizce’de ‘ne bileyim ben’ demek. Fakat bunu çeviren ‘istersen üstümü ara’ diye çevirmiş.]. In addition to such missed messages in the source and the target texts in cases of translations done by rather incompetent translators, Kür is also directing attention to “creativity”. Thus, she is aware of the different possibilities in translating the same word or expression. That is why she states “translation is not such an easy task” which can be done by anyone who knows a foreign language well [(...) çeviri öyle kolay bir iş değil ve ne yazık ki yayınevleri, hele son zamanlarda, daha ucuza getirmek için,

herhangi bir kolej mezununun yapabileceğini zannediyorlar.]. While explaining her point, she states that “even if there is less work to be done, the translator has to deal with all related to grammar, knowledge of the two languages and creativity” [(...) daha az bile olsa, hem dilbilgisi açısından, iki dili bilmek açısından hem de yaratıcılık açısından çevirmene iş düşüyor.]. Here she appears to continue comparing the translator to the author in response to my question and implies that the translator may be considered to have less work than the author in the production of a work, as all the details concerning the plot and characters of a literary work, for instance, are created by the author, unlike the translator of that text. This, Kür claims, is a result of solely “the author’s own consciousness, life and experiences”, not “just the repetition of the same text in another language” [(...) yazarın tamamıyla kendi bilincinden, kendi hayatından, kendi yaşam tecrübelerinden ortaya çıkarak yarattığı bir şey var. Ötekisi sadece onun bir başka dildeki tekrarı.] Regarding the fact that any kind of language use can be seen as a product of one’s consciousness and experiences in life, Kür’s concern here seems to be about the creation of the plot and characters, not simply the language. Interestingly, despite her awareness and respect for the task of translation, Kür’s discourse here sounds as if she does not value translating as much as writing. On the one hand, Kür maintains there is creativity in not only writing but also translating. On the other hand, she describes translating as “just the repetition of the same text in another language” [sadece onun bir başka dildeki tekrarı.] (Aka 2011). This appears as a noteworthy contradiction in her discourse on the task of translating. Nonetheless, it needs to be borne in mind that she first gives a long response to my question concerning the similarities between translating and writing with an emphasis on the sometimes overlooked presence of

‘creativity’ in the rather ‘difficult’ task of translating. It is in the end of this response that she mentions an obvious difference between the two acts. Indeed, Kür undoubtedly makes the point that the two acts resemble one another in another interview done by Fatih Özgüven while talking specifically about her translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*:

(...) I very much liken writing fiction to good literary translation. In the former, you recreate the real life and in the latter, you recreate the life written by somebody in another language. They say it is not possible to do a translation which is both faithful and beautiful. I believe this is wrong because just as you add something from your own while recreating life, it is doubtless that you add something from your own while creating the novel in another language –of course on the condition that you do not go contrary to what the author says.

[(...) özgün edebiyat yazmakla iyi edebiyat çevirisi yapmayı ben çok birbirine benzetiyorum. Birincisinde yaşanan hayatı yeniden yaratıyorsun, ötekinde başkasının yazdığı hayatı başka bir dilde yeniden yaratıyorsun. Hem sadık hem güzel çeviri olmaz derler, bence bu yanlış. Çünkü hayatı yeniden yaratırken nasıl kendinden birşeyler katıyorsan, romanı da başka bir dilde yaratırken şüphesiz kendinden birşeyler katıyorsun – yazarın dediğinin tersine gitmemek koşuluyla tabii.] (Kür in Özgüven 1983, 132-133)

It is, therefore, apparent that Kür sees major similarities between the acts of writing and translating literary works when done with care. She highlights the need to be cautious about the translation of the source text into the target language while pointing to the fact that ‘creativity’ is also required for the translator of a literary text in writing it again in the target language.

Related to the above discussed point, it is of vital importance to put emphasis on the fact that Kür is against using local expressions as a result of which the target text loses its identity as a translation and appears to the target reader as an ‘original’. This point also deserves attention because the ‘creativity’ she advocates does not include adapting the source text to the tastes of the target reader. She considers it “wrong” to turn the voice of the source author into the voice of a Turkish author ‘originally’

speaking the local language, as she believes it is of utmost importance to reveal the fact that “this is a translation” [Çok Türkçe’ye oturtmak, yani sesi çok Türkçe yapmak istemiyorum. Yapmayı yanlış buluyorum. Bunun bir çeviri olduğunun belli olması lazım.]. Having referred to Can Yücel, who, she thinks, has given “successful” examples of such translations in Turkish [Bunu başarılı yapanların en büyük örneği, Can Yücel’dir Türkçe’de.], she notes his Turkish translation of Arthur Miller’s *Cadı Kazanı* [*The Crucible*], in which Can Yücel prefers to use the expression ‘horon tepmek’, an expression used to describe a traditional, local dance in Turkey, while translating a scene of satanic ceremony [Kızlar mesela şeytan töreninde dans ediyorlar, şeytanı çağırıyorlar hikayede. Türkçe’de Can Yücel ‘gece horon tepiyorlar’ demiş.]. Disapproving such translations due to the fact that she is against using “very local expressions” while translating into Turkish and chooses to pay particular attention to the “features of the source language” [Türkçe’de çok lokal olan lafları kesinlikle kullanmıyorum. Tam tersine, o yaratıldığı kaynak dilin özelliklerini çok bozmadan...], she shows the significance she attaches to the representation of the source text in the target language as well as the voice(s) in the source text. Remembering the fact that Pınar Kür is an author-translator who has written a novel like *Asılacak Kadın* and has been interested in translating Rhys’ novels, which, to a certain extent, narrate the experiences of the oppressed, it is possible to assert that she is aware of the importance of one’s power to speak in her own voice (Spivak 1988) and attentive to the voices of those who are unprivileged. Unlike the misrepresentation of “widow-sacrifice” (Spivak 1988, 281), discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, for instance, Kür seems to show meticulous care about the presentation of identities through translation and thus “the role played by

language for the agent” (Spivak 2000, 397). Therefore, it is possible to maintain that Kür, as a powerful agent in her translatorial habitus, does not resemble the translators, criticized by Holland et al. (1998, 25) for not caring about the colonized woman authors’ voice. For instance, *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz [Wide Sargasso Sea]* attracted my attention with the ‘strangeness’ created through the locals’ language use. This is an essential characteristic of both the target and source texts, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5. Kür (in Özgüven 1983, 133) explains that translating the language of the locals has been “the biggest technical challenge” [En büyük teknik sorunum (...)]. This is due to the special effort that needs to be made to create a similar effect in the target text while translating the grammatical ‘mistakes’ made by the local people despite the structural differences between Turkish and English. In addition, Kür states that she specifically aimed at creating a similar effect while avoiding “resemblance to a known dialect in Turkish” [(...) üstelik yerli dilini Türkçe’de bilinen hiçbir lehçeye benzetmeden vermek istedim.], as this would be a misrepresentation. Thus, far from erasing certain characteristics of the source text, Kür highlights her aim to ‘truly’ present the identity of the target text as translation and her Turkish translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea* stands for evidence for this precision of hers.

There are several points that need to be stressed about Pınar Kür’s translations of Jean Rhys’ novels. Related to Kür’s powerful role in translation, it is, first of all, important to highlight that the “process of selection (what is to be translated, what is to be published, who it will be translated by, who will publish it)” (Bourdieu 1999, 222) was fully completed by Pınar Kür in the publication of her Jean Rhys translations. In our interview, Kür clarifies that she is the one who suggested their publication “because she

liked Jean Rhys very much as an author” and actually “urged the publishing house to translate them” into Turkish [Jean Rhys’ı yazar olarak çok beğendiğim için, özellikle yani üstüne ben gittim. Ben zorladım yayınevini bunları çevirin diye.]. Upon my question concerning whether there have been works that she translated with personal interest or that had some kind of an importance for her writing or translating, she stated that Jean Rhys has a special place for her:

Especially Jean Rhys... Her life story has also saddened me very much. She is forgotten for a very long period. She does not exist. I hadn’t heard her name before I saw *Good Morning, Midnight* [*Günaydın Geceyarısı*], a book of hers. It was a new edition. Then I learned that this book wasn’t published after the 1940s. Nobody published her book. After the appearance of *Wide Sargasso Sea* in 1967, it was suddenly discovered and her works were later published once again. (...) *Günaydın Geceyarısı* was the first novel of hers that I read. I was very impressed but then I read *Wide Sargasso Sea*. I first translated it. Then I found the others one by one and translated them. She is a person that I like.

[Jean Rhys özellikle çok... Hayatı da çok üzmüştür beni. Çok uzun bir dönem unutuluyor. Varlığı yok. Ben hiç adını duymamıştım, *Günaydın Geceyarısı* diye bir kitabı geçti elime. Yeni baskı. Sonra öğrendim ki bu 1940’lardan sonra hiç basılmamış. Kimse basmamış bu kadının kitabını. 67’de *Wide Sargasso Sea*’yi ortaya çıkarınca, birdenbire keşfedilmiş ve eserleri sonradan tekrar basılmış. (...) ilk okuduğum kitabı benim, *Günaydın Geceyarısı*’ydı. Çok etkilenmişim ama sonra *Wide Sargasso Sea*’yi okudum. İlk onu çevirdim. Sonra ötekileri sırasıyla ben de buldum ve çevirdim. Sevdiğim bir insan.] (Aka 2011)

In addition to the fact that she is the one who chooses the source text to be translated into Turkish, she writes a preface to her translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Being “the writer of the preface” (Bourdieu 1999, 222), she adds to the roles she carries as an important agent in the publishing of Rhys’ works. As Kür points out in the above quoted part of her speech during the interview, she is not only touched by Rhys’ life story but also likes Rhys and her novels, the first of which she read was *Good Morning, Midnight*. These appear to be the main reasons why she decides to introduce Rhys’ works to the

Turkish readership. Remembering the fact that translators' choosing to introduce a source author mainly because s/he admires her work is influential in fortifying her/his place in the field (ibid.), this fact deserves to be underlined. Furthermore, as Kür explains in her preface to *Wide Sargasso Sea*, discussed in the introduction of this thesis, it is at a "point of stagnation in [her] own writing" (Kür 1989b, 5) that she decides to translate it into Turkish. As a result, at the time, she hoped to "gain personal strength and make it possible to introduce a very important writer to Turkish readership" (ibid.). It is here noteworthy that Kür, while responding to one of my questions concerning author-translators, stated that she thinks author-translators are "more selective than translators" in choosing the works to translate [Yazar-çevirmen tabii ki sadece çevirmen olandan daha seçicidir gibi geliyor.]. Therefore, considering the fact that it is especially after Kür starts to publish her own work that she prefers to translate works that she "likes", that she "feels close to or that has excessively affected" her [Kendi eserlerimi yayınlamaya başladıktan sonradır ki sevdiğim, illa ki kendime yakın bulduğum veya da beni çok aşırı etkilemiş...] can also help to interpret Kür's translating four novels by Rhys.

Secondly, there is the question whether Pınar Kür and Jean Rhys have similar styles in writing or whether there has been an influence of Kür's writing style on the translation of Rhys' novels, specifically *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Referring to Atilla İlhan's metaphor 'blood type' that is expected to be shared by the source author and the translator, Fatih Özgüven (1983) asks if there is such a relationship between Pınar Kür and Jean Rhys. Kür prefers to use the term "affinity" or "uzak akrabalık" [collateral lineage] rather than 'blood type' while describing her relationship with Jean Rhys. Underlining not only her love for Rhys but also similarities between their writing styles,

Kür elucidates that she does not think she has made her own style apparent in her Rhys translations. However, a reader of hers, she reports, has recognized a similarity, as s/he thought they both narrate emotional events quite rationally, without making subjective remarks. Most interesting of all here is questioning whether there is a similarity between the two authors' styles. This is owing to the fact that my investigation of the past discourse on author-translators in *Tercüme* (1940-1966) has demonstrated that the stylistic features in literary works were considered crucial in their translations and that stylistically similar texts in translation could be created only when rendered into Turkish by poet or author-translators. Therefore, in this interview done in the 1980s, a similar focus on stylistic features seen in the source author's and the author-translator's own writing is observed. Kür states that she "doesn't think that she reflects her own style" in her translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea* [(...) kendi üslubumu kitaba yansıtıp yansıtmadığımı da sordu. Sanmıyorum.] (Özgüven 1983, 132). In the interview done for this study, Kür made a similar comment with a wider look on her own writing and translating. She believes there is not an apparent interaction between her writing and translating: "Now... I don't think there are obvious similarities. (...) If one writes a novel and translates another at the same time, there may be an interaction between the two, but there was no such thing [for me]." [Şimdi... belirgin benzerlikler olduğunu zannetmiyorum. (...) Hem romanı yazıyorum hem çeviri yapıyorum, dolayısıyla birbirini etkileyebilir ama öyle bir durum olmuyordu.]. Kür is an author-translator who generally chooses to translate books during the breaks between two works. In other words, she starts to translate after she finishes working on a novel of hers, before starting to work on a new novel or a collection of short stories so that she does not estrange herself from

the act of writing [(...) ikinci bir kitaba başlama aşamasına gelmeden önce, ben genellikle elim durmasın diye çeviri yaparım.]. Except for her “effort” to “discover” new words or expressions in Turkish in rather challenging cases of translation, which also has a positive effect on her writing, she does not think there is an interaction [(...) karşılığını bulma için gösterdiğim çabayla kendi dilimde bir takım şeyler keşfedebiliyorum. Bazen de edemiyorum. (...) kendi dil dağarcığımı zorlamama sebep olduğu için, kendi dilimi daha iyi tanımama da yardımcı olabiliyor. Başka bir etkileşim var mı, bilmiyorum.]. About possible influences of her writing on her translating, she attaches importance to her power as an author-translator to comprehend what the author wants to say while translating especially the works of an author she loves. She adds that she pays attention to being “faithful” to the source text because as an author-translator, she knows and understands “what the other author has been through” in the process of “creating” the source text [Yazarın ne demek istediğini kavrayabiliyorsun. Onu daha baştan söyledim. Kavramak meselesi. Yazarın ne demek istediğini, derinliğini... Sevdiğin de bir yazar olunca... Yazar, öbür yazarın neler çektiğini bildiği için yaratırken... O, tabii, daha anlayışlı ve sadık kalmama yardımcı oluyor.]. In short, Kür does not think that there is an interaction between her writing and translating styles. The only areas that she believes there are interactions are the discoveries she makes about the use of Turkish while translating and her ability to understand the source author ‘better’ as an author-translator, which helps her to aim at translating ‘faithfully’. It should be noted once again that the ‘faithful’ translation she refers to includes the use of ‘creativity’ in literary translation, as word-for-word translation, for instance, does not result in creating target effects similar to those in the source. Nevertheless, this

‘creativity’ does not accept the use of local expressions in the target text, which leads to hiding the identity of the target text as translation and to presenting it as an ‘original’.

It is also interesting that despite her belief that readers may choose to buy author-translators’ translations just as she prefers to read translations only when rendered into Turkish by certain translators, otherwise either in the source language or another foreign language that she knows [(...) ben genelde bakarım kim çevirmiş diye. Eğer İngilizce’den çeviren bir iki tane benim beğendiğim kişi var... Onlardan biriye, okurum. Yoksa aslını okurum kitabın. (...) Rusça’dan n’apayım, n’apayım, aslından okuyamıyorum. Kendi bildiğim, yabancı dillerde okumayı tercih ediyorum çeviri Türkçe’nin yerine.], Kür thinks there is not much interest in the field of Turkish literary translation, or rather in the publishing sector, for translations done particularly by author-translators [Edebiyat dünyasında yok pek. Okur açısından vardır. Okur ‘ben aa Pınar Kür’ün çevirisini okuyayım,’ diyebilir ama yayınevleri, demin de söylediğim gibi, ne kadar ucuza yaptırabilirsek, o kadar ucuza yaptıralım düşüncesinde oldukları için...]. There are certainly times that she sees a demand by the publishing house for her translation of a certain work of literature especially when they see a relation between her own work and the work to be translated [(...) bazen bana geliyor mesela bizim yayınevinden ‘Pınar Hanım bunu siz çevirir misiniz? Bu size göre bir şey’ falan gibi.]. This can be interpreted as the influence of the authorial habitus on the author-translator choices of the publishing houses which are important agents in the field of translated literature. However, one of the main aims of the publishing houses seems to be to economize while getting translations done, not to publish translations mostly rendered by author-translators. Thus Pınar Kür cannot see a general tendency in the field of

Turkish literary translation to opt for translations done by author-translators, rather than translators.

### **Summary**

In this chapter I started with the presentation of Pınar Kür's biography with a focus on points that seem to have had an influence on her identity as an author-translator and then continued with the reception of her own works in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation. I paid attention to sources of influence in Kür's family, and education as well as her personality and work experience, which has a vital role in describing Pınar Kür's habitus in the Turkish literary field and the field of literary translation in the former part of the chapter. The discussion of the reception of her works included not only her well-known novels and short stories but also her early work in poetry, drama and translations. As has already been noted, Kür's symbolic capital, increased with her translations, continued to grow even more with the publication of her novels, which is one indication of the influence of one on the other. Considering the importance of the relationship between the two tasks, I explored Pınar Kür's agency in her own writing and translating. For this reason, in addition to the discussion of when and why she started translating, I studied her views on translation through an analysis of the gathered extratextual data in relation to her translation practice.

In Chapter 4, I will explore Pınar Kür's authorial style with a meticulous look at interactions between the two of her novels, *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, and her translations of Jean Rhys' novels, published between 1982 and 1992.

## CHAPTER 4

### ANALYSIS OF PINAR KÜR'S NOVELS

This chapter presents the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the two novels written by Pınar Kür: *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. In the investigation of these two novels, quantitative analysis takes place both at the beginning stages and whenever a need arises for quantitative data during the qualitative analysis. Therefore, in addition to the results of the quantitative analysis presented at the beginning of the discussion on the corpus, there will be references to the Wordsmith results in the process of interpreting data that specifically appear during the qualitative analysis. This is to arrive at reliable conclusions through the use of two different sources of data. It is also worth restating that this is a data driven study, i.e. the features to be explored are not selected prior to the study. A thorough analysis of Pınar Kür as author-translator has already been carried out in the previous chapter, which provides the background on which the results of the study of Kür's own novels in this chapter and also translations of Rhys' novels in the next chapter can be better interpreted.

While the quantitative analysis of *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* has revealed similarities concerning the most frequently used words, particularly function words, and the use of content words, which draws attention to the plots of the two novels, the qualitative analysis has shown that Pınar Kür has a postmodern approach in her writing of these two novels and she is interested in distinct language uses by different characters or narrators. It needs to be noted that when a parallelism is noticed between the patterns in Kür's own novels and those in the translations, these points will

be underlined in the discussion. Therefore, there will be references to the translations in the discussion on *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* whenever a point needs to be highlighted. Considering the fact that translated novels remain to be studied at this point of the thesis, I will draw attention to only the interactions that appear as a result of this chapter's focus on the foregrounded features in Kür's novels. The major interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles spotted in this chapter are Pınar Kür's search for the 'new' in her writing and translating, use of multiple narrative voices, which is a similarity between her novels and particularly *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, and the possibility to associate different language features with different characters or narrators.

### ***Bitmeyen Aşk and Bir Cinayet Romanı***

Among the six texts in the corpus of this study, *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986) and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (1989) are the two novels written by Pınar Kür. Both the quantitative and qualitative analyses reveal that there are noteworthy similarities between the two novels. First of all, Wordsmith tools show that the type/token ratios of *Bitmeyen Aşk* (2008) and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (2007) are quite close:

Table 1. Statistical Data for *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*

Book Titles	Tokens	Types	T/T Ratio	Sentences
<i>Bitmeyen Aşk</i>	118,813	27,482	23.13	14,132
<i>Bir Cinayet Romanı</i>	77,713	19,735	25.39	9,763

The fact that the number of tokens, types and sentences are higher in *Bitmeyen Aşk* than *Bir Cinayet Romanı* obviously owes to the difference between the lengths of the two

novels. When the ratios are checked, however, a similarity can be noticed. The number of distinct words used in each novel does not change significantly although the total number of words used in the novels varies.

Secondly, the wordlist tool of Wordsmith helps to observe that the most frequently used words in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* are almost the same. The first twenty items in the lists of words used in the two novels demonstrate that Pınar Kür opts for the use of the same function words with minor differences. Investigation of the use of function words may seem to be a less fruitful area, but it should be noted that most of the outstanding research on translator style done in the field of corpus-based studies has findings including those related to the use of function words (Baker 2000; Bosseaux 2007; Winters 2005). For this reason, the fact that all the words in the first twenty of *Bitmeyen Aşk*, except for one function word, that is ‘ki’ [that], appear in the first twenty of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* deserves attention. The function word ‘ki’ [that] appears in the former as the twenty-second most frequently used word, while it is the eighteenth in the latter. In line with this minor rank difference, all the rest of these function words are used in similar frequency in the two novels. For instance, while ‘bu’ [this] appears at the fourth place in the word list of the former novel, it is in the third place in that of the latter. Another example is ‘daha’ [more], showing one of the two highest rank differences, as it is in the seventh place in one and twelfth in the other. Considering the fact that Sinan, one of the main characters in *Bitmeyen Aşk*, reveals his greed in his love life or to say the least, puts emphasis on how passionate he is in his love affair with Nilgün, this repeated use of ‘daha daha’ [more and more] shows that function words can also give clues about the content of the novels. While the only

question word is ‘ne’ [what] in the first twenty of the two lists, ‘ama’ [but] and ‘ve’ [and] are the two linking words, which find place in the first ten of both lists. The only other linking word in the first twenty in both is ‘sonra’ [then]. Not surprisingly, all these words are function words, not content words, which seems to be the most significant reason why the wordlists of the two novels appear similar at the top of the lists. In other words, the frequency of function words does not change much despite changes in content when these two novels are compared.

A comparison of these novels with the four translations, done by Kür, also reveals similarities between the use of function words that appear at the top of the wordlists. To illustrate, except for seven words, all the top twenty words of *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] are also in the first twenty of the most frequently used words of the other three translations. Considering the fact that the comparison here is between four texts, not two, and that half of these seven instances of rank difference are in the first twenty-five of the other texts, the differences do not seem to be striking. Nevertheless, when compared with the wordlists of the novels written by Kür, the difference deserves attention. She seems to be slightly more consistent in her writing than translating. Among the translations, the one that differs most from *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] with four words in the first twenty is *Dörtlülük* [*Quartet*]. A comparative look at the wordlists of *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Dörtlülük* shows three main results. To begin with, the major difference between the two translations seems to be the frequent use of the name of the characters in *Dörtlülük* [*Quartet*], as a result of which the names of the all three main characters appear in the first twenty. This result shows that Kür does not stick to her own preferences and pays attention to Rhys’ different

preferences in different novels. Secondly, there are similarities which match those between her two novels. For instance, the same three linking words as those in Kür's own novels appear in the first twenty of the two translations: 'ama' [but], 've' [and], and 'sonra' [then]. The question word 'ne' [what] also finds place in the top ranks of the two lists for these translations just like her own novels. Thirdly, some of the rank differences are relatively more noteworthy than those between her own novels. For example, 'o' [s/he/ it] is in the third place of the list for the former translation, whereas it appears in the thirteenth place for the latter. These differences between the translations as well as those between her novels and translations can be considered evidence for the fact that although some function words naturally appear at the top of the lists due to the structure of Turkish language, Kür's own preferences in writing and attention to Rhys' preferences in translating are certainly of influence. In some cases it is difficult to make sure whether the language uses that are related to grammar and common in her writing and translating are a result of her own preferences or the Turkish language. This is due to the fact that to my knowledge corpora of Turkish novels written by other authors are unavailable at the moment. After establishing such subcorpora, it will be possible to better check the degree to which the structure of Turkish language affects such results. Establishing corpora of Turkish novels by various authors has not been considered a requirement for the exploration of this thesis topic, but it can certainly be part of a further study. As a result of such research, it can be possible to know whether these language uses are specifically a reflection of Pınar Kür's authorial style.

Although a focus on content words is more appealing in the case of comparing target and source texts than 'original's, as they may direct attention to changes in effect

on the reader, exploring the most frequently used content words in ‘originals’ leads to finding key words concerning the plots and themes of the novels. The table below demonstrates a selection of the most frequently used content words from *Bitmeyen Aşk* (2008) and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (2007):

Table 2. Frequently Used Content Words in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*

Book Titles	Aşk- [Love]	Seviş- [To make love]	Sevgili- [Lover]	Cinsel- [Sexual]	Cinayet- [Murder]	Öldür- [To kill]
<i>Bitmeyen Aşk</i>	287	76	103	58	6	64
<i>Bir Cinayet Romanı</i>	78	26	53	12	258	290

The reason why there is a hyphen after each one of the words given in the table above is that they are all lemmas. To illustrate, in the case of ‘aşk’, not only ‘aşk’ [love] but also ‘aşk’ with suffixes, such as ‘aşkla’ [with love], are added to the total number. The most apparent result found by checking the quantitative data in Table 2 is that the number of times the first four lemmas are used in *Bitmeyen Aşk* is significantly higher than that in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* while the last two columns show the more frequent use of two words in the latter than the former. The difference is again significantly high. This data shows that there are not only strong feelings like love but also terrifying plans like murder in both novels. Besides this similarity of minor importance, the main point is that the focus in *Bitmeyen Aşk* is more on love and sexuality than murder while the opposite is true for *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, which is a finding in line with the titles and plots of the two books.

Before presenting the recurrent patterns in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, spotted during qualitative analysis, it seems appropriate at this stage to introduce the place of the two novels in terms of publication dates among the other

works that came before and after *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and their plots and discuss the criticisms they have received briefly. *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986) is a novel written by Pınar Kür after the publication of her two short story collections. It took several years for Kür to write this new novel after *Asılacak Kadın*, which was published in 1979. This, Kür explains, was a result of the fact that she did not have an interest in writing a long piece of work during the period of September 12 coup d'état, as these were “terribly bad” [korkunç kötü] days (Söğüt 2006, 281). Thus she published two collections of short stories during this period: *Bir Deli Ağaç* (1981) and *Akışı Olmayan Sular* (1983). While writing *Bitmeyen Aşk*, she states, she was thinking over the love relationships she had and in the novel she “did an analysis of all” she experienced with the men she fell in love with until then [Bütün yaşadıklarımın bir analizini yaptım orada ben.] (282). Kür elucidates that she developed a theory she called “mirror theory” [ayna kuramı] because she claims love is possible when people meet somebody in whose mirror they find the opportunity to see their own beautifully reflected image they desire to see [İnsan kendi kendisini görmek istediği gibi yansıtan birine aşık oluyor.] (283). Therefore, almost regardless of the qualities of the beloved, people may be dazzled by their own admirable image in the mirror or the eyes and words of the person who is in love with them.

In *Bitmeyen Aşk*, there is the story of Nilgün and Sinan, who fall in love with each other, drift apart, come across one another years later, get married, and continue to have problems in their relationship. On the one hand, because Sinan is Nilgün's first real love, the man with whom she experiences her first sexual intercourse and the father of the child she decides to abort in his absence, she is deeply affected by the fact that Sinan

seems to have forgotten all about her and does not show up during the time she keeps waiting for him. On the other hand, Sinan cannot make the moves he plans and cannot arrive at the hotel, where Nilgün has long waited for him, in time. In spite of his love for Nilgün, Sinan, under the influence of economically powerful members of his family, marries a girl his family considers appropriate. In the meantime, Nilgün goes out and makes love with various other boys and men, even with those who have serious relationships or are married, but always feels the need to compare them with Sinan and cannot fall asleep before imagining how she murders Sinan each and every night. Then she gets married, too, but cheats on her husband with another man in the second year of their marriage just as Sinan cheats on Suna continuously. After Nilgün and Sinan come across one another and decide that they are still in love, they choose to get married. Nevertheless, they have quarrels about economic problems and past relationships with other men and women, which brings too much tension to their marriage.

In terms of criticisms, those related to ‘obscenity’ in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and literary figures’ as well as readers’ reactions to the trial deserve attention, as the publication of the book was banned for four years. The description of Nilgün’s first sexual intercourse is clearly among the scenes that resulted in Pınar Kür’s having undergone a trial after the publication of *Bitmeyen Aşk*. Kür regards this description of crucial importance in narrating the love affair [Kızın özellikle ilk cinsel deneyimini yazmanın çok gerekli olduğunu düşünüyordum. Bir aşk anlatılırken ilk cinsel deneyim olmazsa olmaz.] and she states, she did not have the slightest idea that her book could be accused of “obscenity” [(...) aklıma gelecek son şey bunun müstehcen sayılacağıydı.] (Söğüt 2006, 285). However, *Bitmeyen Aşk* could not escape from being banned from 1986 until

1990. Kür has two claims concerning the trial and reactions from the field of Turkish literature. First of all, she underlines the fact that the parts that were asserted to depict obscenity were 11 pages long in total, while the whole book was 535 pages long in its first publication. This, she maintains, is such a small ratio that sexuality or obscenity cannot be considered to be in the focus of the book [Beş yüz otuz beş sayfada on bir sayfa ne ki?] (286).

Secondly, she thinks, the fact that she described sexuality in a period when “there were no woman authors who wrote about sexuality as comfortably as [she] did” [Kadın yazarlar arasında cinselliği benim gibi rahat anlatan yok ki o zaman.] (Söğüt 2006, 286) had a major role in the lack of reaction from the other authors in the field of Turkish literature. Referring to Virginia Woolf’s point concerning the difference between the ‘I’ of a woman and the ‘I’ of a man, Sibel Irzık and Jale Parla (2009), in their preface to *Kadınlar Dile Düşünce* [When Women Fall into Language], underline that there are major differences between how and how much woman authors can say ‘I’ when compared with men [Edebiyat alanında da kadınların ve erkeklerin farklı biçim ve derecelerde, farklı sınırlar içinde “ben” diyebildiklerini (...)] (9). This is due to the control mechanisms of the “patriarchal” [ataerkil] societies “over the voices, identities, and bodies of women” [kadınların sesleri, kimlikleri, bedenleri üzerinde] (ibid.). In line with this point, here the attempt, according to Kür, is against woman authors’ describing sexuality in such clarity. This is because when it is a male author who writes about sexuality, he does not receive such reaction. As, according to Kür’s claim, such texts were expected not to be written by female authors in that period of Turkish literature [(...) hakkı yok sanki bir kadının cinselliği ele almak gibi bir erkeksi bakış açısı vardı.]

(287), the Union of Authors in Turkey did not support her in this process [Yazarlar Sendikası bana destek çıkmadı.] (288). This is similar to Kür's writing from male characters' point of view, as it also received some critics' negative reviews when *Akıştı Olmayan Sular* was published, which is discussed in the section on the reception of Pınar Kür in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation in Chapter 3. Just as she did not stop writing from male characters' point of view as a result of those criticisms, the criticisms or rather the norm in the field concerning the description of sexuality by woman authors did not lead to her being silenced. This reveals the fact that she acts as an "AGENT OF CHANGE" (Toury 2002, 151, emphasis original) and "cultural entrepreneur" (Even-Zohar 2005, 10) in her authorial habitus at that specific time in the field of Turkish literature. Kür also directs attention to the readers' reception of *Bitmeyen Aşk* and states that it has always been positive and she has received no negative comments or questions about the sexuality in the book [Bu kitabın okurlar tarafından bana gelen yansımaları hep iyi oldu. Hapishanede okuyanlar bile kalkıp "Bu cinsellik nedir böyle," demediler.] (289). My exploration of the blogs and other internet sites where readers have commented on Pınar Kür and specifically *Bitmeyen Aşk* has also shown there are usually comments about Kür's identity as an author by those who have read her works or her personality mostly by those who have watched her on NTV<sup>6</sup>. In the less frequent instances of comments about the novel, mostly the fact that it is a

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.itusozluk.com/goster.php/p%FDnar+k%FCr/>; <http://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/pinar-kür/>

long novel and that the novel is told by three different narrators are underlined<sup>7</sup>. In addition to this point, some recommend specifically *Bitmeyen Aşk* to other readers<sup>8</sup>. Moreover, one of those narrators', Sinan's, well-depicted, terrible character, which is hard to tolerate, appears to have attracted attention<sup>9</sup>. It is, therefore, possible to claim that there have been different reactions about 'obscenity' in *Bitmeyen Aşk*, as readers of the book do not seem to have a focus on the discussed aspect of the novel, at least in their comments, which is in line with Kür's claim.

*Bir Cinayet Romanı* was published for the first time in 1989, three years after *Bitmeyen Aşk*. In addition to its plot, the fact that it is the first of a trilogy deserves attention. The 'author' as one of the characters in the novel has assigned other characters, like the mathematics professor, who has the role of a detective, the duty of keeping diaries. These diaries will appear in *Ölümün Vazgeçilmez Çekiciliği* [*The Indispensable Charm of Death*], the novel the 'author' is planning to write. Due to the role the 'author' plays in this process of commissioning and evaluating of the diaries, she is "in direct contact with the other characters of the novel" [Romanın kahramanlarıyla birebir ilişki içindedir.] (Özcan 2005, 123). Although the 'author' knows the roles of each one of the characters very well, the characters only know they are characters of a novel. In other words, they do not have a clear idea as to whether they

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://cikolatacikolata.blogspot.com/2011/06/bitmeyen-ask-pinar-kur.html>;  
<http://www.eksisozluk.com/show.asp?t=bitmeyen+ask>;  
<http://kedilervekitaplar.blogspot.com/2010/07/pnar-kurun-romanlar.html>

<sup>8</sup> <http://modernkadinlar.com/?p=1196>

<sup>9</sup> <http://cikolatacikolata.blogspot.com/2011/06/bitmeyen-ask-pinar-kur.html>;  
<http://www.eksisozluk.com/show.asp?t=bitmeyen+ask>

are the murderer, the victim or the witness, but they generally continue to obey the ‘commands’ of the ‘author’ as if their lives were a play on stage. Because *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is the first of a trilogy, *Sonuncu Sonbahar* and *Cinayet Fakültesi*, the two novels that follow the publication of *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, can be read to learn about the important details concerning the identity of the murderer and the victim as well as the source of motivation for the murder. Pınar Kür does not inform her readership about the coming novels of the sequence. A. Ömer Türkeş (2006) indeed speculates that while working on *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, Pınar Kür might not have envisioned writing a trilogy, the final novel of which came seventeen years after *Bir Cinayet Romanı* [1989 yılında *Bir Cinayet Romanı*’nı yazdığında, herhalde, sonunu tam on yedi yıl sonra getireceğini kendisi de tahmin etmemiştii Pınar Kür.]. This, actually, is verified by Kür in *Aşkın Sonu Cinayettir*, as she states that she “didn’t know” it would be a trilogy, either [Aslında bu polisyelerin devam edeceğini ben bilmiyordum.] (Söğüt 2006, 332). For this reason, her readers including some scholars, not expecting this to be a trilogy, naturally interpreted *Bir Cinayet Romanı* on its own or drew conclusions after having read the first two. For instance, Sagaster (2006, 140), after having read the first two, concludes that the ‘author’, who assigns the task of keeping diaries in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, is the ‘real’ murderer and the characters in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and *Sonuncu Sonbahar* belong to the fictive world. Although *Cinayet Fakültesi*, Pınar Kür’s “gift to her readership in the thirtieth year” of her writing career [Yazar, 30’uncu yılında okurlarına yeni bir roman hediye edecek.] (Aktaş 2006), can be read before having read the two other novels of the trilogy [“Cinayet Fakültesi” tek başına da okunabilir.] (Akatlı 2006) or interpreted on its own just as Asuman Kafaoglu-Büke (2006) does in her analysis of the novel with a

focus on important aspects of the novel but without any reference to the previously written two novels, the fact that it is part of a series, the first one of which is *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, had better be borne in mind. After all, the reason why Kür decides to continue writing the story of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* with the two novels that followed is that she enjoyed using the “humorous language” she found in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, which is the only novel of hers she can read again and again with not only pleasure but laughter [(...) yakaladığım o mizahi dil hoşuma gitti. Bu romanı devam ettirmemin nedeni de odur. Eski kitaplarımdan birini alıp okuyayım dediğim zaman okuyabildiğim tek kitap *Bir Cinayet Romanı*’dır! Pek severim onu. Oturup kendi yazdığımı gülererek okuyorum.] (Söğüt 2006, 328). As a “parody” of the detective or crime novel genre, as Kür terms it [(...) ben polisiye bir roman yazmadım bir cinayet romanı yazdım.] (322), with its references to famous works written by authors, like Agatha Christie, one of the two authors whom she refers to as her teachers of literary writing [(...) yazmayı Agatha Christie ve Tolstoy’dan öğrendim.] (331), and Rex Stout [(...) burdaki sahne dedektif romanlarının bir parodisidir, çünkü Emin Köklü ünlü dedektifleri oynar bu sahnede. Zaten romanın başından beri onda biraz Agatha Christie’nin Poirot’sunu, biraz Rex Stout’un şişman ve tembel detektifi Nero Wolfe’u buluruz.] (Moran 2004, 112), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* appears to have significantly contributed to Turkish literature for certain characteristics it shares with *Bitmeyen Aşk* to a certain extent and thus these will be discussed in the comparative analysis made below in detail.

The qualitative analysis makes it apparent that there are two similarities between the two novels and three further similarities in relation to the first point. Pınar Kür, who has generally been interested in realism in literature, as discussed in the previous

chapter, reveals a ‘postmodern’ approach in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. While *Bitmeyen Aşk* cannot simply be referred to as a love story with its experimental character of a “scientific novel” [‘bilimsel roman’ türü denemesi] (Akatlı 2006), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* cannot be considered a typical crime novel, at all [*Bir Cinayet Romanı* da bir cinayet romanının öğelerini barındırmasına rağmen klasik anlamda bir cinayet romanı değildi.] (Önemli 2004, 25). Indeed Kür herself points to the similarity between the two novels, as one aims at depicting the “mechanism of love” while the other at the “mechanism of the novel” [(...) *Bitmeyen Aşk*’da aşkın mekanizmasını ortaya çıkarmıştım ya, şimdi de cinayet aracılığıyla romanın mekanizmasını çözmek istedim.] (Söğüt 2006, 322). Because Kür observes a relationship between love and murder (Söğüt 2006, 321), in *Aşkın Sonu Cinayettir* [Love Ends in Murder], she affirms Söğüt that the two novels are either “siblings” or “mother and son” [Tabii kardeşdir [bu iki kitap]. Ya da ana – oğul.] (ibid.). These two novels are important because they differ from Pınar Kür’s previous work stylistically and critics describe either both novels (Akatlı 2006; Moran 2004) or the latter (Türkeş 2001, 2006) as ‘postmodern’. Similar to Berna Moran (2004, 53), who has dwelled on the use of new narrative techniques in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, other critics have also made comments about the contribution Kür made to Turkish literature with not just *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (Sagaster 2006, 140; Türkeş 2001) but either of the first two novels of the trilogy, i.e., *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and *Sonuncu Sonbahar* (Türkeş 2006) or the trilogy all together (Akatlı 2006). What they underline is the fact that there are such “new” aspects of the novels in the trilogy that the “new track” followed by Kür with this trilogy is the first of its kind in Turkish Literature (Akatlı 2006). According to Kür, the main reason why *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is regarded as

postmodern is that she “mapped out writing a novel” in this novel [(...) roman yazmanın haritasını çıkardım.] (Söğüt 2006, 326) or in Söğüt’s terms, she “demonstrates the internal organs of the novel” [(...) romanın iç organlarını gösteriyorsunuz okura.] (327). In “Bir Cinayet Romanı’nı Eleştirmek”, Fatma Erkman Akerson (1989) directs attention to the unusual use of the word ‘novel’ in the title, which is because the novel does not simply present the story of a murder but it is “a novel of the novel”, depicting how the author of the novel has written the book in the hands of the reader [(...) kitap bir cinayeti (ya da cinayetleri) anlattığı kadar, bu romanın (bir romanın) nasıl yazıldığını da anlatıyor. Yani “bir romanın da romanı”. (...) bir yandan polis romanını yazarken, bir yandan da romanı nasıl yazdığının öyküsünü dolaylı olarak anlatıyor.] (62). Erkman Akerson maintains, the fact that *Bir Cinayet Romanı* does not solely focus on the content but attracts attention to the question how the novel is narrated makes it “a work of art” [Bir sanat yapıtı neyi anlattığı kadar, nasıl anlattığı boyutu üstünden değer kazanır.] (ibid.).

In order to respond to the question why *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* are considered ‘postmodern’, it is also useful to scrutinize the place of these novels in relation to not only other novels of Turkish literature in the period but also Turkish politics and societal issues. Berna Moran (2004), in *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış III: Sevgi Soysal’dan Bilge Karasu’ya* [A Critical Look at the Turkish Novel III: from Sevgi Soysal to Bilge Karasu], argues that unlike the novels of March 12, published before 1980, one of the most distinctive features of the Turkish novel published after 1980 is authors’ interest in “style rather than the societal issues” [1980’den önceki 12 Mart romanları Türkiye’de toplumcu gerçekliğin egemen olduğu bir dönemin

ürünleridir. (...) 1980 sonrası romanının göze çarpan bir özelliği ise yazarın toplumsal sorunlardan çok biçim sorunlarına eğilmesidir.] (33). He adds that although this statement does not cover all the novels of the period, “leading authors”, among whom is Pınar Kür together with Latife Tekin, Orhan Pamuk, and Bilge Karasu, have written works that are evidence for the truth of this argument [Bu saptamanın tüm 1980 sonrası romanları için geçerli olmadığını söylemeğe gerek yok, ama kanımca Latife Tekin, Pınar Kür, Orhan Pamuk, Bilge Karasu gibi önde gelen yazarların, hiç değilse kimi yapıtlarıyla oluşturdukları bir akım için geçerlidir] (ibid.). This, Berna Moran claims, is not only in line with the publication of such novels in European and American literatures since the 1960s [Batı’da ve Amerika’da 1960’larda ortaya çıkmış ve hızla yayılmıştı] (54) but also due to the “difficulty in dealing with societal issues after September 12 coup d’état”, which “resulted in a radical change in Turkish literature” brought by “innovative (*avant garde*) authors” [(...) 12 Eylül darbesinden sonra yazarın toplumsal sorunlara eğilmesi güçleşmişti. (...) yenilikçi (*avant garde*) yazarların Türk romanında köktenci bir değişiklik yaratmalarına neden oldu.] (53). Among the examples Berna Moran (2004) gives of such ‘innovative’ authors is Pınar Kür. He states that *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* are two novels which can easily be distinguished with their narrative techniques from the novels of the previous periods in Turkish literature, as they can be labelled as ‘postmodern’ despite the debates over the term or rather their “escape from realism” can be highlighted [(...) Pınar Kür’ün son iki romanı daha önce Türkiye’de yazılmış romanlara hiç benzemiyordu. Bu romanlara postmodern romanlar demek mümkün ama postmodern kavramı kaypak ve anlamı tartışmalı olduğu için şimdilik ortak bir özelliğini belirtmekle yetinelim. Sözü ettiğimiz romanların bu ortak

yanı gerçekçilikten kaçıştır.] (53-54). This is owing to the fact that detective novel is a genre that is simply viewed as “lacking literary quality” [yazınsal değerden yoksun] (Moran 2004, 107) in world literature and it is not considered to be in the ‘center’ of the Turkish literary polysystem, either, in Even-Zohar’s terms, since “the center of the whole polysystem is identical with the most prestigious canonized repertoire” (Even-Zohar 1990, 17). In order to avoid the use of binary oppositions, it is possible to refer to this genre as that which does not have a relatively secure place in Turkish literature [Pınar Kür’ün parodisini yaparak kullandığı detektif romanı Türk edebiyatında kendine yer edinmiş ve gelişmiş bir roman türü olmadığı için, (...)] (Moran 2004, 106). Because the detective novel genre has been used by postmodernist authors to create different effects on the reader than those generally expected from works in this genre, which is a result of “reflexivity, irony, parody, and often a mixing of the conventions of popular and “high art” ” in postmodernist writing (Natoli & Hutcheon 1993, vii), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* introduces the postmodern use of new elements to the Turkish literature. Börte Sagaster (2006), in the paper entitled “Detective “alaturka”: Crime fiction in Turkey”, aims at exploring the reasons for the “tremendous success” of crime fiction in Turkish literature, as this genre, Sagaster claims, “has become one of the most popular genres” in the 1990s (137) and makes the following analysis:

(...) there is no doubt that the greatest period in the history of the Turkish crime novel began in the years after the coup d’état of September 12, 1980, and in particular after 1990, around which time there was a radical change in both the role and the character of the genre: it now started to awaken the interest of a number of well-known novelists, who began to experiment with the various forms of the genre and to use elements of it in postmodern experimental texts. A first example of this postmodern usage of the genre is provided by the novelist Pınar Kür, (...)

Pınar Kür's novels mark the beginning of a postmodern tradition in which crime fiction is used as an element in a hypertextual game. Elements of the crime novel are also used by postmodern authors of the generation which emerged after 1980, (...) what is important about the postmodern usage of the genre is that it has changed the way in which crime fiction is perceived: both readers and authors of the post-1980s era are much more ready to see the genre as a high quality form of literature, and this in turn changed the way in which authors deal with the genre," (Sagaster 2006, 140)

Sagaster's point that Pınar Kür's *Bir Cinayet Romanı* paved the way for a change in perceptions towards the crime novel in Turkish literature in a period when the genre was not accepted as " 'high' literature" (Türkeş 2006) is certainly of vital importance.

Despite the presence of 'postmodern' novels in the European and American fields of literature, along with other authors Berna Moran refers to, Pınar Kür's presentation of "new or alternative" (Even-Zohar 2005, 10) narrative techniques or approaches to novel writing in the field of Turkish literature seems to make her an "active idea-maker" and "cultural entrepreneur", as these options seem to have had an influence on starting innovative processes (ibid., emphasis original). It also seems plausible to argue that her symbolic capital increased more and more over the years and it had an influence on her writing these novels whose differences from her earlier work and other novels published in the field of Turkish literature have attracted attention. This is because agents get strength from their symbolic capital in practices which are considered to be new when compared with the others' (Bourdieu 1977, 86). In addition to Kür's seeking for the presentation of stylistically new works of literature in her writing career (Söğüt 2006, 283; Yılmaz 2004, 11), she does not aim at doing retranslations but translations of works that had not been published in Turkish (Aka 2011). Therefore, it is her choice to present books that are 'new' for certain reasons in the fields of Turkish literature and literary

translation. This point is the first interaction identified between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles in this analysis. This preference of Kür's in her writing and translating is of vital importance, as it is very much influential on her decision to write or translate a literary work in the first place.

As has already been pointed out, related to the 'postmodern' lineage of *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, there are three further similarities between the two novels. To begin with, both attract attention with their creation of fictional worlds, as they are metafictional, i.e. there is "self-reflexiveness resulting from the invention of alternate reality" (Jablon 1997, 139). In both, the 'author' appears in the novel either as a narrator (*Bitmeyen Aşk*) or as a character (*Bir Cinayet Romanı*) and creates the story by commissioning the other main characters of the novel with the task of writing about either their past starting with a certain period in time (*Bitmeyen Aşk*) or their daily experiences (*Bir Cinayet Romanı*). Though Berna Moran (2004) focuses particularly on *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, it is true for both that these two novels deal with the texts themselves as the author chooses the "novel" to be in spotlight in the novel she is writing and thus deals with the "relationship between fiction and reality" [Pınar Kür'ünki gibi üstkurmaca yapıtlar yaşama değil de anlatının kendisine eğilir, konu olarak romanı irdelerken gerçeklikle kurmaca arasındaki ilişkiyi gündeme getirirler ister istemez] (111). There is, however, a distinctive characteristic of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* that deserves to be underlined. This is related to the postmodernist "wholesale 'nudging' commitment to doubleness, or duplicity" (Hutcheon 2002, 1) through the reflection of the 'real' life in which the book is written and the 'fictive' world at the same time in the novel. These two novels are similar in that they continuously remind the reader that

there is an author involved in the process of writing the novel and that it is not solely life in all its 'reality' that is manifest in the novels created by authors. In the example of *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, however, there is both reference to other texts, "particularly detective novels, rather than life" [(...) *Bitmeyen Aşk*'ta da okura, okuduğu anlatının yaşamı yansıtan bir ayna değil, yazar tarafından uydurulmuş, inşa edilmiş yapay bir yapı olduğunu hatırlatmıştı hep. *Bir Cinayet Romanı*'nda da yansıtılan, yaşamdan çok, daha önce yazılmış metinlerdir- özellikle detektif romanı metinleri.] (Moran 2004, 116) and the author's attempt at writing the 'real' life, at least in appearance. Thus, Kür causes her readers to "question" what is 'real' and what is 'fictional' and not only "question" but also "loosen" the link between the two [Demek ki gerçekçilikten uzaklaşmanın nedeni, (...) gerçeklikle romanın bağıını sorgulamak ve gevşetmek] (ibid.). The 'author' in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is so determined in realizing the goal she has set in 'real' life that she aims at controlling other characters' behavior and attitudes in the process of writing the novel. Unlike the author in the previous novel, the author in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is powerful in bringing changes in characters' behavior and thus modifying the plot. Nevertheless, it is not only the plot but also the 'real' life that seem to be affected by the author's moves. Because it is presented as if everything is 'really' taking place in 'real' life while the book is being written, the 'author' of the book turns into the 'author' of the 'real' life of these characters. This is why Berna Moran (2004) alleges that the reader experiences a challenging process in interpreting the novel, as s/he finds it tricky to decide whether these events take place in the 'real', "outside world" or only in *Ölümün Vazgeçilmez Çekiciliği*, the novel whose creation process is narrated in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* [(...) olaylar ve kişiler hem iç-romanın kurmaca dünyasında yaşıyorlar hem de

gerçek sayılan dünyada. Yani olan biteni iki düzlemde izliyoruz ve zaman zaman kulkuya düşüyoruz: dış dünya nerede bitiyor iç-roman nerede başlıyor?] (112).

Secondly, similar to the interpenetration of the ‘real’ and the fictive worlds in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, discussed above, it is possible to maintain that “the exclusive “either/or” binary oppositions of modernity” (Natoli & Hutcheon 1993, ix) are also repudiated through the use of multiple narrative voices in both novels by Pınar Kür. This choice of Kür’s can be regarded as the use of “a central Postmodernist device” (Ibsch 1986, 151), since multiple narrators are deployed in postmodernist writing in order to depict how perceptions vary and thus how ambiguous ‘truth’ is. This point is important also because it is one of the similarities between these two novels and *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, Pınar Kür’s Turkish translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Although use of multiple narrative voices can be seen only in one of the translations in the corpus, it is noteworthy, as this is the translation with which Kür started translating Jean Rhys’ novels and tried to overcome the difficulties she was experiencing during a “stagnation in [her] own writing”, as she points out in the preface to the translation (Kür 1989b, 5). Therefore, the study of multiple narrative voices certainly sheds light on a similarity between *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, but it also shows an indirect interaction between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles.

While *Bitmeyen Aşk* has three narrators: Nilgün, Sinan, and the author, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is written from the viewpoints of Yıldız Gerçel, Levent Caner, Yeşim Erses, Yasemin, and Emin Köklü, the detective. With a focus on the author, who is one of the narrators in *Bitmeyen Aşk*, Füsun Akatlı (1987), in her article entitled “Bitmeyen Aşk ve Anlatıcı Sorununa Yeni Bir Yaklaşım” [Bitmeyen Aşk and a New Approach to

the Issue of the Narrator], points out that it would not be fair to read this novel as a love story [(...) bir kadınla, (...) bir şair bozuntusunun (...) aşklarının romanı gibi okunursa, gerçekten yazık olur.] (35). Instead, it needs to be read with attentiveness to the theoretical analysis of love [Benim okura önerim, kuramsal ağırlığı vurgulanan bu romana, biraz kuramsal bir okuma ile yaklaşması.] (38). Pınar Kür, in fact, has put emphasis on her search for different styles in all her novels published after *Yarın Yarın* [*Yarın Yarın* 'dan sonra hep biçimin üzerinde durdum ben.] (Söğüt 2006, 283). At another place, she again states that it is the “narrative differences, more than those in the plot” that she considers important [Beni, konudan çok anlatım farklılıkları ilgilendiriyor.] (Yılmaz 2004, 11). It is, therefore, in accordance with Kür’s focus on style, to read the novel with a careful look at the narrative structure. While the parts written through the viewpoint of Nilgün are written in first person singular, those written through that of Sinan are in second person singular, which, Kür states, reflects the fact that Sinan’s existence is dependent on Nilgün or another woman, in whose mirror Sinan can see his own image [(...) o adam, ona ayna tutan birisi olmadan var olamıyor, birine hitap etmeden yaşayamıyor. Onun için de hep birine hitap ediyor.] (Söğüt 2006, 283-284). Akatlı (1987) regards the author, who writes in the third person singular and who is there to present the reader an objective, careful, and analytical look at the relationship between Nilgün and Sinan, as the character who plays the “key” role in the “success” of this novel [(...) bu roman kişisi [yazar], romanın yazınsal başarısının anahtarını Pınar Kür’ün eline tutuşturandır. (...) Ya da ... tersi mi? ] (33). Kür refers to the author’s perspective as the “scientific” one, since the author “establishes the mirror theory” [bir bilimsel bakış açısı ekledim ve ayna kuramını kuran kişi olarak bir de üçüncü kişiyi,

yani yazarı koydum.] (Söğüt 2006, 283). Arguing that it is not of importance to clarify whether this character is Pınar Kür, the author of the novel, or not, Akatlı (1987) states, “Pınar Kür is the author who writes the novel and the ‘author’ in the novel is the written author.” [Pınar Kür, yazan yazardır; romandaki “yazar” ise, yazılan yazar.] (33-34). This structure, Akatlı claims, paves the way for the “literary originality” of the novel [Bu iki katmanın ustaca gözetilmiş olmasıdır (...) ona [*Bitmeyen Aşk*’a] yazınsal bir özgünlük kazandıran.] (34).

As has already been touched upon, *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, similar to *Bitmeyen Aşk*, has multiple narrators. While A. Ömer Türkeş (2006) refers to the presence of three characters from whose points of views the novel is narrated, Berna Moran (2004) draws attention to the fact that there are indeed five narrators. The reason for the difficulty to identify the five narrators is because only the first letters of the first names of the narrators are given in the title of each section. More importantly, the names of some characters begin with the same letter and it is only possible to spot the ‘writer’ of each section by reading the sections carefully. Berna Moran (2004) clarifies this point by pointing to the fact that while it is easy to comprehend that ‘E’ stands for Emin and ‘L’ for Levent, the reader has to make an effort to figure out whether the diaries entitled ‘Y’ are written by Yıldız, Yeşim or Yasemin, whose lives bear major similarities [E ve L, Emin ve Levent’ten başkası olamaz. Ama Y, Yıldız da, Yeşim de, Yasemin de olabilir. Üstelik bu kadınların benzeştiği ortak noktalar da var. (...) Okurun, yazıların kime ait olduğunu içeriklerinden, Y’nin kişiliğinden çıkarması gerektiği için kitabı çok dikkatle okuması şart.] (110). Meltem Özcan (2005), in her master’s thesis on the “Postmodernism in the Turkish Novel in the Republican Period”, interprets this feature

of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* as a “partial (...) difference” (171) [kısmen de olsa bir farklılık], since postmodernist authors do not have the tendency to “conceal” the identity of the narrators in the novels they create through the viewpoints of multiple narrators [Postmodernist roman, (...) anlatıcıyı mümkün olduğunca gizlemeye çalışmaz.] (171). As has been pointed out earlier, it is also interesting that the first novel that Kür chooses to translate from Jean Rhys is *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*], in which the reader has access to the viewpoints of Antoinette, who is the main character, her husband, and Grace Pool. It is, however, not my intention to claim that this translation is a reason why Kür started using multiple voices in narration, since she had already written *Asılacak Kadın*, a novel also with multiple narrators. Considering the fact that Pınar Kür is very much interested in the use of different narrative styles, this narrative structure of *Wide Sargasso Sea* might have played a role in her choosing this novel by Jean Rhys as the first to translate. Thus this feature can be regarded as an indirect interaction between Pınar Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles.

The other noteworthy similarity between *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is the role given to the reader in interpreting the novels, which is in part due to the use of mystery throughout the novels, including their final scenes, as they have open endings. Mystery, which is an element Kür chooses to have in all of her works, as she enjoys creating its effect on the reader [Gizem benim bütün kitaplarımda vardır, esrar, gizem hep hoşuma gitmiştir ve kitabın sonuna kadar bunu korumaya çalışırım.] (Yılmaz 2004, 15), continues as different characters take turns to narrate the events and describe the scenes. This is because there is no omniscient narrator describing all the events, feelings and thoughts in detail. For instance, in *Bitmeyen Aşk*, just as Nilgün and Sinan narrate

what they see from their limited perspectives, the author, who avoids making subjective remarks, observes what is available to her/him and makes the best of her/his reasoning to arrive at inferences. As a result, none of the narrators' views can be considered to fill in all the gaps in the story and the reader has her doubts while reading a certain part by one of the narrators and trying to anticipate what is 'really' taking place or has already.

There is an inevitable need to wait for the next narrator's interpretation so that the blurring in the picture can be adjusted as much as possible. The highlighted role for the reader in interpreting *Bitmeyen Aşk* is apparent in the end of the novel:

The author closes the window just at that instant.  
There had been other times when she couldn't bear to follow the flow of events in the past; the reader will remember. (...)  
So, did she save Nilgün from falling down into the darkness at the last moment?  
Or did she collaborate with Sinan in killing her?  
This is a decision left for the reader to make. (...)

[Yazar, işte tam o anda pencereyi kapatıyor.  
Daha önce de olayların gidişatına dayanamayıp pencereyi kapattığı olmuştu,  
okur anımsayacaktır. (...)  
Böylece, Nilgün'ü karanlığın içine yuvarlanmaktan kurtardı mı son anda? Yoksa Sinan'la birlik olup öldürdü mü onu?  
Bunun kararını okur verecek artık. (...)] (Kür 2008, 630)

There is, therefore, the element of mystery even in the ending, where the reader is left with two alternative scenarios to choose from. Considering the fact that this is a theoretical reading of unending love, it seems noteworthy that the 'author' does not finish the story with conclusive statements about the end of Nilgün and Sinan's love story. A similar ending is the case in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. It looks as if Levent is murdered in 'real' life just as in the novel that is being written. Berna Moran (2004) considers the reader's deducing that this crime is 'really' committed justifiable, but he draws attention to the fact that the details of the murder appear in the diary of the

detective, who is fascinated by the idea of being the author of this novel, and that he might have composed “parts of an alternative novel” [İç romanda yer alması gereken cinayetin gerçekten işlendiğini (...) düşünebilir okur. Haklı olarak. (...) Ne ki bu bilgileri Emin Köklü’nün günlüğünden ediniyoruz (...) yazarlık sevdasına kapılan Emin Köklü’nün yazdığı alternatif romanın parçaları olabileceğini fark ediyoruz.] (112). In the open ending of the novel, where the author of *Ölümün Vazgeçilmez Çekiciliği* seems to be threatened by the detective, Emin Köklü, the reader is still confronted with questions:

“This novel will end just as I like. You will either marry me or...”

(...)

Silence holds for a couple of minutes and then she asks: “Or?”

“Haydar Bilir has got used to working with me. What if I hand him the resolution of this perfect murder? (...) When the day comes, I can easily persuade him in the fact that one of our famous authors’ mysterious death is *suicide*.”

“You, filthy mathematician!”

For a very long time... perhaps forever... we keep glancing at each other viciously.

[Bu roman, benim istediğim gibi bitecek. Ya benimle evleneceksin ya da...”

(...)

Sessizlik birkaç dakika uzadıktan sonra soruyor: “Ya da?...”

“Haydar Bilir benimle çalışmaya alıştı. Bu müthiş cinayetin çözümünü eline tutuşturduğumu düşün... (...) Günü geldiğinde, ünlü yazarlarımızdan birinin esrarengiz ölümünün *intihar* olduğuna kolaylıkla ikna edebilirim onu.”

“Seni pis matematikçi!”

Çok uzun bir süre... belki de sonsuza dek... pis pis bakışıyoruz.] (Kür 2007a, 383)

Thus, similar to *Bitmeyen Aşk*, there is no narrative closure in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, as certain mysteries are not unraveled, at all. The reader is supposed to come to a conclusion as to whether this murder happens in “reality or fiction” [gerçek mi kurmaca mı] (Moran 2004, 112), whether the author is a criminal who has murdered Levent in real life and who tries to conceal her crime or whether the author aims to avenge all

those Levent did in the past by writing a novel in which Levent is murdered [Akın, (...) kendi işlediği cinayeti başkasının üstüne yıkmaya çalışan bir katil mi, yoksa içinde Levent’in öldürüldüğü bir roman yazmakla öcünü alma (...) yolunu seçmiş bir yazar mı?] (114), and whether the novel will end just as the author or the detective plans [Tasarlanan roman ne şekilde bitecek? Akın’ın istediği gibi mi, Emin Köklü’nün istediği gibi mi?] (115). The reason why Akatlı (2006) considers *Bir Cinayet Romanı* as a “reader friendly” [‘okur dostu’] or “easy and pleasant” [kolay ve zevkli] novel, despite the challenges, can be the “freedom” (Moran 2004, 115) enjoyed by the reader. However, Kür states that she does not aim at making the job of the reader in interpreting her works easy. On the contrary, she feels pleased with the reader who brings together the pieces of the puzzle [(...) ben okura pek yardımcı olmak istemem ama koyduğum ipuçlarını, yaptığım küçük numaraları çözebilen okur beni mutlu eder.] (Önemli 2004, 25). Berna Moran focuses on *Bir Cinayet Romanı* in his analysis, but his statement again holds true for both novels: due to the questions left unanswered by Pınar Kür, the novels have open endings which allot the reader “the freedom to determine which alternative solution” is appropriate for the ending [Pınar Kür bu sorulara cevap vermediğine göre romanı sonuçsuz, ama okuru alternatif çözümlerden birini seçmekle serbest bırakıyor demektir.] (115).

Apart from the similarities discussed in relation to the ‘postmodern’ character of the two novels, the qualitative analysis also shows that Pınar Kür benefits from different language uses that change from one narrator to the other in both *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, which is the third interaction spotted between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles. Due to the fact that Kür is not solely motivated by experimenting

with different narrative styles and plays with the language features accordingly [Ne anlattığımdan çok, anlatım biçimi önemli benim için. Ve tabii dili ona göre nasıl yoğurduğum önemli.] (Önemli 2004, 25), this finding is not surprising, at all. However, this feature is of vital importance because it adds to the building of different identities and the kind of narrative perspectives they have in the novels. Although focus on the language of different narrators and/or characters, one of the positive effects of which is the creation of vibrant works with sparkling characters, can be regarded as a prerequisite in literary writing, Kür attracts my attention with her concentration on the changes in different characters' approach to the subject, use of language structures, and word choices. After the discussion of three examples from *Bitmeyen Aşk*, two will be given from *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. The following examples from *Bitmeyen Aşk* are to explore the differences between the languages in addition to the viewpoints of two narrators:

What kind of a cloud is this, haunting the sea, an obstacle against the stolen light of the night? Nilgün... To turn back and look at you... Once again... From a distance... Yes, for the last time... Before locking the door... Beginning a song from the middle, complying with the less...

[Ne türlü bir bulut bu, denize musallat olmuş, gecenin çalıntı aydınlığına engel? Nilgün... Dönüp sana bakmak... Bir kez daha... Uzaktan... Son kez, evet... Kapıyı kilitlemeden önce... Azına razı olarak söylemek gibi bir şarkıyı orta yerinden...] (Kür 2008, 212)

The body temperature of the young girl must have terribly increased. It was possible to understand that she was all coated with a thin layer of sweat from the shiny look of her forehead in the semidarkness. Her heart was probably beating fast, but she was so motionless that it looked as if she didn't even breathe. If she was melting on the inside, the rigidity of her body did not disclose it...

[Genç kızın gövde ısısı müthiş yükselmiş olmalıydı. Her yanını ince bir ter tabakasının kapladığı, yarı karanlıkta alınının ısıldamasından anlaşılıyordu. Herhalde yüreği de çok çarpıyordu ama soluk bile almadığını sandracak bir devinimsizlik içindeydi. İçi eriyorduysa eğer, gövdesinin kaskatılığı açığa vurmuyordu bunu...] (Kür 2008, 112)

For any careful reader of *Bitmeyen Aşk* it is an easy task to distinguish which paragraph is written from whose point of view. I would actually argue that even for someone who has not read the novel, it is possible to draw conclusions about the perspectives and/or characteristics of the person who is narrating. While the first is quoted from the pages written by Sinan, the second is by the author. In the case of *Bitmeyen Aşk*, the use of poetic language, sentence structure, and punctuation especially related to this kind of language distinguish Sinan from the other narrators. Being a poet, Sinan usually writes sentences about rather abstract ideas which he appears to consider poetic and treats them as lines from a poem with the addition of slashes that separate one from the other. Sentence inversion, one of the frequently encountered elements in poetry, for instance, appears in Nilgün's and the author's sentences, too, but they do not seem to attract as much attention as Sinan's do. This is probably because Sinan's sentences, which usually exemplify associations of ideas that cannot be considered ordinary and distinct word choices, can be not only inverted but also left incomplete sometimes with slashes and sometimes with the rather frequent addition of ellipses. The second example is a paragraph from the description of the last moments of the day Nilgün met Sinan. Sinan has given her a ride back home and as Nilgün is about to get off the car, Sinan touches her hands for the first time after telling her that he "does not want to lose her" and that they "will see each other again" ["Seni yitirmek istemiyorum, Nilgün... Yeniden görüşeceğiz..."] (112). Therefore, this is quite an important scene, full of emotions, in the relationship between the two characters and even in describing such a romantic scene, the author, using the third person singular, aims at objectivity by relying on

concrete facts and drawing logical conclusions. Unlike Sinan's sentences, the author's are rarely inverted as in the last sentence of the paragraph, which ends with an ellipsis. Therefore, inverted, incomplete sentences cannot be observed in the author's sentences as frequently as in Sinan's. More importantly, the author's sentences always concentrate on concrete facts, avoiding subjective remarks about all those thoughts, including emotions, that cannot be known for certain by an outsider. These two examples illustrate that there are such major differences between the narrators' voices other than the uses of first person or the third person that it is possible to recognize the identity of the narrator from her/his approach to the subject, sentence structures, and word choices.

The third example which shows the meticulously drawn link between the identities of the characters and their language use is related to the number of times the names of the characters are used in *Bitmeyen Aşk*. In spite of the fact that this may appear to be insignificant at first sight in terms of shedding light on characters, attention needs to be drawn to this point. Although both Nilgün and Sinan are main characters in the novel, the name Nilgün is used 515 times, whereas Sinan appears 729 times. The reason lying behind this result can be found while reading the novel. Obviously Nilgün prefers to refer to Sinan directly by his name or just by using the third person singular, but Sinan has various ways of calling his beloved Nilgün and seems to be almost in a competition of finding new ways of referring to her without mentioning her name. After reading the different nicknames Sinan uses while talking or thinking about Nilgün, the reader comes across this comment by the author about Sinan's habit of giving nicknames to his beloveds: "He soon started to give her a whole lot of nicknames, too. Not 'my gazelle' but 'my dear lamb' ... Not 'my tiny swallow' but 'my pigeon' ... Not 'my rose

branch' but 'my rose leaf'...' [Ona da bir sürü ad takmaya başladı çok geçmeden. 'Ceylanım' değil de 'kuzucuğum'... 'Minik kırlangıcım' değil de 'kumrum benim'... 'Gül dalım' değil de 'gül yaprağım'...] (206). As a poet, Sinan seems to try to make the best of his creativity in his talks with his girlfriends. The difference between the identities of these two characters, Nilgün and Sinan, is reflected even through their use of names and/or nicknames.

As has already been pointed out, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is similar to *Bitmeyen Aşk* in that Pınar Kür ascribes certain language uses to individual narrators in the creation of their identities. Instead of providing specific examples that reveal the connection between characters or narrators and their language uses, I would prefer to make two direct quotations from *Bir Cinayet Romanı* as evidence for the author's goal to preserve the narrators' distinct style:

For now what she wants me to do is only to write an essay telling about myself and how I got into this. She says, how profound and detailed my description of my character and past will be is up to me. What matters is to preserve my own style.

[Şimdilik benden istediği tek şey, kendimi ve bu işe nasıl bulaştığımı anlatan uzunca bir yazı yazmam. Kişiliğim, geçmişim hakkındaki anlatımlarımın ne kadar derine ineceği; ne kadar ayrıntıya yer vereceğim, bana kalmış bir şeymiş. Önemli olan kendi stilimi korumamış.] (Kür 2007a, 19)

"If I write as it occurs to me, then you'll have the most boring novel that cannot be read at all."

"You won't write the novel, I will write it," she said. "I'll fix the parts that appear to be hard to be read and omit the unnecessary parts, repetitions, and so on, but I want to preserve your style as much as possible."

["Aklıma geldiği gibi yazarsam, dünyanın en sıkıcı, en okunmayacak romanı çıkar ortaya."

"Romanı sen değil, ben yazacağım," dedi. "Çok okunmayacak gibi yerleri düzeltirim, gereksiz anlatımları, tekrarları falan çıkarırım. Ama, mümkün olduğu ölçüde senin üslubunu korumak istiyorum.]" (Kür 2007a, 26)

The above examples are from the writings of two narrators: Emin Köklü, the detective, and Levent, the victim of the planned murder by the author, respectively. Both try to understand the expectations of the author so that they can write accordingly. They are both asked not to make any changes in their writing style. This shows the author's focus on style, which is in line with Kür's own writing in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. As Fatma Erkman Akerson (1989) has put it, the plot of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* has a certain degree of importance, but "the other aspects of the novel" related to its fictional structuring, are "sufficiently interesting" [Kitabın olay örgüsü önemli değil demek istemiyorum, ancak olayların içeriği bir yana bırakılsa da, kitabın öteki boyutları yeterince ilginç.] (62). The author in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* appears to consider the styles of the narrators as important as the content of their writing if not more. In short, Kür's attention to the language of different narrators appears to put emphasis on the link between viewpoint and perception and/or character and interpretation. Thus, the significance of reading the novels from the perspective of multiple narrators can be considered to be highlighted. This is a major point, due to which there is a noticeable interaction between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles. Clear examples of the importance attached to language use in the formation of identities in the translated novels are the locals' language, which is a powerful source of 'strangeness' in the reading of *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, the rather striking use of vulgar or derogatory language choices and effective use of slang or slum language in characterization in Kür's translations of the other novels by Rhys, which will be dealt with in detail in the next chapter. The conclusion is that Pınar Kür's attention on the differences between the languages of different characters is reflected in

not only her writing but also translating. This can be claimed to be a result of her theater background, discussed as part of Pınar Kür's 'habitus' in the previous chapter.

To sum up, all the similarities dealt with in relation to Pınar Kür's 'postmodern' approach in writing *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* as well as her attention to the language use of different narrators in both novels, discussed above, reveal important narrative aspects of her authorial style in this period of her writing. As has been underlined multiple times, this is in line with the goal she has set in her writing career, since she aims for the application of 'new' elements in her writing so that she can move on after having introduced a work which is 'different' in certain aspects when compared with her previous work. Including this search for the 'new', use of multiple narrative voices and distinct language uses of different narrators and characters have been underlined as the three main interactions between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles. Another interaction is found as a result of the quantitative analysis. The use of function words appears similar in *Bitmeyen Aşk*, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and her translations. This point, however, is not counted as one of the major interactions, as it is difficult to arrive at reliable conclusions without the use of a corpora of Turkish novels written by other authors, which can help to understand whether the identified patterns in the use of function words are a result of Kür's authorial and translatorial styles or Turkish language structure. It should also be stressed that the focus here has been on the similarities between the two novels in the corpus of this study so that the results of the analysis of Kür's writing can be compared with her translating more soundly. Nonetheless, there are certain differences which can easily be noticed, as the latter novel is much more layered in terms of multifunctionality than the former. This reveals that the

‘postmodern’ aspects became more emphasized in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* than *Bitmeyen Aşk*.

### **Summary**

In Chapter 4, I explored Pınar Kür’s authorial style in her novels *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. The quantitative analysis was followed by the qualitative analysis, but I also benefited from the Wordsmith results whenever I saw a need during the qualitative analysis. The aim was to identify first the recurrent features in Kür’s authorial style and then to underline the interactions that appear as a result of this analysis with a comparative look at these two novels and the translations, which will be investigated in the next chapter.

The quantitative analysis, on the one hand, showed that the most frequently used words, which are function words, are very much similar in the two novels. Another finding of the quantitative analysis was that there are similarities between the two novels in terms of plot, as the wordlists of both novels spot the frequent use of the words ‘love’ and ‘murder’. However, *Bitmeyen Aşk* has a focus on love and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* has a focus on murder. The qualitative analysis, on the other hand, depicted Kür’s postmodern approach in this period of her writing. I observed that the two novels bear similarities in metafictional aspects of the works or rather the relationship between the fictional and the real, use of multiple narrative voices, and the reader’s role in the process of interpreting the novels, which is linked to the mystery in the two novels. In addition to these postmodern aspects, *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* appear to present the

creation of narrators and characters whose voices differ from one another noticeably, as they have distinct language uses.

The use of narrative techniques which are regarded as ‘innovative’ [yenilikçi] (Moran 2004, 53) deserves particular attention, since Pınar Kür is “interested more in narrative differences than plot” [Beni, konudan çok anlatım farklılıkları ilgilendiriyor.] (Yılmaz 2004, 11) and she appears as an “active idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur” (Even-Zohar 2005, 10) in the field of Turkish literature. It also merits attention that Kür has created these two novels, considered ‘innovative’ after years of writing and translating, during which her symbolic capital grew increasingly. When her translations are explored from a similar perspective, it is seen that she aims for the ‘new’ in translating, too, as she prefers to translate those that have not been published before in the field of Turkish literary translation. In addition to her ‘innovative’ novels, her writing from male characters’ points of view as well as female characters and describing scenes of sexuality as a woman author are of vital importance in relation to her agency at that specific time and place. This is owing to the fact that Kür appears to have acted against the norms of the period in the field of Turkish literature. Indeed she not only resisted criticisms but also fought against the banning of her books, one of which is *Bitmeyen Aşk*. Therefore, in the case of Pınar Kür, it is possible to claim that supported by the symbolic capital she has in her authorial and translatorial habituses, she did not conform to certain norms of the field of Turkish literature or the agenda of the society and presented her agency in her literary practice.

The major interactions identified between Pınar Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles, as a result of the analysis in this chapter, appear to be Pınar Kür’s search for the

‘new’ in her writing and translating, use of multiple narrative voices, which is a similarity between her novels and particularly *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, and the possibility to associate different language features with different narrators and characters. These interactions can be described in more detail in the next chapter and additions can be made to them, since the analysis of the translated novels in the next chapter will present Kür’s translatorial style, which may attract attention to other areas of interaction.

## CHAPTER 5

### ANALYSIS OF PINAR KÜR'S TRANSLATIONS

This chapter presents the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the four novels by Jean Rhys translated by Pınar Kür into Turkish: *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz [Wide Sargasso Sea]*, *Dörtlü [Quartet]*, *Karanlıkta Yolculuk [Voyage in the Dark]*, and *Günaydın Geceyarısı [Goodmorning Midnight]*. The path followed in the investigation of each novel is the same as that which was described for the analysis of Pınar Kür's novels in Chapter 4. The analysis starts with the quantitative analysis and continues with the qualitative analysis. However, Wordsmith results are also found to be useful in the process of interpreting the qualitative data. This is because quantitative data supports the qualitative data at various points of the discussion, as a result of which reliable conclusions can be drawn. Language patterns specific to the novels in the corpus are identified only after their investigation.

As has been pointed out in Chapter 2, it is essential for the researcher to pay attention to the source and target text styles, as both the source and the target authors and texts have significant influences on the reading of the texts. It is, however, possible to focus on specific aspects in different studies (Boase-Beier 2006, 5). This chapter will only provide space for Jean Rhys when a particular need arises, since the intention here is not to investigate the source style in relation to the source author's choices or to the source reader. The source texts and source author are mainly taken into consideration for the interpretation of the target text style and the translator's decisions. In the analysis of

Kür's translations of Rhys' novels, the parallel points noticed between the patterns in Kür's own novels and those in the translations will be described.

The analysis shows certain recurrent features identified between the four translations and interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles. According to the results of the quantitative analysis, fewer connecting words and clauses are used when compared with the source texts. In addition, a remarkable variety of discourse particles are preferred by the author-translator. Both of these features are also observed in Kür's own work. The qualitative analysis reveals that second person point of view, which is also noticed in Kür's two novels, and stream of consciousness in narration are the two foregrounded patterns in the Turkish translations of Rhys' four novels. Other recurrent features spotted in the target texts are emphatic language use especially through reduplication, author-translator's preference for intensified word choices when the target texts are checked against the source texts, and distinct language uses of different characters. Among these patterns, emphatic language use and the possibility of associating certain language uses with certain narrators and characters attract attention, as they are two other interactions between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles.

### **5.1. Pınar Kür's Translations of Jean Rhys' Novels**

In addition to editing *Short Fiction in English*, which is a collection of world literature for students of English with an aim to read well-known stories that illustrate the use of various narrative techniques, Pınar Kür has translated numerous works into Turkish. Her translations include works by authors like Agatha Christie, Vincent Van Gogh, Vladimir

Nabokov, Jeanette Winterson, Sam Shepherd, Patricia Highsmith, and Peter Greenaway as well as Jean Rhys, who may attract particular attention due to the fact that Kür translated not just one or two but four of her five novels and a collection of short stories. *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz [Wide Sargasso Sea]* (1982), *Dörtlü [Quartet]* (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk [Voyage in the Dark]* (1989), and *Günaydın Geceyarısı [Goodmorning Midnight]* (1990) are the four translations in the corpus of this study. There will be a presentation of the recurrent language features identified in all four of these translations as a result of the quantitative analysis at the very beginning, where type/token ratios, number of sentences, use of discourse markers, including both connecting words and discourse particles, in the target texts will be discussed in comparison to the source texts. In addition, two of the patterns found as a result of the qualitative analysis, which are the use of second person point of view and stream of consciousness technique in narration, will be presented before the separate analyses of the target texts in the corpus. The qualitative analyses of the target texts will appear in the order of their publication dates, not those of the source texts. The discussion of each novel will begin with information about their narrative points of view, plots and themes, as these are also considered to be parts of the 'style' analysis in this study. Each discussion of the qualitative analyses of the translations will also be related to the results of the quantitative analysis whenever necessary. This is due to the fact that I have benefited from Wordsmith both at the beginning stages of the research and whenever I aimed at spotting a pattern during the reading process.

Because there are certain patterns found in all the four translations, it is of benefit to start with a general look at these points spotted by using Wordsmith as well as two

language uses identified while qualitatively analyzing the novels in the corpus in order to avoid repetition in the discussions of each one of the translations. The table below demonstrates the total number of words used, which are referred to as tokens, in each target and source text, as well as the number of distinct words, that is, types, the ratio between the two and the number of sentences.

Table 3. Statistical Data Concerning Patterns in the Four Translations and Source Texts

Book Titles	Tokens	Types	T/T Ratio	Sentences
<i>Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz</i>	37,789	11,264	29.81	4,887
<i>Wide Sargasso Sea</i>	54,241	5,470	10.08	4,614
<i>Dörtlü</i>	35,464	10,132	28,57	4,989
<i>Quartet</i>	45,290	4,895	10.81	4,308
<i>Karanlıkta Yolculuk</i>	33,980	10,138	29.84	4,788
<i>Voyage in the Dark</i>	47,128	3,696	7.84	4,432
<i>Günaydın Geceyarısı</i>	34,888	10,363	29.70	5,072
<i>Goodmorning Midnight</i>	47,537	4,341	9.13	4,934

There are two points that need to be made in relation to the above findings concerning the differences between the target and source type/token ratios and the number of sentences in the target and source texts. The most remarkable result here appears to be the difference between the type/ token ratios. As can be seen above, ratios of *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* (1989) and *Dörtlü* (2007) are almost thrice as *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1985) and *Quartet* (1985). In the other two translations, the difference is even more striking. A comparison of the type/token ratios of *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* (1989) and *Voyage in the Dark* (1985) appears to show that Kür's translation is almost four times denser than Rhys' in word use.

That Kür's type/token ratios in all four translations beat Rhys' because Rhys uses fewer distinct words than Kür does in her translations can be a flawed conclusion. There

might be some problems due to the scanning and/or language structures that cause this quantitative result. An exploration of possible problem areas has been done due to the fact that reasons for this significant difference between the type/token ratios can vary. First of all, it needs to be noted here that the ratios did not change much after correcting the misspellings in the electronic versions of the novels due to scanning. I not only worked on the major misspellings which seemed to cause problems and most of the minor ones but also deleted the letters and other kinds of characters that came out of the blue at various places on the pages and joined the separated syllables of the same words in the Turkish translations. The separation of syllables, I thought, might have caused the difference between the ratios, but the truth was that it caused only a minor difference. For instance, the type/token ratio for *Dörtlü* was 28.96 before correcting the misspellings, etc. and 28.57 after the correction, and nothing changed in the ratios for *Quartet*. Therefore, this difference does not seem to result from problems due to scanning.

One other possible reason for the difference may be the fact that Turkish is an agglutinating language. In other words, agglutinative suffixes are inserted to the end of words in Turkish to derive new words or add some kind of a new aspect such as negation and tense. That is why there are approximately 30 entries derived from the verb root “inan” [believe], which seems to be an impressive example, in the wordlist of *Dörtlü*. Although English is not an agglutinating language, agglutinative suffixes, such as the plural or simple present tense marker - (e)s and comparative marker – (e)r, are used. In addition, there are various kinds of articles, prepositions and helping verbs in English, which are most often covered through the use of suffixes in Turkish. To go

back to the example given above, there are two entries for “believe” in the English wordlist of *Quartet*, but it needs to be considered that there are words like ‘unbelievable’ and ‘unbelievably’, which also appear in the book. These words cannot be seen when the list is checked alphabetically because the initial letters of these two words is ‘u’, not ‘b’, but they need to be added to the total number of words derived from the root ‘believe’ in the English text. The fact that prefixes can also be used in deriving new words makes this task even more complicated. Therefore, the wordlists in not only Turkish but also English require meticulous work on lemmas to have reliable information concerning type/token ratios. This, however, is exhausting and certainly time consuming to manage to do, especially for the Turkish data, because to my knowledge there is not a lemma list already prepared. Unfortunately, besides the interpretations made above, it is not possible to do the necessary applications using Wordsmith and arrive at reliable conclusions concerning the main reason for the difference between the type/token ratios for each pair of novels and make sure whether Kür uses significantly more distinct words than Rhys.

The second point is related to the relatively small difference between the number of sentences in the translations and ‘originals’. It is apparent that the differences are not statistically significant, at all. Kür, in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, for instance, has 4,887 sentences, whereas Rhys has 4,614 sentences in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Nevertheless, this insignificant result should not lead to ignoring of this area. One may be misled by this result and conclude that Kür does not divide or combine sentences and generally keeps them as they are in the ‘original’, but this does not reflect the truth. Kür does both. The following results concerning the use of “ve”, “ile”, “de/da” in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*

(1989) in relation to “and” in *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1985) as well as “ya” in relation to “or” may give an idea:

Table 4. Connecting Words in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*

Search Words	Pınar Kür	Jean Rhys
ve/ and	286	1,872
ile [and; with]	42	
De	490	
Da	383	
ya/ or	96	194
veya [or]	-	

The results related to the translation of “and” are obviously more striking than that of “or”, but the latter deserves to be noted here, too. Interestingly, there is not a single time “veya” is used instead of “ya” in the Turkish translation. Checking the sentences in which “ile” is used shows that some stand for “and” but not all. Even when all these instances of “ile” summed up with “ve”, the total is 328. In the translation of sentences with “and”, Kür usually chooses to either leave it out and put a comma or put a full stop and start a new sentence. A function word, [da], is sometimes used in translating the sentences with ‘and’. Therefore, it can be useful to add the number of times “de” and “da” are used in Kür’s translation, that is 873. But it has to be underlined that “de” and “da” have a variety of functions in Turkish, some of which are connecting two sentences which express opposing ideas, showing relations between two sentences with the function of words or phrases such as “but” or “other than”, and increasing the emphasis on the message. In translating “too” or “even if”, for instance, these words are likely to be used. For this reason, this will be a highly exaggerated number, but even when all of these instances are assumed to be used for the purpose of serving a function similar to that of “and”, the sum is 1,201. This demonstrates that Kür prefers to use a word with a

function similar to “and” minimum 671 times fewer in her Turkish translation than Rhys does in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Exploring the translation of several sentences in which “and” is often used in the English novel may prove to be useful in revealing how much Kür insists on not using words with a function similar to that of “and”. There is also one “or” used in the ‘original’ quotation here.

“Hekim anneme ne söyledi, annem ona ne dedi bilmem ama, bir daha gelmedi. O günden sonra da annem değişti. Yavaş yavaş değil, birdenbire. Zayıfladı, suskunlaştı, sonunda evden dışarı çıkmaz oldu. Bahçemiz genişti, çok güzeldi, İncil’deki bahçe gibi – Yaşam Ağacı bile vardı. Yabanileşmişti ama. Yollarını otlar bürümüşü. Kurumuş ölü çiçeklerin kokusu, taze, canlı çiçeklerinkine karışıyordu.” (Kür 1989a, 21)

“I don’t know what the doctor told her or what she said to him but he never came again and after that she changed. Suddenly, not gradually. She grew thin and silent, and at last she refused to leave the house at all. Our garden was large and beautiful as that garden in the Bible – the tree of life grew there. But it had gone wild. The paths were overgrown and a smell of dead flowers mixed with the fresh living smell.” (Rhys 1985e, 466)<sup>10</sup>

It is clear that Kür has the tendency to erase “and” in her Turkish translation. Even reading the first 10 pages of the Turkish translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea* with an eye on this fact shows how often this takes place. However, this does not mean that Kür eliminates all “and”s. There are 286 times when “ve” is used in the translation. While there are times when “ve” appears with a simple function, there are other times that create a poetic effect on me as a reader. The following are three examples for these two uses, respectively:

1. “ ‘Adyö’. Bizim kullandığımız adyö sözcüğü gibi değildi bu; *a dieu* demekti ve öyle söylendiğinde çok daha anlamlıydı elbette.” (Kür 1989a, 23)

---

<sup>10</sup> Certain words, phrases, and punctuation marks will be underlined to attract attention to the discussed language features in the target and source texts.

“ ‘Adieu.’ Not adieu as we said it, but a dieu, which made more sense after all.” (Rhys 1985e, 467)

2. “Bir tek dostu vardı – Mailotte adında bir kadın ve Mailotte Jamaikalı değildi.” (Kür 1989a, 23)  
“She had only one friend – a woman called Mailotte and Mailotte was not a Jamaican. (Rhys 1985e, 467)

3. “Ölmek ve unutulmak ve huzura kavuşmak... Tek başına bırakıldığını, hakkında binbir yalan uydurulduğunu, çaresizliğini bilmemek.” (Kür 1989a, 24)  
“To die and be forgotten and at peace. Not to know that one is abandoned, lied about, helpless.” (Rhys 1985e, 468)

After all, Kür uses “ve” in her own short stories and novels frequently. Checking the wordlists of three novels (*Asılacak Kadın*, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and *Sonuncu Sonbahar*) and two collections of short stories (*Akışı Olmayan Sular* and *Hayalet Hikayeleri*) written by Pınar Kür on Wordsmith reveals that while “ve” is used about 600-700 times in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and *Sonuncu Sonbahar* and, thus, it appears in the most frequently used first ten words, in the other three works, it is in the 11th (*Hayalet Hikayeleri*), 15th (*Akışı Olmayan Sular*), and 28th (*Asılacak Kadın*) positions. However, in her translations, “ve” is always in the first ten. In *Dalda Duran Kuşlar*, “ve” appears in the second place and in *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*, the third. Therefore, it might be possible to claim that Kür uses “ve” in her writing quite often when compared with her use of other words, though not as much as Rhys does. As a result, Kür seems to prefer to use “ve” in her translations less than it appears in the ‘originals’ and this is generally similar to her use of the word in her writing. Another conclusion that can easily be drawn is that the number of complex sentences decrease. This is due to Kür’s visible choice of not using connecting words, like “and” in many sentences. Thus the first noteworthy

interaction identified between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles is related to her use of connecting words and clauses.

The final column about the number of sentences in the table demonstrates that the number of sentences in *Dörtlü* overwhelms *Quartet* just as that in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and all the other translations overwhelm their source texts. While a comparison of the number of sentences in the others does not present dramatic results, the number of additional 681 sentences in the pair of *Dörtlü* and *Quartet* attracts attention. The quantitative analysis in this pair definitely shows the preference for fewer connecting words and clauses. Nevertheless, this preference is not as clear as it is in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* while reading because following the structure of the source text in the translation can also be noticed at various places. A good example of the tendency to omit connecting words and clauses is the very first sentences of the novel.

Bir ekim öğle sonrası saat beş buçuğa doğru, Marya Zelli Cafe Lavenue'den çıktı. Boulevard du Montparnasse üzerinde, kibar, görece pahalı bir yerdi burası. Nerdeyse bir buçuk saattir orada oturuyordu; bu sırada iki bardak sütsüz kahve, altı filtresiz sigara içmiş, o haftanın *Candide*'ini okumuştur. (Kür 2007b, 9)

It was about half-past five on an October afternoon when Marya Zelli came out of the Café Lavenue, which is a dignified and comparatively expensive establishment on the Boulevard du Montparnasse. She had been sitting there for nearly an hour and a half, and during that time she had drunk two glasses of black coffee, smoked six caporal cigarettes and read the week's *Candide*. (Rhys 1985c, 119)

While the Turkish target text begins with two relatively short and simple sentences, the first sentence of the English source text cannot be read in one breath. There is first of all a time clause and then a relative clause to provide a description of Café Lavenue in the first sentence of the English text. The following sentence in the Turkish text, which is the final sentence of the first paragraph of the novel, has only a time expression “bu

sırada” [during that time]. In the source text, however, there are two ‘and’s, the first one of which is to connect two sentences and the latter is to connect verbs. The omission of these ‘and’s cannot be noticed at all without checking the target text against the source text because their omission does not cause any ‘strangeness’ in Turkish. On the contrary, it is more in line with the general tendency in the use of ‘ve’ [and] in Turkish. In place of ‘and’s, it is possible to see punctuation marks, such as semicolon and comma, if one sentence in which a connecting word like ‘and’ is used is not divided into two separate sentences.

As has already been pointed out, Kür does not aim at omitting most of the connecting words or phrases, which is clear in her generally following the structure of the source sentences. Although rarely, there are also times she even connects sentences. While the first sentence in the example below depicts the former act, the second one illustrates the latter:

Atölyenin avlusundan bir akordeon dırıltısı yükseldi. Adam, “Evet, bizde muz yok,” şarkısını söylemeye uğraşıyordu aslında, ama tanınmayacak bir biçimde. Dinlerken dinlerken, Marya’nın içini melankolik bir keyif doldurdu. Külüstür parfümerilerin, eski kitap satıcılarının, ucuz şapkacıların, cart renklerde boyanmış kadınlarla yüksek sesle konuşan erkeklerin doldurduğu barların sıra sıra dizildiği daracık sokakların gölgeli yanında dolaşırken de aynı bu duyguya kapılırdı. (Kür 2007b, 12)

The drone of a concertina sounded from the courtyard of the studio. The man was really trying to play ‘Yes, we have no bananas’. But it was an unrecognizable version, and listening to it gave Marya the same feeling of melancholy pleasure as she has when walking along the shadowed side of one of those narrow streets full of shabby *parfumeries*, second-hand book-stalls, cheap hat-shops, bars frequented by gaily-painted ladies and loud-voiced men, midwives’ premises... (Rhys 1985c, 121)

This quotation from the target text in comparison with the source text reveals that focusing on either one of the alternative strategies and looking for examples of them

may not prove to arrive at reliable conclusions. There are different practices followed by the same translator, in this case, Pınar Kür, even in the same translation. Kür makes four sentences in this paragraph and uses ‘ama’ [but] once and –iken, which is a suffix carrying the role of ‘when’ or ‘while’, twice. A comparative look at the target and source texts shows that she prefers to connect the second sentence with the third sentence at the point where ‘ama’ [but] is used. Curious about whether Kür generally uses ‘ama’ in the middle of sentences and not at the beginning, I have used the concord tool of Wordsmith and seen that almost half of the total 180 uses of ‘ama’ in *Dörtlülü* appear at the beginning of the sentence. Therefore, the reason for Kür’s decision to connect the two sentences is not her preference to use ‘ama’ in the middle. Although she omits ‘as’ in the next sentence and starts a new sentence, she adds –iken to the third sentence and uses –iken once again in the place of ‘when’ in her last sentence.

Following this discussion on the use of connecting words, such as ‘de’/ ‘da’ and ‘ya’, both of which have a variety of functions, in the Turkish translations of Rhys’ novels, it is of vital importance to explore the use of discourse markers in general. This is owing to the fact that discourse markers, which add to the readers’ or hearers’ understanding of the relationships between ideas and/or people, include not only connectives but also particles, such as ‘oh’, ‘well’ and ‘you know’. In addition, some connectives may also have the function of a discourse particle when used in different contexts, as in the example of ‘ya’. Here ‘ya’ is different from the ‘ya’ in the phrase ‘ya ... ya (da)’ [either ... or]. While ‘ya’ as a discourse particle can usually be omitted from a sentence without causing a change in ‘meaning’, the omission of the latter requires a change in structure. Otherwise, the message cannot be conveyed. In order to identify the

ones used as a particle, not a connecting word or a noun, as in the example of ‘işte’ [here, here it is; there you are; you see], which also means ‘at work’ in Turkish, each of the times these words appear in the texts has been checked and the other instances have been eliminated for reliable results. For instance, the total number of times ‘ya’ appears in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* is 133, but those used as discourse particle count 37. The table below demonstrates the use of several particles in the four target texts:

Table 5. Use of Discourse Particles in Target Texts

Search Particles	<i>Geniş Geniş Bir...</i>	<i>Dörtlü</i>	<i>Karanlıkta Yolculuk</i>	<i>Günaydın Geceyarısı</i>
İşte	40	50	50	50
Derken	40	44	49	40
Peki	27	13	34	46
Yani	28	47	45	28
Demek	11	10	17	24
A(a)(a)(a)h	6	18	6	15
E(e)(e)(e)	18	33	37	51
Ha(a)(a)(a)	18	27	24	22
Ya(a)(a)	37	58	66	55
Yo(o)(o)(o)	5	8	12	31
TOTAL	230	308	340	362

Although there are other discourse particles, such as ‘aaa’, ‘ay’, ‘hay’, and ‘hey’, used in the target texts, they are generally fewer in number when compared with those listed above. In other words, attention has been paid to choose the discourse particles that appear most frequently and/or have a noticeable use in the translations. A comparative look at the total number of instances discourse particles are used in each target text leads to an interesting result. Considering that *Wide Sargasso Sea* is the first and *Goodmorning Midnight* is the last Jean Rhys novel Pınar Kür translated, Kür seems to have increased her use of discourse particles as she continued translating Rhys’ novels. That is why it is especially after studying *Günaydın Geceyarısı* that I decided that I

should investigate Kür's use of discourse particles in the translations. The use of discourse particles in the target texts can easily be noticed while simply reading the texts, as they often appear in the dialogues and the narration of inner thoughts and feelings. The below quoted texts from *Günaydın Geceyarısı* illustrate the use of several discourse particles:

1. "Lütfen. Bir kafeye gidip konuşamaz mıyız?"  
"Elbette," diyorum. "Olur tabii."  
"Peki, nereye gidelim?" diye soruyor titiz bir sesle. "Paris'i hiç tanımıyorum da. Daha dün akşam geldim."  
"Yaa?" diyorum. (Kür 1990, 74)

'Please. Couldn't we go to a café and talk?'  
'Of course,' I say, 'Why not?'  
'Well, where shall we go?' he says in a fussy voice. 'You see, I don't know Paris well. I only arrived last night.'  
'Oh?' I say. (Rhys 1985b, 388)

2. "Şimdi nereye gidiyoruz?" Koluma giriyor, bu kez Fransızca soruyor: "Şimdi nereye?"  
İyi ya, bana ne zararı dokunabilir? Parası yok, benimse hiç param yok. Dokunulmazlığa kavuşmuşum. (Kür 1990, 79)

'Now, where shall we go?' He puts his arm through mine and says, in French:  
'Now, where?'  
Well, what harm can he do to me? He is out for money and I haven't got any. I am invulnerable. (Rhys 1985b, 391)

3. Diyorum ki: "Ben böyle yerleri severim işte – şık, hareketli, canlı. Beğendin mi?"  
"Hayır, beğenmedim. Ama buraya neden geldiğini anlıyorum. İnsanları ben de pek sevmem."  
Eeee, demek o kadar aptal olmayan biri daha var. (Kür 1990, 80)

I say: 'This is my sort of place – this chic, gay place. Do you like it?'  
'No, I don't like it, but I understand why you come here. I'm not always so fond of human beings, either.'  
Well, here's another who isn't as stupid as all that. (Rhys 1985b, 392)

4. Delmar'la Rusça bir şeyler konuşuyor. "Nasıl, karı iyi mi barı?" diye mi soruyor (...) (Kür 1990, 100)

He talks to Delmar in Russian. Is he saying: ‘Well, was she any good?’ (...) (Rhys 1985b, 405)

5. “Ama alın, beğendinizse sizin olsun. Sevdim sizi. Armağan ediyorum.”  
“Yo, yo. Yani, demek istediğim, parayı şu anda ödeyemem.”  
“Haa, zararı yok canım. Parayı Londra’dan gönderebilirsiniz. (...)” (Kür 1990, 101)

‘But have it, take it, all the same. I like you. I’ll give it to you as a present.’  
‘No, no. All I meant was that I can’t pay you now.’  
‘Oh, that’s all right. You can send me the money from London. (...)’ (Rhys 1985b, 406)

There are two main points that need to be highlighted after analyzing the examples given above. To begin with, the use of the underlined discourse particles in the target texts help to provide the feel of everyday, spoken language. To illustrate, the preference for ‘yo, yo’, rather than ‘hayır, hayır’ while translating ‘no, no’, not only serves to preserve a sound pattern similar to the source but also leads to a language use similar to that which is spoken in everyday life. Second, although there are certainly source discourse particles, the source texts do not present such a variety in the use of discourse particles when compared with the target texts. A careful look at the examples above reveals that a variety of target discourse particles are used while translating a single source discourse particle: ‘well’. There are four different translations of ‘well’ above and it is noteworthy that the intention here was not to spot all the different translations of ‘well’ but to illustrate the use of different discourse particles in *Günaydın Geceyarısı*.

It is hard to present a table with a list of the source discourse particles which are used in the corresponding lines where all the listed target discourse particles appear. There are three reasons for that. First of all, it is an exhausting task to eliminate the other uses of these words in order to have a clear list consisting of their use as discourse

particles. For instance, ‘well’ is also used as an adverb in English and all the instances where it is used in this sense have been eliminated to gather information about its use as a discourse particle in the source texts. Second, Kür does not need to see a discourse particle in the source text to use one in the target, i.e. she sometimes prefers to add one. An example for this fact is the last one, where she adds ‘yani’ despite the fact that she could have only written ‘demek istediğim’ while translating ‘all I meant’. Third, there is obviously and naturally not a single source word or discourse particle that can be found for each one of the target discourse particles by checking the two texts against one another. Nevertheless, among the most commonly used discourse particles in the source texts seem to be ‘well’, ‘ah’ and ‘oh’. Not only these particles but also ‘you see’, which appears in the first example above, are presented in the table below:

Table 6. Use of Discourse Particles in Source Texts

Search Particles	<i>Wide Sargasso...</i>	<i>Quartet</i>	<i>Voyage in the Dark</i>	<i>Goodmorning Midnight</i>
Well	11	96	107	102
You see	2	8	4	6
Ah	4	15	2	15
Oh	30	98	96	86
TOTAL	47	217	209	209

There are certainly other discourse particles, such as ‘eh’, used 15 times only in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, but they are not as noticeable as the ones listed in the table. It should be highlighted that discourse markers like ‘so’ and ‘then’ frequently appear in all the source texts, but other particles with a function similar to ‘ah’ and ‘oh’ can hardly be identified. In addition, Rhys does not present these particles in different spelling to create the sound effect of the uttered words as Kür does in the translations. Kür seems to aim at helping the reader to hear the intonation and stress, not merely the words, which can easily be

linked to her interest, education and work experience in (writing) drama, discussed at various points in the previous chapter on the analysis of extratextual data related to Kür's 'habitus' and her reception as an author-translator. The examples below depict how 'of/ 'öf' are spelt in a variety of ways in *Günaydın Geceyarısı*:

1. Öf, bu konuşmanın iyi geçtiği söylenemez. Hatta kötü geçti. (Kür 1990, 20)  
Well, this has gone badly, there's no disguising it. It has gone as badly as possible. (Rhys 1985b, 355)
2. "Ooof, Ruslar, Ruslar – neden bizim öteki insanlardan farklı olduğumuzu düşünüyorsunuz?" (Kür 1990, 66)  
'Oh, Russians, Russians – why do you think they are so different from other people?' (Rhys 1985b, 383)
3. "Ööof, neden önemli olsun ki?" diyor. "Ama güzel olurdu. ..." (Kür 1990, 168)  
'Oh, important!' he says. 'But it would be nice. ...' (Rhys 1985b, 449)
4. "Öfff, konuşup, durma." (Kür 1990, 169)  
'Oh, stop talking about it.' (Rhys 1985b, 450)

These examples also make it evident that Kür brings vividness to the scene by playing with the spelling, as these differences in spelling help the reader to hear not only what is said but also how it is said. The first example interestingly shows that Kür continues to add new particles to the list of her translations of 'well'. All the rest are translations of 'Oh', all spelt the same. Indeed, this point draws attention to an interaction between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles, as Kür appears to use discourse particles spelt differently in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, too. Although different uses of discourse particles do not appear to be a foregrounded feature of the language use in these two novels, there is certainly a variety in the discourse particles used by Kür, just as in the target texts. Depending on her interpretation of the context, Kür makes a variety of preferences, which is striking especially when the target texts are checked against the

source texts. This analysis presents a noteworthy difference between the uses of connecting words and discourse particles in the target texts in comparison with the source texts. Therefore, it does not seem to be possible to make a general claim about the use of discourse markers. Kür appears to use fewer connecting words, but more discourse particles in number and with a variety in spelling.

As has been mentioned in the beginning of this section, in addition to the discussed recurrent features identified by using corpus software, there are several patterns of language use which attracted my attention while qualitatively analyzing the translations. Effective language use through reduplication, which Vecihe Hatipoğlu (1981) considers as “the richness of Turkish language, its power of creativity” [İkileme, Türkçe’nin zenginliğidir, yaratma gücüdür.] (9) in bringing not only “spirit” but also “music” to the uttered words [bir psikoloji ve müzik olayıdır] (11), and the translator’s choices for intensified expressions when compared with those in the source text are patterns found in all four translations at varying degrees of frequency and influence. However, these two features will not be discussed here. The reason for this is that these features are investigated in relation to the target representation of the plot, themes and/or characters, presented at the beginning of the sections on each one of the translations. The two language uses to be discussed here are second-person point of view and the technique of stream of consciousness, which appears in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*.

While the use of second-person point of view is less frequently noticed and is an area of indirect interaction between Pınar Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles, stream of consciousness has a vital role in the presentation of not only the plot but also the

emotional state of the protagonists in the translations. Second-person point of view, which is not very often encountered in novels, rarely or occasionally appears in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, *Dörtlü*, *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* and *Günaydın Geceyarısı* but has the power to strike the reader. This powerful effect is due to the sudden change from first-person or third-person to second-person and the fact that the reader finds the opportunity to feel intimate with the narrator. Examples vary in length. Among those occasional but powerful uses of ‘you’ in narrating the story are not only places where the second-person is used for only one or two sentences but also whole paragraphs written in the second-person point of view.

1. Bembeyaz yüzler, şaşkın, kamaşmış gibi bakan gözler, amaçsız devinimler, tiz kahkahalar... Yürüyüşleri, konuşuşları, çığlık atışları, siz de onlara gülecek olursanız öldürmeye (kendilerini ya da sizi) kalkışmaları... Evet, evet, bu gibileri hep göz altında tutmak gerek. (Kür 1989a, 195)

White faces, dazed eyes, aimless gestures, high-pitched laughter. The way they walk and talk and scream or try to kill (themselves or you) if you laugh back at them. Yes, they’ve got to be watched. (Rhys 1985e, 565)

2. Şunu iyice anlamanız gerekir ki, Marya, dört dörtlük, sağlam bir rahatlıktan, birdenbire Montmartre’in çeşitli tehlikelerine acımasızca fırlatılmış biri değildi. Hiç ilgisi yok. (Kür 2007b, 18-19)

Marya, you must understand, had not been suddenly and ruthlessly transplanted from solid comfort to the hazards of Montmartre. Nothing like that. (Rhys 1985c, 125)

3. Çok güzel bir sokaktı bu. Evsiz kedilerin sokağı, diye düşünürdü sık sık. (...) Sevimli yaratıklar, ne derseniz deyin. (Kür 2007b, 69)

It was a beautiful street. The street of homeless cats, she often thought. (...) Sympathetic creatures, after all. (Rhys 1985c, 157)

4. Hiç olay çıkmazdı. Olay çıkmasını gerektirecek durumlar olmazdı. Bense hiçbir yere gitmez oldum, herhangi bir yere gitmeyi istemez oldum. İnsan çok kolay alışıyor böyle bir yaşama; sanki ömrünüz boyunca aynı şeyi yapmışsınız – bir iki odanın içinde, bir odadan ötekine dolaşarak yaşamışsınız. Işık her saat

başka bir renge bürünüyor, gölgeler de değişik yerlere düşüp, değişik desenler oluşturuyorlar. İçinize bir tür huzur yerleşiyor ve düşünmeye çalıştığınızda, yüksek, karanlık bir duvarla karşı karşıya buluyorsunuz kendinizi sanki. Aslında hep geceyi istiyorsunuz, karanlıkta yatmayı, örtüleri kafanızın üstüne çekip uyumayı... Derken, siz ne olup bittiğini anlamadan gece geliyor – en iyisi de o. Örtüleri üstünüze çekip, başınızı altına saklayıp kendi kendinize konuşuyorsunuz, “Benden bıktı, beni bıraktı” ve “Bir daha asla, asla, asla.” Sonra da uyuyorsunuz ve rüya da görmüyorsunuz. Sanki ölmüşsünüz gibi bir şey. (Kür 1989c, 126)

There were never any scenes. There was nothing to make scenes about. But I stopped going out; I stopped wanting to go out. That happens very easily. It's as if you had always done that – lived in a few rooms and gone from one to the other. The light is a different colour every hour and the shadows fall differently and make different patterns. You feel peaceful, but when you try to think it's as if you're face to face with a high, dark wall. Really all you want is night, and to lie in the dark and pull the sheet over your head and sleep, and before you know where you are it is night – that's one good thing. You pull the sheet over your head and think, ‘He got sick of me,’ and ‘Never, not ever, never.’ And then you go to sleep. You sleep very quickly when you are like that and you don't dream either. It's as if you were dead. (Rhys 1985d, 86)

5. Bireyci bunlar, tamamen kendi kendileri ile dolular, tanrıya şükür. Ortalıkta dolanıp her an eğlenmek isteyen insan canlısı tipler var ya, asıl onlardan korkacaksın. (Kür 1990, 51)

Individualists, completely wrapped up in themselves, thank God. It's the extrovert, prancing around, dying for a bit of fun – that's the person you've got to be wary of. (Rhys 1985b, 374)

The examples given above demonstrate that whether the translations are narrated in third person or first person, there is also the use of second-person in certain parts of the target texts. Checking the target texts against the source texts makes it clear that this occasional preference for second-person narration is a direct result of the source texts. This is an indirect interaction because Kür follows the source text in her choice of point of view. The only contradicting example I have noticed is the third one from *Dörtlü*. Kür obviously prefers to use second-person point of view despite its absence in this specific source sentence. It is possible to make different translation decisions while rendering

‘after all’ into Turkish, such as ‘ne de olsa’. Nevertheless, Kür makes a preference which requires the choice of tense and subject pronoun suffix, as there is a verb in the target phrase. Here she chooses to use the second plural personal suffix. Although this particular example is obviously not a reflection of the source text, Kür’s preference is related to the fact that it is the second person from whose voice Rhys’ narrator tells the story at certain instances. Another noteworthy point about the effect of the target text in comparison to that of the source text is related to a difference between the structures of Turkish and English. Unlike English, verbs always have suffixes that mark subject pronouns and nouns sometimes have possessive pronoun suffixes in Turkish. Therefore, the response to the question ‘who’ can be given by checking the verb. It is not necessary to use the subject pronoun, but it is possible and can be important to use it when the active subject needs to be stressed. For instance, there is both the verb with the suffix marking the subject pronoun and the pronoun in the subject position in the above given third example ‘siz de onlara gelecek olursanız’. The fourth example, however, seems to best illustrate this difference between the two language structures. While the target reader notices the change in the point of view only when s/he reads the verbs or nouns with the mentioned suffixes, which change from one sentence to the other; there is naturally the repetitive use of ‘you’ in the source paragraph. It is also noteworthy that ‘you’ can be translated in the second singular or second plural, which are different pronouns in Turkish, and Kür almost always opts for the plural. Despite the exceptional uses of the second person singular as in the last example given from *Günaydın Geceyarısı*, in which ‘siz’ is again more frequently used than ‘sen’, Kür seems to address both the whole audience of the novel and the individual readers considering the

respect of the narrator for the readers, as she does not know them intimately. Reading the target text helps to feel the plurality of the readership or respect for and/or distance from each one of the readers very clearly, whereas the source paragraph does not have any such implications due to the English language structure, i.e. the impossibility of making choices between the second singular and second plural personal pronouns, both of which are 'you'. It is here necessary to underline the already mentioned fact that the use of second-person point of view is an indirect interaction spotted between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles. Indeed, the use of second-person and even first-person plural attract attention in Pınar Kür's *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. Below are examples of each use from the former and latter novels:

1. However, if a man comes and says 'I'm yours till I die' and if he repeats it numerous times each and every day persistently, tries to persuade you, leaving no doubts about his sincerity, then you make the mistake of expecting things that don't happen in love.

[Ancak adamın biri çıkıp da 'ölünceye kadar seninim' derse, bunu inatla günde bilmem kaç kez yinelerse, içtenliğinden kuşku bırakmayacak biçimde inandırmaya çabalarsa sizi, yanılıp aşkta olmayan şeyler bekliyorsunuz aşktan.] (Kür 2008, 266)

2. Even though we know that authors are usually malicious and they are the kind of people who can take the risk of doing all kinds of tricks, considering the fact that the author of this novel has set off this journey with not artistic, but scientific concerns, we should first of all accept the fact that s/he will be at least honest with the reader.

[Yazarların, genelde kötü niyetli ve sanat uğruna her türlü hileyi göze alabilecek kişiler olduklarını bilsek bile, bu romanın yazarının, sanatsal değil bilimsel kaygılarla yola çıktığını düşünürsek, okuruna karşı en azından dürüst davranacağını baştan kabul etmemiz gerekir.] (Kür 2008, 74)

3. When does a case of murder start?  
Is it when the idea of murder occurs to you?  
Is it when you begin to develop the idea step by step, instead of rejecting it or forgetting all about it in a short while?

Is it when the decision to murder is actualized?

[Bir cinayet olayı ne zaman başlar?

Öldürme düşüncesi aklınıza düştüğünde mi?

Öldürme düşüncesini hemen reddedeceğinize ya da kısa bir süre sonra unutacağınıza, yavaş yavaş geliştirmeye koyduğunuzda mı?

Öldürme kararı uygulandığında mı?] (Kür 2007a, 1)

4. To die is a success on its own, but even in death we are either others' decision or pessimism. And when we arrive at the point where to die and to murder have the same meaning, it is required to undertake the risk of ceasing to exist, which is the most difficult of all.

[Ölmek başlı başına bir başarı ama orada da başkalarının kararı ya da karamsarlığımız. Ölmekle öldürmenin aynı anlama geldiği noktaya vardığımızda ise, yok olmayı göze almak gerekiyor ki... bu en zoru.] (Kür 2007a, 3-4)

A look at the discussion of the use of different narrative voices or points of view in Pınar Kür's novels and translations of Rhys' novels as well as the examples given here from the two novels for further comparative analysis demonstrates both a similarity and a difference. These instances are observed frequently in neither the two novels nor the translations. In these instances, there is a play with point of view, as second-person singular or plural and first-person plural, specifically in Kür's novels, are used in order to either address the reader or include the reader in the picture. Unlike the translations of Rhys' novels, Kür opts to change not only the narrator from whose voice the reader is exposed to the story but also the point of view used by that narrator. For instance, Nilgün narrates using the first person, but Sinan uses the second-person-singular, addressing women in his life, which is a point discussed in detail in Chapter 4. Therefore, in Kür's writing, the change in point of view does not depend on the author's decision to bring the reader into view, as it also happens with the different choices of

personal pronouns used by the narrators. This can also be regarded as a variety in point of view in Pınar Kür's fiction explored in this corpus.

Stream of consciousness, which is the second pattern identified during the qualitative analysis, is a fictional device that attracts attention in *Günaydın Geceyarısı*, *Dörtlü*, *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, and *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*. Due to the leaps between ideas that come to the mind like a wink of the eye, the protagonists' inner worlds are so strikingly presented that stream of consciousness appears to be one of the most distinct patterns, especially in *Günaydın Geceyarısı*, *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, and *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*. First of all, "a modified stream of consciousness technique" is used in *Günaydın Geceyarısı* (D'Costa 1986, 397). This is owing to the fact that the protagonist in *Günaydın Geceyarısı* opens the doors of her consciousness to the readers, as she narrates all that she remembers from her past during her stay in Paris. A song that she hears or a place that she visits in Paris leads to psychological associations in her mind. Mostly thinking about the past, she narrates whatever crosses her mind and those that she experiences in the present. The fragmentation in narration and the lack of details needed to follow the events in sequence add to the feeling that stream of consciousness dominates the novel. Second, despite the fact that *Dörtlü* did not attract my attention in its use of this technique in narration similar to that in *Günaydın Geceyarısı* or *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*, there is a point that needs to be made about *Dörtlü*, too. In *Dörtlü*, there are parts in which characters' inner thoughts and feelings are narrated in such a way that Marya's blurred view of events and how lost she appears to be in making decisions become clear in a quick flow of ideas:

Kafasının içinde sonsuza dekmişçesine dönüp duran küçük çarklar. Onu seviyorum... Onu istiyorum. Karısından nefret ediyorum. Oysa kendisi de hayvanın biri. Canımı yakmak için her şeyi yapıyor bu adam. Ne yapacağım ben? Onu seviyorum. Onu istiyorum. Karısından nefret ediyorum. (Kür 2007b, 128)

Little wheels in her head that turned perpetually. I love him. I want him. I hate her. And he's a swine. He's out to hurt me. What shall I do? I love him. I want him. I hate her. (Rhys 1985c, 194)

As is obvious, the above example from *Dörtlü* shows contradicting ideas because Marya thinks Heidler wants to hurt her, but still she loves and wants him. In addition, she associates these thoughts with Heidler's wife, remembers her hatred for the wife and these thoughts and feelings turn like 'little wheels in her head'. However, all the elements in this flow of psychological associations are related to the 'realities' that Marya has to fight with in her life and the links between the ideas are so apparent and in that sense 'logical' that this does not appear to be an example of stream of consciousness as clear as those in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*. Powerful instances of the use of stream of consciousness technique are below given from these two novels:

Beni dün getirdikleri –ya da evvelki gün- odayı geçtim. Hatırlamıyorum, belki de çok eskidendi getirdikleri – evi çok iyi tanıyor gibiydim çünkü. (...) Derken bir döndüm, gökyüzünü gördüm. Kıpkızıldı. Tüm yaşamım içindeydi. Guguklu saati gördüm, Cora Teyzemin her renkten yama işi örtüsünü... Orkideleri, hanımellerini, yaseminleri, Yaşam Ağacını gördüm, hepsi alev alev. (...) Papağanın her yabancı görüşte yaptığı gibi *Qui est là? Qui est là?* diye seslendiğini işittim... Benden nefret eden o adam da sesleniyordu: Bertha! Bertha! Rüzgar saçlarıma daldı kanat gibi iki yanına yaydı onları. Belki de havada tutabilir beni, uçarım, diye düşündüm, şu taşlara atlarsam eğer. Ama sonra, kenardan aşağı baktım, Coulibri'de yüzdüğümüz havuzu gördüm. Tia da oradaydı. Elini sallayarak çağırdı beni, kararsız kaldığımda güldü. Sen korkuyor? dediğini işittim. Bir erkek sesi sonra, Bertha! Bertha! (...) 'Tia!' diye seslendim, atladım. Uyandım. (Kür 1989a, 210-211)

I passed the room where they brought me yesterday or the day before yesterday, I don't remember. Perhaps it was long ago for I seemed to know the house well. (...) Then I turned round and saw the sky. It was red and all my life was in it. I

saw the grandfather clock and Aunt Cora's patchwork, all colours, I saw the orchids and the stephanotis and the jasmine and the tree of life in flames. (...) I heard the parrot call as he did when he saw a stranger, *Qui est là? Qui est là?* and the man who hated me was calling too, Bertha! Bertha! The wind caught my hair and it streamed out like wings. It might bear me up, I thought, if I jumped to those hard stones. But when I looked over the edge I saw the pool at Coulibri. Tia was there. She beckoned to me and when I hesitated, she laughed. I heard her say, You frightened? And I heard the man's voice, Bertha! Bertha! (...) I called 'Tia!' and jumped and woke. (Rhys 1985e, 574)

This quoted part from *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* is from the final chapter of the novel. The reader seems to have the chance to feel closest to the protagonist just before the novel ends. Antoinette's inner voice can deeply be heard by the reader as she travels in her memories and moves from past to the present, mingling them with one another. The underlined phrases in this quotation show Antoinette's inability to tell when she came to her room. She does not have a clue about it. Her being lost in time and place makes it hard for the reader to make sure whether Antoinette has 'really' slept and dreamt all that she talks about. It is either a dream or a daydream of a 'mad' woman who feels like she has managed to remember what she was supposed to do: burning the house down. As a reader of the two texts, I have been more deeply influenced by Kür's translation than Rhys' source text. Although Rhys' use of stream of consciousness as a fictional device here at such an important point of the novel as well as the inner thoughts and feelings expressed by the protagonist have powerful effects on the target and source readers, it is the question 'how' these ideas are expressed that leads to a difference in my reading of the two texts. While Kür opts for short and simple sentences in addition to poetic language, Rhys' sentences continue to be long and complex in this instance of stream of consciousness. Owing to the fact that fragmented language use is one of the most prominent features of stream of consciousness technique, Kür's language preferences

help me to feel more like I am hearing Antoinette's inner voice. In addition, Kür makes rather emphatic choices in words and structures. 'Kıpkızıldı', for instance, is Kür's translation of 'It was red'. Kür makes the tone of 'red' clear by preferring the word 'kızıl' [scarlet red]. She also uses a prefix to stress the redness in 'kıpkızıl' and creates a more powerful effect on the reader. A poetic preference in language structure is her use of the phrase 'hepsi alev alev' in translating 'in flames'. She does not use as many 'and's as Rhys does. Instead, she lists the kinds of plants one after another separating them by commas and at the end of the sentence uses the word 'hepsi' [all]. Moreover, the fact that she does not prefer a sentence like 'alevler içindeydi' and prefers 'alev alev' lets the target language be more poetic, as there is the repetition of 'flame' and no suffixes to mark the tense. The next example from *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* attracts attention with not only its resemblance to this example from *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* but also certain features that distinguish it from both *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Voyage in the Dark*, the source text.

*Jaluzilerin aralıklarından seyrediyordum onları kırmızı ve mavi ve sarı giysiler içinde dans ediyorlardı kadınlar koyu renkli boyunlarına ve kollarına ak pudra sürmüşlerdi – konçertina müziğinin eşliğinde dans ediyorlar ve gök kuşağının tüm renklerini taşıyorlar ve gökyüzü masmavi – (...)*

*Başım çok fena dönüyor – ama bir öne bir arkaya bir öne bir arkaya sallanarak döne döne döne dans etmeyi sürdürüyorduk.*

(...)

*Benim sevgilim hiç kaygılanmamalı benim sevgilim kederlenmemeli – bunu bir kez daha söyle dedim içimden bunu bir kez daha söyle ama o dedi ki saat dörde geliyor gitsen iyi olur belki.*

*Artık gitsen iyi olur dedi bana – oyalanmaya çalıştım ama hiçbir yararı yoktu bunun ve bir saniye sonra ayaklarım üzengileri aranıyordu – üzengiler yoktu – dizlerimle sıkı sıkı tutunarak eyerin üstünde kendimi dengelemeye çalıştım.*

(...)

*Dedim ki düşünüyorum ve artık beni hiç bir şey kurtaramaz ama gene de dizlerimi sıkıp yapıştım umutsuzca ve çok fenaydım çok fena. (Kür 1989c, 163-165, emphasis original)*

*I was watching them from between the slats of the jalousies dancing along dressed in red and blue and yellow the women with their dark necks and arms covered with white powder – dancing along to concertina-music dressed in all the colours of the rainbow and the sky so blue – (...)*  
*I'm awfully giddy – but we went on dancing forwards and backwards backwards and forwards whirling round and round*  
 (...)  
*My darling mustn't worry my darling mustn't be sad – I thought say that again say that again but he said it's nearly four o'clock perhaps you ought to be going You ought to be going he said – I tried to hang back but it was useless and the next moment my feet were groping for the stirrups – there weren't any stirrups – I balanced myself in the saddle trying to grip with my knees*  
 (...)  
*I thought I'm going to fall nothing can save me now but still I clung desperately with my knees feeling very sick (Rhys 1985d, 113-114, emphasis original)*

Similar to the previous example from *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, this quotation from *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* is from the final chapter of the novel. Anna, the protagonist, has been through a risky abortion and seems to be half awake half sleeping. It is as if she is hallucinating and then listening to the conversations between the doctor and her friend, Laurie. This example of stream of consciousness resembles the previous one in that Anna travels from her childhood to the near present and the present. Another similarity is related to the effect of repetition in the phrase ‘*çok fenaydım çok fena*’, as in ‘*alev alev*’. This single but powerful repetition brings even more sensitivity to my reading of the target text.

Although Kür's translations of the two parts quoted from the two target texts do not seem to present major differences in translation choices, there is a noteworthy difference here from the example from *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* when the source texts are included in the comparison. This difference is punctuation. Unlike the quoted part from *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Rhys chooses not to put any punctuation marks in this specific part

of *Voyage in the Dark*, except for dashes. The presence of punctuation marks in the translation obviously makes reading easier than the source text is, but it needs to be noted that there are only hyphens, which support the effect of fragmented language use, as in the source text, and full stops. It is also noteworthy that in contrast to the quotation from *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, there is here the frequent use of ‘ve’ [and] in the target text as in the source text. This fact may be a result of Kür’s aiming at using no commas, which are often used in the place of ‘and’s when she prefers not to say ‘ve’ in her translations of Rhys’ novels. In short, the absence of full stops in the source text helps to strengthen the influential use of stream of consciousness on the reader, since where a new sentence ends and where a new one begins becomes vague.

To sum up, the quantitative and qualitative analyses have revealed recurrent patterns in the target texts. Although this is not a statistically proven fact, Pınar Kür seems to have decreased the number of clauses and have made less complex sentences while creating a variety in the use of discourse particles. This can be regarded as a practice which leads to the target reader’s feeling like reading daily spoken language more than the source reader’s. In addition, use of second-person point of view and the technique of stream of consciousness in narration attract attention while qualitatively analyzing the target texts in line with the source texts. There are, however, differences between the effects of these uses in the target and source texts.

### **5.1.1 *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*]**

*Wide Sargasso Sea*, which was published after a period when Jean Rhys was thought to have passed away, that is more than 25 years later than her previous novels, is a novel

written almost like a ‘response’ to Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre*. *Jane Eyre* had always caused discomfort in Rhys as she felt empathy for Mr. Rochester’s wife “presented as a monster” (Athill 1985, xiii). The novel won certain prizes including the W. H. Smith Prize, the Heinemann Award, and the Royal Society of Literature Prize. Her previous works have all received positive criticisms and have been published in Britain and the United States, but *Wide Sargasso Sea* has been the most acclaimed of all Rhys’ work (Simpson 2005, 1). As a result, after the recognition of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, her previous work was republished and both *Sleep it off, lady* and *Smile Please*, which was an autobiographical work, were published for the first time. Rhys deals with the relationship between individuals influenced by differences due to colonization, race, position in the family, and gender while showing the link between these themes and sex and money in *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which is in this sense similar to her first novel, *Voyage in the Dark* (O’Connor 1986, 2).

*Wide Sargasso Sea*, the last novel written by Jean Rhys, is the story of Antoinette, who plays a crucial role by creating apprehension and suspense in *Jane Eyre*, as Antoinette simply has the image of a mad woman, locked up in the attic in the latter novel. Despite the significance of the role played by Antoinette or rather Mrs Rochester due to the effects created on the reader, Antoinette’s story remains occult in *Jane Eyre*. *Wide Sargasso Sea* is certainly connected to *Jane Eyre* at an intertextual level. However, Jean Rhys’ work opens up a big, new window to Antoinette’s world that was not depicted by Charlotte Brontë, as Brontë’s focus was on Jane Eyre, an educated, relatively independent woman of the time in general. In contrast to *Jane Eyre*, *Wide Sargasso Sea* sheds light on the life of a woman treated subordinate.

*Wide Sargasso Sea* is told from the viewpoint of two characters in particular: Antoinette and her husband, to whom Grace Pool's point of view is added towards the end while describing Antoinette's state and her caretaker's uneasiness about looking after Antoinette. As a result of the presence of multiple voices in first person, the reader gets the chance to be exposed to the inner thoughts and feelings of these characters, especially Antoinette and her husband's, since the third voice is heard for only a few pages. This helps to see the bigger picture, as one brings together the pieces of the puzzle. Antoinette, the daughter of a woman who tries to do her best as a widow with only a few locals working for her feels the loneliness in and around their house, as visitors stop coming. As Antoinette continues narrating the story, she tells that her mother gets married with Mr Mason, about which people become jealous. This supposedly happy event and the more prosperous life Antoinette and her family starts to enjoy seems to lead to an ever increasing hatred of the locals, as a result of which comes the locals' burning the house down. Antoinette's mother, who has kept warning Mr Mason of this disaster coming but could not persuade him to leave the place for a while, is furious against her husband and seems to lose her mental health especially after Antoinette's little brother, Pierre, cannot survive due to injuries from the fire. Living with a couple hired by Mr Mason to take care of her, Antoinette's mother appears to be sexually harassed by the man and dies in that lonely world, away from her family.

Mr Mason seems to care about Antoinette and when he dies, he leaves a considerable amount of his wealth to Antoinette, but his son, Richard, arranges a marriage for her. Despite Antoinette's unwillingness and her aunt's negative criticisms, as all her wealth would belong to the husband after the marriage, Antoinette agrees to

get married after she hears some nice words and feels the tender kisses of the man who acts and speaks as if he desires her. After the ceremony, they leave for the house Antoinette was brought up in the Spanish Town, Jamaica, where her husband is fed by the destructive words of a man called Daniel, who argues that he is Antoinette's half-brother and speaks ill of especially Antoinette and her 'mad' mother. Antoinette's husband's turn in narrating the story makes it possible for the reader to be informed about the lack of love and respect in his life. Having been economically dependent on his father and brother, he has thought the way out of this shame was to become wealthy by getting married with Antoinette. Nevertheless, he later starts to feel as if he has sold himself. This feeling in addition to the image created by Daniel of a cunning woman who will probably go mad like her mother hurts Antoinette's husband's pride. Knowing that Antoinette does not like to be called by different names, he keeps uttering names like Bertha at the most private moments of their life. Considering the fact that her surnames keep changing, as her mother gets married with another man and she gets married later with this man, it is only her first name that connects the past and present of her identity. His is an attack on her mental health and/or her dazzling spirit. It is interesting that Antoinette does not mention her husband's name when she addresses him or when she talks about him. This, to a certain extent, makes it possible to take her revenge in my reading. In return to his lack of respect for Antoinette's first name despite her refusals or rather requests is the readers' not learning the name of this character in the first place. He ruthlessly aims at stinging Antoinette in the heart, which he manages to do when he makes love with a servant in the house. After Antoinette falls into a state in which she cannot stay awake and tries to tolerate the pain by drinking, her husband

decides they should leave for England. He then takes her to a house where she is kept locked in the attic, away from the only place and the people she loved. The novel ends with Antoinette's walking out of the room, carrying a candle in her hands and thinking of fire, which she has seen in a dream of hers. Loneliness, hatred and madness, therefore, appear to be the major themes. Reading the story told by different voices at different times, one can comprehend that it is not only Antoinette and her mother, who have suffered from loneliness and have been hated but also Antoinette's husband, who she refers to as "the man who hated me" and then only as "the man" (574) on the last page of the novel.

While reading and analyzing the novel qualitatively, I identified a specific language feature in dialogues and while interpreting the results of the quantitative analysis described earlier, I noticed three other patterns that seem to be present in Kür's translation. Before anything, *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* attracted my attention with the locals' language, which seems to be a significant source of 'strangeness' in the reading of the novel. They speak a dialect which reflects the fact that English is not their mother tongue in the colonial British Caribbean. Regarding the fact that "The Wide Sargasso Sea lies between Rochester's England and Antoinette Cosway's island, between the opposite categories of colonisers and colonised, between the world of capitalism and the post-Emancipation West Indies" (Humm 1991, 63), linguistic differences which have political implications deserve to be investigated with an eye on the identities of the speakers. Various examples of the locals' language can be given from the beginning of the novel till the end. The following are three examples from Godfrey, Amelie and Christophine's speeches:

1. Godfrey dedi ki, ‘Ben gözleyemez atı gündüz gece. Ben çok yaşlandı. Eski günler gittiye gider. Bırak gitsin. İlle de yapışmak çalışmak boşuna. Tanrım beyaz siyah ayrımı yapmaz, beyaz da siyah da bir O’nun için. (...)’ (Kür 1989a, 20)

Godfrey said, ‘I can’t watch the horse night and day. I too old now. When the old time go, let it go. No use to grab at it. The Lord make no distinction between black and white, black and white the same for Him. (...)’ (Rhys 1985e, 466)

2. Antoinette yataktan fırladığı gibi kızı tokatladı.  
‘Ben de sana vurur beyaz karafatma, ben de sana vurur,’ dedi Amelie ve vurdu. (Kür 1989a, 114)

Antoinette jumped out of bed and slapped her face.  
‘I hit you back white cockroach, I hit you back,’ said Amelie. And she did. (Rhys 1985e, 518)

3. (...) O senden daha iyi çok, daha soylu çok senden içindeki kan, bir de aldırılmaz hiç paraya – değer vermez şuncacık bile. Ben ilk baktı senin yüzüne, gördü anladı her şeyi. Sen genç ama sen taş gibi sert. (...)  
‘Sen sevişti onunla sarhoş edinceye dek ... Rom öylesine sarhoş edemez hiçbir zaman... Sensiz yapamaz oluncaya dek... Artık o göremiyor güneşi. Görebiliyor yalnız seni. Ama sen istiyor tek bir şey: Onu param parça etmek.’ (Kür 1989a, 172)

(...) She is more better than you, she have better blood in her and she don’t care for money – it’s nothing for her. Oh I see that first time I look at you. You young but already you hard. (...)  
‘you make love to her till she drunk with it, no rum could make her drunk like that, till she can’t do without it. It’s *she* can’t see the sun any more. Only you she see. But all you want it to break her up. (Rhys 1985e, 552, emphasis original)

At first glance, the language difference between the ‘black’ locals, like Godfrey, Christophine, and Amelie, all of whom work for the Cosways and the ‘white’, like Antoinette’s husband, seems to portray the distance between them. Belonging to different ‘races’ and social classes, these people have totally distinct pasts and presents. Kür manages to stress this difference between ‘races’ and social classes in the target text through the lack of subject-verb agreement, problematic word order in structures like

comparatives and frequent use of inversion, which can especially be seen in the example given from Christophine's speech. Not only Godfrey but also Christophine, a very important character as she is one of the very few people Antoinette trusts and a power figure with her strong character as well as all she knows about 'obeah' in the novel, make grammatically correct sentences, too. Therefore, there is the mingling of " 'standard' and 'non-standard' English" (Humm 1991, 68). This can be considered a reflection of the interaction between the 'black' and the 'white' or the 'colonized' and the 'colonizer', who cannot follow his language when spoken by the 'other', as in the example of Rochester, who complains about the English a very young local servant speaks (see pages 193 and 564). Remembering that Jean Rhys, born in 1890 in Dominica as the white daughter of a Creole mother of Scottish and Irish origin and a Welsh father, lived in a multiracial environment in Dominica, where a negative reaction against British domination grew at the time and that Rhys puts emphasis on "interrogation of racial categories" (Humm 1991, 62) helps to comprehend the effect of such complexity in language and that of the presence of characters, like Antoinette, a Creole, i.e. a person "born in the region, but not of indigenous Carib or Arawak ancestry" (Thomas 1999, 19) or rather a person who does not have "a fixed and definable racial identity" (Humm 1991, 64). Thus it is not possible to speak of binary oppositions of 'black' and 'white'. This feature of the target language, as can be seen in the above quotations, is a reflection of the source language. An exploration of the target sentences by checking the two texts against one another demonstrates that the grammatically correct sentences in the target and the source do not always match. When the language structures do not let a similar 'strange' choice to be made in the translation

of a sentence, Kür brings balance by creating a similar structural difference in a sentence which is grammatically correct in the source. Regarding the key role this language use carries in the novel, Kür seems to have paid meticulous care in creating a similar effect on the target reader to that on the source reader. In addition to the “intimacy” (Humm 1991, 64) between characters such as Christophine and Antoinette, which metaphorically rebels against the imperialist race coding, language differences support the pictorialization of the variety in racial identities or rather ‘othernesses’. As a result, an attempt at rubbing out binary oppositions becomes apparent.

After reading *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, I did a detailed reading of the first 10 pages of Kür’s translation by continuously checking the ‘original’ in order to provide specific examples for the three patterns. To begin with, explicitation is one of the features that can be noticed in this translation when it is checked against the source text. There is not only the addition of one or two words to clarify the time of an event but also the person speaking or to whom one is speaking and other more obvious changes like the addition of clauses or phrases in order to help the reader to interpret what is taking place. Two examples can be given for each of these three kinds of additions:

1. “Hekim anneme ne söyledi, annem ona ne dedi bilmem ama, bir daha gelmedi. O günden sonra da annem değişti.” (Kür 1989a, 21)

“I don’t know what the doctor told her or what she said to him but he never came again and after that she changed.” (Rhys 1985e, 466)

2. “Konuştuklarını, bir süre sonra da gittiklerini duydum.” (Kür 1989a, 29)

“I heard them talking and I heard them leave.” (Rhys 1985e, 470)

Other than the clarification of time, the first example demonstrates the translator's decision to use "annem" in translating "she". It is obvious that there are two people one of whom is a man and the other a woman, that is, the narrator's mother in those sentences. The use of third person singular in Turkish would certainly not provide the readers with the chance to distinguish between the two characters. This might be the reason why Kür clarifies who "she" is. However, in the two instances below it is possible to understand the identity of the person referred to from the context. This clarification seems to make the reader's task easier in the Turkish translation.

3. "Christophine hakkında anneme sorular sordum." (Kür 1989a, 24)

"So I asked about Christophine." (Rhys 1985e, 468)

4. "Beklemekten ilk bıktıp usananın Bay Luttrell olacağını nereden bilebilirdi annem?" (Kür 1989a, 19)

"How could she know that Mr Luttrell would be the first who grew tired of waiting?" (Rhys 1985e, 465)

Apart from the clarification of the identity of the persons in the translation, there is one more point that needs to be underlined here. The above examples show that the proper names of the characters are written in the translation as in the 'original'. That usually seems to be the case. However, there are noteworthy omissions of some other proper names, such as Nelson's Rest and Sargasso Sea. Recalling Tymoczko's point concerning such translator decisions might be helpful here:

Decisions are required in translation, because a translator cannot capture everything, because there are inconsistent demands on the translator, because there are limits on the practicable information load of the target text, and so forth. Translators select some elements, some aspects, or some parts of the source text to highlight and preserve; translators prioritize and privilege some parameters and not others; and, thus, translators represent some aspects of the

source text partially or fully and others not at all in a translation. (Tymoczko 1999, 55)

It looks like Pınar Kür decided to make the location where the events take place clear to the target reader. For instance, the readers of both texts learn that the narrator is in Jamaica on the very first page of the book, but another location, a more specific one, Nelson's Rest, which also appears on the first page for the first time and reappears for thrice more in the source text, is not mentioned in the target text. Kür finds it sufficient to refer to this place by using coherence devices, such as "orada" [there] (20). Therefore, the translator selects Jamaica to be preserved in the text, but not Nelson's Rest and, much more important than that, Sargasso Sea, which is in the title of the book. Remembering Kür's stating that she "describes setting in length" in her works of literature, as she aims at bringing it as "a picture in the reader's eyes", which is "an effect of the theater" on her [Romanda filan da dikkat edersen mekanı çok uzun tarif ederim. Bir resim olarak gelsin okuyucunun gözüne isterim. Bu da tiyatrodan aldığım bir etki.] (Söğüt 2006, 248), it seems appropriate to discuss her possible reasons for her decisions in preserving or omitting the names of location. Kür seems to prioritize making the target reader aware of the fact that the story is set in Jamaica, which has been under the sovereignty of England, and thus reveals the colonial aspect of the novel, colonialism in the Caribbean. Sargasso Sea, nevertheless, is not mentioned in the target text. While "geniş geniş bir deniz" is used as a phrase for 30 times in the target text, "WIDE SARGASSO SEA", typed in capital letters in the source text, appears 50 times. The fact that the title of the source text always appears in capital letters is effective in my feeling the width of the Sargasso Sea. This might be a reason why Kür repeats the

adjective “geniş” and thus emphasizes its width in another way which may also create the same or rather a similar effect on the reader. Kür draws attention the similarity between the mind of the confused protagonist of the novel and the wide sea, which she seems to consider a reason why she prefers to repeat the word ‘geniş’ in its Turkish translation and this, she stresses, is a “reflection of [her] own style, not Rhys” [O kadının zihni de karışık, karmaşık, geniş deniz olduğu için... Sargasso yerine ‘Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz’ dedim ama bu benim kendi üslubumun yansımasıdır, onun değil.] (Aka 2011). It also needs to be noted that the target reader cannot know which sea this is and thus have partial information. In making the decision not to represent Sargasso Sea to the Turkish readers, Kür might have considered the fact that the reader already knows this is Jamaica, the Caribbean. Indeed, she does not like to “use foreign words in the titles” and she does “not want to use the word ‘Sargasso’ in the title” of this target text because she thinks her readers will not have heard of the Sargasso Sea and that the name of the sea would not mean much to her readers [Sargasso kelimesini kullanmak istemedim başlıkta çünkü Sargasso, Şeytan Üçgeni’ndeki denizdir ama kimse bilmez bunu. Zaten yabancı kelime başlıklarda kullanmak istemiyorum.] (Aka 2011). Thus, it may not make much difference for the reader to know whether it is a ‘wide sea’ in this region or specifically the Sargasso in bringing the picture of this sea in their eyes while reading the novel. In my reading of the target text, this is just a sea that is really wide and it is somewhere close to Jamaica. Knowing whether it is Sargasso or not does not change my interpretation of the story, but the name Sargasso in the target text adds to my reading of a mysterious atmosphere in the Caribbean world.

After this extended interpretation of Kür's use or elimination of proper names in the translation comes two more examples concerning Kür's providing extra pieces of information in the target text.

5. "Christophine yeni basılmış paralardan birkaç kuruş vermişti bana, yanımdan ayırmaz, entarimin cebinde taşırdım. Bir gün soyunurken, bunlar yere döküldü, ben de alıp bir taşın üstüne koydum." (Kür 1989a, 27)

"Christophine had given me some new pennies which I kept in the pocket of my dress. They dropped out one morning so I put them on a stone." (Rhys 1985e, 469)

6. "Christophine beni orada bulduğunda hava neredeyse kararmıştı. Oncadır öyle oturmaktan her yanım tutulmuştu, kendim kalkamadım, o yardım etti." (Kür 1989a, 26)

"Christophine found me there when it was nearly dark, and I was so stiff she had to help me to get up." (Rhys 1985e, 469)

In the fifth example given above, the fact that the narrator is taking off her clothes is a detail that Kür adds. Because Tia and the narrator are about to swim, it is possible to guess that these pennies dropped out of her pocket while she was taking off her clothes. But as can be seen in the quotation, no clear information is provided in the source text. To sum up, all the additions make sense and they are not totally the result of Kür's own imagination. However, the fact that Kür aims at making the scenes easier to follow for her readers is a conclusion that can be drawn.

The second pattern that can be identified in Kür's translation is emphatic, effective use of language, which in some cases sounds like daily language. This feature, often seen in Kür's own novels and thus one of the major interactions between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles, is usually done with repetitions and addition of words or phrases in the translation. Below are examples of such instances:

1. “Hemen yanına gittim ama hasta değildi, ölmüştü. Gözlerine sinekler dolmuştu simsiyah.” (Kür 1989a, 20)

“I went up to him but he was not sick, he was dead and his eyes were black with flies.” (Rhys 1985e, 466)

2. “Onların da adı Luttrell’miş. Ama isterlerse İngiliz olsunlar, bizim eski Bay Luttrell’e hiç mi hiç benzemiyorlarmış.” (Kür 1989a, 29)

“They called themselves Luttrell, but English or not English they were not like old Mr Luttrell.” (Rhys 1985e, 471)

3. “Körfezin orada oturan, ara sıra çamaşıra, temizliğe gelen kızlar deli gibi korkarlardı ondan.” (Kür 1989a, 23-24)

“The girls from the bayside who sometimes helped with the washing and cleaning were terrified of her.” (Rhys 1985e, 467)

4. “İki entarisi var. Yıkıyorum giyiyor. Şimdi gökten temiz entari mi insin istiyorsun? Bura dolu delilerle, tanrım canımı alsın.’ ” (Kür 1989a, 29)

“ ‘She got two dresses, wash and wear. You want clean dress to drop from heaven? Some people crazy in truth.” (Rhys 1985e, 471)

5. “Neden kovmuyorsun onu, neden gidip başka bir yerde oturmasını söylemiyorsun?’ diye sordum. Güldü.” (Kür 1989a, 25)

“ ‘Why don’t you tell him to find somewhere else to live?’ I said and she laughed.” (Rhys 1985e, 468)

6. “ ‘Bende daha çok var.’ ” (Kür 1989a, 27)

“ ‘I can get more if I want to.’ ” (Rhys 1985e, 470)

The last example may require an explanation of what is taking place. Tia and the narrator are speaking. Tia sees that the narrator has several pennies and bets she cannot “turn a somersault under water” (469). The narrator gives it a try, but Tia says, she could not do it and gets the money. Mad at Tia and believing that this is unjust, the narrator tells Tia to keep the money and utters those words: “I can get more if I want to” (470). Considering the context including the fact that this is a child speaking, one can

understand why Kür writes, “Bende daha çok var” (27). Boase-Beier (2006) points out that “the reader of the target text will react to choices made by the translator, reflecting her or his cognitive state and views and voice, and also those that have been added during translation” (147). I should, therefore, add that the way Kür expresses this idea is more powerful than Rhys’ in my reading. Kür’s using double ‘o’ in “çok” might have been effective in this feeling of mine because she sounds more alive than fictional to me.

Aiming to further explore the above discussed emphatic use of language in the target text in order to provide more detailed data, I decided to focus on all the instances in which color words are used. That “the regenerative motor of Rhys’s fiction is colour” (Humm 1991, 65) and that “imperialism has always portrayed its own(ed) women as romantic emblems of white purity against the Black Other,” (70) attach a particular importance to colour words, such as ‘beyaz’ [white] and ‘siyah’ [black] in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*. Checking the wordlist of Wordsmith, I have found that the following are the colors used in emphatic forms: bembeyaz (5) [very white], kapkara (1) [very dark], kıpkırmızı (2) [very red], kıpkızıl (3) [very crimson], sapsarı (2) [very yellow], simsiyah (2) [very black], and yemyeşil (2) [very green]. The number of times each one of these words are used shows that ‘bembeyaz’ is the one that most frequently appears among these color words. Because the goal here is to provide more reliable information by investigating a certain category of content words in emphatic form, all the five instances of ‘bembeyaz’ have been studied in comparison with the source text. Four of the five instances demonstrate that Kür has preferred to use ‘bembeyaz’ while translating ‘white’ into Turkish. An example of these four is the following: “Pierre ölmüş, diye düşündüm.

Ölmüş gibi duruyordu. Bembeyazdı, hiç sesi çıkmıyordu. Başını annemin kolundan tümüyle cansız gibi sarkmıştı; gözleri de dönmüş, yalnızca akları görünüyordu.” (45).  
[I thought, Pierre is dead. He looked dead. He was white and he did not make a sound, but his head hung back over her arm as if he had no life at all and his eyes were rolled up so that you only saw the whites.] (480).

Upon my question concerning her emphatic word choices as in the example of ‘bembeyaz’, Kür points to the fact that “there is no such thing like ‘bembeyaz’ in English” and therefore, it is again an example of “the reflection of [her] own style” in the target text [Bembeyaz diye bir şey yok mesela İngilizce’de. White’ sa white’ tır. Değilse, değildir. O da demek ki benim üslubumun yansıması oluyor.] (Aka 2011). There is indeed no source word that requires the use of ‘bembeyaz’ rather than ‘beyaz’ in the target text, but the context in which the word ‘white’ is used cannot be ignored. This is a vivid scene of hatred and fear, in which Antoinette and her family tries to leave the house set on fire by local people. There is the smell of Pierre’s hair, which got burned, in the air and although they manage to leave the house, it is too late, Pierre cannot survive. Taking the details of the scene into consideration and the fact that it is the face of a child who is dead or almost dead, emphasis on the color of his face adds to the target reader’s vivid imagination of the scene. The last example in which ‘bembeyaz’ is used is a result of Kür’s own preference in the absence of ‘white’ in the source text:

Antoinette onun saçlarına yapıştı, dişlerini gösteren Amelie galiba bir yerini ısırmaaya çalışıyordu.  
‘Antoinette! Rica ederim!’ dedim kapıdan.  
Sertçe bana doğru döndü, yüzü bembeyazdı. Amelie suratını elleriyle kapamış sözde hıçkırıyordu ama, parmaklarının arasından beni gözlediğini görebiliyordum. (Kür 1989a, 114)

Antoinette gripped her hair. Amelie, whose teeth were bared, seemed to be trying to bite.

‘Antoinette, for God’s sake,’ I said from the doorway.

She swung round, very pale. Amelie buried her face in her hands and pretended to sob, but I could see her watching me through her fingers. (Rhys 1985e, 518)

As is obvious, there is no use of ‘white’ in the source text, but there is another adjective, ‘pale’, which is strengthened with the use of another word ‘very’. It is only one of the five examples in which the adverb ‘very’ is used in the source text. The fact that Kür prefers ‘bembeyaz’ in translating ‘very pale’ just as she translates ‘white’ deserves attention. Indeed Kür does not choose to translate ‘pale’ as ‘beyaz’ at all instances. She seems to prefer ‘soluk’, for instance, especially when the subject being described is a color, like the color of a dress or flowers. The wordlist of *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* manifests that ‘beyaz’ is used 82 times in the target text and ‘white’ 112 times in the source text. The most apparent reason for the difference between the two is the use of three different words in the target text, i.e. ‘beyaz’ (82), ‘bembeyaz’ (5) and ‘ak’ (15), a synonym of ‘beyaz’, more associated with ideas like cleanliness and innocence. Regarding the fact that ‘beyaz’ and ‘ak’ in total are more significantly preferred than ‘bembeyaz’, I do not claim that Kür often opts for emphatic forms of words as in the example of this color word. It is obvious that these are rare instances when compared with the rest. Nevertheless, color words are not the only kind of content words whose emphatic forms are used. The previously given examples also show various instances of emphatic, effective language use. Therefore, Kür appears to increase the level of word ‘meaning’ or clarify the strength of a certain aspect in her reading and reflect that aspect to the target reader as much as possible. The result is a difference between the effects of the

two texts, as the target reader can notice the foregrounding of emphasis in words and phrases.

In brief, preference for fewer connecting words and clauses, the use of explicitation, effective use of language with repetitions as well as additions of words and phrases result in the fact that Kür's presence as the translator of *Wide Sargasso Sea* can definitely be distinguished in the target text when the target text is checked against the source text. The preface Kür has written to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* is also an obvious instrument of strengthening the translator's 'voice' in the text and thus making her 'visible'.

### **5.1.2 Dörtlü [Quartet]**

*Quartet*, published in 1928 for the first time and told from the third person, omniscient point of view, is the story of a woman whose husband gets caught for theft. Especially after he is imprisoned, Marya Zelli starts to feel lonely and suffers from poverty. At such a desperate time of her life, she meets the Heidlere, a wealthy couple who invite Marya to live with them. Hearing this news, Stephan, Marya's husband, thinks these are people with good intentions, but Mr Heidler is attracted to Marya, who he considers an 'easy' woman. He assumes that he can sleep with Marya and his wife, Lois, seems to approve Heidler's having an affair with her under their own roof. After Lois and Heidler persuade Marya about this affair, Lois starts to annoy her as much as possible. Marya, exhausted of this triangle, feels better when Stephan is out of prison. However, she is still not truly happy because she is in love with Heidler. Not pleased with Marya's decision to stay with her husband, Heidler ends his affair with her. Marya cannot keep

this secret any more, tells Stephan all about her relationship with the Heidlars and cries that she loves Heidler upon hearing Stephan's plan to fight with him and seeing Stephan's gun. Not surprisingly Stephan cannot tolerate this, leaves the place and heads to the train station together with a friend's lover who insists on joining him.

Pınar Kür's translation of *Quartet*, *Dörtlü*, first appeared in 1985 and was later published by Can Publishing in 2006. While some similar language patterns between *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Dörtlü* related to type/token ratio, use of connecting words and clauses are spotted by the use of WordSmith, other features concerning footnotes and rather vulgar or derogatory language choices in the latter translation are identified only after the target text is checked against the source text.

The most apparent feature of the Turkish translation of *Quartet* is the fact that footnotes are used whenever a certain French word, phrase or sentence appears for the first time in the English source text. The Turkish target reader, therefore, is exposed in the Turkish translation to the French expression as it appears in the English source text, but s/he is provided with its meaning in Turkish in the footnote and expected to either remember or check the previous footnote when the same expression appears for the second time. Upon my question about the role of the editors in the publication process of her translations in relation to the language use and footnotes, Pınar Kür makes the following explanation, which sheds light on the choice to use footnotes in *Dörtlü*:

For a long time I always made my own decisions, but you say that footnotes are used in *Dörtlü*. This must have been done by the editor. I don't do it. And I don't know how I overlooked it. (...) In my novel, *Asılacak Kadın*, there is also the use of French, but I didn't provide footnotes on purpose because a good author –both Jean Rhys and I are such authors- explains it in the previous or the following sentence. That's why it is boring to provide an extra footnote. I am opposed to

footnote for one more reason: it distracts the reader's attention. If I add footnotes, I do it as the translator's note (TN) next to the expression.

[Şimdi uzun müddet hep kendim karar verdim; fakat diyorsunuz ki bana *Dörtlü*'de dipnot kullanılmış. Bunu editör yapmıştır. Ben yapmam. Ve de nasıl gözümünden kaçmış bilemiyorum. (...) Benim *Asılacak Kadın*'da da Fransızca vardır da dip not koymamışımdır özellikle çünkü iyi bir yazar –Jean Rhys de öyle ben de öyleyim- zaten bir önceki cümle ya da sonraki cümlede açıklıyor. Dolayısıyla bir de ayrıca dip not konması sıkıcı... Ben dip nota şundan da karşıyorum. Sırf okurun dikkatini dağıtıyor diye. Eğer dip not koyarsam, Ç.N diye, dip not olarak değil, hemen yanına koyarım.] (Aka 2011)

Obviously Pınar Kür states that she is against the use of footnotes in literary works, both her translations and her own writing, and its use in *Dörtlü* cannot be evaluated as the translator's preference. It appears to be the editor's choice to provide footnotes in the target text, which is evidence for the fact that not every single preference in a target text results from the translator's decision process in the act of translating. This is a point related to the fact that translator's style "is subject to all manners of constraints and influences, some of which the translator may only be dimly aware of" (Boase-Beier 2006, 53). As Kür points out, Jean Rhys does not feel the need to provide footnotes, either. Thus, unlike the Turkish reader, the English source reader is left on her/his own with the French language uses in the text. There is not a single explanation of the French words, phrases or sentences in the text or in a footnote. Therefore, it is up to the English reader to search for the meaning of these French expressions or just leave them unknown and grasp their meaning as much as possible from the context if they do not know French. What seems to be more striking than the different roles expected from the readers of the English and Turkish texts is that the effect of the Turkish text seems to be more powerful at some points due to this difference in the use of footnotes despite the translator's opposition to the use of footnotes. In addition, at the beginning of the

footnotes is the acronym (Ç.N), i.e. the translator's note, which appears not to belong to the translator, at all. At a point during my meeting with Kür for the interview, she asked if I also checked the 1985 publication of her translation, since the one in the corpus was a copy of the 2007 edition, which was actually the second edition of the 2006 publication by Can Publishing House. Comparing the two editions showed a noteworthy result. Footnotes appeared in the 1985 edition, too, but interestingly the acronym (Ç.N) was not used in that edition. It was an addition to this rather new edition, in which the intervention of the translator became even more apparent in the translation although the footnotes, Kür anticipates, must have been written by the editor, not her. The mentioned powerful effect is especially apparent in the Turkish translation notes of the French word 'grue' [hooker] and other words or phrases similar in meaning. The following is an example of the use of the word 'grue' in the Turkish and English texts. Stephen is talking about the lover of a friend of his, called Schlamovitz:

“Nasıl bir kız?” diye sordu Marya, ilgilenmişti.  
“Eh, işte, hani *grue* dediklerinden. Gene de iyi bir kız. Sevgilisini görünce öyle çok sevindi ki.”  
“Öyle mi?”  
“Ağladı bile... O tip kızlar erkeklerini çok severler, inan.” (Kür 2007b, 138, emphasis original)

In the footnote, it says, “(Fr.) Sokak orospusu. (Ç.N.)” [Street prostitute]. A search of “sokak orospusu” on Google shows that this phrase is most often used in the description of pornographic videos. The fact that it is not a familiar Turkish phrase in most contexts and the potential derogatory intentions in the use of the phrase might be one reason why its presence in the target and nonexistence in the source texts attracted my attention. The word ‘orospu’ would provide similar associations, but the addition of ‘sokak’ seems to

highlight that it is used in its literal sense, not as a curse. However, the fact that this use of the word ‘grue’ does not appear in at least relatively small French dictionaries, which can be interpreted as its uncommon use in French, might have caused the preference for ‘sokak orospusu’ rather than the simple ‘orospu’ in order to have a similar effect. It is also significant that the acronym ‘Ç.N.’, in reference to the translator’s note in Turkish, causes Pınar Kür to appear with an intervention that does not really belong to her and her ‘voice’ in appearance becomes more marked than it would be without the footnotes. The existence and nonexistence of the footnotes in the target and source texts, respectively, cannot be regarded as a simple difference. This is due to the fact that the footnotes draw attention to the presence of an additional character in the writing of the target text. While the French word is also typed in italics in the English source text, there is no footnote or any other kind of explanation concerning the meaning of the word.

‘What sort of girl?’ asked Marya, interested.  
‘Oh, well, a *grue*, it seems. But she’s a good girl. She was awfully happy when she saw him.’  
‘Was she?’  
‘Yes. She cried. Oh, they’re fond of their men, these girls, I tell you.’  
(Rhys 1985c, 201, emphasis original)

As a reader of the Turkish text in general, I have felt like this is an environment in which the characters see a considerable number of ‘prostitutes’ around. Nevertheless, the lack of English translation of French words, phrases or sentences, such as ‘grue’ and ‘Mince de poules de luxe!’ (72), translated in the footnote as “Lanet olsun, kibar orospular!” (ibid.) [God damn, refined prostitutes!], leads to the source reader’s being less exposed to the word ‘prostitute’ in the English text than the target reader’s. Although the context helps to draw some conclusions, as the ideas of being a ‘grue’ and ‘a good girl’ are

connected with the word ‘but’, a conjunction word that expresses difference, the utterance of the same and/or similar words like ‘prostitute’ results in the emphasis on the presence of such girls. It is also noteworthy that the strategy of providing the Turkish translation of French words or expressions in the footnotes is not always followed. The following is an exceptional example I noticed while manually checking some parts in the target text against the source text:

Derken, Mösyö Lefranc çok bilmiş gözlerle bir onun çökmüş, morarmış gözaltlarına, bir Marya’nın aynadaki görüntüsüne bakıp kendi kendine, “*Ça y est*,” dedi, “biliyordum böyle olacağını. Vay orospu vay.” Bu yüzden Lois’e hizmet ederken sempati ve anlayışla davranıyor, Marya’ya hizmet ederken suratını asıyor, Heidler’a baktığında da yüzündeki anlam şöyle diyordu: “Olmadı, olmadı, sayın bayım. Erkek erkeğe söylemek gerekirse, çok büyük bir hata yapıyorsunuz.” (Kür 2007b, 87)

Then Monsieur Lefranc cast one astute glance at her deeply circled eyes, another at Marya’s reflection in the glass and told himself: ‘*Ça y est*. I knew it! Ah, the *grue*!’ So he waited on Lois with sympathy and gentleness; he waited on Marya grimly, and when he looked at Heidler, his expression said: ‘Come, come, my dear sir. As man to man, what a mistake you’re making!’ (Rhys 1985c, 169)

As can be seen in the above example, while the French expression ‘*Ça y est*’ is kept and its translation is provided in the footnotes as ‘Tamamdır’, the word ‘*grue*’ is not used in the target text and instead it is rendered into Turkish as ‘orospu’ [prostitute]. Coupling the effect of ‘ah’ by repeating ‘vay’, both of which are discourse markers, twice and using ‘orospu’ [prostitute], Kür adds to her extra uses of ‘orospu’ openly in the target text.

Another example of the fact that the presence of prostitutes or prostitute like girls seems to be more highlighted in the target text through the use of footnotes is at the end of the novel. This is when Stephen is hesitant to accept Mademoiselle Chardin’s urge to

leave the place with him, as she asked “ ‘Take me with you, Stephan” and held his arm (233).

“ ‘*Encore une grue,*” diye geçiriyordu aklından.” (Kür 2007b, 190)

“ ‘*Encore une grue,*’ he was thinking.” (Rhys 1985c, 234)

In the target text footnote, this French expression is rendered into Turkish as “Bir sokak orospusu daha” (190) [One more street prostitute]. This final use of French reminds of all the previous uses of the word ‘grue’ and other similar words or phrases and the contexts in which their presence is implied somehow. The closing of the scene with Stephen together with a woman whom he considers as another hooker after he leaves Marya also underlines his thinking that Marya was a hooker.

Related to this comment made by Stephan is the fact that this aspect of Marya’s identity in at least others’ eyes seems to be more highlighted in the Turkish translation.

The following two examples can suffice to delineate this impact on me as a reader:

1. Önemli olan, aşktan tiksindiği, nerdeyse hoşlanmadığı için, Marya’yı sırf düzülme için Hotel du Bosphore’a kapatılmış bir kadıncağızdan başka bir şey olmamaya zorlamasıydı. Bir *petite femme*. Her şeyi sınıflandırma manyaklığının bir parçasıydı bu da elbet. Ama bunu öylesine derin bir inançla yapıyordu ki Marya, tam bir zavallılık içinde, onun düşündüğü gibi bir kadın olma çabasına girişiyordu istemeden. (Kür 2007b, 122)

What mattered was that, despising, almost disliking, love, he was forcing her to be nothing but the little woman who lived in the Hotel du Bosphore for the express purpose of being made love to. A *petite femme*. It was, of course, part of his mania for classification. But he did it with such conviction that she, miserable weakling that she was, found herself trying to live up to his idea of her. (Rhys 1985c, 190)

Beside the content of the paragraph above, which reveals how belittling the situation is for Marya, the word ‘düzülmek’ [to be fucked], an intense word to choose, puts Marya in even a lower position. It is clear from the early chapters of the novel that Marya is

Heidler's mistress, but this choice of slang here implies nothing more than sexual intercourse whose focus is solely on what is being done to the woman by the man who seems to enjoy the power he has. However, there is the phrase 'being made love to' in the source text, which certainly has more positive associations. 'To make love' can be translated into Turkish as 'sevişmek', but the reciprocal construction of the verb stem 'sev-' here as 'sevişmek' indicates that both sides participate, i.e. they have their roles in the action. The reason why Kür has preferred the word 'düzülmek' may be to provide the passivity of the action on the woman's side in the English text. It does not seem possible to find a word which both has positive associations and can be used in passive form in Turkish, but obviously this choice to express passivity does more than that and draws an even darker picture on Heidler's part and a lower position on Marya's part.

Not unrelated to this preference is the phrase 'petite femme', which is translated in the target footnote as "küçük kadınlar" on page 115, where it appears for the first time in the book. The contexts in which this phrase appears help to comprehend that these women are not simply 'little' or 'young', but there is something 'negative' about them. As a reader of the Turkish and the English texts, I have had the same idea because this phrase is translated only literally and not explained in the Turkish footnotes. Thus, even Turkish readers who know both English and French but are not familiar with the phrase and its cultural connotations may not be sure whether this word refers to prostitutes or young, attractive women who flirt with men around. Leslie Heywood (1996), in *Dedication to Hunger: The Anorexic Aesthetic in Modern Culture*, discusses the concept of 'petite femme' in relation to 'femme convenable' by referring to "Jean Rhys: Poses of a Woman as Guest", an essay written by Alicia Borinsky. 'Petite femme', she explains,

is “the unrespectable” and/or “the mistress”, while the latter is “the respectable woman” and/or “the wife” (158).

Although Rhys's early texts don't mention it explicitly, the characteristics the *petite femme* is said to embody are usually attributed to nonwhites, revealing the convergence of patriarchal and colonialist perspectives. But the division between respectable and disrespectable, good and bad, procreative and sexual, legitimate and illegitimate begins to collapse when one examines the conventions that create the divide and see in them that women's bodies are used to constitute their identity and are divided into separate uses or functions. Whether women occupy a position within the social structure or haunt its margins, they are still defined and define themselves as an emptiness that only their relations with men can "redeem," fill, then give shape and thereby existence. To the extent that they both require the shape that relations to men provide to feel that they exist, to have a place that will drag them out of the darkness of undifferentiated space, the *femme convenable* and the *petite femme* are in the same boat. (Heywood 1996, 161)

Heywood's arguments concerning the subject show how carefully one needs to deal with the concept of 'petite femmes'. There is a profound discussion lying behind 'petite femmes' with references to patriarchal and even colonialist aspects of the society. In the example of *Quartet*, the reader sees Marya and Lois, who accept the roles Heidler, the most powerful male figure in the novel, attaches to them. Although Marya and Lois are different in that one is the mistress and the other is the wife, both are unhappy about the roles they are expected to play. On the one hand, Marya is almost forced to stay in Heidler's house due to the economic problems she has in Stephan's absence. She agrees to sleep with Heidler, whom she starts to love in time despite his looking down on her, and spends time with this couple in the society as if there is nothing unethical in this triangular relationship. On the other hand, Lois feels the necessity to appear to consent to the sexual relationship between Marya and her husband in her house so that she can at least know about her husband's affairs and have some kind of a control. Both women are tortured by the unacceptable conditions under which they live, but they seem not to have

many alternatives, as they are women and need men economically and/or for social status at that time and place. The categorizations of women, discussed by Heywood (1996), recall Heidler's speech about the differences between a woman like Marya and a woman like Lois:

Yeniden uzanıp gözlerini kapadı. Küçük kilisede diz çökmüş dua eden, aynı zamanda yan yan bakarak kendisini etkileyip etkilemediğini gözleyen Heidler canlandı gözlerinin önünde. Adam kalktı, kiliseden çıkıp odaya girdi. "Tanrı ahbabımdır benim," dedi. "Herhalde benziyordur da bana. Soğuk gözleri, tombul elleri vardır. Ha ben onun imgesinde yaratılmışım, ha o benimkinde. Hepsi bir. Seni elde etmek için ona dua ettim, istediğim oldu. Senin için bir tavsiye mektubu yazayım istersen. Evet, evet, hatırlatırsan, yazarım. Ne zahmeti canım? Dur şimdi, isteri krizine kapılma. Bir kere Lois senden önce kaptı beni. Hem Lois iyi bir kadın, sense kötüsün. Bu kadar basit işte. Hayat budur. Prensipten olmak bu demektir. Kimse orospuların hakkını vermek zorunda değildir. Olur mu öyle şey? Öyle olsa, dünyanın hali ne olurdu, düşünsene, kızım. Hadi, hadi, iyice düşün. El değmiş mi, değmemiş mi? İlk soru bu. Geliri var mı, yok mu, ikinci soru da bu." (Kür 2007b, 165)

She lay back and shut her eyes and saw Heidler kneeling down to pray in the little church and looking sideways at her to see if she were impressed. He got up and walked out of the church into the room. 'God's a pal of mine,' he said. 'He probably looks rather like me, with cold eyes and fattish hands. I'm in His image or He's in mine. It's all one. I prayed to Him to get you and I got you. Shall I give you a letter of introduction? Yes, I might do that if you remind me. No trouble at all. Now then, don't be hysterical. Besides, Lois was there first. Lois is a good woman and you are a bad one; it's quite simple. These things are. That's what is meant by having principles. Nobody owes a fair deal to a prostitute. It isn't done. My dear girl, what could become of things if it were? Come, come to think it over. Intact or not intact, that's the first question. An income or not an income, that's the second.' (Rhys 1985c, 218)

To begin with, a brief analysis of the discourse Heidler uses here demonstrates how self-confident and authoritative he is. He stresses his power by relating himself to God and almost equalizing himself with the God by claiming that he and God are friends. In his description, God appears to approve Heidler's acts, even make life easier for Heidler so that his wishes come true and thus be on the side of men in their exploiting the women

in their lives. Second, Heidler presents himself as such a respectable member of the society that a recommendation letter written by him will help Marya in her future. Third, Heidler easily classifies the two women as ‘good’ and ‘bad’, but takes it for granted that he not only has the right to be with both but also his having sexual intercourse with a ‘bad’ woman despite the fact that he is married does not have any negative consequences on his social status or any implications related to his character. This seems to be because he is a man. Fourth, women in his life neither have a say before he makes decisions nor can react to his decisions after they are made. They cannot be hysterical or anything. Last but not least, it is possible to claim that Heidler is almost omniscient, like the God, as he knows who owes what to whom and what kind of women are ‘good’ or ‘bad’. His appearance as the authority seems to result in his speaking in the voice of all men who are more powerful than women.

This discussion is related to Kür’s choice to use ‘düzülmek’ in translating ‘to be made love to’ due to the fact that it is, in the case of ‘petite femmes’, of vital importance to express passivity rather than the positive connotations of ‘making love’. The fact that this decision of the translator leads to a darker picture on Heidler’s part and a lower position on Marya’s part seems to help to highlight the metonymical aspects of being a ‘petite femme’ or rather woman in such societies. It is possible for a well-educated, English speaking reader to be aware of the use of the phrase ‘petite femme’, as it is used in English, but it is not possible to claim that either ‘petite femme’ or ‘küçük kadınlar’ will ring a bell for the Turkish reader. This is because there are other expressions used more commonly to refer to such women in Turkish. Therefore, Kür does not use a more familiar word or phrase to clarify what type of women Marya and others are or appear to

be, but by choosing a more powerful word like ‘düzülmek’ and by using the word ‘orospu’ repeatedly in translating different words, she serves to make this aspect of Marya’s identity apparent for the target reader. The following is an example of the places where Kür opts to continue using the word ‘orospu’ although she has other alternatives in Turkish: (2) “Derken kalkar, aynaya bakar, “Tanrım, bu ben olabilir miyim?” diye geçirirdi içinden. “Tevekkeli değil herkes beni orospunun biri sanıyor.” (128). [Then she would get up and look at herself in the glass, thinking: ‘Good Lord! Can that be me? No wonder people think I’m a bad lot.’] (194). In *A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant*, there is an entry for ‘bad lot’ and this expression is defined as “a person of indifferent character” (Leland 1889, 64). It adds that this expression is frequently used to refer to “girls who have, as the French term it, “la cuisse gaie.” (ibid.), the literal translation of which would be “the cheerful thigh”. Searching on the internet, I have not been able to find references to this expression on more reliable dictionary sites but have come across to expressions like “facile femme”, which is ‘easy’ woman, in relation to “la cuisse gaie”. Therefore, Kür’s decision to use ‘orospu’ in translating ‘a bad lot’ just as she does in translating ‘prostitute’ is noteworthy. This preference apparently has a more powerful effect due to not only the subtle differences between the levels of the word choices, which may typically be regarded as synonyms, but also the repetitive use of the word ‘orospu’ [prostitute]. It is also interesting that the term ‘a bad lot’ is not always used to refer to Marya or a woman like Marya. When it is used to refer to Stephan, Kür’s translation is as follows: “Yatağa yattığında elini uzatıp onun yastığını okşadı... Stephan. Kötü işler çeviren bir adamdı. Besbelli. Öyle olsa ne yazardı? “Hiç aldırmiyorum,” diye geçirdi içinden.” (38, emphasis mine). [When she lay down she put

out her hand and touched his pillow gently.... Stephan. He was a bad lot. Possibly. Well, obviously. And what if he were? ‘I don’t care,’ thought Marya.] (137, emphasis mine). It is logical to remember the fact that ‘a bad lot’ is used to refer to ‘easy’ woman, not ‘easy’ man. Therefore, it has different connotations in the case of men. Knowing the characters in the novel and the plot, it is logical to take into consideration that Stephan is a man who is imprisoned for theft. This is a reason Kūr might have regarded in her choosing to translate ‘a bad lot’ into Turkish in a totally different manner when it is Stephan, not Marya, who is presented as an ‘easy’ woman in *Quartet*.

It needs to be noted that it is not only the word ‘orospu’ but also words like ‘hayvan’ and ‘bombok’ or ‘boktan’, which have been used so repetitively that they caught my attention while reading the target text. Because it is not very much possible to compare the number of instances every single word appears in the target and source texts, including those that are not frequently used, by using the wordlist tool of Wordsmith at the very beginning, I have generally checked the most frequently used words at first. Having realized a highlighted use of such rather ‘vulgar’ or rather ‘derogatory’ words during the qualitative analysis, I checked the wordlists of both the target and source texts once again. The differences between the number of times these words are used in the target and source texts can be seen in the table below:

Table 7. Derogatory language use and related words in *Dörtlü* and *Quartet*

Search Words in TT	<i>Dörtlü</i> _Kür	<i>Quartet</i> _Rhys	Search Words in ST
Orospu	6	4	Prostitute
‘Sokak orospusu’	1	-	Street (...)
Fahişe	-	-	Whore
Sürtük	2	2	Hussy
Kaltak	-	-	Hooker
Hafif meşrep	-	3	‘A bad lot’
Basit (kadın)	-	-	Tramp/ Slut
Hayvan	22	14	Animal
		4	Brute
Domuz(luk)	1	3	Swine
Bombok	1	4	Rotten
Boktan	5	3	Rum
Bozuk	3	2	Spoil(t)
Çürük	1	1	Decayed
Çürümüş	2	-	Corrupt
Rezil	3	3	Disgust-ing/-ed
Rezalet	4		

The table above shows the use of three derogatory words: ‘orospu’ [prostitute], ‘hayvan’ [animal] and two words derived from the word ‘bok’ [shit]. The rest is related words that need to be checked to make sure whether synonyms or words close in meaning to these three have been preferred in the two texts. It needs to be noted that the words derived from the given above have been included while counting the number of times they appear in the two texts. For instance, ‘brutality’ and ‘brutal’ are included in ‘brute’.

There are certain points to be made in relation to the findings in this table. To begin with, the table reveals that the number of times the words similar in meaning to ‘orospu’ [prostitute] used in the two texts is the same (9), but Kür’s preferences are more intensified than Rhys’. On the one hand, Kür chooses to use mostly ‘orospu’ [prostitute] and never expressions like ‘hafif meşrep’, which can be considered an alternative translation of ‘a bad lot’. On the other hand, Rhys prefers ‘a bad lot’ almost as many as ‘prostitute’. As has been discussed earlier in this chapter, Pınar Kür, in the interview

with Mine Söğüt, discusses the ‘sexuality’ or the claimed ‘obscenity’ in certain novels of hers and asserts that her description of sexuality in her novels appeared in a period when no other woman author in Turkish literature wrote about sexuality “as comfortably as” she did [Kadın yazarlar arasında cinselliği benim gibi rahat anlatan hiç yok ki o zaman.] (Söğüt 2006, 286). It may be possible to consider Kür’s highlighted use of words like ‘orospu’ [prostitute] repeatedly in this target text in relation to the point she makes, as she appears to use the word quite easily. It is, however, noteworthy that she uses not only ‘orospu’ but also words like ‘sürtük’ [tramp; hussy], ‘şırfıntı’ [slut; tramp] and ‘serbest’ [free; liberal] in similar contexts in her novel *Bitmeyen Aşk*, for instance. Therefore, her use of a relative variety of words related to ‘orospu’ in *Bitmeyen Aşk* when compared with her translation of *Quartet* can be claimed to show that the author-translator has her reasons for sticking to the use of ‘orospu’ repeatedly in *Dörtlülü*. Besides the discussed possible reasons, Kür might have felt the need to consider the fact that Rhys does not use many synonyms of the word ‘prostitute’ in the source text despite the relative variety in comparison to the target text.

Second is the frequent use of the word ‘hayvan’ in the target text, which caused me to expect to see actions and/or attitudes that would not be proper for a human being. I, as a reader, thought characters in this novel might be led by their instincts in their decisions. Thus, the frequent use of the word especially at the beginning had a significant impact on my reading, since it influenced my expectations about the personalities of the characters, who were yet unknown, as well as forthcoming events in the book. Using the concord tool, it is possible to see at which points and how often this word is used by clicking ‘plot’. This analysis shows that it is the beginning, where Kür

clearly opts to use ‘hayvan’ [animal] more often. Even if we count the number of times the word ‘domuz’ [swine] or a derived word in Turkish ‘domuzluk’ [being a swine or acting like a swine] is used, the total number is 23 in target text, whereas it is 17 in the source text. At this stage, it is necessary to check the two texts to make sure which words have been translated as ‘hayvan’ in the target text. The following three examples, with the emphases all mine, illustrate the variety in translation decisions:

1. O zaman yüzünün bir yanı bir titreyişle çarpılıyor, bir an canı yanmış bir hayvanı andırıyordu.

“Bu adam arada bir hayvanca davranıyorsa hiç şaşmam,” diye düşündü Marya. (Kür 2007b, 17)

A tremor would screw up one side of her face so that for an instant she looked like a hurt animal.

‘I bet that man is a bit of a brute sometimes,’ thought Marya. (Rhys 1985c, 124)

2. “Açık mavi gözleri zekiydi gerçi, ama bakışlarının gerisinde bir tür ahmaklık, hatta hayvansılık var gibiydi.” (Kür 2007b, 15)

“His eyes were light blue and intelligent, but with a curious underlying expression of obtuseness – even of brutality.” (Rhys 1985c, 123)

3. Sonra, yemek yemek, yemek yapmak, İngiltere ve son olarak da Marya konusunda söyleştiler. Marya’yı tartışırken üçüncü tekil şahısta konuşuyorlardı, garip ya da hiç değilse yolunu şaşırmış – bu sürüye ait olmayan – bir hayvancıktan söz edermiş gibi... (Kür 2007b, 16)

“They discussed eating, cooking, England and, finally, Marya, whom they spoke of in the third person as if she were a strange animal or at any rate a strayed animal – one not quite of the fold.” (Rhys 1985c, 123)

In the first example, it is possible to see not only the expected translation of ‘animal’ as ‘hayvan’ but also the translation of ‘brute’ as ‘hayvanca’. Kür has made a similar decision in the second example by translating ‘brutality’ as ‘hayvansılık’, which shows her consistency in translating words deriving from ‘brute’ and exemplifies the kinds of words that Kür translated as ‘hayvan’ or words derived from ‘hayvan’ into Turkish. The

last example is interesting in that Kür does not repeat the word ‘hayvan’ in the Turkish translation although it is used twice in the same source sentence. This may be evidence for the fact that Kür does not aim at using ‘hayvan’ as often as possible so that she can create a certain effect without considering other factors, such as an unconventional, repeated use of a single word while describing it with adjectives in Turkish. Instead of repeating the word ‘hayvan’, she connects the two adjective phrases with ‘ya da’ [or] and uses it once and turns ‘hayvan’ into ‘hayvancık’ [little animal] and thus reminds the reader of the lower social status Marya has in the eyes of others.

What is important concerning the use of words like ‘bombok’ or ‘boktan’ is not very much related to the number of times they are used, but again the differences between the effects of target and source text word choices. Reading the target text, I have felt that various characters speak like people who are not very educated and who do not lead a decent life. For this reason, I checked the target text against the source text at several points and found that Kür, as has been discussed earlier, chooses to use words stronger in effect. Examples can easily be given for Marya, who seems to prove that she is not a shy, graceful lady with her speech in the target text:

1. Bir süre tedirginlik içinde bir o yana bir bu yana döndükten sonra içini çekip ışığı açtı, titreyen ellerle bir sigara yaktı. Her şey yalan dolandı. Ne boktan şeyler yapıyorlardı insanlar. (Kür 2007b, 38)

She turned several times uneasily; then sighed, put on the light and lit a cigarette with shaking hands. Humbug it all was. The rotten things that people did. (Rhys 1985c, 137)

2. “Bombok bir mektup bu,” diye düşündü Marya; garsondan bir kağıt daha istedi. (Kür 2007b, 160)

‘That’s a rotten letter,’ thought Marya. She sighed and asked the waiter for more paper. (Rhys 1985c, 215)

3. Bu koridorun en sonunda, çoğu kadın olan bir grup insan, kuyruğa girmiş bekliyorlardı. Kuyruktaki yerini aldığı anda, varoluşun temel deliliğini birden tüm korkunçluğuyla duydu. Bir kez daha düşündü: insanlar çok boktan. (Kür 2007b, 58-59)

At the extreme end of this corridor a queue of people, mostly women, stood waiting, and as she took her place in the queue she felt a sudden, devastating realization of the essential craziness of existence. She thought again: people are very rum. (Rhys 1985c, 150-151)

The first two exemplify the use of ‘bombok’ in translating ‘rotten’ and the last one is an example of Kür’s decision to use ‘boktan’ for ‘rum’. Regarding the fact that ‘bombok’ or ‘boktan’ are not the only possible choices to be made in translating ‘rotten’ and ‘rum’ into Turkish, it is necessary to stress that Marya appears as a foul-mouthed person.

Another main character in the source text, Stephan, who was imprisoned because of theft, did not appear to be as impolite as Stephan in the target text. Although there are not many examples that can be given for Stephan, this single example seems to be impressive evidence for this different impact on me as a reader: “Stephan güldü. “Nah yapardın! En azından uzun süre yapamazdın, inan bana.” (140) [Stephan laughed. ‘Oh, no, you wouldn’t, not for long, believe me.’] (202). There is obviously more than a slight difference between the levels of the chosen words, as such word choices change how strongly the idea is expressed. While ‘nah’, which is a rude way of saying ‘here’ or ‘there it is!’, could generally not be used by a gentle person, ‘oh, no’ could be uttered by anybody, including a young, innocent, well-mannered lady.

To sum up, Pinar Kür’s translation of *Quartet, Dörtlü*, has certain language patterns which seem to have an effect on characterization in the novel. The translation of French words and phrases in the footnotes, which exist in the form of neither footnotes

nor a glossary in the source text, help to depict certain aspects of the characters more apparently than the source. The most evident effect is on Marya's low social status, which is in line with the position of the 'petite femme'. However, it is not only the footnotes but also the repeated use of words like 'orospu' [prostitute] for different source words in the target text that sharpens this aspect of Marya's identity. Strengthening certain aspects of the characters, such as Marya, Heidler and Stephan's, appears to be achieved through the powerful use of rather vulgar or derogatory language in the target text when it is checked against the source text, in which there seems to be milder word choices. This point is of vital importance due to the fact that an interaction between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles appears. Similar to the link between the narrators and their language uses in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, the repeated use of certain words and intensified word choices in this target text have important effects on characterization.

### **5.1.3 *Karanlıkta Yolculuk [Voyage in the Dark]***

Published in 1934, *Voyage in the Dark*, is the story of Anna, whose childhood and youth are reminiscent of Antoinette's life, told in *Wide Sargasso Sea*. It looks as if the two characters share the same or a very similar past up to a certain point in time and then a new story starts with the different present and future of the protagonist. While Antoinette leaves the Caribbean some time after she gets married, Anna leaves the Caribbean as a single, young woman whose English stepmother, Hester, prefers to live in England. Although Anna is not treated as a mad woman and kept locked up in the attic of a house, she does not enjoy a peaceful life far from the edges of madness, either.

What may be considered to push her to those edges or at least unhappiness seems to be the economic difficulties she experiences, as Hester does not want to support her much, and not unrelated to that, the attitudes of others who have a higher status in social life. As a chorus girl, she does not have a respectable position in the society. In addition, despite her lack of a clear plan to be a prostitute, she starts to have affairs with men, the first of whom is Walter, the man she falls in love with. As a result of these affairs, she experiences an unwanted pregnancy. Not knowing who the father is and not intending to give birth to the child, she tries various methods to end the pregnancy and experiences a late, risky abortion in the end. Her always feeling cold can be regarded as a symbol of her psychological distance from England, which is very different from her Caribbean world and the lonely, gloomy life she generally leads even in the presence of those who accompany her. However, it needs to be underlined that unlike the ending of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Anna manages to get help from some friends including Walter to solve her problems. She particularly gets help in finding a woman to do the abortion and the money needed for the abortion. As a result, she escapes from even worse conditions under which she would have to live and decides to start her life “all over again, all over again...” (115). It is still difficult to claim that the novel has a ‘happy’ ending, but this ‘voyage in the dark’ seems to arrive at a brighter end owing to Anna’s rather positive emotional state compared with the earlier stages.

*Karanlıkta Yolculuk*, Pınar Kür’s Turkish translation of *Voyage in the Dark*, has three main patterns in language use. Emphasis on the idea of madness, word choices at stronger levels of emphasis, effective use of slang or slum language in the speeches of certain characters and reduplication, which is also observed in the author-translator’s

own writing, are spotted as the features that assist to make Kür's appearance in the target text more clear. Before discussing these language features identified in the target text, it is of vital importance to explore the point of view through which the novel is narrated, its implications and relation to the target representation of the characters.

*Karanlıkta Yolculuk* was published in 1989 by Can Publishing. Kür's translation is written in the first person point of view of Anna, the main character of the novel, which is in line with the source text. This important "technical shift" in Rhys' narrative voice from the omniscient in *Quartet* to the first person in *Voyage in the Dark* is considered to be significant, as the reader is not simply exposed to the story of the "victim" but more importantly to the voice of the "victim" (Harrison 1988, 123). Reading both the target and source texts gives the chance to hear not only Anna's inner thoughts and feelings but also Anna's understanding of everything that takes place and the effects of other people's words, behavior and attitudes on her. For instance, Anna expresses her thoughts and feelings about the two men, whom Anna and Maudie meet in the streets, after they spend some time together: "İkisinden de tiksiniyordum. Birileriyle ahbap oluyorsunuz sonra da size kaba davranıyorlar. Sokakta ahbap olduğunuz kişiler hep size kaba davranmakta bir sakınca olmadığına inanırlar." (14) [I hated them both. You pick up people and then they are rude to you. This business of picking up people and then they always imagine they can be rude to you.] (6). The underlined sentence is obviously an expression of Anna's feelings about these two men, who, Anna thinks, look down on them. Even when she does not openly express her thoughts and feelings, the reader has the opportunity to be part of her inner world as s/he hears her inner voice. Similar to the emphatic language use in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Dörtlü*, this example

in the translation of *Voyage in the Dark* also shows that the Turkish verb ‘tiksinmek’ [to be disgusted with] is a quite strong preference when compared with the English source verb ‘hate’. Another example of how this first person point of view presents certain aspects of the story and other characters is when Anna sees Walter, one of those two men, alone some time later. Here she comments on Walter’s inner thoughts and attitudes:

“Demek üvey anneni sık sık görmüyorsun? Senin turnelerde sürtmene onaylamıyor mu yoksa? Aile şerefini lekelediğini falan mı düşünüyor?”  
Ona baktım. Benimle alay edencesine sırıtıyordu. Sustum. “Hay Allah,” dedim içimden, “burun kıvrıranlar cinsinden bu da. Keşke gelmeseydim.” (Kür 1989c, 22)

‘So you don’t see much of your stepmother? Doesn’t she approve of your gadding about on tour? Does she think you’ve disgraced the family or something?’

I looked at him, and he was smiling as if he were laughing at me, I stopped talking. I thought, ‘Oh God, he’s the sneering sort. I wish I hadn’t come.’ (Rhys 1985d, 12)

This is Anna’s judgement of Walter’s looks, attitudes and the words he utters. In other words, it is not Walter, who presents his own inner thoughts and feelings about Anna. The reader is directly provided with the spoken words of the other characters only when their speech is directly reported by Anna. It is also significant to note that Kür’s word choices present a more detailed picture of Walter’s smile than Rhys’. As a reader of the target text, I directly feel more uncomfortable about his smile than that in the source text, which leaves the reader with her/his own interpretations of the smile. Kür’s choice of ‘alay etmek’ [to mock, to ridicule] and ‘sırıtmaq’ [to grin] tell more than ‘to laugh’ and ‘to smile’. My understanding of the source text is not very different from that of the source text due to the context, but the intensified word choices made in the target text when compared with the source seem to draw the scene more clearly.

As the above two examples of the effects of the selected point of view of the novel show, other people's despising Anna's profession and even identity is a point frequently reflected from Anna's viewpoint. This seems to be what most affects Anna negatively in her life, as such remarks stress the 'inferiority' of her identity in others' eyes and obviously hurt her feelings. It is not only the men she goes out or sleeps with but also the landladies and even a girlfriend who look down on her and annoy her with their words. An example is the landlady who wants Anna to leave her room as soon as possible: "Tam kapıdan çıkacakken durdu, yeniden bana döndü: "Evimde yosmaları barındıramam, anladın mı şimdi?" Karşılık vermedim. Kalbim güm güm atıyordu." (30) [At the door she turned round and said, 'I don't want no tarts in my house, so now you know.' I didn't answer. My heart was beating like hell.] (18). After expressing her husband's and her own uneasiness about Anna's behavior, such as her arriving the house early in the morning, the landlady openly identifies Anna's profession and thus gives the reason why they want her to leave. Learning that others are aware of her lifestyle and that she is not wanted there any more, she cannot say anything. The use of "güm güm" in the Turkish text has an effective role in letting the reader feel like hearing Anna's heartbeats. Repeating or rather doubling the same sound or word, i.e. reduplication, which is a language pattern noted in the analysis of *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, will further be discussed.

In addition to Anna's being treated in ways lacking respect, there are situations in which Anna attracts attention to her own powerlessness or her lack of respect for her own identity. For instance, the first sexual intercourse of her life happens to be with a man called Walter, to whom she feels emotionally connected. When Walter asks about

her career plans for the future and specifically if she would be interested in getting singing lessons, and so on, Anna responds, “I want to be with you. That’s all I want.” (31). This can be interpreted as both/either her willingness to depend on Walter, lack of readiness to work hard for the best of her career and/or her passion for Walter. Nevertheless, she does not reject the money Walter puts in her purse after their first sexual intercourse and says, “All right, if you like – anything you like, anyway you like.” (23). There is the fact that she does not seem to have planned to get money from him, but she happens to utter those words and even kisses his hand in spite of her later feeling embarrassed of that kiss. Her being in a vulnerable position in which she accepts ‘any’ thing seen appropriate by the man who has money and power and her physically bowing her head with the intention to kiss his hand is symbolic of her powerlessness both economically and socially as well as her finding or putting herself in belittling situations. After Walter decides to stop seeing Anna, Anna feels hurt, but in time she starts to go out with others whom she sleeps with. Directly related to this situation is her anger or rather hatred against those people and depressive emotional state.

Interestingly, as a reader of the Turkish translation, I have felt an emphasis on madness, which can be linked to this anger, hatred and depression Anna experiences. Although the statistical results do not show a high number of words used to refer to the idea of being or going mad in the two texts, differences between the density of such words in the target and source texts and their effects on the reader can be seen when the two texts are studied in comparison.

Table 8. Madness related language use in *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* and *Voyage in the Dark*

Search Words in TT	<i>Karanlıkta Yolculuk</i> _Kür	<i>Voyage in the Dark</i> _Rhys	Search Words in ST
Çılgın	1	4	(Go/ Make/ Be) Crazy
Deli*	11	8	(Go/ Drive/ Be) Mad
Kaçık*	3	5	Potty
Terelelli*	2		
Birkaç tahta(n) eksik	2	2	Not all there
Fıttır-*	3		
Çıldır-*	2		
Aklımı kaçır-	1		
Aklımı oynat-	1		

While the total number of words similar in meaning to ‘mad’ in the target text is 26, there are 19 words of this kind in the source text. More importantly, the variety in Kür’s Turkish target text is obviously very much different from Rhys’ English source text. Although the table above does not demonstrate all the words checked in the two texts and only those that have been found to appear in the texts, about 20 English words, including ‘nuts’, ‘nutty’, ‘balmy’, ‘insane’, and ‘cracked’, have been checked. None of them has been used even once. In contrast to this source text fact, Kür brings diversity by using various other words and phrases similar in meaning, as can be seen in the table. The example below demonstrates how one of these words is used in the target text:

Sonra düşündüm ki, Berners Sokağı’ndaki o otele gitsem, üstümde bir geceliği ödeyecek kadar para var. Ama tabii, bagajsız gittin mi yer olmadığını söylerler. Otelin yarısı boş olsa da yer yok derler. Resepsiyondaki kızın bu sözleri nasıl söyleyeceği o kadar kesin gözümün önüne geldi ki, yeniden gülmeye başladım. Öyle pis pis bakarlar ki insana... Pis sesleri, yüksek, dümdüz, tırmanılması imkansız duvarlar gibi sarar insanın çevresini, üstüne üstüne gelir. Ve buna karşı yapılacak bir şey de yoktur. Fıttırır insan, Laurie’nin dediği gibi. Pis pis bakarlar insana, sesleri de pistir, fıttırır, Laurie’nin dediği gibi. (Kür 1989c, 131)

Then I thought, ‘If I went to that hotel in Berners Street. I’ve got just about enough money on me to pay. They’d say, of course, that they hadn’t got a room if you went in without any luggage. With the hotel half-empty they’d still say that they hadn’t got a room.’ I could imagine so well the girl at the desk saying it that I had to begin to laugh again. The damned way they look at you, and their

damned voices, like high, smooth, unclimbable walls all round you, closing in on you. And nothing to be done about it, either. The answer's a lemon, as Laurie says. The damned way they look at you and their damned voices and the answer's a lemon as Laurie says. (Rhys 1985d, 90)

The use of the verb 'fittirmek' [to lose one's mind, to go crazy] in the target text is a word choice that attracts attention in this paragraph. As a word used most frequently in everyday spoken language, it brings vividness to the text and helps to feel it is 'really' the inner voice of the protagonist that the reader hears. Kür's use of the word 'fittirmek' requires more interpretation when it is checked against the source text. At this point in the source text Rhys writes, 'The answer's a lemon', which is a sentence uttered when the speaker wants to say s/he is not pleased with a certain idea or situation. For this reason, the use of the verb 'fittirmek' is an example of word choice at a stronger level of emphasis when compared with the source sentence. Even 'delirmek' [to go crazy] would be a less striking translation preference. This word choice draws attention to the contempt of the speaker towards the subject and more importantly, to the idea of madness, which is not present here in this specific source paragraph. Remembering the context of the novel and how Anna feels desperate and depressed most of the time helps to better comprehend possible reasons for this translation decision. However, such preference adds to the emphasis on the idea of madness more apparently in the target text than the source text. The second example below also shows how three other madness related words and phrases are used in the target text:

“Senin derdin ne, biliyor musun?” diye sordu. “Terelellisin. Yarı kaçıksın! Kafanda birkaç tahta eksik, anladın mı? Seni kaçık orospu çocuğu. Birkaç tahtan eksik, tamam mı? Asıl derdin de bu. Suratına bir kere bakmak yeter, hemen anlaşılıyor terelelli olduğun.” (Kür 1989c, 130)

‘The thing about you,’ she said, ‘is that you’re half potty. You’re not all there; you’re a half-potty bastard. You’re not all there; that’s what’s the matter with you. Anybody’s only got to look at you to see that.’ (Rhys 1985d, 89)

As can be seen above, Kür uses ‘yarı kaçıksın’ to translate ‘half potty’ and ‘(kafanda) birkaç tahta(n) eksik’ for ‘you’re not all there’, but she also makes an addition by writing ‘terelelli(sin)’ [batty]. The first madness related word Kür prefers in this harsh speech made by Ethel, a friend at whose house Anna rents a room, is ‘terelelli’. What is more, Kür uses this word at the end of the speech, too. While there is no such word at the beginning, there is a reference word at the end of the source text: ‘that’. Kür prefers to explicitate what ‘that’ refers to by using the same word ‘terelleli’. Thus, she not only makes the reference clear but also strengthens the meaning by repeating the word ‘terelelli’ in the beginning and the end. It is also significant that Ethel in the target text does not prefer the word ‘deli’ [crazy] but ‘terelelli’ [batty]. Here Kür makes a word choice that is less frequently encountered in even everyday language and thus brings variety while also considering the women characters’, like Ethel’s, use of slang in their language.

The use of slang or slum language is the fourth important feature noted in the target text analysis, which is important, as the relationship between certain language uses and narrators or characters is one of the interactions between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles. The use of such language only by those who are looked down on by the society adds to the characterization of the chorus girls and/or prostitutes in the novel. This is due to the fact that this language use plays a major role in distinguishing them from the others who have a higher status in the society. It is interesting that this kind of

language is specifically named in the first pages of the target text as can be seen in the quotation below:

(...) Bay Her-neydiyse-adın. Sahi, adın ne?"  
Uzun boylu adam yanıtlamadı. (...)  
Maudie, kenar mahalle ağzıyla konuştu: "Sana diyorum, anacım. Bal gibi işittin. Kulacıkların sağır değil a? Adını bağışlar mısın acaba?" (Kür 1989c, 13)

(...) Mr What's-your name. What is your name, by the way?"  
The tall man didn't answer. (...)  
Maudie said in cockney, 'I was speaking to you, 'Orace. You 'eard. You ain't got clorf ears. I asked what your name was.' (Rhys 1985d, 6)

The narrator informs the target reader that the language spoken by Maudie is "kenar mahalle ağzı" [the dialect of the slum]. 'Cockney' in the source text, however, can be defined as the English dialect spoken by a working class person particularly from the East of London. The concern, pains and delicacy Maudie lacks while choosing her words matches the expression "kenar mahalle ağzı" [the dialect of the slum] in my reading of the target text and thus does not surprise me, at all. However, considering the fact that Rhys refers to the working class people from the East side of London, I have noticed that the effects on me as a reader of the two texts differ. This is owing to the fact that the target text makes the lower social status of characters, like Maudie, clearer than it is in the source text. The reason why Maudie gets irritated is Jones, who is one of the two men Anna and Maudie comes home with. Because Jones does not respond to the question Maudie asks, she starts to grouse and repeats her question. The target expressions also lead to a feeling that Maudie is quite an unconventional person who can easily tease others, whereas the source expressions help me to feel mainly Maudie's fury.

As is obvious from the previous example, Jones and Maudie cannot get along with each other well. However, the other man, Jeffries, and Anna seem to be a possible couple because Jeffries shows his interest in her. He asks if they could have dinner one night and her address in London. After Jones and Jeffries leave, Maudie makes positive remarks about Jeffries, but Anna says, she liked neither of them. This is a point at which the target reader encounters Maudie's use of slang once again, as Maudie teases Anna: "Adresini istediğinde ikiletmedin ama," dedi. (16) ['You gave your address pretty quick, though,' Maudie said.] (8). Again the difference in the effects of the target and the source attracts attention when they are checked against one another. Maudie appears to me as an eccentric character with her use of slang in an amiable tone in the target text. Nevertheless, the language used in the source is quite straight and there is no use of slang, whose presence in the target seems to bolster the idea that Maudie uses the dialect of the slum. It needs to be noted that Maudie is not the only person who speaks such a dialect and uses slang. Laurie, a friend of Anna's, is another character whose speech illustrates the use of similar language. In the following scene Laurie calls out to the old lady working in the house because Anna wants to have a bath. But the old lady appears to have fallen asleep, so Laurie tells her to wake up and hurry up: "Hadi, anacım, uyan. Banyoyu hazırla, bir de çay yap. Hadisene. Ömründe bir kere de acele et, allahını seversen." (108) ['Go on, Ma, wake up. Turn a bath on and get some tea. And hurry for once in your life, for God's sake.'] (73). It is significant that Laurie, too, seems to earn her living as a prostitute and her dialect is similar to Maudie's. This is important because the target reader can start to see them as a separate group of people who have characteristics in common. Checking the two texts against one another demonstrates that

the language uses are similar. However, there is again emphatic use of this language in that the target reader can feel this is everyday language spoken in the streets more apparently than the source reader. An additional reason for the importance of this feature discussed in detail is because Pınar Kür is an author who pays particular attention to the language uses of different characters or narrators in creating their identities and points of views. As has been previously explored in this chapter, both *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* present how distinct different characters or narrators' language uses can be. This is due to their word choices, preferences in language structures and approach to the subject. Thus, it is possible to deduce that Kür, who pays attention to the differences between different characters' or narrators' language uses, is also careful about the creation of this effect on the target readers as she translates, which is a point in line with Kür's own argument that in translating she also "pay[s] attention to those that [she] pay[s] attention in [her] own writing" [Kendi yazımı yazarken nelere dikkat ediyorsam, onlara da dikkat ediyorum tabii ki.] (Aka 2011).

Last but not least, repetitive use of words and phrases is a pattern identified in the target text. This pattern in *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* is very much similar to the effective language use in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, which has already been discussed. First of all, there is reduplication of onomatopoeic words, such as "güm güm" (30), "pat pat" (49), and "tir tir" (59) in *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*. Another example of such reduplication is "bas bas" (23) as can be seen in the quotation below: "Lanet olsun, bırak beni, lanet olsun" deyip duruyordum. "Yoksa bas bas bağırırım." (23) [I kept saying, 'Damn you, let me go, damn you. Or I'll make a hell of a row.'] (13). This is a moment when Anna gets furious at Walter after two kisses and tries to push him away. Walter lets her go and

apologizes. Although the use of reduplication in the target text intensifies the ‘meaning’ and helps the reader to feel how loud Anna is ready to cry, the source text expression is also powerful. This and the previous noted examples are all repetitions of onomatopoeic words, but there are also reduplications of other words in the form of nouns, adjectives, and adverbs. The next quotation illustrates how frequently reduplication can at times be noticed in the novel:

Hava karardı ama kalkıp gaz lambasını yakacak halim yoktu. Bacaklarıma korkunç ağırlıklar bağlanmıştı sanki, kıpırdayamıyordum. Bir keresinde evde de böyle hastalanmıştım. Ateşim vardı, vakit öğleden sonraydı, jaluzileri indirmişlerdi, aralıklarından giren sarı ışık, çizgi çizgi yere düşmüştü. Oda boyasızdı. Yer tahtaları boğum boğumdu, birinin üstünde bir böcek durmuş, antenlerini bir öne bir arkaya uzatıyordu ağır ağır. Kıpırdayamıyordum. Yattığım yerde ona bakıyordum. “Uçacak olur da yatağın üstüne ya da yüzüme konarsa aklımı kaçıırım,” diye düşünüyordum. Ona bakıyordum ve “Uçacak mı?” diye soruyordum kendime. Alnıma koydukları tülbent cayır cayır yanıyordu. (Kür 1989c, 30-31)

It got dark, but I couldn’t get up to light the gas. I felt as if there were weights on my legs so that I couldn’t move. Like that time at home when I had fever and it was afternoon and the jalousies were down and yellow light came in through the slats and lay on the floor in bars. The room wasn’t painted. There were knots in the wood and on one of them a cockroach, waving its feelers slowly backwards and forwards. I couldn’t move. I lay watching it. I thought, ‘If it flies on to the bed or if it flies on to my face I shall go mad.’ I watched it and I thought, ‘Is it going to fly?’ and the bandage on my head was hot. (Rhys 1985d, 18)

Here in the target text reduplication of words again helps to produce a vivid description.

When I check the target text against the source text considering the effects on me as a reader, I first feel the target effect of poetic language use which is partly created by reduplication. The fact that target sentences are shorter and the use of anastrophe, as in the sentence, in which “ağır ağır” is used, also helps to provide this effect to a certain level, but the vital role played by reduplication cannot be ignored. In addition, reduplication sometimes strengthens the level of ‘meaning’, which can be seen in the use

of “cayır cayır yan-” in the target text. Kür’s word choice and preference for reduplication is apparently more intensified than the target expression ‘to be hot’. Thus the target reader can feel the narrated senses more strikingly than the source reader. It is here noteworthy that besides these rather accustomed uses of reduplication in Turkish language, there is the reduplication of adverbs, such as “dinlerken dinlerken” [(while) listening] (1989a, 12) in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, “bakarken bakarken” (2008, 61, 66) and “otururken otururken” (2008, 354) in *Bitmeyen Aşk*, which demonstrate that Kür creates a poetic effect through relatively less frequently noticed uses of reduplication in both her translations and own writing and this is an interaction identified between her authorial and translatorial styles in this study.

In brief, the analysis of *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* has shown that there are certain significant patterns that Kür seems to follow in her translation. To begin with, the emphasis on madness is more apparently identified, as the number and variety of words and phrases similar in meaning to ‘mad’ are higher than the source text. In addition, there are examples of target word choices at stronger levels of emphasis. The second feature is the more effective use of slang or slum language by women characters who have a lower social status. This feature seems to highlight the separation of this group of women from other members of the society who have a higher position through not only lifestyle or experiences but also language use. Finally, reduplication enhances the powerful use of language, brings vividness to target description and thus creates a poetic effect. These appear to be the most striking language features that point to Kür’s presence in the target text.

#### **5.1.4 *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Good Morning, Midnight*]**

*Good Morning, Midnight*, published in 1939, was translated by Pınar Kür into Turkish and published with the title *Günaydın Geceyarısı* in 1990. The intertextuality of the title *Good Morning, Midnight* is due to the fact that it is also the first line of a poem by Emily Dickinson. The poem, whose first two stanzas are given at the beginning of the book, match the novel, as both reflect the loss of sunshine in one's life and how this hurts. The voice in Emily Dickinson's poem longs for the daytime in sunshine, but upon the abandonment of the day, s/he wishes 'good night' to the Day. The day seems to have gone to sleep forever for the persona. In other words, s/he has lost her hope for the future in having the day back in her life. The persona welcomes the Midnight unwillingly since this is not a preference that s/he makes. There seems to be, however, not only disappointment but also an attempt at changing one's perspective in this 'good morning' call to the Midnight, which is technically the beginning of a brand new day although there is no sunshine, yet. Sasha, the protagonist in *Günaydın Geceyarısı*, also presents her tragic experiences, including rape, but interestingly uses humour. Unable to take control of the situation, even to protect her body and soul from a man, she looks as if she tries to ignore the bitter reality and/or see a different aspect of the situation which cannot hurt her and boost her strength to heal her wounds as she says "Olay gerçekten biraz komik" (179) ['This is really a bit comic,'] (456). Due to the humour of the Caribbean, "which is so often political, full of wordplay, sceptical of institutions and power and essentially survivalist", *Good Morning, Midnight* is considered to be "the funniest of Rhys's novels" (Savory 1998, 109).

The plot of *Günaydın Geceyarısı*, which is told from the first person point of view, is more difficult to summarize than those of the other novels by Rhys. This is owing to the fact that the protagonist narrates events or moments from the past without giving details about the context, moves back to the present usually without giving clear clues about the sequence of events. The reader who cannot learn even the real name of the protagonist may feel the need to make some effort to connect events whose reasons and results may not be given at all. It is worth drawing attention to the fact that Pınar Kür's two novels, especially *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, and *Günaydın Geceyarısı* are to a certain extent similar in that the role of the reader in the interpretation process is obvious. This point, however, will not be counted as one of the major interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles, as there are differences between the kinds of roles expected from the readers. For instance, the connection between the events, their reasons and results are quite easy to follow in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, but there is the element of mystery, which causes the additional need for the reader's role in interpretation.

Sasha is the name used by the protagonist, who explains to have started to use this name for the hope of bringing her luck, but she seems to mock herself when she asks, “Şans getirdi mi bana acaba, Sasha adı?” (10) [Did it bring me any luck, I wonder – calling myself Sasha?] (349). Having an unhappy past, she seems not to have had luck on her side very much. This may be a reason why the name Sasha appears only three times in the target and four times in the source text. She cannot enjoy the power to change her luck, but she tries to keep control of herself for the ‘best’ of her emotional

state. Inner monologues similar to the one below can be heard at different points in the novel:

Aman dikkat, dikkat! Heyecanlanma. Heyecanlandın mı, coşkunaştın mı ne oluyor biliyorsun, değil mi? ... Evet. ... Patlamış bir balon gibi nasıl yıkılıveriyorsun biliyorsun, değil mi? Hiç dayanıklı olmadığından. ... Evet, tamamen öyle. Öyleyse, heyecan yok. Sessiz, sakın, akli başında bir onbeş gün geçireceksin. Çok fazla içmeyeceksin, belli kafelerden, belli sokaklardan, belli noktalardan uzak duracaksın, o zaman her şey yolunda gidecek, çok güzel olacak. (Kür 1990, 14)

But careful, careful! Don't get excited. You know what happens when you get excited and exalted, don't you? ... Yes... And then, you know how you collapse like a pricked balloon, don't you? Having no staying power. ... Yes, exactly. ... So, no excitement. This is going to be a quiet, sane fortnight. Not too much drinking, avoidance of certain cafés, of certain spots, and everything will go off beautifully. (Rhys 1985b, 351)

It is interesting that there is again the second-person point of view, but here the narrator does not address the reader. It is herself that the inner voice is talking to. Struggling to survive not only economically but also psychologically, Sasha comes back to Paris in her middle age and keeps thinking of all that she has experienced through the associations created in her mind as a result of the places that she visits, even the sounds that she hears. Her relationship with Enno, the father of her child, and the death of the child seem to have played major roles in her loneliness, which has caused a major depression and even led to her thinking of committing suicide. During her stay in Paris, Sasha meets a gigolo, René, for whom she seems to have empathy, as she understands why he does what he does. Although she keeps rejecting René whenever he is interested in coming to the room she has rented, the gigolo comes to her room without her consent at the end of the novel. They first kiss each other with passion. She seems to have found love and happiness upon his arrival. Full of the fears stemming from her past and the

fear of being heard by others, however, she loses the positive energy in her and asks him to leave. The gigolo does not accept this rejection and forces her to have sexual intercourse with him. Thinking that René will not only rape her but also take her money, she begs him to take only the thousand-franc note, not the rest left in her purse. Sometime after the gigolo leaves the room, she checks her purse and sees that he has not taken anything and says, “Davranışın beni çok duygulandırdı, tatlı jigolo, kalbimin derinliklerinden teşekkür ediyorum sana. Böylesi bir nezakete alışkın değilim.” (184) [I appreciate this, sweet gigolo, from the depths of my heart. I’m not used to these courtesies.] (459). Then, thinking about the gigolo and feeling desperately lonely, she starts to wish René would come back. Imagining his steps back to the room with all the details, she seems to manage to bring him back. A man does come to her room after she gets undressed and ready to make love in bed. She pulls him to the bed in spite of the fact that she abhors him. In line with the narration of most scenes, there is an important lack of information concerning the identity of the man. The main clue seems to be the white dressing gown, which is worn by the man living in the next door, the man who “looks like a priest of some obscene, half-understood religion” [Papaza benziyor – müstehcen ve doğru dürüst anlaşılmamış bir dinin papazına.] (364). This is the man that she fears because she seems to feel from his attitudes that he considers her not a ‘respectable’ woman and has expectations from her. That is why she does not want the man in the next room to see or hear René. She seems to be concerned with being heard more than being raped probably because she is afraid he will visit her, too, if he hears them. In short, the protagonist appears to have given up her struggle against this man, who had been waiting for his time, and uses her imagination to bear the pain.

Obviously there is a difference between the gigolo and the man in the next-door. While the gigolo is a man she seems to have at least sympathy for, the man living in next door is a source of horror in her life. It is also possible that this last scene with the man in the next-door is only a product of her imagination. Imagining René coming into the room, she cannot wipe away the traces of her unhappy past experiences. Thus, knowing that she can hardly bring the gigolo back may have a role in her creating the image of the man that she despises. Whether it is the reality or her imagination, it is important that Sasha cannot find the strength to resist the difficulties in her life and gives up by opening out her arms to the man she fears most. Nevertheless, it is also significant that she does not shed tears or act like a woman in pain in the presence of the two men and tries to appear as a “very strong” woman, a woman, as she admits to herself, who is “strong as the dead” (456) [Ölüler kadar güçlüyüm] (180).

In addition to the language features described in detail in the section on recurrent features in the four target texts, one of which is the variety in the use of discourse particles, *Günaydın Geceyarısı*, Pınar Kür’s Turkish translation of *Good Morning, Midnight*, attracted my attention with its use of slang and derogatory language. Similar to the previously explored target texts in the corpus, *Günaydın Geceyarısı* also presents examples of emphatic language use by reduplication, but emphatic language in this target text is especially noteworthy in the use of slang and derogatory language. It needs to be underlined that use of slang, derogatory language and swear words is interesting due to Kür’s intensified word choices, translation of some French words or phrases and again the variety that she brings, which will be explored in relation to the use of

'madness' related words. Below are five examples that illustrate how intensified Kür's language appears to be at certain points in the target text:

1. Bu gece ikinci sınıf boktan bir bara gitmeyeceğim. Hayır, bu gece müzikli bir yere gideceğim; bir sürü insanla birlikte olabileceğim bir yere; dansedilen bir yere. (Kür 1990, 73-74)

I'm not going to any beastly little bar tonight. No, tonight I'm going somewhere where there's music; somewhere where I can be with a lot of people; somewhere where there's dancing. (Rhys 1985b, 388)

2. Her kadın başka birine kiralandığı bir binaydı, birkaç aile yaşıyordu içinde. (...) Ama çıkarabildiğim kadarıyla, çocuk ona pis bir kadın olduğunu, kötü koktuğunu, bu evde bulunmaya hakkı olmadığını söylemiş. 'Sen çok iğrençsin, keşke gebersen,' demiş. (...) O evde yaşayan iki kadın daha vardı. Biri ince dudaklı, ağzı kapalı bir kadın, ötekisi ise şişko orospu gülüştü. (Kür 1990, 97-98)

This house was one of those that are let off in floors. There were several families living in it. (...) But it seemed that the child had told her that she was a dirty woman, that she smelt bad, that she hadn't any right in the house. "I hate you and I wish you were dead," the child said. (...) There were two other women in the house. There was one with a shut, thin mouth and a fat one with a bordel laugh. (Rhys 1985b, 403-404)

3. Tabii. Anladım şimdi. Aman Allahım, ben öyle bir görünümde miyim? Dişine göre birini bulmak umuduyla Montparnasse'a düşmüş zengin bir karıya mı benziyorum? Kendime çeki düzen vermek için bu kadar uğraştıktan sonra - ? Herhalde öyle.  
Cehenneme kadar yolu olduğunu söyleyeyim mi? Yoo, bir dakika. Galiba şu sırada ben de biraz olsun öç alabilirim. Konuşursun bu gibilerle, anlayışlı davranıyormuş gibi yaparsın. Ve, en beklemedikleri anda dersin ki: Sittir git! (Kür 1990, 75)

Of course. I've got it. Oh Lord, is that what I look like? Do I really look like a wealthy dame trotting round Montparnasse in the hope of - ? After all the trouble I've gone to, is that what I look like? I suppose I do.  
Shall I tell him to go to hell? But after all, I think, this is where I might be able to get some of my own back. You talk to them, you pretend to sympathize; then, just at the moment when they are not expecting it, you say: 'Go to hell.' (Rhys 1985b, 389)

4. Paris pek güzel görünüyor bu gece. ... Bu gece pek hoşluğun üstünde, güzelim benim, sevgilim benim, ah ne malın gözü orospusundur sen! (Kür 1990, 15)

Paris is looking very nice tonight. ... You are looking very nice tonight, my beautiful, my darling, and oh what a bitch you can be! (Rhys 1985b, 352)

5. Mektubu üstüste okuyup okuyup düşünüyor. “İnanmıyorum ona,” diyor. “Hepsi yalan, ağına düşürmek istiyor beni, tuzak kuruyor. Anlıyorsunuz ya, bu kız yalancının teki. O üçyüz frankı maquereau’suna vermek için istiyor. Peki, o pezevenge versin diye ben ona üçyüz frank verecek miyim? Hayır, vermem, vermeyeceğim. ... (...)” (Kür 1990, 88-89)

He is chewing and chewing over this letter. ‘I don’t believe it,’ he says. ‘It’s all a lie, it’s a snare, it’s a trap. This girl, you understand, is a liar. What she wants is three hundred francs to give to her masquereau. Will I give her three hundred francs for her masquereau? No, I won’t. I will not.... (...)’ (Rhys 1985b, 398)

Three points concerning the use of slang and derogatory language illustrated above deserve to be stressed: the choice of intensified expressions, the translation of French words into Turkish, and the variety in the translation of such words. To begin with, the first example and the word ‘geber-’ in the second demonstrate Kür’s preference for intensified words or expressions. In the first example, Kür does not find it sufficient to say ‘ikinci sınıf’ [second class] and to use an adjective like ‘ufacık’ [little] while translating ‘beastly little’. Instead, she adds ‘boktan’, which is a word noted in the analysis of *Dörtlü* for the source words ‘rotten’ and ‘rum’. The second example illustrates the utterance of ‘keşke gebersen’ by a girl that appears to hate a ‘dirty’ woman in the target text. In the source text, however, is the sentence ‘I wish you were dead’. There is obviously no use of slang that increases the intensity of the utterance, unlike the verb ‘gebermek’ [to kick the bucket] in the source text. A young person’s wishing somebody to die, which is one of the messages in both the target and source texts, is a bit shocking, but her using slang in a powerful way in the target text strikes the target reader even more than the source.

The second and the last examples show how Kür can sometimes prefer to make the ‘meaning’ of a French word clear to the target reader by either translating it as in the former or providing a Turkish word in its place when it is used for the second time in the same context instead of repeating the same French word as in the latter. Kür translates ‘bordel’ as ‘orospu’ [whore] and ‘maquereau’ as ‘pezeveng’ [pimp]. In French, ‘bordel’ can be used in a pejorative sense to refer to ‘dump’ or ‘mess’, but it can also be defined as ‘whorehouse’. Kür, considering the context, i.e. that the word ‘bordel’ is used as an adjective for the laugh of a woman who is apparently disparaged, chooses the Turkish word ‘orospu’ [whore]. While there is no definition for ‘masquereau’ in the dictionaries I have checked, English translation of ‘maquereau’, spelt without ‘s’ in the target text, can be ‘pimp’. While these two words are translated into Turkish in two different ways, they are both provided in Turkish. In contrast to this translation practice, the author of the source text neither explains nor prefers to use an English word in the place of the French. Thus, there is a difference between the effects on the target and source readers in that the need for the target reader to make some effort to comprehend the ‘meanings’ of ‘bordel’ and ‘masquereau’ are removed unlike the source text. However, this is not a rule that Rhys always follows in her writing. There are places where she also provides an explanation or a definition of the French expression in English:

Paramı ödemek üzere garsonu çağırıyorum. Yüklü bir bahşiş veriyorum. ...  
Buraya, yalnızca en yakın sinemanın yolunu öğrenmek için gelmişim. Saygın bir kadını ben, un[e] femme convenable, sinemaya gitmekten başka bir niyetim yok. (Kür 1990, 106)

I call the waiter, to pay. I give him a large tip. ... I only came in here to inquire the way to the nearest cinema. I am a respectable woman, une femme convenable, on her way to the nearest cinema. (Rhys 1985b, 409)

The above given example illustrates the use of the Turkish expression and the French in the same target sentence, which is in line with the writing practice in the source text. As it is evident, although Kür's preference in the previous example is certainly a translation decision that does not stem from that certain part of the source text, the appearance of the 'same' expression in two different languages is not a practice unlikely to be seen in the source.

Last but not least, Kür's translation decisions bring variety to the target text in the use of swear words. The third example shows that she does not repeat the idiom 'cehenneme kadar yolu ol-' for the second time in the target text. Instead, she makes an even more striking preference and uses a swear expression 'sittir git' despite the fact that the source expression 'go to hell' is used twice. By choosing 'sittir git', which appears at the end of the paragraph, Kür has found an expression almost the same length and thus as concise as the source. Nonetheless, it is important that this is again an intensified word choice because 'go to hell' could also be translated as 'defol', which is not a swear word. The fourth example illustrates the use of 'orospu' [whore] but with an added emphasis on the character of the subject in focus, which is the city Paris. The target sentence 'ah ne malın gözü orospusundur sen' is definitely more striking than 'oh what a bitch you can be' for two reasons. First of all, there is the use of simple present tense in the target sentence, which causes a generalization of this character of the city, whereas in the source there is the use of a modal verb, 'can', which indicates either ability or possibility in this case. Second, there is the addition of the phrase 'malın gözü' [sly] attracts attention, as it strengthens the negative qualities of the city. As a result of the

two choices, the target text presents different translations of the same words or phrases and thus variety in the use of swear words.

A comparison of the above-discussed feature in the translation of swear words to the use of words related to ‘madness’ in meaning presents noteworthy results. In contrast to the previous feature, here the word ‘deli’ [crazy] and its derivatives are often preferred in the target text. Therefore, Kür seems to have opted for the repetition of the same word and its derivatives instead of bringing variety to the translation of words similar in meaning to ‘mad’ or those that have associations of ‘madness’.

1. Yiyecek düşünmeye başlıyorum. Örneğin şukrut – burada şukrut garni vardır mutlaka. Harika sosisler, harika haşlanmış patates, harika harika haşlanmış lahana. ... Ağzım delice sulanıyor. (Kür 1990, 87)

I start thinking about food. Choucrouste, for instance – you ought to be able to get choucrouste garnie here. Lovely sausage, lovely potato, lovely, lovely cabbage. ... My mouth starts watering violently. (Rhys 1985b, 397)

2. Alfred, şiir söyler gibi, “Tanrının sonsuz sessizliğine soğuk bir sessizlikle karşılık verin,” diyor. Deliler gibi terliyor. (Kür 1990, 124)

And Alfred recites. ‘Answer with a cold silence the eternal silence of the divinity,’ he says. Sweating like hell. (Rhys 1985b, 421)

3. ... Madeleine Meydanı’na yakın bir otele geçiyorum. Bu odada müthiş sinek var. Delirtiyorlar beni. Birini öldürüyorum. (Kür 1990, 141)

... I go to an hotel near the Place de la Madeleine. There are a lot of flies in this room. They torment me. I kill one. (Rhys 1985b, 432)

These examples demonstrate that despite other possibilities, Kür prefers to repeat the same word ‘deli’ and its derivatives. The target text, then, attracts attention with its use of words related to the idea of ‘madness’ more than the source text. There are, however, certainly exceptions to this feature. The following example shows that there is also the use of expressions that do not derive from the word ‘deli’: “Kendimi yatağın üstüne atıp

ađlamaya bařlıyorum. “Ađlama. Ađlarsan aklımı kaçıırım.”” (118) [I lie down on the bed and begin to cry. ‘Don’t cry. If you cry I shall go mad.’] (417). Although the word ‘mad’ appears in the source text, Kür obviously opts for a totally different expression. However, Kür does not seem to prefer this phrase for the sake of bringing variety. ‘Deliririm’ [I shall go mad] is certainly an alternative translation to ‘aklımı kaçıırım’, but ‘deliririm’ has other connotations, which Kür might have chosen to avoid. For instance, one can utter the verb ‘delirmek’ while describing how strongly s/he loves somebody or while expressing her/his rage. Different contexts, therefore, may lead to the use of this word.

In conclusion, the analysis of the target text *Günaydın Geceyarısı* presents three findings. First of all, there is a tendency to make intensified word choices in the use of slang and derogatory words. Furthermore, Kür sometimes prefers to translate a French word or phrase into Turkish. Last, there is not only variety in language use but also repetition of certain words and their derivatives. A focus on one or the other in the investigation of a translation may lead to the overlooking of a contradictory practice as has been pointed out previously in this chapter.

A comparative look at the analyses of Pınar Kür’s two novels, *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, and her Turkish translations of the four Jean Rhys novels draws attention to interactions between Pınar Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles, as has been noted at various points of this chapter. Apparently, Kür does not aim at making very long and complicated sentences by using many connecting words and clauses in either her writing or her translating. Moreover, she plays with the discourse particles, as she translates the same English discourse particle in a variety of ways in Turkish and

again brings variety by spelling these discourse particles in different ways that help the reader to hear the intonation and stress of the speaker. Thirdly, second-person-point of view, which is also observed in her writing in addition to first-person plural, appears to have a significant effect on the reading of the translations despite the fact that it is not frequently identified. The fourth recurrent feature spotted in the Turkish translations of Rhys' novels is stream of consciousness, whose powerful examples are given especially from *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Karanlıkta Yolculuk*. Although stream of consciousness is not a feature noticed in Kür's *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, it needs to be noted once again that the author-translator's presence is clear in the translations due to her preferences in language use and punctuation, which lead to differences between the effects of the target and source texts. Another pattern is Kür's emphatic language use especially through reduplication, which can attract the reader's attention particularly in Kür's translations of the four novels by Rhys and also in *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, as the language is rather poetic. Preference for intensified word choices is only identified as a result of checking the target texts against the source texts and it is not a feature that can be searched in Kür's own work because it requires a comparative look at the target and source texts. Last but not least, it is possible to associate certain language uses with certain narrators and characters in both Kür's writing and translating. The fact that Kür seems to consider this important in her writing and translating becomes clear as a result of the differences created between the effects of the target and source texts, as she prefers to make noteworthy language choices, previously described in detail. Apart from the first two patterns noted, the rest of the features are spotted as a result of the qualitative analysis, but WordSmith provided additional data whenever needed. It also

needs to be recalled that there were two other interactions spotted during the analysis of the author-translator's two novels. Therefore, together with Kür's search for the 'new' and her use of multiple narrative voices, described in Chapter 4, there are seven major interactions highlighted in this study as a result of the analyses of Pınar Kür's two novels and translations of Jean Rhys' novels. Although these features are observed to have varying degrees of frequency and influence on the reading of the texts in the corpus, they are all notable interactions as the discussions reveal.

In relation to Pınar Kür's agency in translating and its relationship with the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation, it is at this point helpful to recall the assumption that "[t]he only space left for creativity and innovation [for translators] is in the ways chosen for achieving the goals of subservience", as the description of translators in today's West, Simeoni (1998) maintains, include required characteristics, such as "silent" and "invisible" (12). In contrast to the assumption to a certain extent, Pınar Kür aims at doing translations whose source authors have not been published before and thus searches for the 'new' in her translating. Moreover, she exemplifies creative translation decisions in a number of ways including her bringing variety to discourse particles and writing in emphatic language especially through reduplication. Her response to my question whether she uses a more emphatic language through reduplication and more intensified words or phrases in the target text when compared with the source is noteworthy here. After hearing some specific examples of such uses of hers in her translations, Kür first explained her reasons and then made a concise statement: "(...) this is the reflection of my own style, not [Rhys']." [(...) bu benim kendi üslubumun yansımasıdır, onun değil.] (Aka 2011). In addition, she wrote a translator's

preface to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*], which was published as a result of her insistent demand from the publishing house [Jean Rhys'ı yazar olarak çok beğendiğim için (...) Ben zorladım yayınevini bunları çevirin diye.], as she liked Jean Rhys' works very much (ibid.). In short, considering all these facts, Pınar Kür is obviously not a translator who can be described as “silent” or “invisible” (Simeoni 1998, 12). One of the reasons for this clear agency in her translatorial habitus can be related to her authorial habitus. Being an author-translator, her symbolic capital grows as a result of not only her translating but also writing and it gives her the strength to act as an agent as has been noted earlier. It is also useful here to refer to Boase-Beier's (2006) claim that “knowing about theories involves creative engagement with them, and that they thus broaden the translator's mind, increase awareness, and so can free the translator from too timid a dependence on the source text” (63). This assertion has implications concerning the rather ‘creative’ translation decisions made by Kür because of her educational background, including her PhD in comparative literature. In addition, Kür's being a well-known author-translator in the field of Turkish literature may play important roles in the readiness of the publishing houses to make her name as visible as possible in the translations. For instance, they may be interested in publishing a preface written by an author-translator like Kür, who has a high symbolic capital for various reasons, including the fact that she has attracted the attention of readers and critics in the field of Turkish literature with her considerable number of literary works. As discussed in Chapter 3, she complains about publishing houses which aim for translations done for less money by rather incompetent translators. However, she is aware of the possibility that readers may be more interested in reading a translation done by an author they know

well [Okur ‘ben aa Pınar Kür’ün çevirisini okuyayım,’ diyebilir.] (Aka 2011). If readers have such an interest, publishing houses can easily be expected to publish translator’s prefaces which make the name of the author-translator more visible especially when it is a new source author whose works are published. In brief, Pınar Kür’s agency in her writing and translating is of vital importance due to the fact that her position as an “active idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur” (Even-Zohar 2005, 10) in particularly the field of Turkish literature becomes apparent. As the discussions in this and the previous chapter show, Kür’s interest in the ‘new’ in her writing and translating, visibility in her translating especially when the target texts are checked against the source texts and lack of interest in conforming to certain norms of the field of Turkish literature or the agenda of the society at the time of the publication of her works direct attention to the symbolic capital she enjoys in her authorial and translatorial habituses.

One final note can be made concerning reasons for Pınar Kür’s interest in translating four of the five novels written by Jean Rhys. After the investigation of all the novels in the corpus in detail, the thematic links between Kür and Rhys’ writing appear as a factor that might have been influential on the author-translator’s choosing Rhys’ novels to translate into Turkish. Although the focus changes from one novel to the other, it has been made clear that *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* portray feelings, thoughts and events particularly related to love, in which there is also sexuality and murder. The study of Kür’s works in general, as Çin (2010) has done, shows that the author-translator has depicted the lives of “oppressed and sexually exploited woman characters” [(...) kadın kahramanların daha çok ezilen ve cinsel anlamda sömürülen kadınlar olduğunu (...)] (266) in a majority of her works. These women, Çin (2010)

asserts, are “cheated, sexually exploited and have love affairs out of wedlock” [Pınar Kür, kadınların aldatılması, cinsel manada sömürülmesi ve gayri resmi ilişkilerde bulunması konuları üzerine hassasiyetle eğilmiştir.] (268). It is of vital importance at this point to see the similarity between Kür’s own comments on this subject and her view concerning Rhys’ having female protagonists who have such unfortunate experiences in her novels. Kür, in the interview she did with Çin (2010), states that she is “especially interested in characters whose lives are incongruous with the society” [Asıl karakterlerin toplumla uyumsuz hayatları beni ilgilendiriyor.], but the fact that “female characters are more in the forefront” of such depiction is because she “[herself] is a woman” and she “thinks it is women who are especially hurt and suffer” from such states [(...) kadın karakterlerin daha ön planda olması (...) kendimin kadın olmam ve toplumun içindeki uyumsuzlukları, rahatsızlıkları ortaya çıkaran koşullarda asıl incinen, asıl hasar görenlerin kadınlar olduklarını düşünmemdendir.] (293). In the preface to the Turkish translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, it is again Kür, who explains that it is “not mainly the conflict between man and woman but the conflict between the ‘weak’ and the ‘powerful’” that Jean Rhys describes in her novels [(...) temelde kadın erkek çelişkisi değil, ‘zayıflar’ ile ‘güçlüler’ arasındaki çatışmadır Jean Rhys’in konusu.] (1989, 13). According to Kür, Rhys’ novels, which demonstrate how weak women suffer from powerful men in the society, is not a result of the author’s imagination, but is due to the real conditions in life [‘Zayıflar’ genellikle kadın, ötekiler de genellikle erkekse bu Jean Rhys’in zorlaması değil, gerçeğin ta kendisidir.] (ibid.). Acclaiming Rhys’ success in the neutral depiction of this fact, Kür adds that the male characters are “hopeless and pitiful” [çaresiz ve zavallı] for other reasons related to their goal to match the male figure drawn

by the society [bu ‘erkeklik’ imgesine uyabilmek için] and thus are not presented as “monsters” [‘canavarlar’], at all (Kür 1989b, 12). Thus it is in both her writing and the Rhys translations she has done that Kür sees the dominant portrayal of women who experience pain and unhappiness, which, she considers, is in line with reality. Considering not only Diana Athill’s (1985, vii) but also Pinar Kür’s (1989b, 12) own stress on the impressive aspects of Jean Rhys’ authorial style, it is not surprising that Kür, as an author-translator who writes and translates with attention on stylistic features, chose to translate almost all literary works written by Rhys.

### **Summary**

This chapter presented the style analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered from Pinar Kür’s translations of Jean Rhys’ novels, *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*], *Dörtlü* [*Quartet*], *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* [*Voyage in the Dark*], *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*]. Use of fewer connecting words and clauses, a variety in the use and spelling of discourse particles, second person point of view and stream of consciousness in narration, emphatic language use especially through reduplication, preference for intensified word choices in the target texts, and distinct language uses of different characters appear as the most important recurrent patterns in the four translations.

The results also show that there are noteworthy similarities in terms of language use between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles, which in fact leads to a rather ‘visible’ translator in the translations especially after checking the target texts against the source texts and by comparatively exploring her writing and translating. Despite Kür’s

aim at preserving Rhys' language preferences in the writing of the target texts, Kür's translatorial voice becomes perceptible as a result of the language use which is also apparent in her authorial voice. Different language uses that change from one narrator or character to the other, which is a finding first noted in Chapter 4, use of rather few connecting words and clauses, variety in the use of discourse particles in translating and spelling, second person point of view and emphatic language use especially through reduplication appear as the foregrounded patterns in Kür's authorial and translatorial styles although the frequency and degree of influence of the mentioned features on the text vary between the novels in the corpus. Among examples of distinct uses of language by different narrators and characters are those by the narrators of *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* as well as the locals' language in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, highlighted use of rather vulgar or derogatory language choices in *DörtlÜ* and effective use of slang or slum language by chorus girls or prostitutes in *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* when compared with the source texts. This is an important feature of Kür's authorial and translatorial styles because these linguistic differences not only have a clear effect on characterization but also have social and/or political implications as previously discussed in the chapter. As a result, in the case of target texts, certain major metonymical aspects of the described life in the setting of the novel or the characters become manifest. Besides Kür's described language choices concerning the use of connecting words and discourse particles as well as second person point of view, emphatic language use through reduplication is significant because it results in a rather poetic language. All these features lead to the creation of literary works with vivid characters speaking everyday language whose intonation and stress can even be heard

due to the variety in spelling. It also needs to be underlined that Kür's habitus deserves attention at this point, since the creation of vivid characters seems to be a direct result of the author-translator's theater background, which covers not only her interest but also education and work experience in the field. Moreover, besides Kür's visibility in her translating practice, her agency in her translatorial habitus is evident due to the primary decisions she makes concerning the publication of translations, as she persuaded the publishing house to publish the translations of Rhys' novels, the preface she wrote to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and her statements about her translation decisions. It is important that these acts of hers can also be related to her authorial habitus. This is because a considerable amount of her symbolic capital is due to her writing practice and the reception of her translations by Turkish readers and critics as well as their publication by the publishing houses in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation.

A focus on narrative structures results in the fact that Pınar Kür's novels differ from the translations she did in the same period of the ten years investigated in this study. This is owing to the fact that she plays with the narrative voices, metafictionality, the author's role in the writing of a novel and the reader's role in interpreting the text, which point to the postmodern approach in these works of hers, so distinctively that despite similar stylistic features, like the use of multiple narrative voices in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and the reader's role in interpreting *Good Morning Midnight*, these two novels of hers can easily be differentiated from Rhys' in terms of narrative style. Such elements of source style that can attract the reader's attention in the works she chooses to translate as in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* and *Günaydın Geceyarısı* could have been influential in Kür's choosing these four novels to translate into Turkish.

In short, Pınar Kür, who stands in the intersection of the literary polysystem and the system of translated literature as an author-translator, exemplifies interactions between her authorial and translatorial styles in this period of her writing and translating. In the next chapter, I will present the conclusions of this thesis.

## CONCLUSION

This thesis set out to explore the interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles while also investigating how far the use of corpus software contributes to the process of data gathering and reaching reliable results in the study of style in literary texts. This chapter provides an overview of the findings of the thesis and revisits the research questions with the aim of responding to them in the light of the results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses. As the findings demonstrate, the links among the texts, the author-translator as the agent, her habitus, and the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation are considered as significant components in this research. After the discussion of these findings, the methodological implications of the study will be explained, as they are related to the second research question, which could only be answered after the actual analyses. Both kinds of analyses have certainly contributed to the thesis throughout the research. The use of corpus software gave the opportunity to have ideas about certain language uses before reading the texts, during which reasons and effects of those patterns could be explored in detail, and strengthened the findings of the former analysis. However, it needs to be underlined that certain aspects of style which have significantly contributed to the discussion of the interactions between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles have been identified only as a result of the qualitative analysis. Finally, comments will be made about possible further studies and the limitations of this study in the conclusion.

### **7.1. Interactions between Pınar Kür’s Authorial and Translatorial Styles**

The literature review in Chapter 2 has revealed that the author or the translator but not the author-translator has significantly been in the focus of literary studies in Turkey and elsewhere. Although importance of research on “authorial habitus” versus “translatorial habitus” is underlined (Simeoni 1998, 26), the habitus of the author-translator is quite neglected. The investigation of an author-translator’s works makes it possible to focus on the same individual’s texts in a comparative study of authorial and translatorial styles. In order to study interactions between Pınar Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles, a corpus of novels which were published in a ten year period, i.e. from 1982 until 1992, was compiled. The selected works in the corpus are *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986), *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (1989), *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] (1982), *Dörtlü* [*Quartet* (first published as *Postures*)] (1985), *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* [*Voyage in the Dark*] (1989), and *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*] (1990). Before the qualitative analysis of the novels, Wordsmith Tools was used to spot striking or recurrent language patterns in Chapters 4 and 5. After the gathering of quantitative data through the use of corpus software, each novel was read and analyzed qualitatively. Wordsmith tools not only made it possible to have certain clues concerning the language uses in the texts before reading the novels but also provided insight into other instances of language use identified at later stages of the qualitative analysis. The data was strengthened by additional sources, such as the preface written by the author-translator to her Turkish translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, interviews with Pınar Kür, one conducted by myself, studies, criticisms and news published about Kür and her work in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation. All these sources of data helped to

identify interactions between her authorial and translatorial styles while also providing clues about the author-translator's 'habitus' and her place in the 'fields' where she published her work.

There were two research questions in this thesis. The answers given to the three further research questions shed light on certain aspects of the first question.

1. Are there interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles?

a. What are the stylistic patterns in the novels Pınar Kür has written and translated in the corpus of this study?

b. How does Pınar Kür's authorial style manifest itself in relation to her translatorial style and vice versa?

c. What does the discourse analysis of Pınar Kür's remarks in interviews and the criticisms written by critics as well as her readership show about Pınar Kür's 'visibility' as a translator and her identity as an 'author-translator'?

2. At what stages and to what extent is corpus-based methodology helpful and/or limited in the analysis of style in literary texts?

In response to the first question concerning the stylistic patterns in the novels Pınar Kür has written and translated in the corpus of this study, the two novels written by Pınar Kür and the four Jean Rhys novels translated by Kür were explored. The quantitative and qualitative analyses of *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* revealed that the two novels are similar in certain aspects of style. On the one hand, the former analysis led to findings concerning similarities in the frequent use of certain function words and the use of content words, as both depict the intermingled relationship of love and negative

feelings which can trigger even murder. On the other hand, the latter analysis made it apparent that there is a postmodern approach in both novels. In addition to metafictionality or the questioning of the relationship between the ‘real’ and the ‘fictional’, use of multiple narrative voices, the reader’s role in the interpretation of the novels, which are related to the postmodern style, distinct language uses by different characters or narrators as a result of their approach to the subject, sentence structures, and word choices is a recurrent feature that has a direct influence on the formation of identities and their narrative voices in the novels. Despite the fact that the two novels share certain elements of style that direct attention to the author-translator’s clear move towards postmodern writing, the use of new narrative techniques in *Bir Cinayet Romanı* are more highlighted than those in *Bitmeyen Aşk* by critics. This seems to be a result of two facts. First, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is certainly much more layered than *Bitmeyen Aşk*, which is a reason why it requires a more in depth interpretation by the reader. Although it is not a simple task to tell whether what is narrated really takes place or is part of the novel that is being written by the author as a character of the novel, the important point is that it is not only the fictive world but also the real life and the influences of one on the other that appear to be depicted in *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. Considering the fact that even the identities of the narrators are not openly given, as it is only possible to see the first letters of their first names and there are three characters who have the same initial and similar lives, it is possible to maintain that Kür creates a novel, certain aspects of which make it a puzzle to be solved just as the detective in the novel tries to solve the crime. Second, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* attracted attention due to the fact that it is an untypical crime novel. The new aspects of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and the next two novels

in the trilogy are considered to open a new window in the field of Turkish literature. Kür, with a focus on stylistic matters rather than the description of societal issues in this novel, is considered to be ‘innovative’ together with other authors in the period after 1980 in the Turkish literature. What distinguishes her from the others is an additional reason why the new aspects of her work are stressed. She was possibly encouraged by her symbolic capital that grew more and more as a result of her earlier work, including not only her novels but also short stories and literary translations one of which is her acclaimed Turkish translation of Agatha Christie’s *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*, as the autonomy an author enjoys in a literary field depends on “the power and privileges conferred by the possession of cultural capital” (Bourdieu 1990, 145). Thus she introduced certain elements of the genre in a new, postmodern style, brought the crime novel to the ‘center’ of the Turkish literary polysystem and thus achieved a ‘higher’ position for the genre. For this reason, the author-translator is regarded to have contributed incredibly to the success of crime novel in the field of Turkish literature. As a result of her influence “on the level of the repertoire” through the texts she produces, her introducing such a new taste to Turkish literature, and starting innovative processes in the writing of crime fiction in the field, Pınar Kür appears as an “AGENT OF CHANGE” (Toury 2002, 151, emphasis original), i.e. an “active idea-maker” and “cultural entrepreneur” in Even-Zohar’s (2005, 10) terms.

Pınar Kür’s four novel translations in the corpus of this study, i.e. *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*], *Dörtlü* [*Quartet*], *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* [*Voyage in the Dark*], *Günaydın Geceyarısı* [*Goodmorning Midnight*], show that there are seven noticeable recurrent features in these target texts. These can be listed as the use of fewer

connecting words and clauses, more variety in discourse particles, such as the use of ‘peki’ [OK], ‘iyi ya’ [fine then], ‘eeee, demek’ [so], and ‘bari’ [at least] in translating ‘well’ in *Günaydın Geceyarısı*, her Turkish translation of *Good Morning Midnight*, second person point of view, stream of consciousness, emphatic language use especially through reduplication, preference for intensified word choices, and distinct language uses of different characters. Obviously, it is possible to spot some of these features, particularly those concerning connecting words and clauses, discourse particles, and intensified word choices only after checking the target texts against the source texts. Therefore, Kür’s ‘visibility’ becomes more apparent as a result of a comparative analysis rather than merely focusing on the target texts. Nevertheless, features, such as emphatic language use, can be observed even before a meticulous analysis. Another point that needs to be underlined is that second person point of view and stream of consciousness appear in the target texts simply because of their use in the source texts. The reason why they are discussed as part of the patterns in the target texts or rather the author-translator’s translatorial style in these target texts is because Kür brings a difference in the target texts due to either more frequent or influential uses. Her translatorial decisions in language use and punctuation in the translation of the stream of consciousness scenes, for instance, cause a difference in the effect of the target text on the target reader when compared with that of the source. Finally, it is noteworthy that the author-translator definitely pays attention to the creation of different voices for different characters. This results in the differentiation of the characters from one another through not only their attitudes but also voices in speech, which strengthens the characterization in the novels. In brief, Kür’s translatorial preferences lead to effects on both micro and macro levels.

While features such as the use of fewer connecting words and phrases, more variety in discourse particles, and reduplication, result in the target reader's being more exposed to a vivid, everyday language, more distinct voices for different characters bring clarity to certain aspects of the characters in the target texts. It also needs to be highlighted that the strengthened aspects of the target setting or characters are important metonymical aspects of the novels due to their social and/or political implications. For instance, the author-translator's effective use of slang or slum language by chorus girls or prostitutes in *Karanlıkta Yolculuk* is in line with the position these women are allotted in the society of the time and place described in the novel. Another example is the locals' language in *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, which is a foregrounded feature of this target text. The 'strangeness' of the locals' language in the target text is carefully created in accordance with that in the source text, but Kür's attention on the translation of locals' language makes it possible for the attentive reader of the target text to ponder or at least be curious about the historical and political aspects of the colonial British Caribbean. Thus the author-translator appears alert to translating different voices including those of the unprivileged and "the role played by language for the agent" (Spivak 2000, 397).

Before making conclusive statements concerning interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles, it is helpful to recall her own remarks on the subject during the interview (Aka 2011). Despite the fact that Kür considers the acts of writing and translating similar due to the "creativity" at different "levels" in both acts [Şimdi ikisinde de belli ölçüde yaratıcılık var.], she does not notice "obvious similarities" between her authorial and translatorial styles [(...) belirgin benzerlikler olduğunu zannetmiyorum.]. This is because she does not start to translate a book before

she completes writing a novel or a collection of short stories. Translating takes place only during the breaks between two works of hers. In terms of an influence of translating on her writing, she regards the discoveries she makes about the use of Turkish important. In addition, her ability to understand the source author ‘better’ as an author-translator, has a positive effect on her doing ‘faithful’ translations, which, she seems to think, is not done by word-for-word translation but by creating target effects similar to those in the source while presenting the target text as ‘translation’, not an ‘original’.

As a result of the comparison between the above described language patterns in the novels Pınar Kür has written and translated, it became possible to respond to the second further question and to highlight the identified interactions between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles. After the exploration of Kür’s authorial style, I as a researcher became familiar with her language use. Considering her authorial style, I studied the patterns in her translatorial style. Kür thinks her authorial style is not clear in her Rhys translations (Özgüven 1983) and she does not know whether there are interactions other than the two she points to in the interview I did with her [Başka bir etkileşim var mı, bilmiyorum.] (Aka 2011). However, I found out that seven points need to be underlined in relation to the interactions. There is such an important similarity in Pınar Kür’s approach to writing and translating that it affects her primary decisions to start working on a certain novel at the earliest stages. This is Kür’s search for the ‘new’ in whatever she writes or translates. Although similarities in themes, plots, and sometimes characters of the novels she writes and translates can be observed, she is keen on bringing a new aspect to her writing by changes in style and translating works by authors who have not been published before in the field of Turkish literary translation.

This point is in line with her stress on the importance of style rather than plot in various interviews.

Other interactions between her two novels, *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, and her Turkish translations of the four Jean Rhys novels also attract attention as a result of profound analysis of the texts in the corpus. First of all, the use of multiple narrative voices, which appears as an indirect interaction, is a foregrounded characteristic of not only *Bitmeyen Aşk* and *Bir Cinayet Romanı* but also *Wide Sargasso Sea*, translated by Kür into Turkish. As is obvious, it is only one of the four translated novels that has this feature and thus it is not a pattern spotted in the translations. However, Kür's expression of "admiration" for Rhys' novels [(...) gıptayla karışık bir hayranlık duyuyorum.] (1989b, 13) and her choosing *Wide Sargasso Sea* to start translating Jean Rhys' works into Turkish, as she aims to overcome a period of "stagnation in [her] own writing" [(...) kendi çalışmalarımnda bir duraklama noktasına geldiğimde (...)] (Kür 1989b, 5) by translating *Wide Sargasso Sea*, makes this point noteworthy. Secondly, the author-translator does not tend to use many connective words and clauses, which prevents strikingly long and complicated sentences. In addition to this feature, the variety in her use and spelling of discourse particles, and emphatic language use especially through reduplication help to create an everyday, spoken language use which is so vivid that the reader can start to hear the intonation and stress of the speakers in the novels. Besides the vividness, which can be related to Kür's habitus, as she has an important theater background, especially emphatic language use leads to a poetic effect. Second-person-point of view, which is the other indirect interaction, appears to be a recurrent feature in Kür's writing and translating, but it needs

to be noted that the use of first-person plural also attracts attention in her own writing. Although this feature is not frequently noticed in the novels, it has a powerful effect. This is because the reader can feel intimate with the narrator upon reading that s/he is addressed or included in the picture by the narrator. Finally, certain language uses can easily be associated with certain narrators and characters in Kür's writing and translating, whose effects on the reading of the texts have already been discussed in detail. It is noteworthy that the strengthening of certain aspects of the characters through repetition or intensified word choices while translating the language of chorus girls or prostitutes, for instance, can be regarded as an effect of the author-translator's ease in writing about sexuality. Just as she describes sexuality comfortably in her writing [Kadın yazarlar arasında cinselliği benim gibi rahat anlatan yok ki o zaman.] (Söğüt 2006, 286), Kür does not show reservedness or timidity in translating certain aspects of target characters or target scenes similar to those in her own work to a certain extent. Nevertheless, the author-translator's ease of expression can be observed not merely in language on sexuality, which Rhys describes strikingly at times but not as detailed as Kür does in certain parts of her novels, but also in the languages of the characters who are not respected by the society due to their 'low' social positions also exemplify intensified word choices. These decisions in writing and translating certainly have major influences on the reading of the texts, as the language of the characters is a significant part of characterization in fiction.

Moving from Pınar Kür's authorial style, it is also possible to make certain claims concerning her interest in translating novels written by Jean Rhys. To begin with, there are thematic links between Kür and Rhys' writing, in the latter of which various

themes, including “male exploitation of women”, “women’s resistance to and collusion with that exploitation”, and “class antagonisms and conflicts” attract attention (Alexander Malcolm & Malcolm 1996, xii). Kür prefers to use the term “affinity” or “uzak akrabalık” [collateral lineage] in describing her relationship with Jean Rhys due to her love for Rhys and similarities between their writing styles (Özgüven 1983). Despite obvious differences between the educational background and social status of the female protagonists in Kür and Rhys’ novels, both authors attract attention to the sexual exploitation and oppression of women especially by men. Kür explains her main intention in her writing as to depict the lives of those who cannot adapt to the society (Çin 2010, 293) and she thinks that Rhys is interested in the depiction of the sufferings of the ‘weak’ against the ‘powerful’, not simply those of women against men [(...) temelde kadın-erkek çelişkisi değil ‘zayıflar’ ile ‘güçlüler’ arasındaki çatışmadır Jean Rhys’in konusu.] (Kür 1989b, 13), who are “hopeless and pitiful” [çaresiz ve zavallı] for other reasons related to their goal to match the male figure drawn by the society [(...) bu ‘erkeklik’ imgesine uyabilmek için (...)] and thus are not presented as “monsters” [‘canavarlar’], at all (Kür 1989b, 12). Kür considers this feature in her own writing (Çin 2010, 293) and Rhys’ (Kür 1989b, 13) as a reflection of real life circumstances. Remembering the fact that both authors are also interested in style, similarities in plots and characters with attention on stylistic matters might be regarded as factors in Kür’s choice to translate four of the five Jean Rhys novels.

## 7.2. Discourse Analysis of Extratextual Data

The response to the question about the discourse in Pınar Kür's remarks in interviews and the criticisms written by critics as well as her readership draws attention to Pınar Kür's clear agency in writing and translating, which also appears to be related to the findings of the discourse analysis of the journals *Tercüme*, *Yazko Çeviri*, and *Metis Çeviri*. Three of the characteristics of her identity as an author-translator appear to be her tendency to resist certain norms of specifically the field of Turkish literature, determination to present stylistically 'new' literary works at least in her own authorial and translatorial habituses if not the fields, and visibility in terms of agency, which is related to the former two characteristics. While her writing about sexuality quite easily as a woman author is a clear example of her lack of interest in conforming to all the norms of the field or the society, her aim to produce literary works which can be distinguished from her previous works in certain new aspects of her writing deserves attention. Taking her success in being regarded "innovative" [yenilikçi] by critics like Berna Moran (2004, 53) in reference to her novel *Bir Cinayet Romanı* into account, it is possible to maintain that she is so focused on moving forward in her writing that she appears to have acted as an agent of change in the field of Turkish literature. She is also keen on and sounds proud of translating works of literature whose authors have not been published in Turkish before (Aka 2011), which points to her search for the 'new' in her translating. Her visibility as an agent in the field of Turkish literary translation becomes apparent when one considers her choosing and persuading the publishing house to publish Jean Rhys' novels and her writing quite a long and informative preface to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [*Wide Sargasso Sea*] about not only the process she went through prior

to and while translating the novel but also the plots, themes, and characters of all the other novels written by Jean Rhys. It is possible to relate this clear agency in her translatorial habitus to the symbolic capital she has in her authorial habitus. Her identity as an author comes first in biographical works written about Pınar Kür and her writing is discussed more frequently and usually in more detail than her translations in interviews and criticisms. This can be regarded as a sign of her having a more critical symbolic capital as an author in the field of Turkish literature. Indeed, although Kür considers literary translation similar to writing literature for certain reasons, writing seems to come before translating in her life. It is possible to make this claim by relying on the information she provides in interviews and her preface to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*. To begin with, explaining her reasons for starting to work as a translator, she pointed to economic needs and the fact that she could not leave the house, as she had a little baby [(...) para kazanmak zorunda olduğumdan ve evden çıkamadığım için başladım çevirmenliğe.] (Aka 2011). Secondly, Kür stated that she translates books in the periods between writing her own works so that she does not stop the act of writing [(...) ikinci bir kitaba başlama aşamasına gelmeden önce, ben genellikle elim durmasın diye çeviri yaparım.] (Aka 2011). Finally, in her preface to *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz*, she points out that one of the reasons for her translating Jean Rhys was because she thought she could overcome the “stagnation” [duraklama] (Kür 1989b, 5) period she was experiencing in her writing at the time by translating Rhys’ works into Turkish. It needs to be borne in mind that all these but especially the last two also reveal that her translatorial habitus has positive influences on her authorial habitus. In addition, the fact that she started to be known in the publishing field as a result of her translations needs to be taken into

consideration. After all, she states that the editors whom she took her own work to were those she knew because of her translating experience [Çevirmen olduğumdan dolayı tanıyorlardı beni, yazar olarak tanımıyorlardı.] (Aka 2011). Therefore, there are clear interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial habituses just like those between her authorial and translatorial styles.

The discourse analysis of the essays on author-translators in *Tercüme*, published between 1940 and 1966, revealed the significant position given to author/poet-translators in the field of Turkish literary translation during the period, which also demonstrates that Kür's action and discourse as an author-translator have historical roots. Author/poet-translators were expected to translate literary works from foreign languages into Turkish. In addition to this expectation, there was emphasis on the importance of the relationship between the source text and the author/poet-translator, which seems to be because the aim was to create stylistically similar target texts to the source texts. Although there is not an emphasis on the need for author/poet-translators for literary translation in *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri*, which were published during the time Kür's novels and translations in the corpus of this study were published, the above-mentioned point was underlined in all the three journals. Kür, who underlines the fact that she likes Jean Rhys very much and has been impressed by her literary works whenever she read them, makes a point in line with the expectations of the field, as the essays and interviews in these journals show. Thus, her reasons for translating Jean Rhys' novels into Turkish match the criteria underlined by authors like Nurullah Ataç (1941b, 2). Essays and interviews in *Tercüme*, *Yazko Çeviri*, and *Metis Çeviri* reveal that style in literary translation is considered to be of vital importance (Özgü 1960; Paker

1988; Salman & Gürsoy 1988; Tuncel 1955; Yazko Çeviri 1982b). One of the reasons for this is that the ‘spirit’ of the source text can be conveyed through the translation of style in literature. Interestingly, the importance attached to translations done by authors and poets who have literary works stylistically similar to those they would enjoy translating in the period of almost three decades *Tercüme* was published, appears to have continued in the later periods to a certain extent. The essays and interviews in *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri*, published in the 1980s and early 1990s, direct attention to the stress on the relationship between the translator and the source text although s/he does not have to be an author-translator. Two examples can be provided for this assumption. Firstly, the question asked by Fatih Özgüven (1983) during the interview he does with Kür is related to this point. As has been discussed in Chapter 3, Özgüven (1983) refers to the metaphor ‘blood type’ Atilla İlhan uses for the expected characteristics to be common between the source author and the translator. Then, Özgüven asks if there is such a relationship between Pınar Kür and Jean Rhys, which shows that although it is not considered to be an indispensable requirement for translators to have such bonds with the source authors, Özgüven sounds as if he considers such a relationship a possible reason for the ‘successful’ translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea* by Kür. The second example is a recent one. In our interview, Pınar Kür points out that the publishing house she works with suggested her to translate the detective fiction by Raymond Chandler, as she also has written works of crime fiction [Raymond Chandler’ın polisiye dizisini önerdiler. Ben de bir iki polisiye yazdığım için, önce bana önerdiler.] (Aka 2011). Whether the editors of the publishing house openly made this point while offering her the translation is unclear, but even if it is a deduction that Kür makes, it is noteworthy.

The discourse analysis of not only Pınar Kür's remarks about her writing and translating practices but also those written by researchers, interviewers, and critics has proved to be essential due to the fact that it becomes possible to understand the position and the symbolic capital of the author-translator in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation.

### **7.3. Methodological Implications**

Concerning the second question about the methodological implications of this study, it is important that corpus methodology has been helpful in exploring the texts in the corpus and the qualitative analysis has definitely played a vital role in complementing the weak points of the quantitative analysis from the beginning till the end of this study. Having done this study with a critical perspective on its methodological aspects, I will now try to point to particular areas where computerized analysis has proved to be most useful, while also describing its limited aspects. Thus, I will be able to answer at what stages and how far corpus-based methodology is helpful and limited in the analysis of style in literary texts.

The first point at which the use of corpus software shed light on possible recurrent patterns to look for was when I checked the wordlists of each novel and concordance lists when I needed to learn more about the use of a specific word before reading the books line by line. By doing so, I had some presuppositions concerning the use of certain words or phrases, which could be related to some macro effects on my reading of the book. Therefore, using the software at the very beginning gave the opportunity to have awareness about one or more possible language uses and thus an

open but cautious eye about them while reading the books, at which stage reasons can be found for the specific translation decisions as well as their effects on the reading of the texts. For instance, the fewer number of conjunctions in the translations when compared with the source texts attracted my attention at the very beginning. This led to my reading the target and source texts with an eye on how and why they are used, omitted and/or added.

Another obvious point is that while human beings have the disadvantage of getting exhausted and thus careless in finding each and every use of a single word or phrase while exploring a language feature, computers do not fail in counting these uses and making lists of them. This positive aspect of computers in general and specifically corpus software in the focus of this study helps the researcher to feel comfortable about the claims s/he makes by relying on quantitative data. It is certainly through the qualitative analysis that I spotted various stylistic aspects, including textual function, narrative point of view, and the content of the novel in focus, without which this analysis of style would have been incomplete. However, the use of corpus software has also been of benefit at certain points of the reading and interpreting of the books. In other words, Wordsmith tools gave the chance to check certain language uses whenever I suspected a pattern while reading and working on the novels qualitatively. The use of the software can not only help to verify or in some cases negate the claims the researcher is making but also provide statistical data or list of various examples from which the researcher can choose to use in the discussion. This clearly helps to feel relieved and to save time and energy. To illustrate, I noticed the derogatory language use in *Dörtlü [Quartet]* only while reading the target text. This is due to the fact that the difference between the uses

of such words was not statistically significant or striking to the eye when the two wordlists were explored. Therefore, Wordsmith Tools was not the primary source of the discussion of such language uses, but it was still helpful at the later stages of the analysis when I aimed at learning the exact number of instances such words are used and investigating each and every use by concordance.

One particular problem was experienced while using corpus software at the stage of interpreting the statistical data provided by the wordlist tool of Wordsmith. This does not actually appear as a limitation of Wordsmith, but it is here noteworthy due to the technicality of the problem. While checking the type/token ratios, I noticed that the tokens for *Bitmeyen Aşk* was 18,813, whereas types were 27,482, which is not possible, at all. This is owing to the fact that the number of types, which are distinct words in a text, cannot be higher than the total number of words in a text, i.e. tokens. Although the statistical data for *Bir Cinayet Romanı* did not bring any questions to my mind, I multiplied the number of pages with the average number of words that appear in both the former and the latter novels to ensure a double check and to reach the correct numbers as much as possible. While the result for *Bir Cinayet Romanı* matched the data provided by the software almost exactly, it was clear that tokens for the former could not be a five digit number, but six and that it had to be a number between 110,000 and 120,000. Regarding the fact that this is the only six digit number and that all the other numbers with five digits appeared to be correct, it is assumed that the first digit of the number for tokens is hidden due to a technical problem. Doing another double check, that is calculating the type/token ratio after adding the first digit of the number of tokens, which

was missing, gave the same result as that which the software gives: 118,813. Only after this process of calculating and pondering on the subject, this minor problem was solved.

In brief, the use of corpus software appears to have contributed very well to the analysis of style in the selected literary texts, but as the discussion on the interactions between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles shows, it is the qualitative data from which most of the striking results have been drawn. This seems to be due to the fact that the focus in this study is style in literary texts, as corpus methodology appears to be limited in this area. However, researchers in this field are already aware of the possible need "to switch to other methodologies to complement" corpus methodology (Baker 2004, 169). Using corpus software can be more helpful for researchers who have access to already created corpora in which the texts in their focus are included, as they will then save time at the beginning stages, which I personally had to deal with. Having overcome the primary obstacles in establishing a corpus, researchers can quickly focus on the wordlists and concordance lists before reading the selected texts. Although I believe in the undeniable importance of the role played by the interpretation of qualitative data in stylistic analysis, as certain aspects of style, like effects of the text on the reader, can best be evaluated as a result of careful qualitative analysis, corpus software has to be given credit for the opportunity it provides in clarifying and strengthening the conclusions drawn by qualitative analysis. For this reason, my aim in benefiting from different sources of data in my methodology appears to have been served as a result of the use of quantitative and qualitative data.

#### 7.4. Future Research

There are three points that need to be touched upon considering further areas of research. First of all, it is necessary to bear in mind that there are agents other than the author-translator who have a role in the production of ‘original’ and translated works of literature. As has been highlighted in this thesis, “no straightforward relationship between the style of the source text and what the text means” (Boase-Beier 2006, 4) can be identified, which is because the reader carries out a major role in interpreting the text. Attention has been given to the role carried out by the translator’s readings of the source texts in addition to the effects of the texts on me as a reader. Moreover, my questions concerning the role of the editors in the publication process of Pınar Kür’s works have given some clues. Considering the importance of the information gathered from the author-translator about the use of footnotes in *Dörtlü [Quartet]*, it appears that contacting editors in person and doing interviews with them can also prove to be useful.

Secondly, the investigation of certain findings, such as Kür’s use of function words, has shown that this area requires more in depth research for more reliable conclusions. It is possible to see that Kür makes her own stylistic preferences while also paying attention to the choices of the source author in translating the novels by Jean Rhys. Nevertheless, without the use of subcorpora of Turkish novels written by other authors in a period close in time, it is not very possible to know the degree to which the structure of Turkish language affects the results. By using subcorpora like the Turkish National Corpus, which cannot be accessed yet, it can be possible to learn more about such uses. Although it will be a corpus consisting of both written and spoken language and covering texts from various genres, it may be possible to select the variables for the

searches. Only then can researchers have reliable information as to whether identified language uses are specifically a reflection of the author's/translator's style or a common language feature shared by various other authors/translators.

Thirdly, the use of corpora which consist of other author-translators' works would also make it possible to investigate the authorial and translatorial styles of those author-translators. Then the conclusions drawn in this study can be generalized for a larger group. Although it is helpful to have enough data to draw general conclusions, as Andrew Chesterman (2004, 33) maintains, the intention would definitely not be to arrive at translation 'universal's in author-translators' work. As the discussion in Chapter 2 demonstrates, it is not possible to establish a corpus representative enough to cover all the translations at all possible times in different cultures (Chesterman 2004, 43) and there can always be "exception[s]" to the universals (Toury 2004, 29).

In conclusion, this study is a step in the research area of "socio-stylistics of habitus-governed authoring and translating" (Simeoni 1998, 30) in the fields of Turkish literature and literary translation. The interactions identified between Pınar Kür's authorial and translatorial styles not only reveal connections between the two practices of the same individual but also point to the fact that it is not possible to spot major differences between 'translated' and 'non-translated' languages at all times and in all contexts. Remembering the search for translation 'universals' in corpus-based translation studies, which has been negatively criticized due to the fact that the idea of 'universal' overlooks the influence of various significant factors, such as cultures, times, places, language pairs, texts, particular authors and translators, it is significant to underline that none of the characteristics of Pınar Kür's translation practice or the

identified interactions between her authorial and translatorial styles can be generalized to all author-translators in the world. Nevertheless, this study revealed that one's authorial habitus can help to improve her/his agency in translatorial habitus and the reception of the target texts in the field of literary translation. Considering the fact that Kür's translations introduced her to the publishing world and that Kür points to the positive effects of translating on her writing at the language level and specifically of translating Rhys in overcoming a stagnation period in her writing, it is possible to claim that one's translatorial habitus can also be helpful in the processes of writing and publishing literary works. Thus in Pinar Kür's case, there seems to be a never ending relationship of nourishment between the two practices, which certainly is influenced by and has an influence on the author-translator's symbolic capital. The active roles Pinar Kür has taken in writing and translating books make her agency in the intersection of the literary polysystem and the system of translated literature apparent.

## APPENDIX

### PINAR KÜR'LE SÖYLEŞİ

- *Bir yazar-çevirmen olarak, yazarlığı ve çevirmenliği ne derece benzer eylemler olarak görüyorsunuz? İki eylemi hangi noktalarda birbirlerinden farklı eylemler olarak değerlendirirsiniz?*
  
- Şimdi ikisinde de belli ölçüde yaratıcılık var... Tabii yani, yazar olarak daha yaratıcısınız ama çevirmenlik de yaratıcılık gerektiriyor, derece farkıyla. Yani çevirmen başka birinin zihninden çıkan metni o metne sadık kalarak -sadık kalmanın altını çiziyorum- sadık kalarak, kaynak dildeki ifadeleri erek dilde mümkün olduğu kadar sadık olarak ve anlaşılır olarak vermek. Bu durumda yaratıcılık niye gerekebiliyor çevirmen için? Çünkü kaynak dildeki bir takım deyimler, söylemler, üslup farklılıkları, erek dilde her zaman tam karşılığı olmayan şeyler. Dolayısıyla bunun tam karşılığını, gerçek karşılığını bulmak zorunda ve bunun için de belli bir yaratıcı çaba gerekiyor. Örnek vermek gerekirse... Kendimden değil de, mesela, bir kötü çeviri örneği. Şu anda kimin olduğunu da bilmiyorum. Soruyor: 'Where is your mother?' diyor mesela. Tam hatırlamıyorum soruyu da cevabı hatırlıyorum. Cevap: 'Search me'. 'Search me' İngilizce'de 'ne bileyim ben' demek. Fakat bunu çeviren 'istersen üstümü ara' diye çevirmiş. Kaynak dili iyi bilmemekten meydana gelen bir şey var burada ama bir de erek dili iyi bilmek lazım ve ikisinin arasındaki mantıksızlığı çözebilmek lazım. Dolayısıyla çeviri öyle kolay bir iş değil ve ne yazık ki yayınevleri, hele son zamanlarda, daha ucuza getirmek için, herhangi bir kolej mezununun yapabileceğini zannediyorlar ki bu doğru değil çünkü dediğim gibi daha az bile olsa, hem dilbilgisi açısından, iki dili bilmek açısından hem de yaratıcılık açısından çevirmene iş düşüyor. Bir de şöyle bir durum var... Bazı motamot çeviriler erek dilde çok enteresan olabiliyor. Halbuki kaynak dilde bildiğimiz, herkesin bildiği adi deyimler. Ne bileyim ben, 'su içene yılan bile dokunmaz'. Şimdi, 'su içene yılan bile dokunmaz', iyi bir kitapta kullanılacak bir deyim değildir. Ama bunu siz Fransızca'ya çevirdiğiniz zaman ve olduğu gibi çevirirseniz, Fransız diyor ki, 'aaa ne enteresan bir benzetme bulmuş' diyor. Onun için bunu Fransızca'ya çevirirken, 'su içene yılan bile dokunmaz' diye değil, 'su içen insanların saygı görmeleri gerekir' cinsinden bir çeviri yapmanız lazım. Anlatabildim mi ne demek istediğimi? Bu aslında dikkat edilmesi gereken bir

şey. E tabii ki hangi noktalarda farklı eylemler olarak değerlendirirsiniz diye sorduğunuz zaman... Tabii yazarın tamamıyla kendi bilincinden, kendi hayatından, kendi yaşam tecrübelerinden ortaya çıkararak yarattığı bir şey var. Ötekisi sadece onun bir başka dildeki tekrarı.

- *Yazar-çevirmeni, sadece yazar olan ve sadece çevirmen olanla bir arada düşündüğünüzde, edebiyat alanında nasıl konumlandırırınız?*
- Yazar-çevirmen tabii ki sadece çevirmen olandan daha seçicidir gibi geliyor. Ben kendimden hareketle söyleyebilirim. Kendi eserlerimi yayınlamaya başlamadan önce, çeviri yaparken, gene seçiciydim de ondan sonra olduğum kadar seçici değildim. Kendi eserlerimi yayınlamaya başladıktan sonradır ki sevdiğim, illa ki kendime yakın bulduğum veya da beni çok aşırı etkilemiş... Mesela Van Gogh'un Theo'ya Mektuplar'ını çevirdim. Bir taraftan yazıp, çevirirken, bir taraftan da hüngür hüngür ağlıyordum. O kadar da etkilemişti beni. Jean Rhys'ı yazar olarak çok beğendiğim için, özellikle yani üstüne ben gittim. Ben zorladım yayınevini bunları çevirin diye. Aynı şey mesela Orlana Fallaci için söz konusu değil. O da çok meşhur bir çevirimdir benim. Doğmamış Çocuğa Mektup. Onu bana yayınevi teklif etmişti ve mesela orada iddialyım ki çeviri esas metinden daha iyidir ki bu kolay söylenecek bir laf değil. O zaman, yazar-çevirmen, daha çok yazarı anlayabildiği için, ona sadık kalmayı da bilecek ve daha seçici olacak diye düşünüyorum. Başka bir şey söyleyemiyorum.
- *Türk edebiyat dünyasında sizce çevirmenle yazar-çevirmene bakış arasında bir fark var mı?*
- Edebiyat dünyasında yok pek. Okur açısından vardır. Okur 'ben aa Pınar Kür'ün çevirisini okuyayım,' diyebilir ama yayınevleri, demin de söylediğim gibi, ne kadar ucuza yaptırabilirsek, o kadar ucuza yaptıralım düşüncesinde oldukları için... ama bazen bana geliyor mesela bizim yayınevinden 'Pınar Hanım bunu siz çevirir misiniz? Bu size göre bir şey' falan gibi. Mesela en son bir dizi önerdiler fakat istemedim. Raymond Chandler'ın polisiye dizisini önerdiler. Ben de bir iki polisiye yazdığım için, önce bana önerdiler fakat kabul etmedim çünkü eskiden okumuştum ama yeni okuyuşta birdenbire çok eskidiğini farkettim yazarın. Ama yani genelde ben bakarım kim çevirmiş diye. Eğer İngilizce'den çeviren bir iki tane benim

beğendiğim kişi var... Onlardan biriye, okurum. Yoksa aslını okurum kitabın. Rusça'dan çevirilerde çok fazla yanlışlar buluyorum, ediyorum ama bunu edebiyat dünyasında herkes fark ediyor mu, bilmiyorum. Ben fark ediyorum.

- *Saygınlık açısından bir farklılık?*
- Bilmiyorum. Benim için var. Benim bellediğim, sevdiğim çevirmenler var. İngilizce'den yapılan bir çeviriyi, eğer Seçkin Selvi yapmışsa, okurum. Başkası yapmışsa, okumam bile. Şöyle bir tek örnek veriyorum, yani var, başka örnekler de vardır. Rusça'dan n'apayım, n'apayım, aslından okuyamıyorum. Kendi bildiğim, yabancı dillerde okumayı tercih ediyorum çeviri Türkçe'nin yerine.
- *Çocukluk yıllarınızdan bugüne baktığınızda, yazar-çevirmenliğiniz üzerinde özellikle etkili olduğunu düşündüğünüz belli olaylar ya da kişiler beliriyor mu aklınızda?*
- Hayır. Olaylar veya kişiler olarak değil de... Çocukluk yıllarımda benim annemin babamın kütüphanesinde olan kitaplardan... Bu kitaplar ki bunlar 'Maarif Klasikleri' diye çıkmıştı. Daha sonra 'Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Klasikleri' diye çıktı. Eski Yunan, Shakespeare, Rus klasikleri, Fransız klasikleri filan. Bunlardan ben özellikle eski Yunan tragediyalarını okumuştum ve ne kadar etkilendiğimi çok sonra anladım. Nasıl çok sonra anladım? Üniversiteye geldim. Üniversitede bu Yunan klasikleri karşıma ders olarak çıktı. 'Aaa ben bu hikayeyi biliyorum. Nereden biliyorum?' Çünkü daha ilkokuldayken okumuşum. Ama nasıl şimdiki çocuklar televizyondaki şiddetten etkileniyorlarsa, ben de o eski Yunan klasiklerinden –Yunan klasikleri de bayağ şiddet doludur yani- ben de o şiddetten etkilenmişim ki sonradan yazar olduğumda hep cinayetler ve ölümlerle uğraştım.
- *Sizin yazın hayatınız çeviriyle mi, kendi yazdığınız eserlerle mi başladı?*
- Yayınlanma açısından önce çeviri yayınlandı fakat ben kendimi bildim bileli yazı yazıyorum. Çocukken Doğan Kardeş'te şiirim çıkmıştı... ama annem göndermiş.

Benim tabii haberim bile yok. Benim okuma yazmam yokken, söylediğim bir şeyi yazmış ve göndermiş. Onu saymazsak eğer, yazdım, piyes yazdım. Tiyatroyla uğraştım uzun yıllar. Kısa öyküler yazdım, vesaire fakat bunları çevirmen olarak tanıştığım yerlere götürüp yayınladım. Bilgi Yayınevi'ne daha önceden çeviri yapmıştım diyelim, E Yayınları'na çeviri yapmıştım. Kendi romanımı yazınca, kalktım, onlara göturdüm. Çevirmen olduğumdan dolayı tanıyorlardı beni, yazar olarak tanııyorlardı.

- *Çeviriye nasıl başladınız?*
- Çeviriye şöyle başladım... Paris'ten döndüm. Doktoramı yaptım ve işsizdim. Çocuğum da çok ufaktı. N'apayım, n'apayım?... Bari hem çocuğuma bakacağım hem de evde yapabileceğim iş olarak... Annemin okuldan arkadaşı Ramazan Gökalp Arkın... Daha geçenlerde öldü. Onun bir yayınevi vardı ve Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi diye bir ansiklopedi yayınlıyordu. Orada işte parça parça konuları alarak başladım. Rasih Güran başındaydı bu ansiklopedinin. O çok beğendi. Önce bir parça verdi, 'git, bunu yaz' dedi. Çevirdim, baktı. 'Aaa' dedi, 'İngilizce'yi Amerika'da öğrenmişsiniz, Fransızca'yı Fransa'da öğrenmişsiniz. Türkçe'yi nerede öğrendiniz?' dedi. O kadar şaşırıldı. Orada başladım. Cumhuriyet Ansiklopedisi... Parça parça alıp çevirerek... Ondan sonra gene Ramazan Gökalp Arkın'ın damadı olan Ergin Telci ve onun arkadaşı Ercan Arıklı, Türkiye'nin ilk seks ansiklopedisini çıkarmaya karar verdiler. Orada da onların editörlüğünü yaparak devam ettim. Sonra Ankara'ya gittim. Orada roman filan çevirdim. Yani para kazanmak zorunda olduğumdan ve evden çıkamadığım için başladım çevirmenliğe.
- *Kitaplarınızın yayınlandığı tarihler sizin onları yazdığınız ya da çevirdiğiniz dönem ve yazma ya da çevirme sıranız hakkında yeterli ipucu verir mi? Yoksa yayın tarihlerine bakmamız bizi yanıltabilir mi?*
- Onu bilemeyeceğim. Yanıltabilir. Kendim yazmaya başladıktan sonra boş kaldığım dönemde... Yani bir kitabım yayınlandı. Onun hemen arkasından başka bir kitaba başlayamamak gibi bir zorluğum var. Çoğu yazar için de öyledir. Biri bitince, bir oh, rahatlırsın, biraz nefes alırsın. Ama ondan sonra ikinci bir kitaba başlama aşamasına gelmeden önce, ben genellikle elim durmasın diye çeviri yaparım... El

durması diye bir şey var. Bu, piyanistler için de vardır. Atletler için de vardır. Atletler için el durması değildir de, kasların... Ben, yani, kendi yazmalarım arasında bunları koydum. Tam bilinçli olarak bir sıralama yapılabilir mi yapılamaz mı... onu bana sormayın. Siz bir şeyler çıkarabiliyorsanız kendinizden, çıkarın. Bilemeyeceğim.

- *Tez çalışmamdaki inceleme için on yıllık bir dönem belirledim. O dönemde yazdığınız ve çevirdiğiniz eserleri inceliyorum. Ben kitapların yayın tarihlerine bakarak, o on yıllık dönemin içinde olup olmadığı sonucuna varıyorum. Halbuki belki yayınlanmadan iki sene önce yazdınız ama o tarihte yayınlandı gibi bir şey olabilir mi diye merak ettim.*
- Hayır. Yarın Yarın –ilk kitabım- o çok başarılı olduğu için... Yarın Yarın, 2 sene bekledi bittikten sonra. Onun dışındaki bütün kitaplarım yayınevine teslim ettiğimin üçüncü ayında, beşinci ayında çıkmıştır. Yani o kadar bile geçmemiştir. Bazen ‘hadi hadi, çabuk’ derler. Ne zaman bitireceksin diye dır dır ederler. Onun için öyle daha önce yazdım, sonra bastırdım gibi bir şey yok. Bir tek Yarın Yarın. Ondan sonra böyle bir şey yok.
- *Çevirilerinizi incelerken, çeviri metniyle ilgili dil ve dip not kullanımı gibi her türlü tercihinizi sadece sizin kararınız olarak değerlendirebilir miyiz? Yoksa Everest’teki ve Can’daki editörlerinizin de bazı kararlarda rolü olmuş mudur?*
- Şimdi uzun müddet hep kendim karar verdim; fakat diyorsunuz ki bana Dörtlü’de dipnot kullanılmış. Bunu editör yapmıştır. Ben yapmam. Ve de nasıl gözümden kaçmış bilemiyorum ...
- *Bana ilginç geldi çünkü Fransızca sözcüklere, ifadelere sıklıkla rastlanılan Jean Rhys romanlarından üçünün çevirisinde dip not tercih edilmemiş ama Dörtlü’de dip notlarda Fransızca ifadelerle ilgili açıklamalar yapılmış.*

- Benim Asılacak Kadın'da da Fransızca vardır da dip not koymamışımıdır özellikle çünkü iyi bir yazar –Jean Rhys de öyle ben de öyleyim- zaten bir önceki cümle ya da sonraki cümlede açıklıyor. Dolayısıyla bir de ayrıca dip not konması sıkıcı... Ben dip nota şundan da karşıyım. Sırf okurun dikkatini dağıtıyor diye. Eğer dip not koyarsam, Ç.N diye, dip not olarak değil, hemen yanına koyarım. Dörtlü'dekini hiç hatırlamıyorum ama hiç bir tanesine dip not koymadığıma göre...
- *Çevirdiğiniz eserleri nasıl belirliyorsunuz? Bazen yayınevlerinden teklif geliyor dediniz.*
- Şimdi başlangıçta yayınevinden teklif geliyordu. O zamanki parasal ihtiyacıma göre kabul ediyordum. Ben ilk başladığımda forma hesabı yapılırdı. 16 sayfa = 1 forma. Forma başına şu kadar para diye pazarlığını yapardım. Avansını alırım, avanssız katiyyen başlamazdım. Şimdi zavallılar yapıyorlar... Yeni basımlardan mutlaka telif alırım. Yenilere bakıyorum imzalattırıyorlar bir tek basımdan şu kadar diye... Yani ikinci basımdan para vermiyorlar falan. Bende öyle değildi. Eğer çok pespaye bir şeyse, çevirmem ama gelmedi öyle bir şey elime. En kötüsü mesela Al Capone'un hayatıdır ama enteresan gelmişti bana. Bir taraftan da Amerikan demokrasisinin nasıl işlediğini, nasıl parayla çalıştığını, para üzerine kurulu olduğunu gösteren bir kitaptı. Sadece bir gangsterin hayatı değildi. Başkasının daha önce çevirmediği yazarları tercih ediyorum. Jean Rhys'i de öyle. Fallaci'yi de önce ben çevirdim. Jeanet Winterson'ı da benden önce kimse çevirmedi. Sonra başkaları çevirdi. Ben istemediğim için başkasına gitti o kitaplar.
- *Yeri gelmişken... Fallaci'yi hangi dilden Türkçe'ye çevirdiniz?*
- Efendim, İngilizce'den çevirdim. Fallaci, ondan sonra gitti, Yunanlı bir adama aşık oldu. Türklerden nefret etmeye başladı ve Türkçe yayını durdurdu kitabın. Dediler İngilizce'den çevirmiştir. Bizim Can Yayınları tekrar teklif ediyor basmak için. İtalya'da bir Türk'e okutturuyor ve bir takım eksiklikler, yanlışlıklar gönderiyor bana kitapta. Bunlar tabii İngiliz yaparken... İngilizce'ye çevirirken atlanmış olan bölümler olabilir. Bunun üzerine, Erdal Öz de bir başka, direk İtalyanca bilen birisine o bölümleri çevirtirdi ve yeni baskıya ekletti. Yeniden çıkmasına izin verilince... Fakat ben hala iddia ediyorum ki benim çevirim, –Fallaci'nin İtalyancası'nı bilmem ama- İngilizcesi'nden daha iyidir çünkü çok basit bir şey...

Bir örnek vereyim... Gerçi senin konun Fallaci değil ama... Rüya anlatır, rüyalarını anlatır. Hele son rüya artık kitabın en önemli şeyidir. Ve bazı şeyleri masal gibi anlatır. Ben burada mesela, mişli geçmiş kullandım. Mişli geçmiş, başka hiç bir dilde yoktur. Ve şimdiki çevirmenler... o kadar bilinçsiz olanlar var ki... Televizyonda falan duyuyorum. Onlar da direk mişli geçmişini unutuyorlar. Mesela 'dün akşam bizim eve hırsız girdi,' diyor. Halbuki, eğer sen orada değilsen, 'bizim eve hırsız girdi,' denmez. 'Bizim eve hırsız girmiş,' denir çünkü sen yoksun.

- *Haberin olmadan girmiş olmalı...*
- Ben burada otururken girdiyse, tamam ama sinemadayken girmişse, girmiş olur o zaman. Mişli geçmişini bizim çevirmenlerimizin çoğu unuttu çünkü çevirdikleri kaynak dilde yok. Dolayısıyla o mişli geçmişin kullanımı çok büyük de şeyler katmıştır esere. Onu söyleyeyim.
- *Çevirdiğiniz eserler arasında sizin için kişisel anlamda, yazarlığınız ya da çevirmenliğiniz açısından özel yanları olanlar var mı diye soracaktım. Buna biraz evvel bir parça değindiniz aslında...*
- Jean Rhys özellikle çok... Hayatı da çok üzümüştür beni. Çok uzun bir dönem unutuluyor. Varlığı yok. Ben hiç adını duymamıştım, Günaydın Geceyarısı diye bir kitabı geçti elime. Yeni baskı. Sonra öğrendim ki bu 1940'lardan sonra hiç basılmamış. Kimse basmamış bu kadının kitabını. 67'de Wide Sargasso Sea'yi ortaya çıkarınca, birdenbire keşfedilmiş ve eserleri sonradan tekrar basılmış. Dolayısıyla ben Günaydın Geceyarısı'nın yazıldığından ki 40'larda yazılmış bir kitap sanıyorum ki savaş öncesi veya hemen savaş sonrası, neyse... ama arada hiç yeni basımı yapılmamış. Ta ki Wide Sargasso Sea ortaya çıkınca, millet uyanmış... Dolayısıyla ilk okuduğum kitabı benim, Günaydın Geceyarısı'ydı. Çok etkilenmişim ama sonra Wide Sargasso Sea'yi okudum. İlk onu çevirdim. Sonra ötekileri sırasıyla ben de buldum ve çevirdim. Sevdiğim bir insan. Dediğim gibi, Theo'ya Mektuplar da çok etkilemiştir. O hem etkiledi dedim, hem ağlardım hem yazardım hem de çok zorlandığım, en zorlandığım çevirilerden biridir çünkü adam yazar değil. Yazarın mektup yazma şekli de farklıdır. Bu adamın derdi resim yapmak, işte para bulup boya almak, şu, bu... Dolayısıyla hem İngilizce metinlerden

hem Fransızca metinlerden yararlandım o kitap için çünkü aslı Hollandaca. Onu da çok etkileyenler arasında söyleyebilirim.

- *Delilikle ilgili bir de bilimsel çalışma var çevirdiğiniz eserler arasında...*
- Delilikle ilgili değil de, bipolar personality. Durulmayan Bir Kafa. O manik depresif bir şeyle ilgili... Ama delilikle ilgili diyorsan... onu ben Akışı Olmayan Sular'dan sonra çevirdim. Ama delilik her zaman beni ilgilendirmiştir ve Akışı Olmayan Sular gerçek bir olaya dayanır. Yani onun manik depresif hikayeyeyle ilgisi yok. Zaten Akışı Olmayan Sular'daki şizofrenidir. Gerçi onun için, çok kitap devirdim şizofreninin semptomlarını öğrenmek için...
- *Çeviri yapmaya başlamadan önce ve çeviri eylemi sırasında özellikle nelere dikkat edersiniz?*
- Bir kere başından sonuna okuyup hikayeyi bilmeye dikkat ederim. Bunca yıl olmasına rağmen gene lügatla çalışırım fakat hiç bir zaman da 'Ayy bunu nasıl söyleyeceğim Türkçe, nasıl anlatacağım?' deyip çok düşünüp, sonra lügata baktığımda, lügatta benden iyi bir şey bulamadığımı da ifade etmek isterim. Ha bazen çiçek, böcek isimleri. Onları, evet çünkü onların Türkçe isimlerini de doğru dürüst bilmem. Çiçek, böcek isimleri, coğrafi terimler filan... Onlar için lügata bakarım ama gerçekten zor bir idyomu hiç bir zaman lügatta bulamadım. Yani lügatla çalışırım ama genelde nelere dikkat ederim?... Kendi yazımı yazarken nelere dikkat ediyorsam, onlara da dikkat ediyorum tabii ki.
- *Yazarlığınız ve çevirmenliğiniz arasında herhangi bir etkileşim olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz? Sizce yazdığınız ve çevirdiğiniz eserler arasında biçem düzeyinde belirgin benzerlikler veya farklılıklar var mı?*
- Şimdi... belirgin benzerlikler olduğunu zannetmiyorum. İnsan farkında olmadan olabiliyor bazen ama hep beraber, aynı sırada yaptığım işler olmadığı için... Hem romanı yazıyorum hem çeviri yapıyorum, dolayısıyla birbirini etkileyebilir ama öyle

bir durum olmuyordu. Şu vardır... Çevirmenliğimde benim yazarlığıma yararlı olan şey: Fransızca ve İngilizce'de olan bazı kavramlar, bazı sözcükler çok zorlayıcı oluyor karşılığını bulma açısından. Yani karşılığını bulma için gösterdiğim çabayla kendi dilimde bir takım şeyler keşfedebiliyorum. Bazen de edemiyorum. Çok frustrated oluyorum. Bak, şimdi, mesela, frustrated dedim. Frustrated'ı çevir bakalım. Örnek vereyim... Van Gogh'u çevirirken... Adam bir sürü renk söylemiş. Bu renklere lügatı açıp baktığımda: küf sarısı, limon sarısı, işte bilmem altın sarısı... Bin tane sarının değişik şeyleri fakat şimdi İngilizcesi'nde de Fransızcası'nda da hep farklı kelime. Ben, halbuki, 'sarı, sarı, sarı' demekten baygınlık geçiriyorum. Böyle frustration dediğim bu olabiliyor. Bazen de kendi dil dağarcığımı zorlamama sebep olduğu için, kendi dilimi daha iyi tanımama da yardımcı olabiliyor. Başka bir etkileşim var mı, bilmiyorum. Onu siz kendiniz bulacaksınız artık.

- *Yazarlığınızın çevirmenliğinize?...*
- Yazarın ne demek istediğini kavrayabiliyorsun. Onu daha baştan söyledim. Kavramak meselesi. Yazarın ne demek istediğini, derinliğini... Sevdiğin de bir yazar olunca... Yazar, öbür yazarın neler çektiğini bildiği için yaratırken... O, tabii, daha anlayışlı ve sadık kalmama yardımcı oluyor.
- *Eserlerinizde ikilemelerle, ilaveli tekrarlarla ya da kaynak metinle kıyaslandığında daha güçlü bulunabilecek ifadelerle vurgulu bir anlatım oluşturduğunuzu düşünüyor musunuz? Bu açıdan değerlendirdiğinizde yazdığınız ve çevirdiğiniz eserler arasında bir fark görüyor musunuz?*
- Nasıl? Bir örnek versene...
- *Mesela 'koşa koşa geldi' ya da 'dinlerken dinlerken'... Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz'in başlığında bile öyle. Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz-Wide Sargasso Sea. Daha şiirli bir anlatım hissediyorum ben.*

- Evet, kadın, 'wide' demiş. Şimdi, orada, Sargasso kelimesini kullanmak istemedim başlıkta çünkü Sargasso, Şeytan Üçgeni'ndeki denizdir ama kimse bilmez bunu. Zaten yabancı kelime başlıklarda kullanmak istemiyorum. O kadının zihni de karışık, karmaşık, geniş deniz olduğu için... Sargasso yerine 'Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz' dedim ama bu benim kendi üslubumun yansımasıdır, onun değil.
- *Değil. Evet, bence de öyle. Kendi eserlerinizde de dikkatimi çeken bir şey bu. İkilemeler dışında ilaveli tekrar olarak 'bembeyaz' gibi kullanımlarınız var. 'Bembeyaz bir entari giymişti...'*
- Bembeyaz diye bir şey yok mesela İngilizce'de. White'sa white'tır. Değilse, değildir. O da demek ki benim üslubumun yansıması oluyor.
- *Çevirdiğiniz eserlerdeki karakterlerin seslerini oluştururken, günlük konuşma dillerini yakalama amaçlı yazarlığınızda benzer bir çabanız oluyor mu? Bu ve bunun gibi yaratıcılığın öne çıkabileceği noktalarda kaynak metin ne dereceye kadar sizi yönlendiriyor?*
- Demin söylediğim bir şey, biraz bunun cevabı oluyor. Hani 'su içene yılan bile dokunmaz' örneği. Bunu başarılı yapanların en büyük örneği, Can Yücel'dir Türkçe'de. Çok Türkçe'ye oturtmak, yani sesi çok Türkçe yapmak istemiyorum. Yapmayı yanlış buluyorum. Bunun bir çeviri olduğunun belli olması lazım. Kalkıp, mesela... Ben geçen sene okuttum Arthur Miller'ın Cadı Kazanı'nı. Türkçe çevirisini Can Yücel yapmış. Kızlar mesela şeytan töreninde dans ediyorlar, şeytanı çağırıyorlar hikayede. Türkçe'de Can Yücel 'gece horon tepiyorlar' demiş. Yok böyle bir şey. Bu o kadar lokal bir şey ki bunun Arthur Miller'ın Amerika'da pürüten bir dinle ilgili bir kitabında yer alması mümkün değil. Türkçe'de çok lokal olan lafları kesinlikle kullanmıyorum. Tam tersine, o yaratıldığı kaynak dilin özelliklerini çok bozmadan... Hani 'search me'de olduğu gibi değil tabii ki ama... Yerel bir dil haline sokmayı kabul etmiyorum.
- *Jean Rhys'in bir ya da iki değil, biri hariç bütün romanlarını çevirmişsiniz. After Leaving Mr Mackenzie'yi niye siz çevirmediniz?*

- Mackenzie'yi çevirdiđimi zannediyorum valla. Onu mutlaka sorun. Can Yayınları'na gidip bütün listeyi alabilirsiniz.
  
- *Çok teşekkür ederim.*
  
- Rica ederim.

## REFERENCES

- Aka, Elif. 2011. Unpublished interview with Pınar Kür. Bilgi University Santral Campus. Feb 17.
- Akan, Ali Rauf. 1946. "Tercüme Dergisinin Özel Sayısı." [The Special Issue of the Translation Journal.] *Tercüme* 7: 37, 85-86.
- Akatlı, Füsün. 1987. "Bitmeyen Aşk ve Anlatıcı Sorununa Yeni Bir Yaklaşım." [Bitmeyen Aşk and a New Approach to the Narrator Issue.] In *Edebiyat Defteri*, 33-38. Istanbul: Afa Yayınları.
- Akatlı, Füsün. 1998. "Öykülerde Dünyalar." [Worlds in Stories.] In *Pınar Kür Hakkında* [About Pınar Kür], İhsan Işık, 2362. *Türkiye Edebiyatçıları ve Kültür Adamları Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6. K-N. Ankara: Elvan Yayınları, 2006.
- Akatlı, Füsün. 2004. "Anlatı Edebiyatımızda Pınar Kür'ün Yeri." [Pınar Kür's Place in our Narrative Literature.] *Radikal*, April 30. Accessed October 22, 2010. [http://www.radikal.com.tr/ek\\_haber.php?ek=ktp&haberno=2697](http://www.radikal.com.tr/ek_haber.php?ek=ktp&haberno=2697)
- Akatlı, Füsün. 2006. "Pınar Kür'ün 'Cinayet'leri." [Pınar Kür's 'Murder's.] *Milliyet Kitap*. Accessed November 26, 2010. <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2006/11/02/kitap/axkit02.html>
- Akbatur, Arzu. 2010. "Writing/ Translating in/to English: The 'Ambivalent' Case of Elif Şafak." PhD diss., Boğaziçi University.
- Aksoy, Nazan. 2008. "Türk Romanında Yenilikçi Yönelişler." [Innovative Turns in the Turkish Novel.] In *Çağdaş Türk Yazını*, edited by Zehra İpşiroğlu, 15-36. Istanbul: Toros Kitaplığı.
- Aktaş, Burcu. 2006. "Pınar Kür'ün Yeni Romanı Polisiye." [Pınar Kür's New Novel is in the Detective Genre.] *Radikal*, September 30. Accessed November 4, 2010. <http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalHaberDetayV3&ArticleID=793209&Date=29.07.2011&CategoryID=113>
- Alexander Malcolm, Cheryl, and David Malcolm. 1996. *Jean Rhys: A Study of the Short Fiction*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Andrews, Molly. 2000. "Introduction." In *Lines of Narrative. Psychological Perspectives*, edited by Molly Andrews, Shelley Day Selater, Corinne Squire and Amal Treacher, 77-80. London & New York: Routledge.
- Arpa, Yasemin. 2008. "Pınar Kür'den Hilmi Yavuz'a Sert Yanıt." [Pınar Kür's Harsh Response to Hilmi Yavuz.] *NTVMSNBC*. Updated February 7, 2008. Accessed December 8, 2010. <http://www.arsiv.ntvmsnbc.com/news/434799.asp>
- Arrojo, Rosemary. 1997. "The Asymmetrical Relations of Power and the Ethics of

- Translation.” *TextconText* 1: 1-12.
- Ataç, Nurullah. 1941a. “Tercüme Dair.” [On Translation.] *Tercüme* 1: 6, 505-507.
- Ataç, Nurullah. 1941b. “İkinci Yıla Girerken.” [At the Turn of the Second Year.] *Tercüme* 2: 1, 1-3.
- Athill, Diana. 1980. “Foreword.” In *Smile Please: An Unfinished Autobiography*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Athill, Diana. 1985. “Introduction.” In *Jean Rhys: The Complete Novels*, vii-xiv. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Ayluçtarhan, Sevda. 2007. “Dr Abdullah Cevdet’s Translations of (1908-1910): The Making of a Westernist and Materialist “Culture Repertoire” in a “Resistant” Ottoman Context.” MA thesis, Boğaziçi University.
- Baker, Mona. 1995. “Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research.” *Target* 7: 2, 223-243.
- Baker, Mona. 2000. “Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator.” *Target* 12: 2, 241-266.
- Baker, Mona. 2004. “A Corpus-Based View of Similarity and Difference in Translation.” *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9: 2, 167-193.
- Balmer, Josephine. 2006. “What Comes Next? Reconstructing the Classics.” In *The Translator as Writer*, edited by Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush, 184-196. London & New York: Continuum.
- Barberis-Grasser, Marie-Anne. 1994. “Romantizm: Kaybolan Düşler Nesli.” [Romantism: The Generation of Lost Dreams.] In *Thema Larousse: Tematik Ansiklopedi*, 5, 86-87. Istanbul: Milliyet.
- Barnes, Barry. 2000. *Understanding Agency: Social Theory and Responsible Action*. London: Sage Publications.
- Barthes, Roland. 1972. “Authors and Writers.” Translated by Richard Howard. In *Critical Essays*, 143-151. Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1995. “The Death of the Author.” In *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader*, edited by Sean Burke, 125-130. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1991. *Translation Studies*. Revised ed. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. 1994. “The Visible Translator.” *In Other Words*, 4, 11-15.
- Becher, Viktor. 2010. “Towards a More Rigorous Treatment of the ‘Explication Hypothesis’ in Translation Studies.” Paper presented at MATS 2010 in

University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.

- Bengi, Işın. 1990. "A Re-evaluation of the Concept of Equivalence in the Literary Translations of Ahmed Midhat Efendi: A Linguistic Perspective." PhD diss., Hacettepe University.
- Bilkur, Nili. 1985. *Ayrılıktan Sonra. [After Leaving Mr Mackenzie.]* Istanbul: Can.
- Birkandan, İlknur. 2000. "Uluslararası İletişimde Çevirmenin Rolü." [The Translator in International Trade.] MA thesis, Istanbul University.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2005. "Bourdieu the Ethnographer: The Ethnographic Grounding of Habitus and Voice." *The Translator* 11: 2, 219-236.
- Boase-Beier, Jean. 2006. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. Edited by Theo Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Bonnefoy, Yves. 1992. "Translating Poetry." In *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, 186-193. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Borillo, Josep Marco. 2010. "An Analysis of Explicitation in the COVALT Corpus." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2007. *How Does it Feel? Point of View in Translation: The Case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loic J.D. Wacquant. 1992. "The Purpose of Reflexive Sociology (The Chicago Workshop)". In *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Pierre Bourdieu and Loic J.D. Wacquant, 61-216. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Translated by Matthew Adamson. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson and edited by John Thompson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. "The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas." In *Bourdieu. A Critical Reader*, edited by Richard Shusterman. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bouveresse, Jacques. 1999. "Rules, Dispositions, and the Habitus." In *Bourdieu. A*

- Critical Reader*, edited by Richard Shusterman. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bowker, Lynne, and Jennifer Pearson. 2002. *Working with Specialized Language: A Practical Guide to Using Corpora*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Burke, Sean. 1995. "Introduction: Reconstructing the Author." In *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader*, edited by Sean Burke, xv-xxx. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Butler, Paul. 2008. *Out of Style: Reanimating Stylistic Study in Composition and Rhetoric*. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.
- Callinicos, Alex. 2004. *Making History: Agency, Structure, and Change in Social Theory*. Historical Materialism Book Series. Boston : Brill.
- Camcı, Meral. 2006. Sorumluluk-Görünürlük ve Etik: Çevirmen 301. Madde'den Yargılanmalı mı? Çevirmen Sorum(suz)(lu)luğunun Açılım ve Sınırları [Responsibility-Visibility and Ethics: Should the Translator Be on Trial for Article 301? On Explaining the Translator's (Ir)Responsibility and its Limits]. Paper presented at Istanbul University. Accessed September 9, 2010. [www.cevbir.org](http://www.cevbir.org)
- Cappelle, Bert. 2010. "Where are our Manners? Language-dependent Omission of "Manner" Expressions in Translated Texts: Research Outline." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- Cary, Edmond. 1960. "Şiir Çevirisi." [Poetry Translation.] Translated by Fuat Pekin. *Tercüme* 14: 71-72.
- Cemal, Ahmet. 1983. "Türkiye'de Çevirmenlik." [Being a Translator in Turkey.] *Yazko Çeviri* 15: 8-12.
- Chamberlayne, Prue, Joanna Borat, and Tom Wengraf. 2000. "Introduction: the biographical turn." In *The Turn to Biographical Methods in Social Science: Comparative Issues and Examples*, edited by Prue Chamberlayne, Joanna Borat and Tom Wengraf, 1-30. London & New York: Routledge.
- Chatman, Seymour. 1971. "Editor's Introduction." In *Literary Style: A Symposium*, edited and in part translated by Seymour Chatman, ix-xv. London & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chatman, Seymour. 1978. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Chatman, Seymour. 1990. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Chesterman, Andrew, and Rosemary Arrojo. 2000. "Shared Ground in Translation Studies." *Target* 12:1, 151-160.

- Chesterman, Andrew. 2004. "Beyond the particular." In *Translation Universals: Do they Exist?*, edited by Anna Mauranen and Pekka Kujamaki, 33-49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cockerill, Hiroko. 2006. *Style and Narrative in Translations: The Contributions of Futabatei Shimei*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary. 2003. John Sinclair, founding editor in chief. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Cross, Mary. 1993. *Henry James: The Contingencies of Style*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Culler, Jonathan. 2006. *Flaubert: The Uses of Uncertainty*. Aurora, CO: Davies Group, Publishers.
- Çavuşoğlu, Özgür. 2007. "'Türkçe Söyleyen" Can Yücel: The "Rewriter" *par excellence*." MA thesis, Boğaziçi University.
- Çin, Nazmiye. 2010. "Pınar Kür'ün Romanlarında ve Öykülerinde Kadın Problemleri." [Woman Issues in Pınar Kür's Novels and Short Stories.] MA thesis, Selçuk University.
- D'Costa, Jean. 1986. "Jean Rhys (1890-1979)." In *Fifty Caribbean Writers: A Biobibliographical Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Daryl Cumber Dance, 390-404. NY: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Davis, Kathleen. 2001. *Deconstruction and Translation*. Manchester: Saint Jerome Publishing.
- Demircioğlu, Cemal. 2005. "From Discourse to Practice: Rethinking "Translation" (*Terceme*) and Related Practices of Text Production in the Late Ottoman Literary Tradition." PhD diss., Boğaziçi University.
- Denturck, Kathelijne, and Sofie Niemegeers. 2010. "Explicitation – Implication – Unique Items: The Case of Modal Particles and Causal Connectives." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982a. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." In *Margins of Philosophy*. Translated by Alan Bass. Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982b. "Difference." In *Margins of Philosophy*. Translated by Alan Bass, 3-27. Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982c. "Semiology and Grammatology: Interview with Julia Kristeva." In *Positions*. Translated by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1985. "A Letter to a Japanese Friend." In *Derrida and Difference*, edited by Wood & Bernasconi, 1-5. Warwick: Parousia Press.

- Devrim, İzzet-Melih. 1940. "Edebi Tercüme." [Literary Translation.] *Tercüme* 1: 3, 275-277.
- Dizdar, Dilek. 2006. "Çevirinin Sınırları ve Çevirmenin Sorumlulukları." [The Limits of Translation and the Responsibilities of the Translator.] *Varlık* 1185, June, 5-7.
- Dorsay, Atilla. 2004. "Onun Hayaletleri Çok Başka." [Her Ghosts are Much Different.] *Sabah*. August 8. Accessed June 21, 2010.  
<http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2004/08/11/cp/gnc116-20040808-102.html>
- Erkman Akerson, Fatma. 1989. "Bir Cinayet Romanını Eleştirmek." [To Criticize a Crime Novel.] *Hürriyet Gösteri* 101, April, 62-65.
- Erkul, Ahu Selin. 2005. "Discourses on translators and translation in the Turkish fiction." MA thesis, Dokuz Eylül University.
- Evans, J. Claude. 1991. *Strategies of Deconstruction: Derrida and the Myth of the Voice*. Minneapolis & Oxford: University of Minneapolis.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. "Polysystem Theory." *Poetics Today* 11: 1, 9-26.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2000. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 192-197. London: Routledge.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2002. "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer." In *Translations: (re)shaping of literature and culture*, edited by Saliha Paker, 166-174. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2005. "Idea-makers, Culture Entrepreneurs, Makers of Life Images, and the Prospects of Success." *Papers in Culture Research*, 1-19. Accessed January 4, 2010. <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers>.
- Fairclough, Norman, and Ruth Wodak. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, edited by Teun A. Van Dijk. Vol. 2, 258-285. London: Sage.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1999. "Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis." In *The Discourse Reader*, Jaworski, A. and N. Coupland, 183-211. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. "Authors and Writers." *Critical Essays*, 143-151. Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Frankenberg Garcia, Ana. 2010. "What Makes Translation Different? A Top-Down Approach to Identifying Distinctive Lexis." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent Translation Studies, Jan 8-9, 2010.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1995. "Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming." Translated and edited by James Strachey. In *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader*, edited

- by Sean Burke, 54-62. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gagnon, Daniel. 2006. "Cross-writing and Self-translating: One Canadian/ Quebec Experience." In *Translating Identity and the Identity of Translation*, edited by Madelena Gonzalez and Francine Tolron, 46-59. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Gomez Castro, Cristina. 2010. "Anchor Terms' Lists of Controversial Issues as a Methodological Tool in Corpus Based Translation Studies." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2005. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances: Field, 'Habitus', Capital and 'Illusio'." *The Translator* 11: 2, 147-166.
- Gutt, Ernest-August. 2000. "Issues of Translation Research in the Inferential Paradigm of Communication." In *Intercultural Faultlines*, edited by Maeve Olohan. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Güvemli, Zahir. 1946. "Edebiyat." [Literature.] *Tercüme* 7: 37, 88-90.
- Halverson, Sandra. 2000. "The Fault Line in Our Common Ground." *Target* 12:1, 356-362.
- Harrison, Nancy Rebecca. 1988. *Jean Rhys and the Novel as the Women's Text*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: UNC Press Books.
- Hatipoğlu, Vecihe. 1981. *Türk Dilinde İkileme* [Reduplication in Turkish Language]. 2nd ed. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Hauser, Arnold. 1973. *The Social History of Art 3: Rococo, Classicism and Romanticism*. First published in two volumes in 1951. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hermans, Theo. 1985. "Translation Studies and a New Paradigm." In *The Manipulation of Literature*, edited by Theo Hermans, 7-15. London: Croom Helm.
- Hermans, Theo. 1996. "Translation's Other." Inaugural lecture delivered at University College London, March 19.
- Hermans, Theo. 2002. "The Production and Reproduction of Translation: System Theory and Historical Context." In *translations: (re)shaping of literature and culture*, edited by Saliha Paker, 175-194. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Heywood, Leslie. 1996. *Dedication to Hunger: The Anorexic Aesthetic in Modern Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Retrieved Oct 26, 2010 from <http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft3g500552/>
- Hızır, Nusret. 1941. "Tercüme Dair Yazılar Hakkında." [About the Essays on

- Translation.] *Tercüme* 2: 9, 265-268.
- Holland, Dorothy, William Lachicotte, Debra Skinner, and Carole Caine. 1998. *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Holmes, James. 1988. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." In *Translated: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, 66-80. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Humm, Maggie. 1991. *Border Traffic: Strategies of Contemporary Women Writers*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Huotari, Lea. 2010. "Animation of the Subject in Translation: an S-universal?" Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 2002. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Routledge.
- Ibsch, Elrud. 1986. "Duplication and Multiplication: Postmodernist Devices in the Novels of Italo Calvino." In *Approaching Postmodernism*, edited by Douwe W. Fokkema and Hans Bertens, 135-157. Paper presented at a workshop on postmodernism, University of Utrecht, 21-23 September, 1984. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Inghilleri, Moira. 2005. "The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies." *The Translator* 11: 2, 125-145.
- Irzik, Sibel. 1990. *Deconstruction and the Politics of Criticism*. New York & London: Garland Publishing.
- Irzik, Sibel, and Jale Parla. 2009. "Önsöz." [Preface.] In *Kadınlar Dile Düşünce* [When Women Fall into Language.], edited by Jale Parla and Sibel Irzik, 7-12. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Istanbul: İletişim.
- Işık, İhsan. 2006. *Türkiye Edebiyatçıları ve Kültür Adamları Ansiklopedisi* [Encyclopedia of Turkish Men of Letters and Culture.] Vol: 6. K-N. Ankara: Elvan Yayınları.
- İleri, Selim. 1983. "Attila İlhan'la Çeviri Üzerine." [On Translation with Attila İlhan.] *Yazko Çeviri* 10: 106-109.
- İnce, Ülker. 1988. "Bir Çeviri Sorunu." [A Translation Problem.] *Metis Çeviri*: 6, Winter, 36-40.
- Jablon, Madelyn. 1997. *Black Meta-fiction: Self-consciousness in African American Literature*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Jimenez-Crespo, Miguel. 2010. "Translation Universals and New Translation Modalities: Explicitation in Web Localization." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.

- Kafaoğlu-Büke, Asuman. 2006. "Fakültede Katil Var." [Murderer at the Faculty.] *Dünya Gazetesi Kitap Eki*, December 25. Accessed January 5, 2010.  
<http://edebiyatelestiri.blogspot.com/2006/12/cinayet-fakltesi.html>
- Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. 2003. "Edebiyat ve Kültür Dizgesini Şekillendirmede İdeolojik Açından Çevirinin ve Çevirmenin Rolü." [The Role of Both the Translational Action and the Translator –in terms of ideology- in Shaping the Literary and Cultural System.] PhD diss., İstanbul University.
- Karantay, Suat. 1990. "Türkçe'den İngilizce'ye Yazın Çevirisinin Sorunları Üzerine." [On the Issues of Literary Translation from Turkish to English.] *Metis Çeviri* 13, Fall, 13-20.
- Kasap, Nesrin. 1988. "Nuran Yavuz'la Yayınevi-Çevirmen İlişkileri Üzerine." [On the Relationship between the Publishing House and the Translator with Nuran Yavuz.] *Metis Çeviri* 3: 123-128.
- Kendall, Gavin. 2007. "What Is Critical Discourse Analysis?" Ruth Wodak in Conversation with Gavin Kendall. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2), Art. 29. Accessed January 22, 2010.  
<http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/wodak/interview.pdf>
- Kenny, Dorothy. 1998. "Creatures of Habit? What Translators Usually Do with Words?" *Meta* 43-4: 515-523.
- Kenny, Dorothy. 2001. *Lexis and Creativity in Translation: A Corpus-Based Study*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Kermen, Nuray, trans. 1972. *Günaydın Geceyarısı*. [Good Morning, Midnight]. İstanbul: Tel Yayınları.
- Kurultay, Turgay. 1988. "Melahat Togar ile Söyleşi." [Interview with Melahat Togar.] *Metis Çeviri* 5, Fall, 13-20.
- Kür, Pınar. 1976. *Yarın Yarın* [Tomorrow Tomorrow]. İstanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar. 1976. "Pınar Kür'le." [With Pınar Kür.] *Cumhuriyet*. April 8. Quoted by Atilla Özkırımlı. 1987. *Türk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Vol: 3. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.
- Kür, Pınar. 1977. *Küçük Oyuncu* [Small-time Actor]. İstanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar, trans. 1989a. *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [Wide Sargasso Sea]. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (First published in 1982.) İstanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar. 1989b. "Çevirenin Önsözü." [Translator's Preface.] In *Geniş Geniş Bir Deniz* [Wide Sargasso Sea], translated by Pınar Kür, 5-17. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. First published in 1982. İstanbul: Can.

- Kür, Pınar, trans. 1989c. *Karanlıkta Yolculuk [Voyage in the Dark]*. Istanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar. 2008a. *Bitmeyen Aşk [Unending Love]*. 2<sup>th</sup> pocket ed. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1986 by Can) Istanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar, trans. 1990. *Günaydın Geceyarısı [Good Morning, Midnight]*. Istanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar, trans. 1991. *Dalda Duran Kuşlar [Sleep It Off Lady]*. Istanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar. 2004. *Akışı Olmayan Sular [Still Waters]*. 10<sup>th</sup> ed. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1983 by Can) Istanbul: Everest.
- Kür, Pınar. 2004. *Asılacak Kadın [A Woman to Hang]*. 12<sup>th</sup> ed. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1979 by Bilgi) Istanbul: Everest.
- Kür, Pınar. 2004. *Hayalet Hikayeleri [Ghostly Stories]*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Istanbul: Everest.
- Kür, Pınar. 2004. *Sonuncu Sonbahar [Final Fall]*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1992 by Can) Istanbul: Everest.
- Kür, Pınar. 2006. *Cinayet Fakültesi [Faculty of Murder]*. Istanbul: Everest.
- Kür, Pınar. 2007a. *Bir Cinayet Romanı [A Novel of Murder]*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1989 by Can) Istanbul: Everest.
- Kür, Pınar, trans. 2007b. *Dörtlü [Quartet (first published as Postures)]* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (First published in 1985). Istanbul: Can.
- Kür, Pınar. 2008b. “Haydi Gel Bizimle Ol.” [Hey Come and Join Us] *NTV*. Feb. TV program done with Çiğdem Anad, Müjde Ar & Aysun Kayacı.
- Kür, Pınar. 2008c. *Bir Deli Ağaç [The Mad Tree]*. 12<sup>th</sup> ed. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1981 by Yazko Publishing) Istanbul: Everest.
- Laviosa, Sara. 1998. “Core Patterns of Lexical Use in a Comparable Corpus of English Narrative Prose.” *Meta* 43: 4, 557-570.
- Laviosa, Sara. 2002. *Corpus-Based Translation Studies: Theory, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Leech, Geoffrey N., and Michael H. Short. 1981. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. English Language Series. Longman: London & New York.
- Lefevere, Andre. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
- Leighton, Lauren G. 1991. *Two Worlds, One Art: Literary Translation in Russia and America*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Leland, Charles G. 1889. *A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant: Embracing English, American, and Anglo-Indian Slang, Pidgin English, Tinkers' Jargon and Other*

- Irregular Phraseology*, compiled and edited by Albert Barrere & Charles G. Leland. Vol: 1. A-K. The Ballantyne Press.
- Malmkjaer, Kirsten. 2000. "Relative Stability and Stable Relativity." *Target* 12:2, 341-345.
- Martinez-Llenas, Barbara. 2010. "Under-representation of Typical Elements of Spanish in Translated Texts." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- McEnery, Tony, Richard Xiao, and Yukio Tono. 2006. *Corpus-Based Language Studies: An Advanced Resource Book*. London & New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, Elsa and agencies. 2006. "Controversial Turkish Writer Wins the Nobel Literature Prize." *Times Online*. Accessed April 25, 2011.  
[http://entertainment.timesonline.co.uk/tol/arts\\_and\\_entertainment/books/article599510.ece](http://entertainment.timesonline.co.uk/tol/arts_and_entertainment/books/article599510.ece)
- Mehrez, Samia. 1992. "Translation and the Postcolonial Experience: The Francophone North African Text." In *Rethinking Translation*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 120-138. London and New York: Routledge.
- Meister, Jan Christoph, Tom Kindt, and Wilhelm Schernus. 2005. "Introduction: Narratology beyond Literary Criticism." *Narratology beyond Literary Criticism. Mediality, Disciplinarity*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Metis Çeviri. 1990a. "Öykü Çevirisi Üzerine." [On Short Story Translation.] *Metis Çeviri* 12, Summer, 13-16.
- Metis Çeviri. 1990b. "Şiir Çevirisi Üzerine." [On Poetry Translation.] *Metis Çeviri* 13, Fall, 11-20.
- Miao, Jun. 2010. "The Syntactic Skeleton of the Translator's Style: Statistical Measures of Categorical Usage in Parallel Translations." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- Mithat Alam Film Merkezi. 2006. "Pınar Kür: Tiyatro Sinemanın Görseelliğini, Kendi Yaratılış Sürecimde de Yaşarım." [Pınar Kür: I Experience the Visuality of the Theatre and the Cinema in my Own Process of Creation.] *Mithat Alam Film Merkezi Söyleşi, Panel ve Sunum Yıllığı*. Moderatör: Yamaç Okur.
- Moran, Berna. 2004. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış III: Sevgi Soysal'dan Bilge Karasu'ya*. [A Critical Look at Turkish Novel III. From Sevgi Soysal to Bilge Karasu.] Edited by Nazan Aksoy and Oya Berk. 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Istanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.

- Munday, Jeremy. 1998. "A Computer-Assisted Approach to the Analysis of Translation Shifts." *Meta* 43: 4, 542-556.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2008. *Style and Ideology in Translation: Latin American Writing in English*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Naci, Fethi. 2002. *Yüzyılın 100 Türk Romanı*. [100 Turkish Novels of the Century.] 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Istanbul: Adam.
- Natoli, Joseph P., and Linda Hutcheon. 1993. "Introduction: Reading a Postmodern Reader." In *A Postmodern Reader*, edited by Joseph P. Natoli and Linda Hutcheon, vii-xiv. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Nikolaou, Paschalis, and Maria-Venetia Kyritsi. 2008. "Introduction. Selves in Translation." In *Translating Selves. Experience and Identity between Languages and Literatures*, 1-17. London & New York: Continuum.
- Nikolaou, Paschalis. 2008. "Turning Inward: Liaisons of Literary Translation and Life-Writing." In *Translating Selves: Experience and Identity between Languages and Literatures*, edited by Paschalis Nikolaou and Maria-Venetia Kyritsi, 53-71. London & New York: Continuum.
- O'Connor, Teresa F. 1986. *Jean Rhys: The West Indian Novels*. New York: New York University Press.
- Oker, Celil, Elif Şafak, Faruk Ulay, Murathan Mungan, and Pınar Kür. 2004. *Beşpeşe* [Five in a Row]. Istanbul: Metis.
- Olohan, Maeve. 2000. "Shifts, But Not As We Know Them? Research Models and Methods in Translation Studies." In *Intercultural Faultlines*, edited by Maeve Olohan. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Olohan, Maeve. 2004. *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Önemli, İdil. 2004. "Pınar Kür: Hayalet İmgesiyle Üslubu Yoğurarak Farklı Bir Anlatıma Ulaşabilirim Diye Düşündüm." *Varlık* 2004/07-1162: 22-25.
- Önertoy, Olcay. 1984. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Romanı ve Öyküsü*. [Turkish Novel and Short Story in the Republican Period.] Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Özcan, Meltem. 2005. "Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Romanında Postmodernizmin Yeri." [The Place of Postmodernism in the Turkish Novel in the Republican Period.] MA thesis, Mersin University.
- Özçelik, Nil. 2009. "Translation and Reception of Feminist Speculative Fiction in Turkey: A Multiple-Foregrounding Analysis." PhD diss., Boğaziçi University.

- Özgü, Melahat. 1960. "Yeni Bir Faust Tercümesi." [A New Translation of Faust.] *Tercüme* 14: 69-70, 158-168.
- Özgülven, Fatih. 1983. "Pınar Kür'le Jean Rhys Üzerine." [On Jean Rhys with Pınar Kür.] *Yazko* 2-11.
- Özkırımlı, Atilla. 1987. *Türk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi*. [The Encyclopedia of Turkish Literature.] 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Vol: 3. Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi.
- Paker, Saliha. 1988. "Nermin Menemencioğlu ile Söyleşi." [Interview with Nermin Menemencioğlu.] *Metis Çeviri* 4, Fall, 13-22.
- Paker, Saliha. 2011. "Translating 'the shadow class (...) condemned to movement' and the Very Otherness of the Other: Latife Tekin as Author-Translator of *Swords of Ice*." In *Translation and Opposition*, edited by Dimitris Asimakoulas and Margaret Rogers, 146-161. Bristol, Buffalo, and Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Paloposki, Outi. 2001. "Enriching Translations, Simplified Language? An Alternative Viewpoint to Lexical Simplification." *Target* 13: 2, 265-288.
- Paz, Octavio. 1981. "Söz Sanatı ve Söze Bağlılık Açısından Çeviri." Translated by Ahmet Cemal. *Yazko Çeviri* 1: 163-173.
- Pekkanen, Hilka. 2010. "The Duet between the Author and the Translator: An Analysis of Style through Shifts in Literary Translation." PhD diss., University of Helsinki.
- Plato. 1995. "From The Republic." In *Authorship. From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader*, edited by Sean Burke, 19-22. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Popovic, Anton. 1970. "The Concept 'Shift of Expression' in Translation Analysis." In *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, edited by James S. Holmes, 78-87. Mouton: Slovak Academy of Sciences.
- Puurtinen, Tiina. 1998. "Syntax, Readability and Ideology in Children's Literature." *Meta* 43: 4, 524-533.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome. pp. 1-19.
- Pym, Anthony. 2000. *Negotiating the Frontier: Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History*. St. Jerome Publishing: Manchester.
- Rhys, Jean. 1976. *Sleep it off, Lady*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rhys, Jean. 1980. *Smile Please: An Unfinished Autobiography*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

- Rhys, Jean. 1984. *The Letters of Jean Rhys*. Edited by Francis Wyndham & Diana Melly. Elisabeth Sifton Books. New York: VIKING.
- Rhys, Jean. 1985a. *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*. In *Jean Rhys: The Complete Novels*, 235-344. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1930 by Jonathan Cape.) New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Rhys, Jean. 1985b. *Good Morning, Midnight*. In *Jean Rhys: The Complete Novels*, 345-463. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1939 by Constable.) New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Rhys, Jean. 1985c. *Quartet*. In *Jean Rhys: The Complete Novels*, 117-235. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1928 by Chatto & Windus.) New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Rhys, Jean. 1985d. *Voyage in the Dark*. In *Jean Rhys: The Complete Novels*, 3-116. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1934 by Constable.) New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Rhys, Jean. 1985e. *Wide Sargasso Sea*. In *Jean Rhys: The Complete Novels*, 463-575. (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1966 by Andre Deutsch.) New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Rustin, Michael. 2000. "Reflections on the biographical turn in social science." In *The Turn to Biographical Methods in Social Science: Comparative Issues and Examples*, edited by Prue Chamberlayne, Joanna Borat and Tom Wengraf, 33-52. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sagaster, Börte. 2006. "Detective "Alaturka": Crime Fiction in Turkey." In *Intercultural Aspects in and around Turkic Literatures*, edited by Matthias Kappler, 137-147. Proceedings of the International Conference Held on October 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> 2003 in Nicosia. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Salman, Yurdanur, and Müge Gürsoy. 1988. "Tahsin Yücel ile Söyleşi." [Interview with Tahsin Yücel.] *Metis Çeviri* 6, Winter, 11-19.
- Savory, Elaine. 1998. *Jean Rhys*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, Clive. 2000. *Translating Baudelaire*. Exeter, UK: University of Exeter Press.
- Scott, Mike. 1998. *Wordsmith Tools*, Version 3.0. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sever, Şirin. 2004. "Kür 12 yıllık küskünlüğünü hayalet öyküleriyle bozdu." [Kür put an end to her 12-year-long resentment with her ghost stories.] *Sabah*, January 5. Accessed February 12, 2010. <http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2004/05/01/gny110.html>
- Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus." *Target* 10: 1, 1-39.
- Simeoni, Daniel. 2000. "When in Doubt, Contextualize..." *Target* 12:2, 337-341.

- Simpson, Anne B. 2005. *Territories of the Psyche: The Fiction of Jean Rhys*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Simpson, Paul. 1993. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Simpson, Paul. 2004. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sinanoğlu, Suat. 1941. "Protagoras'ın Tercümesi Hakkında." [On the Translation of Protagoras.] *Tercüme* 1: 5, 485-487.
- Sinclair, J. 2005. "Corpus and Text - Basic Principles." In *Developing Linguistic Corpora: a Guide to Good Practice*, edited by M. Wynne, 1-16. Oxford: Oxbow Books. Accessed January 16, 2008. <http://ahds.ac.uk/linguistic-corpora/>.
- Söğüt, Mine. 2006. *Aşkın Sonu Cinayettir: Pınar Kür ile Hayat ve Edebiyat* [Love Ends in Murder. Life and Literature with Pınar Kür]. Istanbul: Everest.
- Spivak, Gayatri. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson & Lawrence Grossberg, 271-313. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri. 2000. "The Politics of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 397-416. London: Routledge.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2001. "The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey 1923-1960." PhD diss., Boğaziçi University.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2005. *Kapılar: Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar* [Doors. Approaches to Translation History]. Istanbul: Scala Yayıncılık.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2008. *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Taner, Refika, and Asım Bezirci. 1990. *Seçme Romanlar (Yazarları, Özetleri, Eleştiriler, Kaynaklar.)* [A Collection of Novels (Their Authors, Summaries, Criticisms, Sources.)]. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Istanbul: Kaya Yayınları.
- Thomas, Sue. 1999. *The Worlding of Jean Rhys*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Toury, Gideon. 1980. "The Translator as a Non-Conformist-to be or: How to Train Translators so as to Violate Translational Norms." *Angewandte Übersetzungswissenschaft: Internationales Übersetzungswissenschaftliches Kolloquium an der Wirtschaftsuniversität*. Ed. S.-O. Poulsen & W. Wilss. Aarhus, Denmark, June 19-21, 180-194.

- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Toury, Gideon. 2002. "Translation as a Means of Planning and the Planning of Translation: A Theoretical Framework and an Exemplary Case." In *Translations: (re)shaping of literature and culture*, edited by Saliha Paker, 148-165. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Toury, Gideon. 2004. "Probabilistic explanations in translation studies: Welcome as they are, would they qualify as universals?" In *Translation Universals: Do they Exist?*, edited by Anna Mauranen & Pekka Kujamaki, 15-32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tunalı, Gülfer. 2006. "Çevirmen Kimlikleri: Tarihsel, Dizgeci ve Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım." [Translator Identities: A Historical, Systemic and Critical Approach.] MA thesis, Dokuz Eylül University.
- Tuncel, Bedrettin. 1940. "Tercüme Meselesi." [The Issue of Translating.] *Tercüme* 1: 1, 79-82.
- Tuncel, Bedrettin. 1955. "Kısa Notlar." [Brief Notes.] *Tercüme* 11: 60, 130-138.
- Türe, Fatma. 1993. "Kate Millett'in Cinsel Politika Kuramına Göre Pınar Kür'ün Romanları." [Pınar Kür's Novels in the Light of Kate Millett's Sexual Politics.] MA thesis, Boğaziçi University.
- Türkeş, A. Ömer. 2001. "Polisiye Tarihimize Kısa Bir Yolculuk." [A Short Excursion into Our History of Detective Novel.] Kapak [Cover.] *Radikal Kitap*, August 10. Accessed Aug 4, 2011. <http://romanyazilari.blogcu.com/polisiye-tarihimize-kisa-bir-yolculuk/84505>
- Türkeş, A. Ömer. 2006. "Kapak." [Cover.] *Radikal Kitap*, October 6. Accessed on August 4, 2011. <http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalEklerDetayV3&ArticleID=858713&Date=29.07.2011&CategoryID=40>
- Tymoczko, Maria. 1999. *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2004. "Difference in Similarity." In *Similarity and Difference in Translation: Proceedings of the International Conference on Similarity and Translation*, edited by Stefano Arduini and Robert Hodgson. New York: Rimini.
- Tytler, A. F. 1941. "Tercümenin Prensipleri Hakkında Bir Deneme." [An Essay on the Principles of Translating.] Translated by Erol Güney. *Tercüme* 2: 8, 170-176.
- Üster, Celal. 2003. "Yeryüzü Kitaplığı." [The Library of the Earth.] *Radikal Kitap*, August 29.

- Van de Velde, Marc, and Gert De Sutter. 2010. "Do the mechanisms that govern syntactic choices differ between original and translated language? A corpus-based translation study of PP extraposition in Dutch and German." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.
- Van Doorslaer, Luc. 1995. "Quantitative and Qualitative Aspects of Corpus Selection in Translation Studies." *Target* 7: 2, 245-260.
- Van Peer, Willie. 1986. *Stylistics and Psychology: Investigations of Foregrounding*. London: Croom Helm.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, Hans. 1994. "Translation Today: Old and New Problems." In *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*, edited by M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker, and K. Kaindl, 3-16.. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Wacquant, Loic J.D. 1992. "Toward a Social Praxeology: The Structure and Logic of Bourdieu's Sociology." In *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Pierre Bourdieu and Loic J. D. Wacquant, 1-61. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Webb, Jen, Tony Schirato, and Geoff Danaher. 2002. *Understanding Bourdieu*. London: Sage Publications.
- Weidle, Wladimir. 1940. "Tercüme Sanatı." [The Art of Translation.] Translated by Bedrettin Tuncel. *Tercüme* 1: 4, 386-389.
- Williams, Brackette F. 1996. "Introduction: Mannish Women and Gender After the Act." In *Women out of Place: The Gender of Agency and the Race of Nationality*, edited by Brackette F. Williams, 1-37. New York & London: Routledge.
- Winters, Marion. 2005. "A Corpus-Based Study of Translator Style: Oeser's and Orth-Guttman's German Translations of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Beautiful and Damned*." PhD diss., Dublin City University.
- Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer. 2009. "Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology." In *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Yazko Çeviri. 1982a. "Çeviri Konuşmaları: Ataol Behramoğlu/ Barış Pirhasan." [Talks on Translation: Ataol Behramoğlu/ Barış Pirhasan.] *Yazko Çeviri* 5: 185-189.
- Yazko Çeviri. 1982b. "Çeviri Konuşmaları: Memet Fuat/ Akşit Göktürk." [Talks on Translation: Memet Fuat/ Akşit Göktürk.] *Yazko Çeviri* 7: 144-152.
- Yazko Çeviri. 1982c. "Çeviri Konuşmaları: Tomris Uyar/ Murat Belge." [Talks on Translation: Tomris Uyar/ Murat Belge.] *Yazko Çeviri* 4: 168-173.

Yılmaz, Zerrin. 2004. "Pınar Kür: Gizem Hep Hoşuma Gitmiştir." [Pınar Kür: I've Always been Fond of Mystery.] *E Aylık Kültür ve Edebiyat Dergisi* 63, June: 11-15.

Zangeneh Bar, Sasan. 2010. "Persian Personal Pronouns in Translated and Non-Translated Persian Texts: A Comparative Corpus-Based Study of the Frequencies." Paper presented at MATS 2010 in University College Ghent, Belgium, January 8-9.