



Hacettepe University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of Translation and Interpretation, M.A.

**ENRICHMENT OF NATIONAL LITERATURE THROUGH
TRANSLATION: SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRANSLATION BUREAU
IN THE TURKISH REPUBLIC'S SOCIAL AND CULTURAL LIFE, AS
WELL AS TURKISH TRANSLATION HISTORY**

Semra Kunt Akbař

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2007

ENRICHMENT OF NATIONAL LITERATURE THROUGH TRANSLATION:
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRANSLATION BUREAU IN THE TURKISH
REPUBLIC'S SOCIAL AND CULTURAL LIFE, AS WELL AS TURKISH
TRANSLATION HISTORY

Semra Kunt Akbař

Hacettepe University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of Translation and Interpretation, M.A.

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2007

KABUL VE ONAY

Semra Kunt Akbař tarafından hazırlanan “Ulusal Yazının eviri Yoluyla Zenginleřtirilmesi: Tercüme Bürosunun Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin Toplumsal ve Kültürel Yařamındaki ve Türk eviri Tarihindeki Önemi” bařlıklı bu alıřma, 7 Haziran 2007 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda bařarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından yüksek lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiřtir.

Prof. Dr. Ayfer Altay (Bařkan)

Prof. Dr. Berrin Aksoy (Danıřman)

Do. Dr. Asalet Erten (İkinci Danıřman)

Prof. Dr. Belgin Elbir

Do. Dr. A. Lerzan Gültekin

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geen öğretim üyelerine ait olduėunu onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. İrfan akın
Enstitü Müdürü

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin kağıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

- Tezimin tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezim sadece Hacettepe Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezimin yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

7 Haziran 2007

Semra Kunt Akbaş

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to

my advisor **Prof. Dr. Berrin Aksoy**, for offering me her invaluable guidance and support throughout my extended period of graduate study, as well as my undergraduate years;

my professors **Prof. Dr. Ayfer Altay**, **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aymil Doğan**, **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Asalet Erten** and **Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Ersözlü**, for sharing their knowledge and experience with me;

my parents **Necila** and **Altan Kunt**, and my sister **Rana Kunt**, for having made me who I am;

my dear friend **Nilüfer Yeşil**, for being a continuous source of inspiration for me, and **Talip Esmer**, for encouraging me to start an M.A. and supporting me all the way through; and

my husband **M. Murat Akbaş**, for being as he is, and our eighteen-month-old **Yusuf Altan**, for the joy he brought us.

ÖZET

KUNT AKBAŞ, Semra. Ulusal Yazının Çeviri Yoluyla Zenginleştirilmesi: Tercüme Bürosunun Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Toplumsal ve Kültürel Yaşamındaki ve Türk Çeviri Tarihindeki Önemi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2007.

1940 yılında kurulan ve 1966 yılına kadar etkinliğini sürdüren Tercüme Bürosu, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün ilke ve devrimlerinin en önemli sonuçlarından biridir. Büronun Türk halkına sunduğu çeviri yapıtlar, halkı aydınlatma ve böylece ulusal bir kültür ve çağdaş ve laik bir ulus yaratmaya yardımcı olma görevinin birer yansımasıdır. Bu tezin amacı, Tercüme Bürosu tarafından yapılan çevirileri dönemin tarihsel, politik, toplumsal ve kültürel koşulları içinde değerlendirerek söz konusu çeviri yapıtların Türk kültürüne, toplumuna ve yazınına olan etkilerini belirlemek ve bu çevirilerde ortaya çıkan normları betimlemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda giriş bölümünde Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin kuruluşu, Atatürk ilke ve devrimleri ve Türk Rönesansı konusunda artalan bilgisi verilmekte ve Tercüme Bürosunun bu tarihsel ve toplumsal bağlamdaki yeri anlatılmaktadır. Sonrasındaki bölümde Tercüme Bürosunun ve çevirilerinin Türk yazını çoğuldizgesindeki rolünü ve işlevini daha iyi incelemek amacıyla, Türkiye'deki toplumsal ve kültürel ortam çoğuldizgeci bir yaklaşımla ele alınarak Çoğuldizge Kuramına kısa bir kuramsal giriş yapılmaktadır. Bu incelemenin ardından, Tercüme Bürosunun çeviri normlarını ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla, çeviri kuramının 1970'lerde betimleyici çeviribilimin doğuşuyla doruğa ulaşan kısa bir tarihçesi sunulmaktadır. Bunu Tercüme Bürosu tarafından yayımlanan çeviri yapıtlarda kendini gösteren normların erek odaklı çeviribilim çerçevesinde betimlenmesi izlemektedir. Gerek çoğuldizge kuramı gerekse erek odaklı yaklaşım bağlamında yapılan incelemeler, Tercüme Bürosu çevirmenleri ve zamanın eleştirmenleri başta olmak üzere, çevirmenler, edebiyatçılar, eleştirmenler ve aydınların söz konusu çeviriler konusundaki düşünce ve yorumlarına dayandırılmaktadır. Bu düşünce ve yorumlar Tercüme Bürosunun Türk ulusunun kültürel tarihindeki önemini göstermektedir. Tercüme

Bürosu, günümüz Türkiye'sinde genel olarak edebiyatın ve özel olarak çevirinin varmış olduğu düzeyin temeli ve Atatürk ilke ve devrimlerine bağlılığın ve Türk ulusunun çağdaşlaşma ve uygarlaşma ülküsünün bir anıtıdır.

Anahtar Sözcükler

Tercüme Bürosu, Çoğuldizge Kuramı, Erek Odaklı Yaklaşım, Betimleyici Çeviribilim, Norm.

ABSTRACT

KUNT AKBAŞ, Semra. Enrichment of National Literature through Translation: Significance of the Translation Bureau in the Turkish Republic's Social and Cultural Life, as well as Turkish Translation History, Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2007.

The Translation Bureau, established in 1940, is one of the most significant outcomes of the principles and reforms of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. The works it presented to the Turkish nation are reflections of its mission, which was to enlighten the people and help in the creation of a national culture and a contemporary and secular nation. The objective of this thesis is to evaluate the Bureau translations within their historical, political, social and cultural context with a view to identifying their effects on Turkish culture, society and literature and to describe the norms that manifested themselves in these translations. In line with this objective, introduction chapter provides background information about the proclamation of the Turkish Republic, Atatürk's principles and reforms, Turkish Renaissance and explains the place of the Translation Bureau in this historical and social setting. The following chapter provides a brief theoretical introduction into the Polysystem Theory, since the social and cultural environment of Turkey shall be taken up within the framework of a polysystemic approach, in order to better examine the role and function of Translation Bureau translations. After this examination, a concise history of translation theory that culminated in the birth of descriptive translation studies in 1970s is presented. This is followed by a description of the norms in the translated works published by the Translation Bureau within the framework of target-oriented approach. Examinations carried out in the context of both polysystem theory and target oriented translation studies are based on the remarks of the translators, litterateurs, critics and intellectuals. The Translation Bureau is the groundwork of the level Turkish literature and translation

have reached, as well as a monument to the dedication to Atatürk's principles and reforms, and the contemporarization and civilization ideal of the Turkish nation.

Key Words

Translation Bureau, Polysystem Theory, Target-Oriented Approach, Descriptive Translation Studies, Norm.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.1.1 Foundation of the Turkish Republic	1
1.1.2 The European Renaissance	3
1.1.3 The Turkish Renaissance	4
1.1.3.1 Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's Principles and Reforms	6
1.1.3.2 Village Institutes	7
1.1.3.3 Translation Bureau	10
1.2 METHODOLOGY	11
1.2.1 Aim and Scope	11
1.2.2 Data Analysis	12
1.2.3 Literature Review	12
1.2.4 Limitations	14
1.3 OVERVIEW	15
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND OF THE TRANSLATION BUREAU	17
2.1 HISTORY	17

2.1.1 Translation Activities in the Ottoman Empire	17
2.1.2 Translation Activities between 1923 and 1940	20
2.1.3 Translation Activities after 1940: Foundation of the Translation Bureau	22
2.2 THE MISSION OF THE TRANSLATION BUREAU	24
2.3 TRANSLATORS AND TRANSLATIONS	26
2.3.1 Translators	26
2.3.2 Translations	34
2.4 <i>TRANSLATION (TERCÜME)</i> JOURNAL	35
2.4.1 Content	36
2.4.2 Significance	36
CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATION BUREAU TRANSLATIONS AND THE TURKISH LITERARY POLYSYSTEM	38
3.1 POLYSYSTEM THEORY	38
3.1.1 Russian Formalism	38
3.1.2 The Concept of System	39
3.1.3 The Concept of Polysystem	40
3.1.4 Stratification of Systems	41
3.1.5 Translation and the Literary Polysystem	42

3.2 TRANSLATIONS BETWEEN 1859 AND 1940 AND THE TURKISH LITERARY POLYSYSTEM	44
3.2.1 Ottoman Literature (13 th to Early 19 th Century)	44
3.2.2 First Novel, Poetry and Play Translations	46
3.3 TRANSLATIONS OF THE TRANSLATION BUREAU AND THE TURKISH LITERARY POLYSYSTEM	50
CHAPTER 4: TRANSLATION BUREAU TRANSLATIONS: NORMS	57
4.1 A BRIEF HISTORY OF TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATION THEORY	57
4.2 DESCRIPTIVE TRANSLATION STUDIES	61
4.2.1 Background	61
4.2.2 Translation Norms	64
4.3 NORMS IN TRANSLATION BUREAU TRANSLATIONS	66
4.3.1 Preliminary Norms	67
4.3.1.1 Translation Policy	68
4.3.1.2 Directness of Translation	70
4.3.1.3 Summary	71
4.3.2 Initial Norm	71
4.3.3 Operational Norms	77

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	80
Bibliography	83
Appendices	92
Appendix 1: Number of Works Translated and Published by the Translation Bureau by Their Sources	92
Appendix 2: Number of Works Translated and Published by the Translation Bureau by Their Publication Years	94
Curriculum Vitae	96

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

It is a generally accepted fact that national language has a powerful influence on the identity of a nation. It is said that the shortcut to destroying a nation is to exterminate its language. It seems equally true that a nation can be built through language. Translation Bureau, which is a reflection of this understanding, was established in 1940 with the aim of translating the masterpieces of the Western civilization into Turkish as one of the means of founding a new nation state on the remains of an exhausted empire. Part of a giant endeavor to help the Turkish Republic take the prestigious place it deserves among the world nations, the Translation Bureau is a monument to Turkey's ideal of modernization, westernization, and secularization.

For a better understanding of the nature of the Translation Bureau and its role in the cultural life of the Turkish nation, one needs to have a look at the historical process by which the Turkish nation was transformed from a religious, agricultural society to a secular, industrial and contemporary nation.

The Turkish Republic founded in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is the epitome of the reawakening of a nation. The foundation of the republic is a consequence of a national war of independence fought by a poor and debilitated nation against the leading powers of the world.

1.1.1 Foundation of the Turkish Republic

The Turkish Republic was founded in the aftermath of the World War I. The Central Powers among which was the Ottoman Empire were defeated by the Allied Powers. This defeat was followed by the signing of the Treaty of Sévres, according to which Anatolia was going to be partitioned among the Allied

Powers. The treaty which meant *de facto* abolition of the Ottoman Empire was not ratified by Vahdettin, the Ottoman sultan then. However, with the determination to take their share of the enervated Ottoman, the Allied Powers started the occupation of Anatolia from İzmir in May 1919. Meanwhile, Mustafa Kemal, who was then a commander in the Ottoman military, was on a historic voyage from İstanbul to Anatolia.

Mustafa Kemal had been sent to Anatolia by Vahdettin. When he stepped ashore in Samsun on May 19, 1919, he was the appointed General Inspector of the Ottoman Forces in Anatolia. Mustafa Kemal, who, in this post, contacted the commanders and civil administrators in Anatolia, started the national resistance against foreign occupiers. The Ottoman government in İstanbul was aware of and bothered by Mustafa Kemal's independent decisions and actions in Anatolia, and called him back to Istanbul in June 1919. He did not pay heed to this call and convened a congress in Sivas, and planned another one in Erzurum. Before the Erzurum Congress, under pressure from the Istanbul government, he had to resign from all his military posts. However, by then his position as the leader of the national struggle against occupying forces had already been established. This national struggle, Turkish War of Independence, which lasted three years from 1919 to 1922, saved Anatolia and İstanbul from all occupying forces and culminated in the proclamation of the Turkish Republic. After the victory was won, the Allied Powers were forced to undersign a new treaty with the Turkish Republic. The Treaty of Lausanne that annulled the Treaty of Sevrés was a document recognizing and fortifying the status of the Turkish Republic as a sovereign state in the international arena.

When Mustafa Kemal had landed at Samsun and started the National War of Independence, he had two motives: to organize a national resistance against the foreigners occupying Anatolia and to revive Turkish nationalism (Kongar 1998: 82). In fact, the end of World War I was marked with the decline of empires and rise of nation states, and Mustafa Kemal was determined to catch up with the contemporary world in that respect, beside others.

Therefore, the military victory won, as significant as it may be, was only part of what Mustafa Kemal had in mind for the Turkish nation. He had seen how the Ottoman Empire had been left behind and out of the Western world due to its failure to keep pace with political, scientific and social advances there and hence, Mustafa Kemal was willing to make the newly founded republic a prestigious member of the contemporary world order.

In order to do that, the Turkish nation looked to the west, as “the most advanced level of civilization was the western civilization” (Tunaya 1999:19). However, this western orientation was not a blind imitation and did not mean a complete abandonment of Turkish values. What were to be imported from the west were the universal values of humanity, the idea of enlightenment and the contemporary and civilized world view that conferred the western countries this advanced level of civilization. In this way, the Turkish nation would be recreated, preserving its national identity on one hand, and being equipped with the key concepts of the contemporary western world, like reason, scientific thought, individualism, humanism, freedom and equality, on the other.

1.1.2 The European Renaissance

The Western world had reached this level of civilization through such a transformation, six centuries ago with the Renaissance. As George S. Robbert explains,

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, often referred to as the Age of Renaissance, experienced marked and profound changes, which characterized Europe's transition from the medieval to the early modern period [1973:131].

The Age of Renaissance was characterized by a revival of the humanist spirit. The term humanism originates from the Latin word *humanitas*, which was, as Nicholas Mann explains,

used by Cicero and others in classical times to betoken the kind of cultural values that one would derive from what used to be called a liberal education: the *studia humanitatis* constituted the study of what we might

now think of as 'arts' subjects – language, literature, history and moral philosophy in particular [1997:1].

Likewise, George S. Robbert describes the Latin term *humanitas* as “the civilizing force of art and literature in the widest sense” (1973:172). This civilizing force, according to the Renaissance men, laid in the classical Greek and Latin texts. The concerned texts were valued to such an extent that, as Robbert notes

the humanists coined the term 'middle ages' to heap abuse upon the long period which separated their era from a previous golden age, ancient Greece and Rome [1973:172].

However, the Renaissance was not limited to arts and humanities alone. Bozkurt Güvenç notes that although its focus seems to be on arts and humanities, the Renaissance had fundamentally affected all human relations and social institutions from philosophy to state administration, education to science, production to consumption, and considers Renaissance as the starting point of the history of contemporary civilization (2002:81-82). Thus, while Petrarch, who is considered the father of humanism, and Boccaccio, whose *Decameron* is an example of the secular spirit of the era, were producing literary works with the inspiration and under the guidance of the classical times, scholars like Coluccio Salutati and Leonardo Bruni were reviving the humanist spirit in the political arena (Robbert 1973:173-174). As Robbert states in *The World of Europe: The Renaissance World*

They believed that the city states should be modeled on the cities of classical times and that each citizen should be allowed to rise to a position of responsibility and power if he showed the aptitude [1973:173-174].

1.1.3 The Turkish Renaissance

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who was aware of the fact that the foundations of the contemporary Western civilization were laid in the Renaissance, aimed to create the Turkish Renaissance to enable the Turkish nation to reach the western level of civilization. This Renaissance would be created through the

establishment of the humanist spirit in the nation. Suat Sinanoğlu describes the birth of the Turkish humanism as follows:

... the Turkish Humanism did not arise from a movement originating from within the society. Its first impetus was of an external origin. The force that drove the Turkish society to renew itself is a humane impulse; the impulse to survive individually and as a society. The Turkish society has understood that as long as it did not provide a serious ideational and moral education to the young generations and thereby ensure the adoption of the principles established by Atatürk, it would not experience an irrevocable salvation through technical advances and renewal of social institutions [1999:33].

The irrevocable salvation noted by Sinanoğlu required conversion of an agricultural and religious society into an industrial and secular nation in a perfectly systemic way, that is, with all its accompanying institutions and throughout the whole nation.

With all its accompanying institutions, because the organization of the state required fundamental changes. According to Emre Kongar, the reason why previous attempts towards westernization in the Ottoman Empire failed was their fragmented structure. These attempts addressed only some aspects of the deeply flawed order, without touching the underlying problem of political power (1998:111). The Ottoman Empire was first of all a religious state and a monarchy. The Ottoman Sultan was also Sheikh ul-Islam, that is the supreme authority in the Islamic world. The empire was governed by religious rule and the legal system was based on religious law, Shari'a. The power of the Sultan arising from the power of religion was matched with the traditional structure of the society. This traditional and religious social structure was reflecting the "community of believers" (*ümmet*) mentality of the Islamic world, as opposed to the individual-focused world view of the West and that was the reason why civilization and westernization efforts had to target the whole nation. Tarık Zafer Tunaya, who compares the political and social structure of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic says

The Ottoman Empire was a state which harbored various masses and nations within its wide country and in its universal form. The Turks were the founding and dominant element in this state. However, today they have forsaken a political structure relying on religious foundations and organization and become the founders of a new state established in the

example of the West and in the order of Western democracy. This state is the Turkish Republic [1999:10].

As Tarık Zafer Tunaya states, the transformation of the Turkish nation required establishing a new form of government, which was the republic. As the first two articles of the Turkish Constitution states, the Turkish state is a republic and the Turkish Republic is a democratic, secular and social state of law.

1.1.3.1 Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's Principles and Reforms

The establishment of the Republic was followed by many reforms in practically all areas of life, in accordance with the ultimate aim of creating a contemporary Turkish state. These reforms depended on the widely known six indispensable principles Mustafa Kemal envisioned for the contemporary Turkish Republic. These are republicanism, populism, secularism, reformism, nationalism and statism. Republicanism principle, which is a tribute to democracy, is a verification of the nation state and a guarantee against reversion to Shari'a. Populism, which embraces the whole society, but with a degree of positive segregation towards the needy, puts emphasis on the social state property of the Republic. Secularism, which forms the basis of democracy and reforms, ensures that legal, educational and cultural life is spared from the domination of religion. Reformism, which aims to promulgate the enlightenment ideas to everyone and everywhere, secures not only the current reforms, but also the future of the republic. Nationalism, which is part of the historical process of the decline of empires and rise of nation states, is a non-aggressive weapon against imperialism. Last, but not least, statism, which seeks to provide the basis of industry, is a means of economic development (Akşin 2005b:117-121; Kongar 1998:117-122).

As stated above, these six principles formed the basis of the reforms that aimed at creating a contemporary Turkish state. These reforms can be addressed under five main headings as political, social, legal, educational and economic reforms. Political reforms included the proclamation of the Turkish republic, as a democratic and secular state, and abolition of the sultanate and caliphate.

Among the social reforms which literally transformed the daily life of the Turkish people were the changing of the dress code to be in tune with the European raiment, adoption of the international units of weight and length, as well as the European calendar, and closing down of dervish lodges. Under the legal reforms, a new civil code and a new penal code were adopted, and women were granted suffrage, long before Italy (1946), Greece (1949) and Switzerland (1971), to name a few examples. Education reforms included introduction of the new Turkish alphabet in 1928, as a great step towards increasing literacy rates, which remained low due to the difficulty of reading and writing in the old Arabic alphabet. Also addressed under educational reforms were educational institutions, which were thereafter regulated by a uniform system of national education, and enlightenment and education of the public, through the establishment of Turkish Language Association and Turkish History Association. Economic reforms comprised abolition of capitulations and religious taxes, as well as provision of such public services as transportation.

It is seen that there is not one single aspect of political, social, legal or cultural life that went undealt with in the reform process. While working towards instituting these fundamental reforms, Mustafa Kemal developed a progressive mind-set in his nation, which is evidenced by the fact that the westernization process with its focus on contemporariness he started was sustained by the Turkish people after his death. Thus, although the esteemed leader died in 1938, 1940s saw very important moves towards westernization. Two of these moves were the establishment of Village Institutes and the Translation Bureau.

1.1.3.2 Village Institutes

Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, a prominent researcher and translator, describes village institutes as follows:

The Turkish revolution can be defined as an effort to make literacy in its current sense, the property of majority. In the first years of the Republic, Atatürk and İnönü considered the availability of literacy to the large mass, that is the rural people, a condition for our rebirth as a contemporary nation. The increasing efforts of the new state in this direction have finally revived

the hope that the embarrassing split between literate people and rural people will disappear in the near future. Village Institutes are the personification of this hope [1999:12].

Village Institutes established in 1940 were schools that aimed to educate teachers for village schools. This organization which has no precedents in the history of mankind aimed to ensure development of rural areas, to raise awareness in the people living there and to equip them with the knowledge and skills that will make them the pillars of the national objectives. That aim makes sense in consideration of the fact that most of the population in the first decades of the republic consisted of people living in rural areas. The co-education provided by Village Institutes would cover both academic subjects and arts and crafts that would benefit the rural people. The curriculum included tools and methods of agricultural activities and animal breeding to help students in their daily rural activities and academic subjects to imbue them with the ideas of enlightenment. The students who would graduate from Village Institutes would themselves become teachers in these institutes. This idea was effectuated on April 17, 1940, when fourteen village institutes were established in different places throughout Anatolia. In 1941 seven more institutes were added to the previous ones, and the number of institutes totaled to twenty one. Until they were converted to primary schools in 1954, almost twenty thousand teachers and other professionals graduated from village institutes. Those graduates included very successful future writers, artists, educators and politicians. Thus the Village Institutes fulfilled their mission, which was to register the rural people in the ranks of those defending westernization and modernization (Katoğlu 2005c:428-430). This initiative which was in perfect harmony with and contributed significantly to the Turkey's westernization cause was launched by Hasan Âli Yücel, the Minister of Education between 1938 and 1946.

Can Yücel, well-known Turkish poet and translator, describes his father, Hasan Âli Yücel, as one of the pioneers of westernization, which was a movement of humanism (Anamur 1997:xv). Similarly, Sina Akşin considers Hasan Âli as one of the key men of the Turkish Renaissance (2005c:261). He made invaluable contributions to education in the Republic. One of his successors, Hikmet

Uluğbay states in the inauguration speech he delivered on occasion of the 100th anniversary of Yücel's birth

Hasan Âli Yücel dedicated his whole life to grant our nation an education system that shall provide the Turkish youth, to whom Atatürk entrusted the Republic, contemporary knowledge, so that they would not need to look for a new savior, and laid the foundations of this system in a very sound and rational manner (Uluğbay 1998:2).

Education in the period after the proclamation of the republic encompassed not only formal education, but also public education. After the adoption of the Latin alphabet, a literacy mobilization was started to teach the Turkish public the new script and to boost the literacy rates, which was estimated to be 5 to 10% in 1928, when the Latin alphabet was adopted (Naci 1999:9). However, this was not enough for the further aim of changing the mentality of a society who lived under religious rule for centuries. It was necessary to provide a new mind-set to the people, in order to replace the religious and conservative way of thinking with a humanist and progressive one. The main split between these two perspectives is communitarian and individual thinking. Islamist thinking is communitarian, with the individual having little willpower of his own and being subject to the willpower of God. However, humanist thinking favors the individual against the community, forcing him to think freely on his own life and values. The embodiment of this way of thinking is Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum*, which is translated into English as "I think therefore I am." In the Eastern Islamic reasoning, "I" is forever overshadowed by the omnipotent and omnipresent concept of *Allah*. Therefore the Turkish people needed the means to find their individual selves.

As stated earlier, the West also had a transition from the religious and communitarian to the humanist and individual world view in the 14th to 16th centuries and the impetus behind this transition was a return to classical Greek and Roman art and literature. Efforts to enable Turkish people to think and live like their contemporaries were thus modeled on the European Renaissance. Hasan Âli Yücel, as the Minister of Education, planned the details of this model,

among which were Village Institutes that were briefly described above, and the Translation Bureau.

1.1.3.3 Translation Bureau

Translation Bureau was established in the same year with the Village Institutes, 1940, but was a more ambitious and comprehensive project. This project consists of the systemic translation of the masterpieces of the Western world which bestowed it with its present shape. Hasan Anamur describes the Translation Bureau as follows

This translation movement is both an opening to all dimensions of contemporary world civilization, a re-structuring and enlightenment at the level of thought, an enterprise targeting literary, artistic, emotional, and spiritual education, purification and satisfaction, and an indicator of a peaceful understanding of the world, devoid of all kinds of prejudices (1997:i).

The Translation Bureau dramatically affected translation itself, and the cultural milieu of the Turkish nation through translation. This effect can be explained in several ways, which also distinguish the work undertaken by the Bureau from the previous and later translation undertakings:

1.The Translation Bureau was a state institution affiliated to the Ministry of Education, and carried out a state policy. In fact, there were preceding translation institutions founded by the state, but they did not either undertake or undertook but could not accomplish a specific mission like that of the Translation Bureau, that is, to contribute to the all-inclusive westernization cause of the Turkish nation.

2.The Translation Bureau embarked on this mission as part of a larger endeavor of contemporarization. It was one of the pillars on which Turkey's enlightenment aspirations were founded.

3.The Translation Bureau carried out a translation project, vast both in terms of quantity and quality, and exhibited a very systemic approach to translation. It employed the leading intellectuals of the time, who selected the works to be

translated and did the translations. Selection, translation and correction processes were carried out meticulously, in due consideration of the significance of the task at hand.

4.The translations of the Bureau planted seeds of the production of original literary and philosophical works, thereby making a unique contribution to Turkish culture and literature.

5.In addition to translated works, the Translation Bureau published a journal named *Translation (Tercüme)*, which not only was a source of information on translation, but also provided a forum for translators to deal with translation issues. These reflections and discussions on translation were the first examples of theorizing about translation in Turkey.

In brief, the Translation Bureau is an institution established for the purpose of helping to introduce and establish the ideals of contemporarization and Western humanism in the Turkish nation by means of systemic and fast-paced translation of the pivotal literary and philosophical works of the Western world.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

1.2.1 Aim and Scope

As the executor of a vast translation enterprise undertaken as a state policy, the Translation Bureau was among the most influential cultural institutions of the young Turkish Republic. Translations published by the Bureau left have a deep mark on the translators and perusers alike. So much so that, those particular translations have been published several times by several different publishing houses in the 60 years that have elapsed since then. Most recently, İş Bankası started to publish the same books in a new series called “Hasan Âli Yücel Klasikler Dizisi” in the year 2006.

Hence, this thesis aims to explore

1.the significance of the texts translated by the Translation Bureau in Turkish literary and cultural life in the light of Itamar Even-Zohar's Polysystem Theory, and

2.the norms that prevailed in the concerned translations in the light of Gideon Toury's target-oriented approach within descriptive translation studies with a view to shed some light on why and how these target texts came to play such a time-honored role in Turkish.

1.2.2 Data Analysis

In order to answer these questions, written statements about the Translation Bureau, its translators and translations as they appeared in various newspapers, journals, biographies, memoirs and other books published either in 1940s or in the following years have been employed. These statements are made by authorities, like the Minister of Education Hasan Âli Yücel, translators working for the Bureau like Nurullah Ataç and Erol Güney, intellectuals of the time like Halide Edip Adivar, and those people who studied that period for translational or non-translational, like social, cultural, historical etc., purposes. All of the concerned statements are originally in Turkish and translated into English by the writer of the thesis.

To be able to evaluate the role of texts translated between 1940 and 1966 in the Turkish literary and cultural milieu both in the concerned years and afterwards, this anecdotal evidence is evaluated within the framework of two theories, namely Polysystem Theory by Itamar Even-Zohar and Target-Oriented Translation Studies by Gideon Toury.

1.2.3 Literature Review

It would not be wrong to say that Translation Bureau translations or translation activities in the period after 1940s are among the most widely researched topics in translation studies tradition in Turkey. Polysystem Theory developed by

Itamar Even Zohar and addressing translated texts within the more comprehensive context of literature and culture and descriptive translation studies put forward by James Holmes and elaborated by Gideon Toury in 1970s proved extremely conducive to such historical studies which established connections between the historical, social, cultural and literary transformations of the nation and the translations in the nationalization, modernization and westernization movement in the Turkish Republic.

Akşit Göktürk, who is a literary critique, translator and writer, is the first translation studies scholar who studied Republican Turkish translation history in the light of descriptive translation studies in his 1986 book *Çeviri: Dillerin Dili*, which is also the first original work on translation in Turkey. In this book Göktürk reviews the norms that obtained in translation in various historical periods in Turkey.

Following Akşit Göktürk, another translation studies scholar, Saliha Paker studied Polysystem Theory and reviewed translations in the Reformation (*Tanzimat*) period of the Ottoman Empire in the light of polysystem theory and descriptive translation studies. Her article "Translated European Literature in the Late Ottoman Literary Polysystem" appeared in the summer 1986 issue of *New Comparison* (Rifat 2003:26). In addition to the summary of the Turkish translation tradition she contributed to *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2004), Paker also edited and wrote the preface of a book titled *Re(Shaping) of Literature and Culture*, which was published in 2002 and included essays by prominent scholars like Gideon Toury, Itamar Even-Zohar, Theo Hermans, Mona Baker and José Lambert (Rifat 2003:398).

Among articles outlining the historical evolution of translation in Turkey is Berrin Aksoy's "Translating as Rewriting: The Concept and Its Implications on the Emergence of A National Literature." This article which is about to be translated into Polish was published in July 2001 in the international e-journal named *Translation Journal*, where Aksoy sheds light upon the contribution of the Translation Bureau to the establishment of a Turkish national identity and culture.

Another article on this topic is Alfer Altay's "*Osmanlılardan Günümüze Çeviri Etkinliği*" published in 2002 issue of the *Journal of Translation Studies*, issued annually by the Translation and Interpretation Department of Hacettepe University Faculty of Letters. In the concerned article, Altay examines translation history in four periods, one of which covers the activities of the Translation Bureau.

Suat Karantay, a professor in the Translation Studies Department of Boğaziçi University like Saliha Paker, published, among others, an article ("*Tercüme Bürosu' Normlar ve İşlevler*") dealing with the norms in the Translation Bureau in 1991 (Rifat 2003:396).

Lastly, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar produced in 2001 a 600-page doctoral dissertation titled "The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey 1923-1960", which is a comprehensive account of translation history after the proclamation of the Turkish Republic. Additionally, in a 2005 book titled *Kapılar Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar* she examines translation activities under the auspices of Hasan Âli Yücel, as well as translation policies and strategies of two publishing houses, namely Altın Kitaplar and Varlık Yayınları.

1.2.4 Limitations

In the light of the studies mentioned above, one of the limitations of this thesis may be its focusing on what looks like a widely-studied topic, that is, the Translation Bureau translations. However, the significance of this state-led translation endeavor as part of a nation's cultural transformation process may justify one more humble attempt to describe this groundbreaking period of Turkish translation history for the purposes of further emphasizing the importance of Turkey's westernization and modernization efforts, as well as the role translations assumed therein.

Another limitation of this thesis may be that when dealing with the norms in translated texts, the discussion is based on the statements of translators and critiques about the translations, rather than an analysis of the translated texts

themselves. However, the sheer number of translated works taken together with the variety of source cultures, source languages and historical periods of source production makes it evident that such an analysis would require an extremely comprehensive study that could be carried out most probably by a multilingual team.

As a result, this thesis is a brief descriptive account of a historical cornerstone of literary translation tradition in modern Turkey.

1.3 OVERVIEW

In the following chapter, translation activities before the Translation Bureau shall be summarized with a view to explaining the cultural and literary milieu into which the Bureau was introduced, and translation activities carried out by the Bureau shall be examined with particular emphasis on the mission it set out to fulfill, the translations published, the translators who worked for the Bureau and the *Translation (Tercüme)* journal published.

The third chapter shall explore the contribution of the Translation Bureau to Turkish culture and literature in the light of Polysystem Theory elaborated by Itamar Even-Zohar. For this purpose, the Polysystem Theory shall be introduced briefly and the role of the Translation Bureau in the shaping of the Turkish literary polysystem in 1940s shall be discussed in terms of a deliberate cultural planning effort.

This discussion shall be followed by a descriptive analysis of the norms in the translations published by the Translation Bureau. This analysis shall be informed by a target-oriented approach and based on the norms that guided the translators. Norms and the concept of equivalence in the production of the translations shall be investigated not in the actual texts, but on the basis of the opinions as stated by the translators of the Bureau about their translations.

The last chapter shall comprise the concluding remarks about the role of the Translation Bureau in the Turkish Republic's cultural and literary life, as well as the history of translation in Turkey.

CHAPTER 2: TRANSLATION BUREAU: BACKGROUND

2.1 HISTORY

2.1.1 Translation Activities in the Ottoman Empire

The history of translation in Turkey goes back to the 14th century (Günyol 1985:31), but the institutionalization of translation and interpreting as a profession started in the 16th century due to an increase in diplomatic and commercial activities of the Ottoman Empire (Paker 2004:571). The first Translation Committee in the Ottoman Empire was founded in 1717. The committee headed by poet Nedim and comprising 25 members was appointed by Grand Vezir İbrahim Paşa to translate from both European and Oriental languages (Paker 2004:576). In addition to Islamic works, the first classical Greek translation was done into Ottoman (translation of the Aristotle's *Physika* by Esat Efendi), which Vedat Günyol considers the first reflective interest in the classical Greek (1985:34).

This committee was followed by Sublime Porte (*Babıali*) Translation Chamber established in 1833 under the rule of Selim III. This chamber dealt primarily with foreign affairs, handling the communications of the Sublime Porte with foreign consulates, and was composed primarily of Ottoman Greek translators (Günyol 1985:34; Yazıcı 2004:89). The Translation Chamber which was affiliated to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was headed first by Yahya Efendi, and then by İshak Efendi, both of whom were Muslim converts and teachers at the Engineering School (Günyol 1985:34). Niyasi Berkes and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar regard this chamber both as a school for future intellectuals and a place where a new world view and a new political ideal developed (Berkes 1978:197; Tanpınar 1999:211). For instance, significant authors and intellectuals of the Reformation period, like Namık Kemal and Şinasi, had in fact worked in this Chamber (Günyol 1985:34).

The successor of the Translation Chamber was the Academy of Sciences (*Encümen-i Daniş*), established in 1851 “in response to the need for an institution to join the areas of education and knowledge” (Berkes 1978:231). Academy of Sciences is a product of the first formal westernization enterprise of the Ottoman Empire in the period known as Reformation (*Tanzimat*). The Ottoman Empire, which was experiencing consecutive failures in both military and political arenas, had to establish alliances with France and England to gather its strength. This alliance, however, required the empire to set up a new order, which was believed to be ensured by the proclamation of *Tanzimat-ı Hayriye*. Thus, Reformation (*Tanzimat*) was declared in 1839 and brought about several innovations in legal, political and social order. These innovations included conferring to non-Muslims the same rights enjoyed by Muslims (Toprak 2005a:313-315).

Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, who was appointed to outline the program of the Academy of Sciences, emphasized the need to attach importance to education and the state’s responsibility thereof (Kayaoğlu 1998:55). The academy which aimed to eradicate illiteracy and encourage sciences would also prepare textbooks for *Darülfünun* (Home of Sciences) the university which was planned to be established. The members included both Ottoman scholars, like Ahmet Vefik Paşa, Hayrullah Efendi, and Hoca İshak Efendi, and foreign experts, among whom were James Redhouse and Joseph von Hammer (Berkes 1978:231; Yazıcı 2005:53). Turgay Kurultay notes that the academy could publish a total of 21 books, of which 15 were translations and 6 were original works (qtd. in Yazıcı 2005:53).

Niyasi Berkes states that although the Academy of Sciences failed to produce fruitful works in the areas of language and literature, it led to the foundation of another institution, which was the Ottoman Scientific Society (*Cemiyet-i İlmiye-i Osmaniye*) (1978:231-232). The Ottoman Scientific Society was established in 1861 for the purpose of publishing all kinds of non-religious works and offering public courses (Yazıcı 2005:54). The Society started publishing a monthly journal, *Journal of Sciences* (*Mecmua-i Fünun*), in July 1862. This journal which

is the second journal published in Turkish after *Events of Medicine (Vakayi-i Tıbbiye)* (Kabacalı 2000:69) was directed by Tahir Münif Paşa, who had learnt German, English and French in Germany and then in the Translation Chamber and who had a keen interest in European natural sciences and French materialistic philosophy (Berkes 1978:232). In the piece he wrote to present the journal, Münif Paşa admitted that the journal could not compete with its foreign counterparts and noted that its objective was to “help the youth in the country develop” (qtd. in Kabacalı 2000:69). The journal included articles written to introduce the scientific disciplines of geology, physics, biology, geography together with papers focusing on subject areas like finance, economy and philosophy, authored by scholars of the time (Kabacalı 2000:69). The journal which also gave birth to the idea of founding a Home of Sciences (*Darülfünun*) (Berkes 1978:232) was published until 1867, when the Ottoman Scientific Society was dissolved due to the appointment of its members to different places (Kabacalı 2000:69).

Another successor of the Academy of Sciences was the Translation Society (*Tercüme Cemiyeti*) founded in 1865 and affiliated to the Ministry of Education (Kayaoğlu 1998:119). This Society is distinguished from both the Academy of Sciences and the Ottoman Scientific Society in that its target audience was not limited to the academia and it exhibited a completely Western orientation (Kayaoğlu 1998:131; Yazıcı 2004:56). Both Kayaoğlu and Yazıcı note that the society failed to fulfill its mission and was dissolved shortly (Kayaoğlu 1998:131; Yazıcı 2004:56).

Following the dissolution of the Translation Society, its duties were delegated to Grand Education Assembly (*Meclis-i Kebir-i Maarif*). The Assembly, which included members from various religious communities, consisted of two parts, namely an Administrative Department (*Daire-i İdare*) and a Scientific Department (*Daire-i İlmiye*). The Scientific Department was assigned to produce original and translated books and booklets to public schools, to communicate with European universities, to promote the Turkish language, and to annually present and exhibit its scientific works (Kayaoğlu 1998:133-136). According to

Taceddin Kayaoğlu, explicit expression of the requirement of Latin and Greek languages as well as the intentions of communicating with European universities distinguish this Department from its predecessors, the Academy of Sciences and the Translation Society, and point to its aspirations to westernization (Kayaoğlu 1998:131).

The re-organization of the Ministry of Education in 1879 under the rule of Abdülhamid II led to the introduction of a new department within the ministry. There is no available information about the activities of this department, Department of Original and Translated Works (*Telif ve Tercüme Dairesi*) (Kayaoğlu 1998:150-152). In fact the Ministry of Education of the time, convinced that the department did not fulfill the mission it was established to accomplish, closed it down, only two years later, in 1881 (Kayaoğlu 1998:154). Thirty three years later, the department was re-opened with the proclamation of the Second Constitutional Monarchy. The department was charged with producing original and translated works to be used in schools for the purpose of promoting public education (Kayaoğlu 1998:159). As Mine Yazıcı explains, subject areas like agriculture, veterinary sciences, law, and economics, were addressed by the department, which also took the first steps through professional publishing, as evidenced by the issuing of serial and volume numbers for published books (2004:121). Taceddin Kayaoğlu provides a comprehensive list of the works published by the first translation institution of the Ottoman Empire in the 20th century in his book *Türkiye’de Tercüme Müesseseleri* (1998:161-180).

2.1.2 Translation Activities between 1923 and 1940

In the period between 23 April 1920 and 1940, until the Translation Bureau was founded, the state regulated translation through a Compilation and Translation Committee (*Telif ve Tercüme Encümeni*). This Committee was founded in 1921 and chaired by Samih Rifat, who is known for the claim that the Turks were the oldest race on earth and Turkish language was the mother of all languages (Kayaoğlu 1998:212). The aim of the Committee was to “extend learning all

through the country and develop the national culture” (Kayaoğlu 1998:200). In accordance with this aim, the books published were predominantly textbooks for the schools. However, as Kayaoğlu notes, it is remarkable that the first book published by the committee was a catechism for village schools, which was an attempt to enter into contact with the people through religion (Kayaoğlu 1998:201).

After Samih Rifat, the committee was headed by Ziya Gökalp, who is a well-known Turkish nationalist, for 4 months. The works translated in this period predominantly concerned sociology, philosophy and Turkish history. This dominance is explained by the fact that translation activities are guided by not only historical conditions, but also individuals (Kayaoğlu 1998:224).

Another characteristic of the translations of the committee, as explained by Hilmi Ziya Ülken, was popularizing the western knowledge by abridging large books to booklets of several sheets. Ülken finds this popularization tendency dangerous, as “it does not enable grasping the spirit of the works and leads to the formation of very superficial convictions about them” (1935:378).

In addition to the publications by the state, there were several private publication houses which also published mainly textbooks (Kabacalı 2000:177). Among these private publication houses were *Ahmet Halit Kitabevi*, *Gayret Kitabevi*, *Hilmi Kitabevi*, *İnkılap Kitabevi*, *Kanaat Kitabevi*, *Remzi Kitabevi* and *Vakit Kitaphanesi*. Of these publication houses, *Gayret Kitabevi*, for instance, published 16 dictionaries in various fields; *Remzi Kitabevi* published 24 translations in the series “Translations from World Authors”; and *Vakit Kitaphanesi* 67 books in “Collected Translations, Past and Future” series (Kabacalı 2000:178).

Besides these, Society for the Examination of Turkish Language (later renamed as Turkish Language Association) established in 1932 and Society for the Examination of Turkish History (later renamed as Turkish History Association) also published some books, the total of which was about 65 (Kabacalı 2000:178).

The problem with all these well-meaning efforts was, as Vedat Günyol notes in his article “Translation in Turkey” (“*Türkiye’de Çeviri*”), that they were unorganized and haphazard (1985:39). Hilmi Ziya Ülken also complains about private translation efforts’ being “mostly personal and unorganized, rather than being organized and conducted by committees” (1935:378), and adds that all these efforts are “insufficient and weak, relative to the translation activities we expect for the westernization of our country” (1935:382). Ülken observes two other problems associated with the translation work undertaken after the Reformation (*Tanzimat*) Period and before the Translation Bureau. These problems, which are the failure of the translations to conform to the Turkish style and lack of any efforts to promote the translated books (1935:382), are worth noting, as they are among the issues the Translation Bureau addressed.

2.1.3 Translation Activities after 1940: Foundation of the Translation Bureau

Considering the state of affairs in the particular context of translation, and the broader areas of culture and literature after the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, establishment of the Translation Bureau can be viewed as the one and only wide, state-led translation move aimed to provide cultural and literary fuel to the newly formed Turkish state.

The Turkish nation in fact needed that fuel, as a new civilization was in the process of being created. Turkey was taking off its Islamic identity and putting on a democratic and secular western identity. Translation was one tool in this changing process. As Hilmi Ziya Ülken notes

Translation is the transfer of an entire civilization. This transfer cannot be effected by indiscriminate and random selections. Civilization does not consist of the present day’s products only. In order to duly penetrate into it and be creative within it, it is absolutely necessary to reach its roots. That is what the Muslims did, when they were learning the Indians and the Greeks. The Europeans took up this troublesome task, when learning the Islamic civilization. Likewise, we observe the same ardor in today’s most recent reawakening movements [Ülken 1935:383].

As a cornerstone in the reawakening of the Turkish nation, the foundations of the Translation Bureau were laid in the First Publications Congress that convened on May 1-5, 1939 in Ankara. The Congress organized by the Ministry of Education concentrated on reviewing the printing and publication issues in the country and determining the procedures to be followed by the state, as well as the individuals in the printing and publication process. Among the issues addressed in the Congress were yearly planning of the works to be translated into Turkish, creation of a children's literature, production of encyclopedias and reference dictionaries, setting up of awards to encourage production of original works and translations. In order to pursue these objectives, seven committees, one of which was concerned particularly with translation issues, were established (Kabacalı 2000:180).

The Translation Committee, headed by Etem Menemencioğlu, a professor at the School of Political Sciences, comprised a rapporteur, Mustafa Özün, a literature instructor at Gazi Institute of Education, and twenty five other members, who were

Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar, Ali Kami Akyüz, Bedrettin Tuncel, Burhn Belge, Cemil Bilsel, Fazıl Ahmet Aykaç, Fikret Adil, Galip Bahtiyar Göker, Halil Nihat Boztepe, Halit Fahri Ozansoy, İzzet Melih Devrim, Nasuhi Baydar, Nurettin Artam, Nurullah Ataç, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, Rıdvan Nafiz Ergüder, Sabahattin Rahmi Eyüboğlu, Sabahattin Ali, Sabri Esat Siyavuşgil, Selami İzzet Sedes, Suut Kemal Yetkin, Şinasi Boran, Yusuf Şerif Kılıçer, Yaşar Nabi and Zühtü Uray [Kayaoğlu 1998:282-283].

All of these members were eminent intellectual and literary figures of the day. The Committee drafted a report, which included such points as the establishment of a permanent Translation Bureau and issuing a periodical *Translation (Tercüme)* journal. Attached to the report was a list of the works suggested for translation. The list included Greek and Latin classics, and works of German, Russian, Italian, Spanish, British, American, French, as well as Eastern and Scandinavian authors (Kayaoğlu 1998:283-295).

After the approval of the report prepared by the Translation Committee, a Translation Board was convened by the Ministry of Education on February 28, 1940 in Ankara. The concerned board held four other meetings presided over

by Adnan Adivar and focusing particularly on translation methods to be adopted in the translations. In the last meeting a list of the works to be translated was drawn up. This last meeting also marked the decision to establish a Translation Bureau, which was

To undertake the duties of arranging, distribution to the translators, examination and printing of the works on the list, as well as regulating and supervising translation publications of private institutions [Kayaoğlu 1998:297].

The Translation Bureau thus formed was headed by Nurullah Ataç, had a general secretary, Saffet Pala, and four other members, namely Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Sabahattin Ali, Bedrettin Tuncel and Enver Ziya Koral (Kayaoğlu 1998:298-299).

2.2 THE MISSION OF THE TRANSLATION BUREAU

As indicated above, the aim of the Translation Bureau was described in the Report of the Translation Committee from the First Publications Congress as

to undertake the duties of arranging, distribution to the translators, examination and printing of the works on the list [drafted by the Translation Board], as well as regulating and supervising translation publications of private institutions [Kayaoğlu 1998:297].

In his article tracing the historical development of translation activities in Turkey, Vedat Günyol, a translator working for the Bureau, explains the objective of the Translation Bureau as follows:

to place our translation goal, toward which we have been working for a century and which is a stringent condition on us in order to meet and become familiar with the West, on a rational level [Günyol 1985:39].

In the concerned article Günyol contrasts the translation activities before and after the Translation Bureau and states

the Translation Bureau addressed the translation of world classics in a systematic manner, in accordance with the statism policy of Atatürk [1985:39].

According to him, this was a dire necessity as our national library was lacking the major masterpieces of the world.

As indicated in the Introduction chapter, this systematic translation undertaking was part of a larger westernization project aimed at bringing Turkey above the level of the world civilization through creation of the Turkish Renaissance and its humanist spirit. The Renaissance as understood by the members of the Bureau is explained by Orhan Burian, a leading member of the Translation Bureau as follows:

Constructiveness of the Renaissance is an epopee; the epopee of a knight-soul who conquered the realm of dragons from one end to the other. These conquerors are innumerable, but the two are the largest and the most certain: the Renaissance taught the individual his humanity and the nation its nationality. It is through this didactic soul that mankind was saved from the pressures of religion and the scholastic thought dominated by it; achieved freedom of feeling and thought; learned to know and trust in himself; was freed of the obligation to live in the shadow of the other world, and started enjoying this world. For creative thought one has to have trust in his life; it is the Renaissance which provided the first impetus to science and arts which they needed [2004:56].

The Turkish Republic also needed these two conquerors to get rid of the dragons on its land. The nation was learning its nationality through political, legal and social reforms. However, teaching the individuals their humanity required a different kind of effort, which was to be materialized through language and literature. The Anatolian people had been living under the shadow of the Ottoman sultans and Islamic religion for centuries. The monarchic and religious rule had left no room for individualism and free and critical thought. In order for the political, legal and social reforms to be long-lived, they had to be embraced by the people and in order for the people to embrace these reforms, the former had to change their way of living and thinking fundamentally. In the West this change was effected by way of a return to classical Greek and Roman era. The great thinkers of the Renaissance had secured such a turn by re-introducing the works of art, literature and philosophy produced at that time. Francesco Petrarch, for instance, who is “one of the most important leaders in the recovery of the classical heritage” (Robbert 1973:173) learned Greek, worked to spare and gather old manuscripts, wrote biographies

of the famous persona of the ancient era and tried all forms of Latin poetry (Gökberk 1999:169). Similarly, another notable humanist, Erasmus, collated various Greek manuscripts, and produced Latin and Greek editions of the *New Testament* (Hamilton 1997:109-113). In his *Adagorium*, which was a collection of Greek and Latin proverbs, he sought to apply the experience and wisdom of the past to the realities of the present time (Günyol 1985:96).

Thus, by re-producing ancient Greek and Latin works in Turkish, as the Renaissance intellectuals did in their native languages, a similar transformation in the individual's way of thinking and living was to be realized. Just as the European Renaissance marked the transition from medieval ages to the early modern age, the Turkish Renaissance was to crown the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic in the social and cultural areas of life, through the creation of a people comprised of free thinking, productive and contemporary individuals.

2.3 TRANSLATORS AND TRANSLATIONS

2.3.1 Translators

In the period between 1940 and 1966, a total of 314 translators worked intermittently for the Translation Bureau. Among the most eminent translators were Nurullah Ataç, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Orhan Burian, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Behçet Necatigil, Suut Kemal Yetkin, Necati Cumalı, Sabri Esat Siyavuşgil, Sabahattin Ali, Reşat Nuri Güntekin, Azra Erhat, A. Kadir Meriçboyu, Nasuhi Baydar, Bedrettin Tuncel, Niyazi Berkes, Suat Yakup Baydur, Orhan Veli Kanık, Oktay Rifat, Melih Cevdet Anday, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Avni Givda, Erol Güney, Mehmet Karasan, İrfan Şahinbaş, Lütfi Ay, Fehmi Baldaş, Nihal Yalaza Taluy and Hamdi Varoğlu. (Ötüken and National Library Bibliography Institute Members 1967:384-392).

Nurullah Ataç (1898-1957) was the first chairperson of the Translation Bureau. He is a translator, critic and essayist, well-known for his efforts for the

purification of the Turkish language. His introduction into literature was through poetry. He published 6 poems, as well as essays and drama criticisms in the journal *Dergah* between 1921 and 1922 (Necatigil 2002:59). In the Republican period, after contending that he was not skilled in writing poetry, he wrote only essays and criticisms, while producing translations (Necatigil 2002:59). His essays and criticisms were published in various newspapers and periodicals like *Akşam*, *Milliyet*, *Vakit*, *Cumhuriyet*, *Ulus*, *Varlık* etc. (Kurdakul 1983:77). In these pieces, he incessantly expressed his disapproval of the use of Arabic and Persian words in Turkish and introduced new words to replace them. His opposition to the Arabic and Persian words stemmed from his conviction that these were the words belonging to a different kind of civilization. If Turkish people were to adapt to the contemporary Western civilization, they had to change their language and the words they used. His rejection of foreign words in Turkish was to such an extent that he abandoned the use of the conjunction “ve” (and), a conjunction with a very high frequency of use in Turkish, on the grounds that it was of Arabic origin, and even abandoned his first name “Nurullah” on the same grounds, undersigning his original works and translations as Ataç only. Through intensive efforts, he introduced many new words into Turkish, some of which are still used frequently, while others fell into oblivion. Ataç also contributed to the emergence of a new prose style (Kurdakul 1983:77). He translated about 50 volumes of classical and contemporary books from Greek, Latin, French and Latin (Necatigil 2002:59) Among these were Sophokles’ *Philoktetes* (1941), Lukianos’ *Morceaux Choisis* (*Seçme Yazılar*, 1944-1949), Aisopos’ *Fables* (*Masallar*, 1945), Prosper Mérimée’s *L’occasion* (*Fırsat*, 1944), Alfred de Musset’s *André del Sarto* (*André del Sarto*, 1943), Stendhal’s *Le Rouge et Le Noir* (*Kırmızı ve Siyah*, 1941-1942). Ataç was a great devotee of *Divan* poetry. Although he considered these poems outdated, he could not keep himself from reminiscing and using them in his essays and even translations. One significant case in point is his translation of *Les Liaisons Dangereuses* (*Tehlikeli Alakalar*) from Choderlos De Laclos. In the translation of this book, which is a novel written in the form of a collection of letters and is a novelty for the Turkish literature, Ataç added many endnotes to explain

concepts that he thought would be necessary for a better understanding of the text. What is more interesting and unique is that, he also quoted *Divan* poems in these endnotes, where he deemed appropriate. For instance in one letter where the letter writer, a male suitor, asks his sweetheart why she did not keep to his word, Ataç guides the reader to an endnote at this part of the text and the endnote contains a verse by the *Divan* poet Galip that is a poetic expression of the male suitor's complaint ("*Durmaz mı o ahdlar vefalar.*") Ataç explains his devotion to poetry as follows:

Is it possible for me to say that I do not like the meter of our old poems? It has molded my understanding of literature, my taste; I feel its voice deep down me, as an indispensable part of my self [1998:88].

Ironically, he is also a westernization enthusiast as evidenced by his following statement:

We should not avert our eyes from Europe; there are many, innumerable things that we should take from Europe. Some people advise us to remain faithful to our conventions, to shut the European books and make do with our own literature. I am not one of them. We need to melt ourselves in the European civilization; our salvation lies there. [1998:16].

In short, Nurullah Ataç is not only a prolific writer and translator, but an intellectual who comprehended the significance of working towards the creation of a contemporary civilization in Turkey and spent invaluable efforts to this end.

Sabahattin Eyüboğlu (1908-1973) is the vice chairman of the Translation Bureau. He is an essayist, art historian, translator and a cinema critic. He was an associate professor at the French Language and Literature Department of Istanbul University Faculty of Letters, and worked as a teacher at Hasanoğlu Higher Village Institute. He wrote for various periodicals like *Hakimiye-i Milliye*, *Tan*, *Kültür Haftası*, *İnsan*, *Varlık*, *Yaprak*, *Tanin*, *Yeni Ufuklar*. He focused on Anatolian art, scientific thought, and national culture (Kurdakul 1983:218-219). Like Nurullah Ataç, he is an ardent defendant of westernization. He asserts that whatever value the humanity has can be unearthed through Europe and can be of use only with a European mentality (Akşin 2005c:267). Eyüboğlu who has adopted the humanist spirit is also an individualist. According to him, the highest value is the individual. Masses of individuals make up the endeared society,

called the people. Western civilizations owe their birth and development to their reliance on the people (Günyol 1988:140).

An advocate of westernization and humanism, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu authored and compiled many research volumes concentrating on the history of Anatolia, Turkish language and religion (Necatigil 2004:163), and translated both contemporary and classical scientific and literary works, which include Platon's *Politeia* together with M. Ali Cimcoz (Kurdakul: 1983:219) and Michel Eyquem de Montaigne's *Essais* (*Denemeler*, 1960).

Orhan Burian (1914-1953) is an essayist, critic and a professor of English Literature at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography. Vedat Günyol who was asked to describe Orhan Burian in the 30th anniversary of his death, describes him as “one of the most conscious defendants of the humanism movement in Turkey, the pioneer of those who greet Atatürk's endeavors as the Asian Renaissance” (Günyol 1988:134). In the preface to *Denemeler, Eleştiriler*, a posthumous collection of Burian's essays and criticisms, Talat Sait Halman uses the analogy of broadening horizons, in reference to *Ufuklar*, the journal Burian published, in order to describe him and cites ten areas where Burian introduced new horizons into the Turkish culture: science, criticism, education, translation, humanism, publication of periodicals and anthologies, ethics, cultural synthesis and role modeling (2004:19-29). Orhan Burian translated several literary works from English including Shakespeare's *Othello* (*Othello*, 1943), *Hamlet* (*Hamlet*, 1944), and *Macbeth* (*Macbeth*, 1946)

Yaşar Nabi Nayır (1908-1981) is a poet, novelist, translator and a periodical publisher like Orhan Burian. The literary periodical *Varlık* he started in 1933 is still published today. He translated from French, particularly the works of Honoré de Balzac [*Le Colonel Chabert* (Albay Chabert, 1944)], Prosper Mérimée [*Les ames du Pugatoire – La Venus d'Ille* (Araftaki Ruhlar. Ille Venüsü, 1944), *Contes* (*Hikayeler*, 1945), *Carmen* (*Karmen*, 1945)], and Alfred de Musset [*On ne saurait penser a tout* (*Bettine. Ummadık taş baş yarar*, 1944)]

Behçet Necatigil (1916-1979) is a poet, teacher and a translator. He is known for his experiments with innovative forms in poetry (Kurdakul 1983:357). Necatigil translated from German Thomas Mann's *Die Tool in Venedig* (*Venedik'te Ölüm*, 1952) and Wilhelm von Scholz's *Die Beichte* (*İtiraf*, 1966), among others.

Suut Kemal Yetkin (1903-1980) is an essayist, professor of aesthetics and art history at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography and a translator. His essays were published in periodicals like *Varlık*, *Türk Dili*, *Ulus Kültür Dünyası*, and *Sanat ve Edebiyat*, which he directed (Kurdakul 1983:514). He was educated in France and wrote essays on aesthetics, arts, and philosophy, as well as Islamic art. Yetkin is regarded one of the representatives of the essay as a genre (Necatigil 2004:401). He translated from German and French and among his translations are Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz's *La Monadologie* (*Monadoloji*, 1962), André Gide's *Morceaux Choisis* (*Seçme Yazılar*, 1948) and *Prétextes*, *Nouveaux Prétexts*, *Incidences*, *Choix* (*Seçme Yazılar*, 1966), and Sidonie Gabrielle Colette's *La Vagabonde* (*Avare Kadın*, 1957, with Lütfi Ay).

Necati Cumalı (1921-2001) is a poet, short story writer, novelist and translator. He is best known for his novelette *Susuz Yaz* (*Dry Summer*, 1962) (Kurdakul 1983:148-149), which was filmed and was awarded the Golden Bear in Berlin Film Festival in 1964, the first international cinema award Turkey received (Necatigil 2004:111). His translations include Prosper Mérimée's *La Carosse du Saint-Sacrement* (*Altın Araba*, 1963) from French and Gottfried Keller's *Sieben Legenden* (*Yedi Efsane*, 1946, with Dora Güney) from German.

Sabri Esat Siyavuşgil (1907-1968) is a poet, novelist and translator. He was a professor of psychology at İstanbul University Faculty of Letters and published his research in the areas of psychology, education and folklore (Necatigil 2004:339). His translations from French include Alphonse Daudet's *Lettres de mon Moulin* (*Değirmenimden Mektuplar*, 1944) Alain René Lesage's *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane* (*Gil Blas de Santillane'in Maceraları*, 1945-1946), Victor-Marie Hugo's *Ruy Blas* (*Ruy Blas*, 1948) and Edmond Rostand's *L'aiglon* (*Yavru Kartal*, 1952).

Sabahattin Ali (1907-1948) is a novelist, short story writer, teacher and translator. He is considered the leading short story writer of socialist realism (Kurdakul 1983:410). His translations include Sophokles' *Antigone* (1941) and Christian Friedrich Hebbel's *Gyges und sein Ring* (*Gyges ve Yüzüğü*, 1944).

Reşat Nuri Güntekin (1886-1956) is a teacher and a very prolific novelist, short story and drama writer. He worked as the cultural attaché of the Turkish Republic in Paris. He is widely known for his novel *Çalılıkıuşu* (1922), which was first serialized in *Vakit* newspaper (Kurdakul 1983:243). The novel owes its significance to its introduction of an idealist and intellectual lady into Anatolia (Necatigil 2004: 180). Among Güntekin's translations are Jean Jacques Rousseau's *Les Confessions* (*İtiraflar*, 1955-1961) and Emile Zola's *Vérité* (*Hakikat*, 1945).

Azra Erhat (1915-1982) is a writer and translator. She is best known for her translation from Greek classics, among which is Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, a joint translation with A. Kadir Meriçboyu, which was awarded Habib Edip Törehan Science Award in 1959 and Turkish Language Association translation award in 1961 (Kurdakul 1983:205). Erhat who is a prolific writer in several genres produced a *Mythology Dictionary* (1972), wrote travel books and essays, and published research works, as well as a book of children's literature (Necatigil 2002: 153). *Yazko Çeviri* journal instituted an award in her name: Azra Erhat Çeviri Ödülü (Azra Erhat Translation Award), awarded in 1983 and 1984 (Necatigil 2003: 420). Her translations include *Electra* (*Elektra*) (1941) by Sophocles, *Eirene* (*Eirene*) (1947) by Aristophanes and *L'improptu de Versailles* (*Versailles Tulûâtı*) (1944) by Jean Baptiste Poquelin de Molière with Orhan Veli Kanık.

A. Kadir Meriçboyu (1917-1985) is a poet and translator. He is one of the pioneers of social realist poetry movement (Kurdakul 1983:29). Among his translations is Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, a joint translation with Azra Erhat, which was awarded Habib Edip Törehan Science Award in 1959 and Turkish Language Association translation award in 1961 (Kurdakul 1983:205).

Erol Güney (1914-) is a journalist and translator. Erol Güney, whose biography published in 2005 by Haluk Oral and M. Şeref Özsoy provides valuable insights about both the Translation Bureau and its prominent translators, translated *Visnevyj Sad* (*Vişne Bahçesi*) (1944) by Antone Chehov with Şahap Sıtkı İlter, *Kapitanckaja Doc'* (*Yüzbaşının Kızı*) (1944) by Alexandre Sergeyevic Pushkin with Sabahattin Âli, *Zenitba* (*Bir Evlenme*) (1945) by Nikolai Vasilievic Gogol with Melih Cevdet Anday, *Pervaja Ljubov* (*İlk Aşk*) (1944) by İvan Sergeyevic Turgenyev with Oktay Rifat and *Oblomov* (*Oblomov*) (1945-1948) by Ivan Alexandrovic Goncharov with Sabahattin Eyüboğlu.

Bedrettin Tuncel (1910-1980) is a translator and writer (Necatigil 2002:373). Tuncel, who also penned essays on translation, translated *Oidipus Tyrannos* (*Kıral Oidipus*) (1941) from Sophocles, *L'école Des Femmes* (*Kadınlar Mektebi*) (1941) from Jean Baptiste Poquelin de Molière together with Sabahattin Eyüboğlu and *Le Chandelier* (*Şamdancı*) (1942) from Alfred de Musset with Sabahattin Eyüboğlu.

Niyazi Berkes (1908-1988) is a writer and researcher. Berkes, who studied philosophy and sociology and lectured in Turkey as well as Canada, India and the United Kingdom, translated *Apologia* (*Sokrates'in Müdafaası*) (1942) by Plato and *Politika I* (*Politika I*) (1944) by Aristotle.

Among other prolific translators and their translations are **Nasuhi Baydar** who translated *Le Médecin de Campagne* (*Köy Hekimi*) (1942) and *Eugénie Grandet* (*Eugénie Grandet*) (1945) by Honoré de Balzac, as well as *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu* (*Geçmiş Zaman Peşinde*) (1942) by Marcel Proust with Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu; **Hamdi Varoğlu** who translated *Theages* (*Theages*) (1943), *Minos* (*Minos*) (1943) and *Anterastai* (*Rakipler*) (1943) by Plato, *Julie ou la Nouvelle Héloïse* (*Julie Yahut Yeni Héloïse*) (1943) by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Une Page d'amour* (*Bir Aşk Sayfası*) (1944-1945), *La Joie de Vivre* (*Yaşamak Zevki*) (1945) and *Le Reve* (*Hülya*) (1945) by Emile Zola, *Chroniques Italiennes* (*İtalya Hikayeleri*) (1944) by Stendhal, *Les Chroniques Italiennes* (*İtalya Hikayeleri*) (1966) by Marie Henri Beyle and *Histoire de la Révolution Française* (*Fransız İhtilali Tarihi*) (1950) by Jules Michelet; **Suat Yakup Baydur**

who translated *Kratyols* (*Kratyols*) (1944) and *Alkibiades II* (*Alkibiades II*) (1943) by Platon, *Athenaion Politeia* (*Atinalıların Devleti*) (1943) by Aristotle, *Poésies* (*Şiirler*) (1945) by Solon and *Ergakai* (*İşler*) (1948) by Hesiodos; **İrfan Şahinbaş** who translated *Alkibiades I* (*Alkibiades I*) (1942) *Meneksenos* (*Meneksenos*) (1944) and *Epistolai* (*Mektuplar*) (1943) by Plato, *Doctor Faustus* (*Doktor Faustus*) (1943) by Christopher Marlowe, *Gulliver's Travels* (*Gulliver'in Seyahatleri*) (1943-1944) by Jonathan Swift and *King Lear* (*Kıral Lear*) (1959) by William Shakespeare; **Fehmi Baldaş** who translated *Candide ou de l'optimisme* (*Candide veya İyimserliğe Dair*) (1944), *Contes* (*Hikayeler*) (1945-1946) and *Dialogues et Anecdotes Philosophiques* (*Feylesofça Konuşmalar ve Fıkralar*) (1947-1948) by François Marie Arouet de Voltaire, *Cinq-Mars* (*Cinq-Mars*) (1950) by Alfred de Vigny, *Le Causeries du Lundi* (*Pazartesi Konuşmaları*) (1952-1961) by Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve and *De l'esprit des Lois* (*Kadınların Ruhu Üzerine*) (1963-1965) by Charles Louis de Secondat Montesquieu; and **Mehmet Karasan** who translated *La Recherche de la Vérité par la Lumiere Naturelle* (*Tabiat Işığı ile Hakikatı Arama*) (1945) and *Regulae ad Directionem Ingenii* (*Aklın İdaresi için Kurallar*) (1945), *Lettres sur la Morale* (*Ahlak Üzerine Mektuplar*) (1946) by René Descartes, *La Morale Professionnelle* (*Meslek Ahlakı*) (1949) by Emile Durkheim and *Les Deux Sources de la Morale et de la Religion* (*Ahlak ile Dinin İki Kaynağı*) (1949) by Henri Louis Bergson.

Poet **Oktay Rifat** (1914-1988) translated Jean Baptiste Poquelin de Molière's *Les Amants Magnifiques* (*Şanlı Âşıklar*, 1950), *L'amour Médecin* (*Sevda Hekimi*, 1943) and Honoré de Balzac's *Louis Lambert* (*Louis Lambert*, 1946). Essayist **Vedat Günyol** (1912- 2004) translated Jean Jacques Rousseau's *Du Contrat Social* (*Toplum Anlaşması*, 1946) and Honoré de Balzac's *Gobseck l'usurier* (*Tefeci Gobseck*, 1947). **Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu** (1889-1974), novelist, translated Marcel Proust's *A la Recherche du temps perdu* (*Geçmiş Zaman Peşinde*, 1942-1945, with Nasuhi Baydar). Famous poet **Orhan Veli Kanık** (1914-1950) translated Jean Baptiste Pouquelin de Molière's *L'impromptu Versailles* (*Versailles Tuluatı*, 1944, with Azra Erhat) and *Tartuffe* (*Tartuffe*, 1944). Poet, novelist and essayist **Melih Cevdet Anday** (1915-2002) translated Jean Baptiste Pouquelin de Molière's *Don Juan* (*Don Juan*, 1943).

Oktay Rifat and Orhan Veli Kanık rendered together Alfred de Musset's *Il faut qu'une porte soit ouverte ou fermée* (*Bir Kapı ya Açık Durmalı ya da Kapalı*, 1943). **Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar** (1901-1962) translated Euripides' *Alkestis* (*Alkestis*, 1943) and *Medeia* (*Medeia*, 1943).

All the translators working for the Translation Bureau were progressive, contemporary intellectuals, teachers, writers and scholars of the time, who were dedicated to the great project of contemporarization of the young Republic. Introducing all the translators with even very short descriptions would exceed the scope of this thesis, so several further examples of these literary figures and their translations, and the relation between the qualities of the Translation Bureau translators and the effect of their translations on the cultural and literary milieu of the Turkish Republic shall be discussed in the next chapter, under the heading Translations of the Translation Bureau and the Turkish Literary Polysystem.

As it can be seen from the foregoing, members of the Translation Bureau were not selected randomly. They were versatile individuals, pioneers in the Turkish intellectual and cultural life, and displayed a deep commitment to the cause of westernization. The task of being intermediaries between the Western civilization and Turkish people were not imposed on them, but self-conceived with a rational and objective mind-set.

2.3.2 Translations

The Translation Bureau published 1247 volumes in the 26 years between 1940 and 1966. Of these, 113 were German classics, 5 American classics, 308 French classics, 80 British classics, 24 Scandinavian classics, 29 Italian classics, 47 Latin classics, 20 Hungarian classics, 88 Russian classics, 66 Eastern-Islam classics, 94 Greek classics, as well as 124 modern works of drama (Ötüken and National Library Bibliography Institute Members 1967:viii-xi) (See Appendix I for a complete list).

As the numbers indicate, the vast majority of the books translated were European works of literature. These translations aimed both to fill a gap in the Turkish bibliotheca and pave the way for the production of original literary works. This is evidenced by the criteria used in the selection and actual translation of the works. The works selected for translation were those accepted as the classical and modern masterpieces of the Western civilization, although there were some 68 Islamic-Eastern masterpieces among the volumes translated.

Great importance was also attached to the acts of translation and editing. The translators who were to translate a book were asked to translate 25-30 pages and send their translation to the Bureau for inspection. This draft translation was to be checked by one or two experts, and if found adequate, the translator would continue with the translation. The translation would be subjected to a second check after it was finished (Kayaoğlu 1998:299).

Another important aspect of the translations was their directness. The translations of the Bureau were mostly from the original languages, and only rarely indirect translations, that is, translations from a second language were allowed (Ötüken and National Library Bibliography Institute Members 1967:vii).

The importance of these translation strategies shall be discussed in the third chapter in the context of norms in translation.

2.4 TRANSLATION (TERCÜME) JOURNAL

Translation (Tercüme) is a biannual journal published by the Ministry of Education, in accordance with the decision taken in the First Publications Congress. Its first issue was published on May 19, 1940, immediately after the Translation Bureau was founded. A total of 87 issues of the journal was published until 1966 (Kabacalı 2000:202).

In the words of Nurullah Ataç, the first chairperson of the Translation Bureau, the main aim of the journal was

to introduce the Turkish readers with authors writing in other languages, and particularly Europe's best authors whose insights have spread everywhere [Ataç 1999:369].

Ataç also notes that there are other journals and newspapers that serve this purpose, but these do not adequately present authors of the past centuries, whereas “real understanding is based on the knowledge of the past” (1999:369.).

2.4.1 Content

Translation (Tercüme) journal can be viewed as an extension of the systematic attempt towards cultural development through translation by the Translation Bureau. In the preface he wrote for the first issue of the journal, Minister of Education Hasan Âli Yücel notes

Along with the translation of pre-determined books, we have also not forgotten to give direction and momentum to the translation work by seeing and demonstrating what translation itself is, and how it should be, through what other nations have done in that matter. With this purpose in mind, we present the *Translation [Tercüme]* journal to the Turkish intellectuals and invite those who consider themselves so to help us [Yücel 1999:368].

In line with the objective of showing what translation is and how it should be, the *Translation* journal contained essays and statements about translation problems, as well as critiques and abstracts of translated works. In his article “*Tercüme Mecmuası*” Orhan Burian, a Translation Bureau translator, reports that the journal contained excerpts from world classics, pieces on translation, and translation critiques, as well as quotations from foreign journals, studies on translation and translation bibliographies (Burian 2004:214).

2.4.2 Significance

The *Translation* journal, content of which is briefly explained above, is significant in the history of translation in Turkey in several aspects. The first aspect is that it is the first of its kind in Turkey and has not had many

successors. (There are only two other journals, namely *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri*, which followed suit, and fell into oblivion).

The second aspect is the journal's longevity and wide influence. *Translation* journal was issued for 26 years and was regarded a useful source for the intellectuals and the public alike. Hasan Âli Yücel, for instance, noted that İsmet İnönü, the president of the time, was the most persistent and careful reader of the journal, and considered it a "textbook" for teachers (1999:375). Another example of the importance attached to the journal by the head of the state İsmet İnönü is quoted by Erol Güney, a Bureau translator, in his memoir *Erol Güney'in Ke(n)disi* as follows:

İsmet İnönü and Hasan Âli Yücel considered *Tercüme* journal which was published six times a year very important. We were doing things that were irrelevant to the state of affairs in the world. The Second World War was going on and Turkey could have joined it any time. There were deprivation, trouble in finding drugs and despite all these, İnönü would ask "Do you read the *Tercüme* journal?" to people he saw in his visits [Oral and Özsoy 2005:97].

The third and maybe the most important aspect is that the *Translation* journal included ideas on the practice and theory of translation. The translators not only gave examples from their translations, but also described their translation processes, focusing on the particular problems they encountered and the solutions they found. There was a dynamic exchange of ideas and a lively discussion going on between translators. Thus, just as the Translation Bureau initiated a systematic translation effort, the *Translation* journal started a systematic thinking about translation, which laid the foundations of translation theory in Turkey. In fact, the ensuing discussion about the translation norms in the Bureau translations shall be guided mostly by the statements of the translators, as enclosed in the *Translation* journal.

CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATION BUREAU TRANSLATIONS AND THE TURKISH LITERARY POLYSYSTEM

3.1 POLYSYSTEM THEORY

Polysystem theory is a theory of culture. Developed by the Israeli cultural studies scholar Itamar Even-Zohar, polysystem theory examines cultures as systems from a functional perspective and aims to unveil the laws that govern diversity and complexity of cultural phenomena.

The concept of system is used by Even-Zohar as a means of understanding semiotic phenomena, like culture, language and literature (Even Zohar 1990:9). He borrows the term from the Russian Formalists.

3.1.1 Russian Formalism

Russian Formalism, a school of literary theory and criticism, is a product of a society of researchers working in Moscow and St. Petersburg between 1915 and 1930. These researchers were members of the Moscow Linguistic Circle and the Society for the Study of Poetic Language ("*Opoyaz*"). With members from a diverse background, "formalism comprised theorists of literature (Victor Schklovsky, Osip Brik, Jurij Tynyanov), historians of literature (Boris Eykhenbaum), linguists (Roman Jakobson, Lev Jakubinsky), verse specialists (Boris Tomashevsky), philologists (Grigory Vinokur) and at least one ethnographer (Vladimir Propp) (Pike 1979:8).

The name formalism comes from the emphasis of the concerned group on literary form, rather than literary content. In Terry Eagletons' words,

Formalism was essentially the application of linguistics to the study of literature; and because the linguistics in question were of a formal kind, concerned with the structures of language rather than with what one might actually say, the Formalists passed over the analysis of literary content for the study of literary form [1996:3].

In line with the importance they attached to literary form, Russian formalists believed that literature could best be studied according to specific principles established primarily for this field, rather than being explained by philosophy, theology, aesthetics and social factors. They considered both literature and the study of literature to be autonomous (Rifat 2000:183-184).

In order to make a claim for autonomy, Russian formalists made a special emphasis on the scientific nature of their work. As Christopher Pike explains in *The Futurists, the Formalists, and the Marxist Critique*,

At root, the formalist inquiry was indeed 'scientific' in the broad sense that it aimed at an objective and precise study of elements that constituted the system of literature: the 'poetics' which they wished to create was to be a science, not an interpretation of literature [1979:9].

3.1.2 The Concept of System

Of the Russian formalists, Shklovskij made particular contributions to prose, Jakobson to poetry, Eykhenbaum to genres and Tynjanov to literary evolution (Aytaç 2003:132). According to Tynjanov, whose main focus was literary evolution and who introduced the concept of system into Russian formalism, literary tradition was a struggle consisting of deconstruction and reconstruction of elements (Gentzler 1993:110). There was a constant flux of change in literature and this change was determined by structural evolution of systems. Jurij Tynjanov explains the system concept as follows:

Elements ... do not exist in isolation, but always in an interrelationship with other elements of other systems. ... the entire literary and extraliterary world could be divided into multiple structural systems. Literary traditions composed different systems, literary genres formed systems, a literary work itself was also a unique system, and the entire social order comprised another system, all of which were interrelated, "dialectically" interacting with each other, and conditioning how any specific formal element could function [Gentzler 1993:112].

Even-Zohar who borrowed the above concept of system from Tynjanov to explain cultural phenomena complains that the functionalist or structural approach was wrongly associated with static systems and thus was misunderstood even by professionals in semiotic disciplines, and makes a

distinction between static and dynamic systems in his theory. Study of static systems emanating from Ferdinand de Saussure, 20th century linguist regarded as the founder of contemporary linguistics and pioneer of the structural linguistics movement (Rifat 2000:21), eliminates the factor of time-succession (diachrony). According to Even-Zohar, this elimination is understandable and defensible, in order to obtain a level of abstraction to reveal the principal mechanisms of language functioning (1990:10-11). However, exclusion of the time factor from a study of systems and its inclusion therein bring about quite different results. A system includes not only synchrony, but also diachrony, each of which is also a system within itself (Even-Zohar 1990:11). In fact, it is the element of diachrony that separates dynamic systems from static systems, which lack this historical dimension, according to Even-Zohar.

Similarly, Roman Jakobson and Jurij Tynjanov emphasize the need to address both synchrony and diachrony in the study of literature:

The sharp opposition of synchronic (static) and diachronic cross-sections has recently become a fruitful working hypothesis, both for linguistics and for history of literature, inasmuch as it has demonstrated that language, as well as literature, has a systemic character at each individual moment of existence [Jakobson1987:48].

3.1.3 The Concept of Polysystem

This multitude of systems leads Even-Zohar to conclude that semiotic systems, with their heterogeneous and open structure, are necessarily polysystems. A polysystem, according to Even-Zohar, is

a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent.” [1990:11]

This use of the term polysystem emphasizes both heterogeneous and dynamic nature of systems (Even-Zohar 1990:12).

3.1.4 Stratification of Systems

Russian formalists who also argued for heterogeneous and dynamic systems, attributed these properties to the hierarchy between various strata in a system. Literary stratification was conceptualized by Victor Shklovskij, founder of *Opoyaz*, the (Petersburg) Society for the Study of Poetic Language. This stratification is determined by canonization, which denotes legitimacy or illegitimacy of literary norms and works. Shklovskij suggested that some models and texts were canonized in a particular literature. But from a diachronic perspective, there was a constant change in what was canonized and what was not.

Various strata in the polysystem are in a constant struggle (Even-Zohar 1993:14). Phenomena which occupy the peripheral stratum at a certain time may come to occupy the central stratum and replace the central phenomena, and vice versa. According to Even-Zohar, canonicity in the polysystem is best seen in the repertoire, which he defines as “the aggregate of laws and elements (either single, bound or total models) that govern the production of texts” (1990:17). The repertoire in a polysystem is canonized or non-canonized depending on the relations within a polysystem. Which repertoire is canonized at a certain time is determined by cultural factors at work at that particular time in that particular society.

In addition to canonized and non-canonized repertoires, Even-Zohar makes a further distinction between primary and secondary repertoires. This distinction is based on the innovativeness and conservatism in systems (Even-Zohar 1990:21) and is closely associated with stratification. Cultural patterns governing the behaviour of elites in a society determine the stratification and canonization of conservatory or innovatory repertoires (Even-Zohar 1990:18).

When a literary repertoire is well-established with its models and texts, it becomes a conservative repertoire. It is also a secondary repertoire, as it becomes petrified. Petrification, in Even-Zohar's terms, does not allow the

repertoire to cope with the changing needs of the society in which it functions" (1990:17). Innovative models and texts, on the other hand, form the innovative and thus the primary repertoire, as they augment and reconstruct the repertoire by introducing new elements into it (Even-Zohar 1990:21). Primary repertoires in polysystem theory begin to occupy the central strata in the system, due to their innovativeness. However, owing to the continuous tension between various strata, primary repertoires become secondary, if they are sustained long enough, and this is how the literary polysystem evolves.

3.1.5 Translation and the Literary Polysystem

Itamar Even-Zohar attributes a special role to literary translations in the evolution of literary polysystems. In "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem" he complains from the fact that translations have not been dealt with consistently and thoroughly in histories of literatures and states that "there is no awareness of the possible existence of translated literature as a particular literary system" (1990:45). However, he finds this lamentable as he considers "translated literature not only as an integral system within any literary polysystem, but a most active system within it" (1990:45). He then goes on to ask through which ways translated literature comes to play an active and central role in the literary polysystem.

Itamar Even-Zohar identifies three conditions under which translated literature may assume such a role:

(a)when a polysystem has not yet been crystallized, that is to say, when a literature is 'young,' in the process of being established; (b)when a literature is either 'peripheral' (within a large group of correlated literatures) or 'weak,' or both; and (c)when there are turning points, crisis or literary vacuums in a literature (1990:46).

Under such conditions, translations take an active part "in shaping the centre of the polysystem" (1990:46). Translations of foreign works introduce new models and features into the target polysystem. Inasmuch as translations constitute both canonized and primary, that is to say legitimate and innovative repertoires,

“translation is likely to become one of the means of elaborating the new repertoire” (1990:46).

However, it is also possible that translated literature may occupy a peripheral position in the literary polysystem, in which case translated works reflect the non-canonized and secondary models and norms, and help to preserve the current repertoire (Even-Zohar 1990:48-49).

It is worth noting that translated literature is itself a system, and thus, subject to stratification. Therefore, it may not be possible to talk about the whole system of translated literature occupying either a central or peripheral position in a literary polysystem. In Even-Zohar’s terms, “This means that while one section of translated literature may assume a central position, another may remain quite peripheral” (1990:49).

The position occupied by translated literature in a literary polysystem makes a marked influence on the translation norms and translator behaviour alike. Even-Zohar argues that when translated literature occupies a central position, translation equivalence tends towards adequacy, and translators are likely to deviate from the norms and models in the target literary polysystem in search of new norms and models (1990:50-51).

Within this framework, the next part of this thesis shall summarize translation activities between 1859, when the first novel, poetry and philosophy books were translated from Western languages into Turkish, and 1940, when the Translation Bureau was founded, with a view to shedding light on the Turkish literary polysystem before the Translation Bureau and then explore the role of translations in the Turkish cultural and literary polysystem in the years between 1940 and 1966, as defined by Itamar Even-Zohar’s model.

3.2 TRANSLATIONS BETWEEN 1859 AND 1940 AND THE TURKISH LITERARY POLYSYSTEM

In the introduction of this thesis, a brief historical background was provided about the nationalization process of Turkey starting from the First World War. However, an analysis of the role of the Translation Bureau in the Turkish cultural and literary polysystem in terms of its contribution to the westernization of the Turkish Republic requires examining the evolution of the literary polysystem in the Ottoman era and tracing the origins of westernization efforts back to the Reformation (*Tanzimat*) period.

3.2.1 Ottoman Literature (13th to Early 19th Century)

The Ottoman literature between the late 13th century and 19th century is known as the Classical Turkish Literature (Birinci 2004). Language used in the classical Turkish literature was the Ottoman language, which comprised Turkish, Arabic and Persian and which was used as the written language throughout the life of the Ottoman Empire (Ergin 1990:61). However, the Turkish intellectuals borrowed not only the lexis and grammar of Arabic and Persian, but also their literary conventions and genres.

The Ottoman literary polysystem was dominated by poetry, and *Divan* poetry in particular, as a genre, so much so that classical Turkish literature is also called *Divan* literature. *Divan* is the name given to the notebook where all the poems of a poet are collected. This notebook had a certain structure and the poems in it followed a fixed order in terms of their subjects and types of prose (Birinci 2004). *Divan* literature, according to Mustafa Nihat Özön, reflected the feelings, thoughts and taste of the intelligentsia in the Ottoman (1941:2). The most common types of poetry used in *Divan* literature were *kaside*, *gazel*, *mesnevi*, and *rubai* and the content of all these types was determined by Islamic sources, like the Koran, maxims of Mohammed the prophet, stories about other prophets, stories about dervishes, and *tasavvuf*. (Birinci 2004). In fact, one significant

aspect of *Divan* poetry, as Hilmi Ziya Ülken observes, was its ties with the Islamic world view (2005:45). This world view was sometimes symbolized in figures of speech and sometimes formed the gist of the poem (Ülken 2005:45).

Parallel to the elite *Divan* poetry, there was a popular literature in the Ottoman (Özkırımlı 1981:414). This popular literature comprised the popular poetry (*halk şiiri*), which also fed from Islamic sources, but was built on a simpler language and unsophisticated forms.

Although there were some individual examples of prose in the classical Turkish literature, as Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar observes, the Ottoman literature was a literature of poetry until the 19th century (2002:22).

An examination of the Ottoman repertoire in terms of centre-periphery relations and canonized-noncanonized forms reveals that poetry as a genre occupied the centre of the polysystem and was the canonized form, with the noncanonized prose at the periphery. In addition, poetry was also stratified in itself, where *Divan* poetry produced the established and respected, that is canonized, literary works and popular poetry reflected the lower taste.

As indicated earlier, in the evolutionary literary polysystem model, there is a constant struggle between various strata. When the central repertoire is too conservative, that is secondary, it becomes petrified and is replaced by innovative repertoires. However, neither the central nor peripheral strata in the Ottoman literary polysystem of the 19th century could produce innovations, that is, both of these repertoires were secondary. In his article summarizing the Ottoman Turkish literature, Prof. Necati Birinci explains the unchanging nature of the Ottoman literature as follows:

Turkish literature in the Ottoman period dragged its existence uninterruptedly from the late 13th century to the mid 19th century without any major deviations and variations, any major changes in form and content, without distorting the aesthetic criteria and classical structure of the Islamic civilization on which it was found, despite some minor differences that emerged over time [2004].

Cevdet Kudret also complains from the self-containment of the Ottoman literature:

When a literature becomes introvertive and tries to make do with what it has, it begins to decay and produce crippled products, like a marriage between relatives. The last period of our Divan poetry is the most marked example of this situation. In order to produce better offspring, one has to turn to the outside world [1999:82-91].

Likewise Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar points to the lack of progression in the Ottoman literature and associates this state with losing touch with other literatures:

In reality there was a scarcity of inspiration resulting from the fatigue of the innermost human being who had lived locked within fixed and definite limits for centuries. As in all Islamic arts and thought, our poetic and ideational life showed a lack of blood and a degeneration of fashions. This was a result of always being self-contained in both contact with the outer world and external goods and in interpreting and explaining the human soul, as well as an obligation of looking for change, which all living things need, only in one's own surroundings and in his own elements and traditions, which have not been enriched with any external influence [1942:39].

3.2.2 First Novel, Poetry and Play Translations

In these circumstances the innovations required for the survival and evolution of the literary polysystem had to be imported. In fact, significance of the Reformation period in terms of Turkish literary polysystem is marked by the first translations of three new genres, namely western poetry, novel and philosophical dialogue into Turkish.

The first translation of western poetry into Turkish was İbrahim Şinasi's *Tercüme-i Manzume*. This lithograph, which was published in 1859, included Lamartine's poem *Souvenir* from his work *Méditations*, Racine's plays *Esther*, *Athalie*, and *Andromaque*, La Fontaine's *Le loup et l'agneau*, as well as pieces from Gilbert and Fénélon (Özön 1941:21). The concerned work which was published again in 1860, and published in 1862 under the title *Müntahabat-ı Eş'ar* was a novelty in terms of both its genre and content. The didactic tales inspired Şinasi to produce similar works in Turkish among which are *Eşek ile*

Tilki, Arı ile Sivrisinek, Karakuş yavrusu ile Karga (Özön 1941:21-22). Another noteworthy point about the first poetry translator İbrahim Şinasi is his also being the author of the first play written and published in Turkish, *Şair Evlenmesi*. In this comedy, Şinasi, who was known to show a special interest in drama when he was in Paris and tried not to miss any of Molière's plays, criticized the old marital conventions (Özön 1941:128). Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar emphasizes two important aspects of this one-act play. Firstly, the play opens the door to a new sense of realism, which our literature had never seen before, and secondly, it does this by making use of a popular and local theatrical convention, namely the genre of *ortaoyunu*. Another point that needs attention is, according to Tanpınar, the language used in the play. The characters in Şinasi's play talk in the language of the people, layman's language, and this is not only about words, but about the style of expression (1942:148).

The first novel translation was *Terceme-i Telemak*, rendered into Turkish by Grand Vezir Yusuf Kâmil Paşa from Abbé Fénelon's *Les Aventures de Télémaque*. The book was translated in 1859 and published in August 1862. It was received so favourably that it was reprinted six months later in February 1863. Grand Vezir Yusuf Kamil Paşa, who was known for his grandeur and pride, explained his decision of translating this book on the grounds that the wisdom in it could display some good qualities of the sultan. Mustafa Nihat Özön presents some of the items listed in the index of the translation as examples of the kind of wisdom conveyed by the book. Among these items are ways to develop a country, a description of the duty of a ruler, how to behave during wartimes etc. (Özön nd:144-147). The language used in the translation was also in conformity with the linguistic conventions of the time, that is, with an elegant style, and the translation was used as an example of stylistics in schools (Özön 1941:225).

Another new genre, philosophical dialogue, entered the Turkish cultural and literary polysystem with Münif Paşa's translation of *Muhaverat-ı Hikemiye*, which included philosophical dialogues by Voltaire, Fénelon and Fontenelle and was published in 1859 (Paker 2001:577). As Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar explains,

this work introduced to the readers some fundamental issues like human nature, consideration of fame, individual ambitions, love of country, social ethics, education of young girls and women, and discussed these topics in a way much different than that has been customary until that day (1942:132). Tanpınar also stresses that the ideas in this work had moved almost a whole generation and describes Münif Paşa as the man who opened moral principles of the Reformation to debate through translation (1942:132).

The translations following these first three are *Mağdurin Hikayesi*, which was an abridged version of Victor Hugo's *Les Miserables* and was serialized in a newspaper *Ruzname-i Ceride-i Havadis* in 1862; Voltaire's *Microméga* translated as *Hikaye-i Feylesofiyeye-i Mikromega* by Ahmet Vefik Paşa and Ali Bey in 1871; Albert Dumas' *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo* translated as *Monte Kristo* by Teodor Kasap and published in 1873; Chateaubriand's *Atala* translated as *Atala* by Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem in 1872; Daniel de Foe's *Robinson Crusoe* translated as *Tercüme-i Hikaye-i Robenson* by Lütü in 1864 and by Şemsettin Sami in 1884 (both are abridged translations); Bernardin de Sain-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* translated as *Pol ve Virjini* by Sıddık in 1873; and Le Sage's *Le Diable Boiteux* translated as *Topal Şeytan* by Teodor Kasap in 1872.

A complete list of the translations in that period can be found in Mustafa Nihat Özön's *Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (1941). The list covers the period between 1859 and 1938 and includes about 325 translations from 45 writers. Most of these translations (37 out of 45) were from French authors, with the exception of several (6) Russian and (3) British authors, who were also translated from French.

Hilmi Ziya Ülken summarizes the translation efforts in the period following Reformation as follows:

Relative to the real translation activity we expect for the westernization of our country, what has been done is very deficient and weak. That is because, first of all, most of the translations after the Reformation are dispersed and coincidental. It is not possible to determine why and according to which criteria they were selected. They are generally born out

of the desires of translators or some limited needs put forward by publishers. Therefore they could not form a series and individually they remained ineffectual. Secondly, these translations were made on the basis of daily needs and too hastily. As it is usually forgotten that translation is not just transfer, but almost the production of a new work, sentences are translated as they are and are not adapted to Turkish style. I believe that this language incongruity is much more dangerous than translation negligence about details, as it makes the reader lose interest in translated works. Thirdly, the translations are left on their own and there is no attempt to introduce them to public. Neither the author nor the publisher thinks that writing is as important as producing. These works will be perused particularly in schools and by intellectual families. It is necessary to prepare handbills, summaries and newspaper advertisements, as well as short criticisms to inform them about these works [1935:382-3].

Despite its shortcomings, translation activity in the Reformation brought new blood to the Turkish literary polysystem. But the extent of the translation efforts and the number of translated works did not match the Turkish westernization ideal and was not enough to make profound changes in the polysystem in line with this ideal. The reasons why translations between 1859 and 1940 fell short of the expectations can be summarized as follows:

1. Almost all the translations of Western literary works were from a single source language, which was French. However, westernization required tapping all sources of the western civilization to the largest extent, with all its variety and heterogeneity. In this respect, innovatory ideas, linguistic forms and literary genres of cultures other than that of France were neglected in the Reformation period translations.
2. Selection of translated works was random. There was no systematic effort to find out which texts and models the national library lacked and there was no planning to address these lacks. The criteria for the selection of works to be translated were arbitrary.
3. There was no particular approach followed in the translations as to the method of translating. If translations are expected to fill a certain gap in the polysystem, a particular method has to be followed in the process of translation. The function that translated works is expected to fulfil determines the method(s) used in the process of translation.

4. There was not any single body, official or unofficial, regulating and guiding dispersed translation efforts. However, presence of such a body could have easily ruled out the two drawbacks Ülken noted in the summary of Reformation period translations, namely lack of selection criteria and promotion of translated works. Besides, such a body could establish ties between translators, opening communication channels and providing fertile grounds for discussions about translation.

5. Majority of the translated works were novels, and particularly action novels, which targeted “second class” readers (Özön n.d.: 140). Yet other genres like poetry, drama, children’s literature, travel literature, memoirs to name a few, were as weak as, if not weaker than, novel in the Ottoman literary polysystem.

Thus, the translated works were not sufficient, neither in quantity nor in quality, to bring about the profound change the literary system had been devoid of for almost six centuries. The westernization target of the Turkish Republic entailed a much greater translation project in the cultural and literary arena to match the new and contemporary world view and life style that was introduced by the state.

3.3 TRANSLATIONS OF THE TRANSLATION BUREAU AND THE TURKISH LITERARY POLYSYSTEM

In the speech he delivered in the First Publication Congress convened in 1939, the Minister of Education Hasan Âli Yücel stated that the Ministries of Education had not succeeded in issues of translation and original work production, and explained the content of this congress as follows:

There is no doubt that this congress is also of a consultative character. Nevertheless, decisions that shall result from the work here shall function as the most fundamental program for both state organization and private publication enterprises in the coming years, and the problems which are identified and for whose resolution and organization guidelines are set here shall be overcome one by one through the energetic and practical working methods of the Turkish Republic [qtd. in Kayaoğlu 1998:280].

These words by Yücel may be evaluated as a reflection of the cultural planning policy of the Turkish Republic. As Itamar Even-Zohar notes, “cultural planning is a regular activity in the history of collective entities of any size, be they ‘family’, ‘clan’, ‘community’ or ‘nation’” (1994). He adds that successful implementation is an important aspect of cultural planning and requires introduction of change into the current order (1994). Defining culture as “an aggregate, or a repertoire which organizes social action”, Even-Zohar puts emphasis on the structuredness of a repertoire, which is “interdependence of the components of a repertoire in the sense that their value is determined by their relation to each other” (1994). He also stresses the concept of “options” and states that the multiplicity of options increases the chances of success of cultural planning (1994).

The translation project envisaged by the Ministry of Education and implemented by the Translation Bureau addressed both of these aspects of cultural planning, namely structuredness and multiplicity of options. Structuredness of the translation project undertaken reveals itself on two levels: first, at the organizational level and secondly at the practical level. At the organizational level, translation was taken as a state policy and located in the wider framework of westernization policy of the state which encompassed all other areas of political, legal, social and cultural order. Hasan Âli Yücel who saw the interdependence of that part of the Turkish cultural repertoire with the others, located the translation efforts in the context of an all-embracing ideal, as evidenced by his following words:

The Republican Turkey who aspires and is resolved to become a distinguished organ of the western cultural and ideational community has to translate into its own language old and new thought products of the civilized world and fortify its self with the emotion and cognition of this realm” [qtd. in Kayaoğlu 1998:281].

At the practical level, the structuredness of the cultural planning effort sustained through translation manifests itself in both the quantity and quality of the translated works. The Translation Bureau published 1247 volumes in 26 years. In addition to the sheer number, the quality of the works translated also

reflected a certain structure, with the western classics that played a substantial role in the creation of European Renaissance taking the lead in translations, as indicated in Chapter I. Halide Edip Adivar, an intellectual and writer, who also fought in the National War of Independence, explains the word “classics” as follows:

The word classics refers extensively to three things. Firstly, and literally, it refers to the famous Greek and Latin works which form the basis of the western culture; secondly to masterpieces that make up the golden age in the literature of a nation; and thirdly to any book which critics would describe as a classic in any age, even today [1999:238].

After defining classics in this way, Adivar emphasizes two aspects of classics, namely the language and content. In terms of language, she explains how translations enriched the target languages, by making them both more developed and more comprehensive. But she also adds that classics not only include art and literature, but also ideas, philosophy and even science (1999:239).

Adivar’s comments reveal that Translation Bureau contributed to the Turkish literary polysystem by bringing both new models and features and reinforcing the world view targeted by the Republican government.

Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeler Klasikler Bibliyografyası, a bibliographical source prepared by Adnan Ötüken and National Library Bibliography Institute Members and containing the publication information about the literary works translated by the Translation Bureau lists the number of translations by their sources and by their publication years. These two lists can be found in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, respectively.

An examination of the works translated by the Translation Bureau demonstrates that the following changes were introduced into the literary polysystem:

1.The Turkish literature was introduced with the literary, and although to a lesser extent, philosophical and scientific products of a variety of sources, which include British, Danish, Dutch, German, Hungarian, Italian, Scandinavian, Spanish as well as French sources from Europe, Iranian, Indian and Chinese

sources from the East and Far East, as well as American and Latin American sources from the New World. Recalling the role of the richness of options in the success of cultural planning Even-Zohar pointed out, it is clear that the Translation Bureau translations made a significant attempt to increase the options available in the Turkish literary polysystem.

2. Again in reference to the options available in the literary repertoire, the introduction of new genres together with subtypes within these can be cited as another contribution of the Bureau translations to the Turkish literary polysystem. These subtypes were associated with both the contents and forms of the literary works. The themes dealt with in literary works translated by the Bureau showed a wide variety, whereby it became apparent that all kinds of topics could be dealt with in prose and poetry and the seeds of the thematic diversity in literature were sown.

3. As Nazım Hikmet, the world-famous Turkish poet, points out in one of his letters, translations also played a role in the enrichment of the linguistic possibilities of the Turkish language. According to him,

... when you read a translated novel you would not think that it was written by a Turkish author. On the contrary, you should understand the nationality of the author who wrote it and when s/he had written it. In other words, in translation a Russian author and a French author should speak in their respective languages, not in the language of the Turkish author who did the translation [qtd. in Aksoy 1995:81].

This way, Nazım Hikmet thinks, it is possible for languages to enrich one another and open their doors to each other, instead of staying within their narrow limits (qtd. in Aksoy 1995:81).

4. Translations also fuelled the production of original literary works. It was already noted that almost all the translators who worked in the Translation Bureau were novelists, poets, play-wrights, essayists themselves. Together with translations, they produced many literary and non-literary works. Ataç's over ten books containing his essays, Eyüboğlu's books including art criticisms and research into Turkish art and culture, Burian's essays and poetry compilations, Nayır's poems, plays and essays, Necatigil's poems and plays, Yetkin's poems

and essays, Cumalı's poems, plays, short stories and novels, Siyavuşgil's poems and essays, Ali's poems, novels and short stories, Güntekin's novels are just a few examples of the numerous original works Translation Bureau translators contributed to Turkish literature. Besides, all those men and women of letters set examples for the future literary figures of the Turkish polysystem. As Vedat Günyol notes

It was through these translations that such values as Yaşar Kemal, Fakir Baykurt, Talip Apaydın, Mehmet Başaran flourished and developed [1988:93].

Similarly, Nedim Gürsel pinpoints the innovative force of translation in contemporary Turkish literature, particularly after 1940s:

Translation activities did not only aim at pure information transfer, but also formed the substitutive force and sometimes the basis of all sought-for innovations and major pioneering initiatives. See the relations between *Garip* generation and French poetry or those between existentialist philosophy and distressed authors like Demir Özlü, Ferit Edgü etc.! See Gorki translations of Remzi Publication House and realistic understandings of Orhan Kemal, and even Füzûzan! [1999:80]

It can be said that Translation Bureau translations made a profound change in the Turkish literary polysystem by creating a new repertoire. Translations came to play a major role in the shaping of the centre of the polysystem. The conditions prevalent in the Turkish literary polysystem in 1940s were consistent with the three conditions, in which, according to Even-Zohar, translations participate actively in shaping the centre of the polysystem. Firstly, Turkish literature was young and in the process of being established, in the sense that despite a very long literary history, old literary conventions had been forsaken and a new repertoire was being formed in line with the needs of the time and the Turkish nation. Secondly, Turkish literature was peripheral and weak in relation to other European literatures. The European literature had entered a new era in the Renaissance with new genres, forms and themes, but the classical Turkish or Ottoman literature had direly lagged behind these literary innovations. Thirdly, there was indeed a turning point in the cultural life of the Turkish nation. The Turkish nation was going through a civilization shift and renouncement of the old literary conventions entailed their replacement with

new ones. Thus, translations assumed a very important function in the establishment of the contemporary Turkish literature. The fact that the translation activities that assumed the responsibility to contribute to the westernization and modernization cause of the Turkish nation were coordinated and implemented by the state in a well-organized and systematic manner was also effective in the central role translations assumed.

As a result of the changes translations brought about, the translated novel was placed at the centre of the literary polysystem. When explaining the emergence of novel in Europe in the 16th century, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar states that novel starts when civilization and culture turn their course to the human, when the conventions of the Middle Ages are defied, and when the human beings are awakened (2002:26). Similarly, Fethi Naci associates the novel with the individual and the individual as a member of the bourgeois society in particular. According to him,

The novel materializes only when bourgeois life style and 'the individual' appear clearly enough.... However, Ottoman society was an economically underdeveloped agricultural society; the 1838 British Trade Agreement not only eradicated the established small industry, but also eliminated the prospects of industrialization and thus the possibility of the establishment of a bourgeois society, making the country an open market. This course of events resulted in the Ottoman society's becoming a semi-colony. Such a social structure is one that prevents the formation of 'the individual' [1999:11].

Therefore, it is no coincidence that development of novel in the Turkish literary polysystem is concurrent with the establishment of a new political and social order and revival of the humanism spirit in the country.

In spite of the central role novel came to play in the Turkish literary polysystem, the developments in poetry in 1940s and onwards cannot be underestimated. Comparing the development of poetry and prose in the last century, Ferit Edgü gives the upper hand to poetry. Arguing that the Turkish novelists could not produce novels which extended the borders of the genre and broadened its horizons within the contemporary art of novel, he states that the Turkish poets produced world class poems (2003:12). The origins of this development in

modern Turkish poetry can be traced back to 1940s, the birth of the *Garip* movement. As a reaction to the conventional poetry, three poets, Orhan Veli Kanık, Oktay Rifat, Melih Cevdet Anday started a poetry movement that rid itself of meter and rhyme, used daily language and touched daily subjects (Özkırımlı 1981:429-430). It is worth noting that these three poets, who are accepted by literary historians as the initiators of the new poetry, were all translators who worked for the Translation Bureau.

The Translation Bureau generated a literary atmosphere marked by innovation, energy and creativity. Part of this generation can be attributed to the fact that translations were very well-received by the Turkish readers, as evidenced by number of re-prints of the translated works (see Appendix 2). This favourable reception leads one to wonder how or by which method the translators translated their source texts? Which aspects of translation made these translations attractive and helped them become part of the Turkish literary repertoire?

The following chapter of this study shall attempt to answer these questions by examining the comments of Translation Bureau translators to find out the norms that appeared in their translations.

CHAPTER 4: TRANSLATION BUREAU TRANSLATIONS: NORMS

4.1 A BRIEF HISTORY OF TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATION THEORY

The emergence of translation in the history of humankind can be traced back to the emergence of writing and alphabets. In fact, as Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth explain, translators played active roles in the invention of alphabets, as well as development of national languages and literatures:

The translators who developed writing systems extended the boundaries within which knowledge could be disseminated [Bulgaria, Moravia and Armenia]; they helped awaken the collective consciousness of ethno-linguistic groups [Goths and Slavs]; they participated in the emergence of national pride [Armenia, Georgia and Moravia]; and they imported new ideas and spiritual values [Ojibway and Cree]. They contributed to the birth of literature and the preservation of cultural heritage; they gave an impetus to literacy and the democratization of education. Throughout the world, they paved the way for cultural, social and spiritual progress [1995:19].

But how did this adventure of the translation and translators begin? The first translator in history is considered Livius Andronicus who translated *Odyssey* from Greek into Latin in 240 BC (Yazıcı 2001:5, Kelly 2004:495). Andronicus is followed by two other prominent translators of the ancient times, namely Cicero (106-43 BC) and Horace (65-8 BC), who not only contributed to the development of a truly Roman literature (Baker 2001:495), but also are regarded the first translation theorists due to their introduction of the two poles of translation, namely word-for word (*verbum de verbo*) and sense for sense (*sensum du sensu*) translation (Yazıcı 2001:6).

In his book *Memes of Translation*, Andrew Chesterman offers a history of translation, particularly translation in Europe. In this history, Chesterman uses the concept of meme, which he borrowed from Richard Dawkins' book *The Selfish Gene*. A meme is the cultural counterpart of a "gene" in biology and is used to explain the concept of cultural evolution (1997:5). In the evolution of

translation, Chesterman identifies eight translation memes and explains each one with a metaphor (1997:20-42).

The first translation meme is “words” and associated with the Greek view of language. According to this view, words have absolute and invariant meanings and language is a structure that consists of smaller units which are words. Thus, translation is all about deconstructing the original structure and building a new structure with the same units. The metaphor of this stage of translation is “translation is rebuilding” (Chesterman 1997:20-21). Historically this stage corresponds to the age of classical antiquity, roughly between 7-8th century BC starting with the Greek poet Homer and going on until the 5th century AD, when the rise of Christianity started (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_antiquity).

The second stage in the evolution of translation, or the second translation meme is “the word of God”, which is related with the translations of Bible into Latin. The metaphor for this stage, which is “translating is copying” makes it clear that translations of the religious texts required utmost faithfulness to the original, which was the word of God and could not be meddled with in terms of neither content nor form (Chesterman 1997:21-23). This stage coincides with the Middle Ages (5th-14th centuries).

“The word of God” stage was followed by “rhetoric” stage, when it was recognized that not only holy, but also non-religious texts were translated and that the latter required a different method of translation. It was in this stage that the method to be used in translation was associated with the text-type, and freer translations were allowed in secular texts. This attitude, which was a reaction to both the over-literal translations of the previous stage and the subservient status of the translators, gave rise to an understanding of translation as a rhetorical practice, as opposed to the grammatical approaches of the previous two stages. The metaphor for this stage, “translating is imitating”, symbolizes the aspiration of translations to exceed the source and translators to do better than the writers (Chesterman 1997:23-26). This stage of translation is concurrent with the Renaissance in Europe (14th-17th centuries).

The extremely free translational attitude of the “rhetoric” stage soon created its own antithesis, which was the “Logos” stage that started in the late 17th century. Translators in this stage sought to strike a balance between the two extremes of the previous two stages, that is, “the word of God” and “rhetoric” (Chesterman 1997:26). Andrew Chesterman associates the translation activities in this period with the German Romantic Movement and the nationalization process of Germany (1997:26-27). Luther’s translation of the Bible into German in the Reformation Period had revolutionized the German language and planted the seeds of the flourishing of German national literature in the 18th century (Gökberk 2000:85-86). Another historical development correlated with the “logos” stage is the revival of hermeneutics by Friedrich Schleiermacher, who is considered the father of hermeneutics. Schleiermacher, who argued for a “deliberately marked, strange, foreign” translation had nationalistic aims of boosting the status of German through translation (Chesterman 1997:26-28). The metaphor for this stage “Translating is creating” sheds light on the translations’ role in shaping and enriching the target language (Chesterman 1997:27).

The turn from romantic excursion to positivistic tradition in the philosophical adventure of the mankind marked the opening of a new stage in translation history, which Chesterman calls “linguistic science” (1997:30). This stage of translation is associated with a wider variation of translated texts from holy and literary texts to pragmatic ones, like legal and technical documents, tourist brochures and advertisements. In this scientific view, which is associated with the first half of the 20th century, translation was addressed within the context of linguistics and dominated by discussions on equivalence. The metaphor for this stage is “translating is transcoding, that is decoding and recoding”, which reflects a mechanical approach to translation, treating the elements of language as mathematical signs (Chesterman 1997:30-33).

The sixth stage in the evolution of translation, or the sixth translation meme is communication, which stresses the co-presence of linguistic and non-linguistic factors in translation. The metaphor for this meme, “translating is sending a

message to someone”, illuminates the sociological perspective adopted. Various translation scholars, like Hans Vermeer, Justa Holz-Mänttari, Anthony Pym, and Christiane Nord put forward theories that dealt with translation in its wider sociological context. In his *Skopos* theory Hans Vermeer considers translation a social action and focuses on the purpose or *skopos* of translation. Justa Holz-Mänttari gives the translator a central status in the chain of communication. Anthony Pym defines a socio-politico-economic framework for translated texts and Christiane Nord emphasizes both extra-textual and textual factors in her text analysis model. This stage displays the effects of Marxist thought, which emphasizes the social and economic factors in the formation of social structures (Chesterman 1997:33-36).

The fall of the source text and the rise of the target text that started in the communication stage is furthered in the “target” stage, where translations are regarded as independent texts in the target culture. This meme which appeared in 1970s tended towards a descriptive, rather than a prescriptive approach, and introduced new concepts into the translation theory, like norms and constraints, which shall be dealt with in more detail in the next part, Descriptive Translation Studies. The dominant metaphor for this meme is “translation is manipulation”. Various scholars, among whom are Eric Cheyfitz, Kyoko Inoue and Andre Lefevere, have conducted studies about the manipulative force of translations and translators (Chesterman 1997:36-40).

The last stage in the evolution translation is the “cognition” stage, which put emphasis on the thinking processes of translators. Thus, as opposed to the understanding of translation as a social action, translation in this stage is regarded as a cognitive process and priority is given to the thinking processes of translators. Hence the metaphor for this meme: “translating is thinking”. This stage of translation has given rise to studies that seek to reveal what goes on in a translator’s mind in the act of translation (Chesterman 1997:40-42).

The foregoing brief description of the historical evolution of translation demonstrates that throughout its several thousand-year history, translation had been for the most part subordinated to other disciplines that had left their stamp

on certain historical periods. So that, translation was defined in philosophical terms in antiquity, religious terms in the Middle Ages, artistic and literary terms in the Renaissance, and linguistic terms in the first half of the twentieth century.

4.2 DESCRIPTIVE TRANSLATION STUDIES

4.2.1 Background

The emergence of translation as an independent scholarly field occurs only several decades ago, in 1970s. The first step in this process is the proper designation of the discipline. In “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies”, a paper presented in the Translation Section of Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics, held in Copenhagen 21-26 August 1972, and issued later in the same year by Amsterdam University, James Holmes points to the disagreement on the name of the field of translating and translations and emphasizes the need to give a name to this new field in order to open communication channels between researchers (2000:173). He then goes on to review the various names used to denote translation in German, French and English and finally suggests the term “translation studies”:

...the designation “translation studies” would seem to be the most appropriate of all those available in English, and its adoption as the standard term for the discipline as a whole would remove a fair amount of confusion and misunderstanding. I shall set the example by making use of it in the rest of this paper [Holmes 2000:174-175].

After designating the field of translating and translations as translation studies, Holmes goes on to offer a classification of the areas covered by translation studies. According to this classification, translation studies comprises two major fields, namely applied translation studies and pure translation studies, which in turn consists of two branches, which are descriptive translation studies (DTS) or translation description and theoretical translation studies (ThTS) or translation theory (Holmes 2000:176). The aim of descriptive translation studies, according to Holmes, is “to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience” (Holmes 2000:176).

After this first emphasis on the descriptive branch of translation studies by James Holmes, Gideon Toury, an Israeli translation studies scholar, associated descriptiveness with the autonomy of the discipline:

No empirical science can make a claim for completeness and [relative] autonomy unless it has developed a descriptive branch. The reason for this is that an empirical discipline, in contradistinction to non-empirical sciences, is initially devised to study, describe and explain [to which certain philosophers of science would add: predict], in a systematic and controlled way, that segment of "the real world" which it takes as its object [1985:16].

Gideon Toury, who elaborated on James Holmes' schematic description of translation studies on one hand and made use of Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory in the context of translation on the other hand, thus formulated what is known as the target-oriented approach. When compared with previous translation theories, this approach is seen to differ from its predecessors in several respects, which can be outlined as follows:

1. In the target-oriented approach to translation, translation is not defined in terms of the source text, source language or source culture, but explained with reference to the target language and target culture:

...for the purpose of a descriptive study, a 'translation' will be taken to be any target-language utterance which is presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds [Toury 1985:20].

This definition later gave rise to such concepts as assumed translation, which is a concept explaining the fact that any text assumed to be a translation in the target culture is treated as a translation therein, and pseudo-translation, which refers to texts that are presented to the target culture as translations, but in fact are not.

2. Parallel to the definition of translation in reference to target language and culture, translated texts are accepted as objects of the target culture, since

it is the target or recipient culture, or a section of it, which serves as the initiator of the decision to translate and of the translating process [Toury 1985:18-19].

Therefore, the target-oriented approach deals with translation in the context of the target culture and concentrates on the relations between the translated text and other translations, as well as original texts in the target language, as opposed to the timeworn practice of comparing and contrasting source and target texts.

3. In line with the empiricist nature of descriptive translation studies, Gideon Toury considers the starting point for translational research to be the translated texts. According to him,

Translated texts and their constitutive elements are observational facts, directly accessible to the eye. In contrast, translating processes, i.e. those series of operations whereby actual translations are derived from actual source texts, though no doubt also empirical facts and as such a legitimate part of the object-level of translation studies, are only indirectly available to study, as they are a kind of “black box” whose internal structure can only be guessed, or tentatively reconstructed [1985:18].

Thus, Toury argues for a focus on the products of translation, that is translated texts, rather than translation processes, as the former lends itself better to description.

4. This focus on description of translated texts entails a total abandonment of prescription within descriptive translation studies. As Edwin Gentzler explains, Toury’s research into literary translations into Hebrew “caused him to be skeptical of abstract theories involving ideal author-original text/translated text-reader models” (1993:127). And thus, in the target-oriented approach, Toury avoided “a predefinition of what a translation ‘should’ be” (1993:127). Toury himself explains this avoidance in the following way:

One of the main reasons for the prevailing lack of descriptive translation studies has no doubt been the overall orientation of the discipline towards its practical applications. Thus, whereas for a fully-fledged empirical science such applications – important as they may be – are only extensions of the discipline into “the real world”, the applications of translation studies in the form we usually know them ... represent the main constraint on the very formulation of the theory which underlies them, if not the very reason why its formulation is imperative. Small wonder that a theoretical approach oriented towards practical applications should show preference for prescriptive pronouncements which, as a rule, derive either from sheer speculation or from theoretical and descriptive work done within the

framework of other, more “basic” disciplines, such as contrastive linguistics, contrastive textology or stylistique comparée. What it does not wish to do is to rely on research carried out within its own framework – which is why the lack of descriptive translation studies has never really bothered translation scholars [1985:17].

In this descriptive approach, what is to be described, according to Gideon Toury is functional-relational concepts, which form the subject matter of descriptive translation studies (1985:21).

5. Among the functional-relational concepts which comprise the subject matter of descriptive translation studies, the one with utmost significance is the concept of equivalence. According to Gideon Toury,

the notion of equivalence ... differs from current concepts of translation equivalence in that it is not one single target-source relationship established on this or that type of invariant [1985:36].

In line with the triadic classification of the field of translation studies, Toury suggests three types of equivalence:

It [equivalence] is therefore the entire set of possible relationships, which, for the purposes of descriptive translation studies, functions as POTENTIAL EQUIVALENCE; the place of this notion in the theoretical branch of the discipline. Any part of this initial potential may on occasion function - within some observational phenomena- as a distinguishing factor, and in that case we have ACTUAL [or realized] EQUIVALENCE, whose proper place is, of course, DTS [Descriptive Translation Studies]. Finally, any relationship that is POSTULATED as equivalence, on whatever ground and for whatever purpose, belongs in the domain of the applied extensions of translation studies [1985:36-37; original emphasis].

The concept of equivalence in the target-oriented approach can be best understood in the context of another central notion, which is that of norms.

6. Norms have a central place in the target-oriented approach because, according to Toury, translation is a norm-governed activity (2000:200).

4.2.2 Translation Norms

Toury, uses the notion of norms in the context of translation decisions and as an essential tool in determining regularities of social behavior. He maintains that

they are at work in every stage of the translating event and present themselves at every level of the product of the translating event (2000:202).

Gideon Toury distinguishes two groups of norms, which are preliminary norms and operational norms. Preliminary norms are divided into two subheadings as translation policy and directness of translation. Translation policy is associated with the factors governing the choice of text types and individual texts which will be translated into the target culture at a certain point in time. Directness of translation concerns the decisions as to whether to translate the texts directly from their source languages or indirectly from second languages, as well as the attitude of the target culture towards various source languages (Toury 2000:202).

As opposed to preliminary norms that apply to the processes that are at work before the act of translation, operational norms are those that govern the translation act itself. Of the operational norms that guide translator decisions during the act of translation, matricial norms involve such considerations as fullness of translation, distribution of textual material in the text, and segmentation. Textual-linguistic norms, the second component of operational norms, on the other hand, determine the selection of target language textual and linguistic material that shall replace such material of the source text (Toury 2000:202-203).

In addition to preliminary and operational norms, Toury introduces an initial norm to account for the translator's choice between the requirements of two sources, which are the target text/language/culture and source text/language/culture. When a translator decides to stick with the norms of the source text/language/culture, the translation produced will be an adequate one. When the translator chooses to conform to the norms of the target text/language/culture, on the other hand, the result will be an acceptable translation. Thus, what determines the translation equivalence is the initial norm, or the translator's decision to comply with either the source or target norms (Toury 2000:200-201).

A general evaluation of Gideon Toury's target-oriented approach reveals that translation here emerges as an autonomous scientific discipline, in which the object of the discipline of Translation Studies is the target text(s). Target texts are regarded as facts of the target culture and translators as social actors. The study of target texts is carried out in the context of translator decisions which are guided by norms that are prevalent in a certain target culture at a specific point in time. The aim of the study is not to prescribe rules to be obeyed, but to describe the norms that are manifested in the target text. Norms determine the concept of equivalence, which is described in the target-oriented approach in terms of the function of translation and its relations with other translated and original texts in the target culture.

This approach is particularly conducive to an examination of the translations produced by the state-led translation endeavor in a certain period in Turkish history. Accordingly, the next part shall explore translation norms in the translations published by the Translation Bureau on the basis of the statements of individuals who took part in this translation endeavor.

4.3 NORMS IN TRANSLATION BUREAU TRANSLATIONS

As indicated earlier, the Translation Bureau was founded to accomplish a certain mission, which was to contribute to the social and cultural aspects of the Turkish Republic's westernization process. This mission is expressed by Hasan Âli Yücel as

attending to and reviewing of translation activities in our country by the Ministry of Education and translating the old and new literary classics that are deemed necessary for our national library into our language within the framework of a specific plan and system [Kayaoğlu 1998:297-298].

In order to understand what is meant by a "specific plan and system", it may be useful to have a look at the action plan prepared by the Translation Bureau to be followed within this ambitious project. Orhan Burian lists the steps followed in the work undertaken by the Translation Bureau:

(1) to gather people who dealt with translation issues of the country either theoretically or in practice and to consult them; (2) to have this group of people draw a list of the works known as classical works in major languages of the world; (3) to resolve to translate the works in this list in five years; (4) to distribute the works to volunteers, but in case that the volunteer is not known to be a capable person, to check their translation competence in advance; (5) to examine the incoming translations in terms of accuracy and originality of expression in the headquarters; (6) after the translation is deemed appropriate, to publish it in uniformity with other books of the same series [1999:250].

This extent of fastidiousness and the seriousness with which the Bureau took its responsibility was in harmony with the mission it undertook. As Celal Şengör states in his book exploring the contributions of Hasan Âli Yücel to Turkish enlightenment, Yücel, who sincerely embraced Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's saying "Science is the best possible guide in life", reckoned that the works to be presented to the Turkish library would be a mental exercise for members of the nation, guide them towards many new goals and thus encourage thinking scientifically and being civilized (2003:141).

It is clear from the foregoing that translations of the Translation Bureau were intended to serve a particular function. This function must have influenced the translation norms in that period.

4.3.1 Preliminary Norms

As explained above, preliminary norms guide the decisions taken before the act of translating and concern translation policy and directness of translation. It can be said that preliminary norms in the Translation Bureau translations were determined at an institutional, rather than an individual level. Translation activities were carried out by a state institution affiliated to the Ministry of Education and this institution decided on issues related to translation policy and directness of translation.

4.3.1.1 Translation Policy

Translation policy which governed choice of text types and individual texts to be translated into Turkish was consistent with the mission of the Bureau, which was stated above. The main consideration in the selection criteria for the texts to be translated was to fill the gaps in the Turkish national library. As Hasan Âli Yücel noted, efforts were spent for a hundred years to translate and publish many works, but the major masterpieces of the world could not have found a place in our national library, which was heartbreaking evidence of a haphazard pursuit (qtd. in Kayaoğlu 1998:298).

Accordingly, the works chosen for translation were those lacking in our national library, which were, for the most part, literary masterpieces of the world, including novels, drama and poetry, as well as philosophical works. In a 1941 article, Orhan Burian evaluates the translation activities in recent years and finds them too weak to stand even the simplest analysis (2004:207). He explains this weakness in three respects, which are in respect to works, in respect to translators and in respect to publishers. Burian attributes the first respect, weakness in translated works, which is relevant to translation policy, to the randomness observed in the selection of works to be translated. He summarizes his point by saying

The works which are most frequently translated at present are worthless works with dubious value, chosen from authors of our time or recent past, and therefore have not become established, and maybe will never be so in the world literary history [2004:208].

Similarly, in a 1940 article Bedrettin Tuncel questions the value of the texts translated before the Translation Bureau:

The reasons why translations after *Tanzimat* [Reformation] did not stir our literature are well known. The works selected did not have any inherent, definite value. Works of the West, world classics in particular, were completely disregarded. It is now understood that transfer of worthless works, which were considered in terms of their commercial, rather than literary value, into Turkish would not avail [1999:3].

In contrast, Translation Bureau translations were selected in a planned and systematic fashion, as evidenced by the words of Azra Erhat:

Its [Translation Bureau's] purpose, its mission was to find sources and to determine and establish them. It is not true that it looked for these sources only in the Greek-Latin tradition. It was a democratic institution and it certainly adopted a scientific attitude open to a multiplicity of ideas in accordance with the western line of thought. You know that as the first step, it reviewed classical works, those works that are worth being classical works, as well as those which expressed the universal human values, and it prepared lists. It found out works of international literature which would be useful to translate into our language and to be disseminated in our society, those which have already been well-established in the world, and which are not disputable [1999:117].

Likewise, İzzet Melih Devrim emphasizes the value of the literary works selected for translation into Turkish:

It is true that no one has the power to create great authors, however it is in our power to take into our language the works which comprise the most praiseworthy treasure of the humankind in flawless translations and to make up for what is missing in our national library [1999:12].

It can be said that the translation policy elements or criteria adopted in the selection of texts to be translated into Turkish find their best expression in the preface Hasan Âli Yücel wrote for the Bureau publications:

... reiteration of the literatures of other nations by a nation in its own language, or more precisely, in its own conception means augmentation, invigoration and re-creation by the latter of its own intelligence and power of comprehension in direct proportion with the works concerned. That is the reason why we deem translation activities important and influential in our civilization cause. In nations which could have oriented all facets of their intelligence to all sorts of such works, writing, which is the incontrovertible vehicle of thought and literature, which forms the architecture of language, have an impact that penetrates and permeates deeply into the soul of the mass as a whole. An individual and communitarian form of communication with such an influence reflects a robustness and ubiquity that would pierce and exceed all limits in time and space. Whichever nation has a prosperous library in this respect has achieved a higher level of percipience in the civilized realm [1999:241].

4.3.1.2 Directness of Translation

Directness of translation which concerns choice of source languages reflects the westernization ideal of the Turkish nation, and is closely associated with the objective of creating the Turkish Renaissance.

As translations were meant to help in the creation of a contemporary and civilized nation composed of free-thinking individuals, translated texts were predominantly works of such societies in the West. As shown in Appendix 1, most of the works translated were from European sources, with Europe representing the advanced level of civilization. In addition to contemporary European, that is French, German, British and Italian sources, classical Latin and Greek texts were also given priority in translation. This prioritization was consistent with the aim of creating the Turkish Renaissance, as the European intellectuals had turned to the concerned works in the European Renaissance of the 14th century. Bedrettin Tuncel explains the significance of translating Greek and Latin works into Turkish as follows:

If the birth of a radical humanism is really desired, the starting point would be this [Greek and Latin classics]. Time has already come to introduce the most beautiful examples of Greco-Latin civilization. It is well-known how these examples created useful and valuable movements in France, Britain and Germany. We also know what the 16th century humanists offered to the classics of the 17th century. It is this humanism movement that gave rise to Corneille and Racine [1999:5].

Besides, choice of source languages, directness of translations concerned the target culture's level of tolerance for indirect translations or translations from a second language. This practice was very common in the Ottoman translation tradition, where most of the European works were translated not directly from their source languages, but from Arabic and Persian, which functioned as intermediary languages. However, one of the hallmarks of the Translation Bureau translations was translating the texts directly from their sources, as indicated by Bedrettin Tuncel:

One of the fundamental points is the translation of texts directly from the source. It is not right to translate a work written in English into Turkish from

French. However, there is no doubt that it will be highly useful to resort to translations of the work in languages of various other cultures. For instance, if in the process of translating Faust, one examines its translations in English and French, this will increase the likelihood of approximating the original. To translate the works from their originals should be preached as an invariable principle [1999:4-5].

4.3.1.3 Summary

An examination of the preliminary norms that prevailed in the Translation Bureau translations reveals that

1.in terms of translation policy,

a.text types selected for translation were predominantly literary works in general, and novels, poems and drama in particular, which were lacking in the Turkish national library; and

b.selection of individual texts depended on the criteria of being well-established and valued in their home literatures, having retained their literary value through time, and having contributed to the development and flourishing of their home cultures.

2.in terms of directness of translation,

a.the texts translated by the Translation Bureau, unlike translations in previous periods, were from Western and particularly European sources, in line with the westernization aim of the Republic; and

b.as agreed in principle, almost all texts were translated directly from their source languages, and second languages were used only as a last resort and as references for the purpose of aiding the translation process.

4.3.2 Initial Norm

Initial norm concerns the translator's choice between the requirements of two sources, which are the target text/language/culture and source

text/language/culture. In Gideon Toury's target-oriented approach, it is the initial norm which determines the type of equivalence obtained in the target text. If the translator decides to stick to the norms of source text/language/culture, the resulting translation is an adequate translation. However, when the translator observes the norms of the target text/language/culture in the translation process, an acceptable translation is produced (Toury 2000:201).

In his polysystem theory Itamar Even-Zohar associates the role that translated literature assumes in the target culture with the type of equivalence obtained in the target text. When translated literature occupies a central position in the target polysystem, translators tend to opt for adequate translations, through which they depart from the literary tradition of the target culture and introduce innovations thereto. On the other hand, in case that the translated literature is peripheral in the target polysystem, translators are more eager to find ready-made models for the source text, whereby equivalence shifts towards acceptability.

As indicated in Chapter II, the social and cultural circumstances in 1940s gave translations a central status in the Turkish literary polysystem. In that case, according to Polysystem Theory, one expects translators to produce adequate translations as stated by Even-Zohar:

Periods of great change in the home system are in fact the only ones when a translator is prepared to go far beyond the options offered to him by his established home repertoire and is willing to attempt a different treatment of text-making [1990:51].

Nevertheless, an examination of the Translation Bureau translators' comments on their translations demonstrates that there is not a complete agreement on the source which would be heeded to in translations. It is true that in terms of the language to be used in translation, there was a general accord on using simple and readily comprehensible Turkish in the translations (Paker qtd. in Karantay 1999:341). This principle was in line with the language reform of the Republican period. Suat Yakup Baydur explains the content of the language reform and the grounds on which it was founded as follows:

1.The Ottoman language which was born when the Turks was within the circle of *Islamic civilization* has not sufficed to respond to the new concepts they met when they entered into the circle of *European civilization*; stocks of French words that passed into our language in all areas, medicine, natural sciences, law, philosophy are the most tangible evidence of this need ... 2.*Adoption of the Latin alphabet* together with the huge difficulties encountered in spelling and pronunciation of words borrowed from Arabic and Persian ... 3.*Abolishment of Arabic and Persian language courses* in schools, and unintelligibility of the Ottoman language for the young generation, as well as the failure of the young people to differentiate between Arabic words and terms. 4.The insufficient and unsystematic nature of available terms, the need for concepts and words that has become increasingly compelling under the influence of European culture ... 5.The desire to get closer to the public, to make words that strive in Anatolian people's speech and conversation available in written language and to systematize terms. [1999:10-11; original emphasis].

Despite this general consensus, translators of the Translation Bureau used and advocated different approaches in their translations and this variation led to heated exchanges of opinion. One such exchange was between Nurullah Ataç and Reşat Nuri Güntekin which started with two articles of the latter, published in *Translation (Tercüme)* journal in July 1944. In the concerned article, Güntekin likens the Turkish translator to an artist who does not have all the necessary main paints on his/her palette:

Our translator is devoid of the possibility of doing a mechanical translation like his/her European counterpart; as s/he struggles with words in the face of a dictionary with occasional voids and shades, s/he is bereft of the strength to deal with meaning and soul [1999:21].

In response to these articles which focus on the weakness of Turkish, Ataç writes

Maybe because I have gained more experience in time, my thoughts are changing; I feel more weakness on my part, than on the part of Turkish. I do not say 'This word cannot be expressed in this language' any more; rather I ask 'There is no question that this word can be expressed in Turkish, but how?' and concluding 'It is me, I cannot find it', I feel sorry [1999:26].

After that counterargument, Ataç gives an example to clarify his point and shares the conclusion he has arrived:

Then I understood that in translating, one should look for the equivalent of not the words in a sentence, but the whole sentence. What informs us

about the writer's message is not the words, but the whole formed by their combination [1999:279].

Ataç associates this claim with the artistic value in translation:

Each novel, each poem is above all a work of art; when translating, it is compulsory to try making it still a work of art in its new language. If an exquisite sentence in a language you translate has become an insipid one in your language, you would be betraying the essence, no matter how much you stick with the meaning [1999:28].

Likewise, in an earlier article, Ataç points to the importance of observing norms of the target language in translations:

A person who translates a book from any language into Turkish should consider, above all and above the ideas in the text s/he is working on, the requirements of Turkish, and should observe them. If s/he constrains the language, his/her message would be unintelligible; and thus s/he would be unfaithful to the text. That is why I only laugh at those who say 'What else shall we do? We cannot deviate from the text' and attempt to write dull sentences which do not look like Turkish; they do not grasp that this extent of faithfulness is in fact unfaithfulness, that they betray the text by sticking too blindly to it [1999:15].

In reference to faithfulness to the source text, Ataç also argues for deviating from the form of the source text and prioritizing the form of the target text and presents sentence structure as a case in point:

Some claim that it is never permissible to break a single sentence in the original text into two sentences in translation. They say 'Since the writer has thought this as a single sentence, we have to translate it as a single sentence. A sentence essentially contains one idea; others are secondary ideas that surround and shed light on it; when we separate any of them we would be attaching more significance to it and thereby we would betray the intention, the idea of the writer.' This is a grammarian obsessed with analytical logic talking. In reality what encourage a writer to write in long or short sentences are concerns of harmony and form. It is possible to show, even in the most meticulous of writers, some words used for the sole purpose of providing harmony to the sentence [1999:16].

A short paragraph from Ataç's translation of Choderlos de Laclos' *Les Liaisons Dangereuses* (*Tehlikeli Alakalar*) may illustrate how acceptability figures in his translation. The translation is presented in Turkish, as a back translation would not convey the sentence structures (inverted sentences) and word choices (words of Turkish culture, like "*kardeşçığım*" and "*inşallah*"), which read perfectly Turkish.

Gördün ya kardeşçiğim, duruyorum sözümde; bütün zamanımı da öyle hotozlarla, fistanlarla geçirmiyorum. Senin için zaman bulamaz olur muyum ben? Ama şu bir tek günde gördüğüm süsü, ziyneti, birlikte geçirdiğimiz dört yılda görmedim doğrusu. O Tanville çalımlısı, bizi görmeye her gelişinde hani giyinir kuşanırdı da bizi kıskanıyoruz sanırdı, manastıra bir uğrayayım, inşallah onu da çağırtacağım, kıskanmak nasıl ourmuş anlasın [Laclos 2000:25].

As revealed by his comments and the above cited translation, Nurullah Ataç is one of the most, if not the foremost, of fervent supporters of acceptability in translation. In retrospect, another notable practitioner of acceptability was Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, whose relations with Ataç were in fact sour and who found Ataç's attitude somewhat extremist (Oral and Özsoy 2005:135).

Nonetheless, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu opted for acceptability in his translations, as evidenced by the following words of Azra Erhat:

... several Shakespeare translations of Eyüboğlu, particularly drama translations, were found awkward for being written in an excessively informal language. It was said that kings and queens would not talk like that; maybe a more pompous and pretentious style was expected. However, in his La Fontaine translation Eyüboğlu took pains to make all sorts of animals in the fables use the most forceful idioms and narratives and converted the vainglorious language that resembled the language spoken in the French palace of the 17th century to a simple and clear public language comprehensible to everyone [1999:61].

Similarly, Güzin Dino who describes the place of Sabahattin Eyüboğlu in translation movements in Turkey emphasizes the purity of his language:

One of the characteristics of his style was his expression of the most sophisticated information and concepts in the most unadorned, the most unimposing and the simplest language, to translate Montaigne, La Fontaine or Rabelais who are typically French as if they had written in Turkish [1999:299].

Another translator who opted for acceptability in translation was İzzet Melih Devrim. In an article where he summarizes "conditions and qualifications absolutely required to properly translate a literary work", Devrim says

It should always be born in mind that the aim is to retain the pleasure and excitement that the original stirs. This is possible only by creating the impression that [it was] *written directly*. Ultimately, the point is not to produce exercises for school children, which the Europeans call 'thèmes',

but to translate literary works from one language to another with an artistic mastery [1999:14; original emphasis].

While Nurullah Ataç, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu and İzzet Melih Devrim chose to follow the target language and culture norms in their translations, thereby producing acceptable translations, there were also those who opted otherwise and prioritized adequacy over acceptability. Among the representatives of adequacy, or adherence to source text/language/culture norms, in Translation Bureau translators is Orhan Burian.

As quoted by Bülent Aksoy, Orhan Burian criticizes Ataç's translation of Choderlos De Laclos' *Les Liaisons Dangereuses* (*Tehlikeli Alakalar*) as follows:

In this translation, Nurullah Ataç uses Turkish in such an artistic manner that we feel as if we were reading a book about the eighteenth century Turkey instead of eighteenth century France. Here translation is not a means any more: the translator gives up transferring sentences, but tries to find a brand new expression for the author's feelings and thoughts in Turkish that would suit them. However, this is a dangerous task; the translator who leaves the atmosphere of the original may get caught in his personal atmosphere and feel dizzy [1995:75].

Thus, Orhan Burian makes it clear that a translator needs not to stray from the source text and its author. In response to this criticism Ataç says:

Isn't this what every translator wants? He shall take a work from some language, translate it into his own language, and restate it in his own words, his own syntax. This is what translation is all about [2000:118].

In descriptive translation studies terms, while Ataç talks about the requirements of one's own language, thus asking for a target orientation and an acceptable translation, Burian stresses the demands of the original, thereby opting for a source orientation and an adequate translation.

This preference of Burian may be illustrated by a short piece from his translation of William Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (*Macbeth*), which closely follows source language norms and reads like a translation:

Güvenlikte olmadıkça hükümdar olmak neye yarar. Banquo'dan korkumuzun kökleri derinde. Onun, yaratılıştan hükümdarca bir yanı var ki bu korku verici. Fazla korkusuz: O korkusuzluğunun yanında yiğitliğine

rehberlik eden bir de akı var, akılsızca bir iş yapmıyor. Varlığından korku duyduğum bir o var: yanında oldum mu zekâm siniveriyor sanki. Dediklerine göre Antonius da Caesar'ın yanında böyle olurmuş. Bana hükümdarlığı kondurdıkları zaman cadılara çıkıştı, kendisine de bir şey söylemelerini buyurdu. O zaman, geleceği görenler onu hükümdar soyuna ata olacak diye selamladılar [Shakespeare 1999:57].

Another translator who, like Orhan Burian, believed that a translator should not deviate from the source text/language/culture norms was Suut Kemal Yetkin who explains his attitude in translation in the following words:

There is no doubt that a translator who translates a work written in a foreign language into his own language should above all consider the requirements of his own tongue. However, it is only natural that he should mirror that work whose atmosphere he breathes together with its style; that is because as opposed to the general conviction, the atmosphere, the spirit of an artistic work emerges from not what it tells, but the relationship between, that is the union of, what it tells and the style of telling it. (...) A translator who imposes his own style on the work he is translating to his language and even translates works of various climates in the same style is the victim of either his lack of understanding or arrogance. A good translator of Balzac is the one who knows how to obliterate himself in Balzac, who feels himself as Balzac [qtd. in Aksoy 1995:82].

Thus, it is clear that there was no general consensus pertaining to the initial norm among the Translation Bureau translators. Some of the translators chose to adhere to the norms of the source text/language/culture in their translations, while others preferred to observe the target text/language/culture norms. This duality led to the production of both adequate and acceptable translations. As a result, acceptable translations functioned as a means of facilitating the favorable reception of translated texts, while adequate translations served to provide the Turkish language and literature with new forms, texts and models.

4.3.3 Operational Norms

As opposed to preliminary norms and the initial norm, which govern the translator decisions before the act of translating, operational norms are at work during the translation act itself. Like preliminary norms, operational norms are divided into two, as matricial norms and textual-linguistic norms. Of these, the former concerns whether the translation is made fully, how textual elements are distributed in the text and whether these elements are segmented or not,

whereas the latter involves choice of textual and linguistic materials in the target language in place of these materials in the source text.

As indicated in the limitations section in Chapter I, a proper discussion of operational norms entails a detailed analysis of the textual and linguistic materials in the translated texts, which is beyond the scope of this thesis both due to the vast number of texts translated and the variety of source languages from which texts were translated.

However, it needs to be noted that there are articles and studies focusing on the textual and linguistic aspects of translation Bureau translations. These generally include a comparison of the translations with their originals and with the translations of the same work in different periods.

One such article is Asım Bezirci's "*İlyada Çevirileri*" ("Translations of Illiad") (1999:494-502), where he compares eight translations of Homer's *Illiad* by different translators in different historical periods. One of these is Azra Erhat and A. Kadir's joint translation, which won two translation awards. Bezirci compares and contrasts the first sentence of all eight translations in terms of language, poetics and literalness, and finds Erhat and Kadir translation the most satisfying one in these respects.

Similarly, in an article concentrating on poetry translation ("*Çeviri ile Meviri Üzerine*") (1999:82-91), Cevdet Kudret discusses Turkish translations of Verlaine's, Goethe's, Valéry's, Lorca's and Shakespeare's poems in the light of their sentential elements and offers some suggestions about the organization of textual elements in poetry translation.

Another textual-linguistic study is Nasuhi Baydar's "*Tercüme ve Tenkidin Zorlukları*" ("Difficulties in Translating and Criticizing") published in *Translation (Tercüme)* journal in 1943 (366-373). In the concerned article, Baydar responds to a criticism of his translation of *Le Médecin de Campagne* (*Köy Hekimi*), and discusses the textual and lexical elements in his translation, comparing them with their counterparts in the source text. In this context, he refutes the critic's

accusations that the translator omitted some parts of the source text, while justifying his decisions at word and sentence level with reference to various sources like Şemsettin Sami's *French dictionary*, as well as *Littre* and *Dictionnaires National*.

The examples cited above demonstrate that translator decisions at the operational level may have many implications in the organization of textual and linguistic elements in the target text, which may be explained in further studies with a text-linguistic focus.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Turkish is the language of the Turkish nation. The Turkish language is the most beautiful and the wealthiest language in the world, as well as being the easiest. Therefore, every Turk loves his/her language and works to improve it. Besides, the Turkish language is a sacred treasure for the Turkish nation. That is because, in all precarious situations it experienced, the Turkish nation has seen that its ethics, traditions, memories, interests, in short everything that comprises its nationality at present, has been preserved through its language. The Turkish language is the heart of, the memory of the Turkish nation [Mustafa Kemal Atatürk qtd. in Turan 1998:18-19].

The foregoing words of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk demonstrate the importance he attached to Turkish language. This importance is closely associated with the uniting power of national language, which Mustafa Kemal was undoubtedly aware of as a foresighted leader. It is also the impetus behind the language reform, by which Arabic alphabet was replaced by Latin alphabet. Adoption of the Latin alphabet, along with many other political, social and cultural practices and institutions of the Western civilization, is one of the steps the Turkish nation took towards its ideal of being a respected part of the contemporary world.

The Translation Bureau was founded in 1940 in the First Publication Congress convened in Ankara under the auspices of the Minister of Education Hasan Âli Yücel with the aim of filling the gaps in the Turkish national library. The previous translation endeavors had not produced the outcomes expected: many of the literary masterpieces of the world were lacking on our bookshelves, and occasional translations were insufficient both quantitatively and qualitatively. Hence, the Translation Bureau was to take up the translation work in a systematic manner and a carefully planned process.

The establishment and activities of the Translation Bureau were in fact examples of a cultural planning movement. The Turkish nation had fought a war of independence, founded a secular and contemporary Republic on the remains of a religious and traditional empire, and effectuated many reforms in political, social, legal and educational arenas. The Translation Bureau was part of this transformation process. The translations published by the Bureau introduced

new repertoires and models to the Turkish people, increasing the number of options available to them. In the context of translation, these options concerned primarily culture and literature. Translations brought about energy and innovation to Turkish literature, which was enriched by not only translated works, but also the original works produced after them.

Being assigned the mission of enriching the target culture and literature, the works to be translated were carefully selected according to their universal value and in line with the overall objective of demonstrating the western line of thought, social order, individual life style to the Turkish society. Together with the selection of works to be translated, principles to be observed in the translation process were also decided. According to these, all the works were to be translated directly from their source languages, and not from second languages. The translators who would do these translations were individuals who had proven their competence in their respective fields. Furthermore, the translation process was strictly planned, so that each translation was checked several times before being assigned to a translator and after the translation was completed. All these details were evidence to the seriousness with which the Bureau took its mission.

The Translation Bureau is a prominent extension of the Turkish Revolution, and a tribute of the first Republican generation to its founder. It is the continuation of the cultural transformation that started with the language reform. Translation Bureau translations not only introduced a new, humanistic and civilized world view to the Turkish society, but also laid the foundations of a national literature. They provided the Turkish intellectuals, writers and critiques with new literary and artistic models. They may even be considered the starter of the process by which a Turkish novelist won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 2006.

In addition to its significance in the Turkish nation's cultural life and literature, the Translation Bureau also has a unique place in Turkish translation history. Besides being the most comprehensive and purposeful state-led translation movement in the Republican history, it paved the way for dealing with translation on a theoretical basis. *Translation (Tercüme)* journal, which was

published by the Bureau for 26 years, was not only a valuable source of information for general public, but also constituted the first forum where translators presented samples from their translations, discussed their own and fellow translators' translation decisions, exchanged their views and followed the flow of ideas about translation in different parts of the world.

It is no wonder that the Translation Bureau, its translators and translations are still studied and discussed in the light of recent theories of translation. The humanist spirit, free thought and bright hope in a better future that the Translation Bureau contributed to the Turkish nation are self-evident justifications of further research into this endeavor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADIVAR, Halide Edip. "Klasikler ve Tercüme." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:238-240.
- AKSOY, Berrin. "Translating as Rewriting: The Concept and Its Implications on the Emergence of A National Literature." *Translation Journal* (July 2001): 20 May 2007 <<http://accurapid.com/journal/17turkey.htm>>
- AKSOY, Bülent. "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Çeviri Anlayışları." M. RİFAT (Ed.), *Çeviri ve Çeviri Kuramı Üstüne Söylemler*, İstanbul: Düzlem, 1995:73-92.
- AKŞİN, Sina. "İdeolojik Bakımdan Atatürkçülük." S. AKŞİN (Ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*, İstanbul: Cem, 2005b:117-121.
- AKŞİN, Sina. "Hasan Âli Yücel." S. AKŞİN (Ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 5 Bugünkü Türkiye 1980-2003*, İstanbul: Cem, 2005c:261-262.
- AKŞİN, Sina. "Sabahattin Eyüboğlu." S. AKŞİN (Ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 5 Bugünkü Türkiye 1980-2003*, İstanbul: Cem, 2005c:266-269.
- ALTAY, Ayfer. "Osmanlılardan Günümüze Türkiye'de Çeviri Etkinliği." *Journal of Translation Studies*, 12, December 2002:1-12.
- ANAMUR, Hasan. "Hasan Âli Yücel ve Türkiye'de Çeviri." H. ANAMUR (Ed.), *Hasan Âli Yücel Anma Kitabı Çeviri: Ekinler ve Zamanlar Kavşağı*, İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, 1997:i-vii.
- ATAÇ, Nurullah. "Ben II." *Diyelim Söz Arasında*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık, 1998:15-19.
- ATAÇ, Nurullah. "Rübailer." *Diyelim Söz Arasında*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık, 1998:88-91.

- ATAÇ, Nurullah. "İkinci Yıla Girerken." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:369-371.
- ATAÇ, Nurullah. "Tercüme Dair." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:15-18.
- ATAÇ, Nurullah. "Tercüme Üzerine." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:26-30.
- ATAÇ, Nurullah. "Bir Tercüme Dolayısıyla." *Günlerin Getirdiği Sözden Söze*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık, 2000:116-119.
- AYTAÇ, Gürsel. *Genel Edebiyat Bilimi*, İstanbul: Say, 2003.
- BAYDAR, Nasuhi. "Tercüme ve Tenkidin Zorlukları." *Tercüme*, 17-19, 1943:366-373.
- BAYDUR, Suat Yakup. *Dil ve Kültür*, İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları, 1999.
- BERKES, Niyazi. *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, İstanbul: Doğu-Batı Yayınları, 1973.
- BEZİRCİ, Asım. "İlyada Çevirileri." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:494-502.
- BİRİNCİ, Necati. "Osmanlı Dönemi Türk Edebiyatı." *Milli Eğitim Dergisi* (2004): 18 April 2007 <<http://yayim.meb.gov.tr/dergiler/163/birinci.htm>>.
- BURİAN, Orhan. "Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Klasikleri Üzerine." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:250-254.
- BURİAN, Orhan. "Renaissance." E. GÜRAY (Ed.) *Denemeler Eleştiriler*, Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2004:56-57.
- BURİAN, Orhan. "Tercümeciliğimiz." E. GÜRAY (Ed.) *Denemeler Eleştiriler*, Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2004:207-211.

- BURİAN, Orhan. "Tercüme Mecmuası." E. GÜRAY (Ed.) *Denemeler Eleştiriler*, Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2004:213-218.
- CHESTERMAN, Andrew. *Memes of Translation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1997.
- "Classical Antiquity." Wikipedia. 3 May 2007 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_antiquity>
- DE LACLOS, Choderlos. *Tehlikeli İlişkiler* (1782) (Trans. Nurullah Ataç), İstanbul: Can, 2000.
- DELISLE, Jean and J. WOODSWORTH. *Translators through History*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1995.
- DEVİRİM, İzzet Melih. "Edebi Tercüme." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:12-14.
- DİNO, Güzin. "Sabahattin Eyüboğlu ve Türkiye'de Tercüme Hareketleri." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:294-302.
- EAGLETON, Terry. *Literary Theory An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- EDGÜ, Ferit. *Sözlü/Yazılı*, İstanbul: Dünya, 2003.
- ERGİN, Muharrem. *Üniversiteler için Türk Dili*, İstanbul: Bayrak, 1990.
- ERHAT, Azra. "Ortak Çeviri." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:58-62.
- ERHAT, Azra. "Azra Erhat'la Konuşma." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:115-119.
- EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. "Polysystem Theory." *Polysystem Studies Poetics Today International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and*

Communication Volume 11, Number 1. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, 1990:9-26.

EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. "The Position of Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *Polysystem Studies Poetics Today International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication* Volume 11, Number 1. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, 1990:45-51.

EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. "Culture Planning and The Market: Making and Maintaining Socio-Semiotic Entities." Paper delivered at the Dartmouth Colloquium, "The Making of Culture", Dartmouth College, 22-27 July 1994, <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/papers/plan_clt.html>.

EYÜBOĞLU, Sabahattin. *Köy Enstitüleri Üzerine*, İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık A.Ş., 1990.

GENTZLER, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*, London: Routledge, 1993.

GÖKBERK, Macit. *Felsefe Tarihi*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1999.

GÖKBERK, Macit. *Değişen Dünya Değişen Dil*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık, 2000.

GÖKTÜRK, Akşit. *Çeviri: Dillerin Dili*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık, 1994.

GÜNTEKİN, Reşat Nuri. "Türkçenin Eksikleri" Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:18-25.

GÜNYOL, Vedat. "Türkiye'de Çeviri." *Bilinç Yolunda*, İstanbul: Ada, 1985:31-44.

GÜNYOL, Vedat. "Büyük Hümanist: Erasmus." *Bilinç Yolunda*, İstanbul: Ada, 1985:92-99.

GÜNYOL, Vedat. "Çevirinin Getirdikleri." *Gölgeden Işığa*, İstanbul: Cem, 1988:92-93

- GÜNYOL, Vedat. "Orhan Burian." *Gölgeden Işığa*, İstanbul: Cem, 1988:133-136.
- GÜNYOL, Vedat. "Sabahattin Eyüboğlu." *Gölgeden Işığa*, İstanbul: Cem, 1988: 139-143.
- GÜRÇAĞLAR, Şehnaz Tahir. "The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey 1923-1960." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi. 2001.
- GÜRÇAĞLAR, Şehnaz Tahir. *Kapılar Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar*, İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık, 2005.
- GÜRSEL, Nedim. "Uygurlık ve Çeviri." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:77-81.
- GÜVENÇ, Bozkurt. *Kültürün abc'si*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.
- HALMAN, Talat Sait. "Burian Ufukları." E. GÜRAY (Ed.), *Denemeler, Eleştiriler*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2004:19-29.
- HAMILTON, Alastair. "Humanists and the Bible." J. KRAYE (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997:109-113.
- HOLMES, James. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." L. VENUTI (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000:172-185.
- JAKOBSON, Roman. "Problems in the Study of Language and Literature." (with Jurij Tynjanov) *Language in Literature*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987:47-49.
- KABACALI, Alpay. *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiye'de Matbaa Basın ve Yayın*, İstanbul: Literatür, 2000.

- KARANTAY, Suat. "Tercüme Bürosu Normlar ve İşlevler." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:338-344.
- KATOĞLU, Murat. "Köy Enstitüleri." S. AKŞİN (Ed.) *Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*, İstanbul: Cem, 2005b:428-430.
- KAYAOĞLU, Taceddin. *Türkiye'de Tercüme Müesseseleri*, İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1998.
- KELLY, Louis G. "Latin Tradition." M. BAKER (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, 2004:495-505.
- KONGAR, Emre. *21. Yüzyılda Türkiye*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1998.
- KUDRET, Cevdet. "Çeviri ile Meviri Üzerine." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:82-91.
- KURDAKUL, Şükran. *Düşün ve Edebiyatımızda Şairler ve Yazarlar Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Türk Klasikleri, 1983.
- MANN, Nicholas. "The Origins of Humanism." J. KRAYE (Ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997:1-19.
- NACİ, Fethi. *Yüzyılın Yüz Romanı*, İstanbul: Adam, 1999.
- NECATİGİL, Behçet. *Edebiyatımızda İsimler Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Varlık, 2004.
- ORAL, Haluk and M. Ş. ÖZSOY. "Tercüme Dergisi." *Erol Güney'in Ke(n)disi*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005:96-97.
- ORAL, Haluk and M. Ş. ÖZSOY. "Nurullah Ataç." *Erol Güney'in Ke(n)disi*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005:135-139.

- ÖTÜKEN, Adnan and National Library Bibliography Institute Members. *Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeleer Klasikler Bibliyografyası*. Ankara: National Library, 1967.
- ÖZKIRIMLI, Atilla. "Türk Yazın Tarihinde Akımlar", *Türk Dili Yazın Akımları Özel Sayısı*, Ankara: TDK, vol. XLI, no. 340-348, 1981:411-435.
- ÖZÖN, Mustafa Nihat. *Son Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1941.
- ÖZÖN, Mustafa Nihat. *Türkçede Roman*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, n.d.
- PAKER, Saliha. *Re(Shaping) of Literature and Culture*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 2002.
- PAKER, Saliha. "Turkish Tradition." M. BAKER (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, 2004:571-582.
- PIKE, Christopher. *The Futurists, the Formalists, and the Marxist Critique*, London: Ink Links Ltd., 1979.
- RİFAT, Mehmet. *XX. Yüzyılda Dilbilim ve Göstergebilim Kuramları 1 Tarihçe ve Eleştirel Düşünceler*, İstanbul: Om, 2000.
- ROBBERT, George S. *The World Of Europe: The Renaissance World*, Missouri: Forum Press, 1973.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. *Macbeth*, (1606) (Trans. Orhan Burian) İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı ve Yayıncılık A.Ş., 1999.
- SİNANOĞLU, Suat. *Türk Hümanizmi II*, İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık A.Ş., 1999.
- ŞENGÖR, A.M.C. *Hasan Âli Yücel ve Türk Aydınlanması*, Ankara: Tübitak Yayınları, 2003.

- TANPINAR, Ahmet Hamdi. *Ondokuzuncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1942.
- TANPINAR, Ahmet Hamdi. "Devlet Tesisleri ve Fikir Hayatı: İlk Tercümeleri İlk Eserler." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:211-216.
- TANPINAR, Ahmet Hamdi. *Edebiyat Dersleri*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002.
- TOPRAK, Zafer. "İktisat Tarihi." S. AKŞİN (Ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 3 Osmanlı Devleti 1600-1908*, İstanbul: Cem, 2005a:313-315
- TOURY, Gideon. "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies." T. HERMANS (Ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature*, Kent: Croom Helm, 1985:16-41.
- TOURY, Gideon. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." L. VENUTI (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000:198-210.
- TUNAYA, Tarık Zafer. *Batılılaşma Hareketleri I*, İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık A.Ş., 1999.
- TUNCEL, Bedrettin. "Tercüme Meselesi." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:3-6.
- TURAN, Şerafettin. *Atatürk ve Ulusal Dil*, İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık A.Ş., 1998.
- ULUĞBAY, Hikmet. "Açılış Konuşması." S. BOYBEYİ (Ed.), *100. Doğum Yıldönümünde Hasan Âli Yücel*, Ankara Atatürk Yüksek Kurumu Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 1998:1-7.
- ÜLKEN, Hilmi Ziya. *Uyanış Devirlerinde Tercümenin Rolü*, İstanbul: Vakıf, 1935.
- ÜLKEN, Hilmi Ziya. *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, İstanbul: Ülken, 2005.

YAZICI, Mine. *Çeviribilime Giriş*, İstanbul: Emek, 2001.

YAZICI, Mine. *Çeviri Etkinliği*, İstanbul: Multilingual, 2004.

YAZICI, Mine. *Çeviribilimin Temel Kavram ve Kuramları*, İstanbul: Multilingual, 2005.

YÜCEL, Can. "Hasan Âli Yücel." H. ANAMUR (Ed.), *Hasan Âli Yücel Anma Kitabı Çeviri: Ekinler ve Zamanlar Kavşağı*, İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, 1997:xv-xvii.

YÜCEL, Hasan Âli. "Önsöz." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:367-368

YÜCEL, Hasan Âli. "Tercüme." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:375.

YÜCEL, Hasan Âli. "Klasiklere Önsözler." Ö. YAĞCI (Ed.), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Edebiyat Çevirileri Seçkisi*, Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1999:241-242.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Number of works translated and published by the Translation Bureau by their sources

German classics	113
Supplements to German classics	1
Modern German literature	2
New German literature	5
German scientific works	1
American classics	5
New American literature	4
American scientific works	1
Austrian classics	1
Modern Austrian literature	2
Babel classics	1
Chinese classics	7
Danish classics	1
French classics	308
Supplements to French classics	14
Modern French literature	11
New French literature	2
French scientific works	6
Indian classics	3
British classics	80
Modern British literature	3
New British literature	4
British scientific works	6
Supplements to Iranian classics	2
Scandinavian classics	24
Spanish classics	2
Italian classics	29
Modern Italian literature	5
Latin classics	47
Classics in Latin	1
Latin American classics	1

Hungarian classics	20
New Hungarian literature	2
Hungarian scientific works	2
Dutch classics	3
Russian classics	88
Supplements to Russian classics	3
Russian scientific works	3
Eastern-Islamic classics	66
Texts in old Turkish	1
Supplements to Eastern-Islamic classics	1
Greek classics	94
Supplements to Greek classics	1
State Conservatory publications	1
Modern drama works	124
School classics	10
Works on art of drama	6

Source: *Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeleer Klasikler Bibliyografyası* (1967), by Adnan Ötüken and National Library Bibliography Institute Members, pp. viii-xi.

**Appendix 2: Number of works translated and published by the
Translation Bureau by their publication years**

Year	Number of volumes	First edition	Following editions
1940	10 (State Conservatory publications only)	10	-
1941	13	13	-
1942	27	27	-
1943	68	67	1
1944	97	97	-
1945	115	110	5
1946	152	143	9
1947	57	57	-
1948	46	46	-
1949	64	64	-
1950	42	42	-
1951	23	23	-
1952	31	31	-
1953	18	17	1
1954	26	24	2
1955	36	32	4
1956	24	21	3
1957	11	10	1
1958	36	14	22
1959	26	18	8
1960	25	9	16
1961	14	11	3
1962	45	18	27

1963	59	25	34
1964	63	17	46
1965	75	17	58
1966	44	10	34
Total	1247		

Source: *Dünya Edebiyatından Tercüme Klasikler Bibliyografyası* (1967), by Adnan Ötügen and National Library Bibliography Institute Members, p. vi.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Information

Name and Surname : Semra Kunt Akbaş
Place and Date of Birth : Ankara, July 3, 1972

Educational Status

B.A. : Hacettepe University Faculty of Letters,
Department of Translation and Interpretation, 1994

Professional Experience

Workplaces : 1992-1994 Popüler Bilim (periodical/science),
translator.

1994-1996 Bilkent University, Faculty of Letters,
English Unit, instructor.

1996-now Bilkent University, School of English
Language, English and Translation Studies
Department, instructor

1994-1996 **Alkim Yayınevi**, translator.

Translated Books:

*Public Speaking, by Dale Carnegie, April 1994.

*Stop Worrying Start Living, by Dale Carnegie, May
1995.

*Essays, by Michel de Montaigne, August 1995.

*The Prince, by Niccolo Machiavelli, August 1996.

1996-now **Hekimler Yayın Birliği**, translator.

*The Wish for Power and the Fear of Having It, by Althea Horner, June 1997.

*I'd Rather Be Married, by Al Crowell, July 1997.

*Stop Blaming Start Loving, by Bill O'Hanlon and Pat Hudson, September 1997.

*Be Yourself, by Timothy Pole, November 1997.

*Peter Pan Syndrome, by Dan Kiley, December 1997.

*Women and Self-esteem, by Linda Tschirhart and Mary Ellen Donovan, November 1998.

*Achilles Syndrome, by Petruska Clarkson, November 1998.

*Chicken Soup for The Working Soul, by Jack Canfield, Mark Victor Hansen, Maida Rogerson, Martin Rutte and Tim Clauss, December 1998.

*If Only I'd Listen to Myself by Jacques Salomé and Sylvie Galland, January 1999.

*Being Happy, by Andrew Matthews, March 1999.

*Making Friends, by Andrew Matthews, March 1999.

*Alaaddin Factor by Jack Canfield and Mark Victor Hansen, July 1999.

*Dare to Win, by Jack Canfield and Mark Victor Hansen, July 1999.

*Follow Your Heart by Andrew Matthews, August 1999.

*Heart at Work, by Jack Canfield and Jacqueline Miller, November 1999.

*A Third Serving of Chicken Soup for the Soul, by Jack Canfield, Mark Victor Hansen, May 2000.

*The 10 Smartest Decisions a Woman can Make Before 40, by Tina B. Tessina, Ph.D., August 2000.

*Chicken Soup for the Cat and Dog Lovers' Soul, by Jack Canfield, Mark Victor Hansen, Marty Becker, Carol Kline, January 2001.

*Chicken Soup for the Fathers' Soul, by Jack Canfield, Mark Victor Hansen, Jeff Aubery, Mark Donnelly, and Chrissy Donnelly, 2002.

*Human Moments, by Edward M. Hallowell, 2003.

*A Taste-Berry Teen's Guide to Managing the Stress and Pressures of Life, by Bettie B. Youngs and Jennifer Leigh Youngs, 2004.

*Make It A Winning Life Success Strategies for Life, Love and Business, by Wolf J. Rinke, 2005.

*Flow, by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, 2005.

*A Guide to Rational Living, by Albert Ellis and Robert A. Harper, 2005.

*The Power of Focus, by Jack Canfield, Les Hewitt, and Mark Victor Hansen, 2006.

*Without Conscience, by Robert D. Hare, 2006.

*Authentic Happiness, by Martin E.P. Seligman, 2006.

*How to Make Yourself Happy and Remarkably Less Disturbable, by Albert Ellis, 2007.

*Learned Optimism, by Martin E.P. Seligman, 2007.

June 2000-now Psychology Today
(periodical/psychology) (Turkish editions), translator.

29-30 November 1996, Bilkent University First
Tourism Forum, **conference interpreter**.

6-7 December 1997, Bilkent University Second
Tourism Forum, **conference interpreter**.

5 February 1999, Türk Eczacıları Birliği, Bioavailability Conference, **conference interpreter**.

1997 December Son Duvar (periodical/literature), translator.

* “Notes on an Unfinished Novel” by John Fowles.

* “Postmodernism 1” by Patricia Waugh.

* “Postmodernism 2” by Patricia Waugh.

1999 February –2001 **Ayrıntı Yayınevi**, translator.

Translated Books:

*Salomé Her Life and Work, by Angela Livingstone, January 2001.

*Mother, Madonna, Whore, by Estella V. Welldon (with Can Kurultay), October 2001.

*The Ethical School, by Felicity Haynes, 2002

*Celebrity, by Chris Rojek, 2003

2004-2005 **Arkadaş Yayınevi**, translator.

Translated Books:

*The Human Body Atlas, by Global Book Publishing, 2006.

2004-2005 **Tohum Otizm Vakfı**, translator.

Translated Books:

*The Autistic Spectrum, by Lorna Wing, 2005.

Contact Information

E-mail address : kunt@bilkent.edu.tr

Date : 7 June 2007