

T.C.
DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MÜTERCİM-TERCÜMANLIK ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZCE MÜTERCİM TERCÜMANLIK PROGRAMI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

145255

145255

**AN ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC
TRANSFER IN THE TRANSLATION OF
“DAĞIN ÖTEKİ YÜZÜ”**

Deniz BAŞKAYA

Danışman
Prof. Dr. Azize ÖZGÜVEN

2004

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans Tezi Projesi olarak sunduğum “An Analysis of Cultural and Linguistic Transfer in the Translation of “Dağın Öteki Yüzü” ” adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin bibliyografyada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

Tarih

02.07.2004

Deniz BAŞKAYA

İmza



TUTANAK

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü' nün 7/7/04 tarih ve 13 sayılı toplantısında oluşturulan jüri, Lisansüstü Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 18 maddesine göre İngilizce Mütercim-Tercümanlık Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Deniz BAŞKAYA' nın " An Analysis of Cultural and Linguistic Transfer in the Translation of "Dağın Öteki Yüzü" " konulu tezi incelenmiş ve aday 3/9/04 tarihinde, saat 14. da jüri önünde tez savunmasına alınmıştır.

Adayın kişisel çalışmaya dayanan tezini/projesini savunmasından sonra 60 dakikalık süre içinde gerek tez konusu, gerekse tezin dayanağı olan anabilim dallarından jüri üyelerine sorulan sorulara verdiği cevaplar değerlendirilerek tezin/projenin BAŞARILI olduğuna oy birliği ile karar verildi.

BAŞKAN



ÜYE

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nilson GÖKŞEN



ÜYE

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fikri ÖZBAŞ



YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURULU DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ

TEZ/PROJE VERİ FORMU

Tez/Proje No: Konu Kodu: Üniv. Kodu

- Not: Bu bölüm merkezimiz tarafından doldurulacaktır.

Tez/Proje Yazarının
Soyadı:BAŞKAYA

Adı: Deniz

Tezin/Projenin Türkçe Adı: “Dağın Öteki Yüzü” Romanının Çevirisindeki Kültürel ve Dilsel Aktarım Üzerine Bir Çözümleme

Tezin/Projenin Yabancı Dildeki Adı: An Analysis of Cultural and Linguistic Transfer in the Translation of “Dağın Öteki Yüzü”

Tezin/Projenin Yapıldığı
Üniversitesi:Dokuz Eylül
Diğer Kuruluşlar:

Enstitü:Sosyal Bilimler

Yıl:2004

Tezin/Projenin Türü:

Yüksek Lisans:

Dili:İngilizce

Doktora:

Sayfa Sayısı:96

Tıpta Uzmanlık:

Referans Sayısı:50

Sanatta Yeterlilik:

Tez/Proje Danışmanlarının

Ünvanı: Prof.Dr.

Adı: Azize

Soyadı: ÖZGÜVEN

Ünvanı:

Adı.

Soyadı

Türkçe Anahtar Kelimeler:

- 1- Karşılaştırmalı Çözümleme
- 2- Kültürel ve Dilsel Aktarım
- 3- Erek Odaklı Çeviri
- 4- Kültüre Özgü Unsurlar
- 5- Bağlam

İngilizce Anahtar Kelimeler:

- 1- Comparative Analysis
- 2- Cultural and Linguistic Transfer
- 3- Target-Oriented Translation
- 4- Culture-Specific Items
- 5- Context

Tarih:

İmza:

Tezimin Erişim Sayfasında Yayınlanmasını İstiyorum

Evet

Hayır

ÖZET

1996 yılında Orhan Kemal Roman Ödülü'nü kazanan Erendiz Atasü'nün Dağın Öteki Yüzü adlı romanı The British Council'in talebi üzerine 2000 yılında İngilizce'ye tercüme edilmiştir. Romanın Türk tarihi ve kültürünü İngiliz edebiyat repertuarında temsil eder konumda oluşu çevirisindeki kültürel aktarımı daha da önemli kılmaktadır. Bu araştırmanın amacı çeviri sürecinde yiten kültürel ve dilsel ayrıntıları belirlemek ve bu kaybın gerisindeki etkenlere işaret etmektir.

Araştırmanın ilk bölümünde kültür ve çeviri arasındaki ilişkiye değinilmekte, ikinci bölümde eşdeğerlik konusu ele alınmaktadır. Kültür, dil ve çeviri arasındaki etkileşime değinilen üçüncü bölümün ardından çevirinin karşılaştırmalı çözümlemesinde kullanılacak kavramlar tanıtılmaktadır. Araştırmanın beşinci bölümündeki karşılaştırmalı çözümlemenin ardından son bölümde romanın çevirmenleri üzerinde etki ettiği varsayılan dış etkenler kültürler arası bir bakış açısından incelenmektedir.

Bir kez daha vurgulamak gerektiği gibi bu araştırmanın hedefi romanın çevirisinin niteliğini ölçmek değil, erek metindeki dilsel ve kültürel eksikliklere dikkat çekmektir.

ABSTRACT

Erendiz Atasü's novel Dağın Öteki Yüzü (the winner of The Orhan Kemal Novel Prize in 1996) was translated into English upon the request of The British Council in the year 2000. As a representative of Turkish history and culture in the English literary repertoire, the cultural transfer in the translation of the novel becomes more important. This study aims to determine the cultural and linguistic items of the source text which disappear through the translation process and to point out the factors behind this loss.

In the first part of the study, the interdependencies between culture and translation are introduced. After referring to the question of 'equivalence' in translation, the interactions between culture, language and translation are examined in the third part. In the fourth part, the key concepts that are used in the comparative analysis of the source and target texts are introduced. Following the comparative analysis, the external factors which are supposed to affect the translational strategies of Maslen and Atasü are examined in an intercultural perspective in the final part of the study.

It should be stressed once again that the aim of this study is not to evaluate the quality of the translation but to indicate the linguistic and cultural deficiencies in the target text.

AN ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC TRANSFER IN THE TRANSLATION OF “DAĞIN ÖTEKİ YÜZÜ”

YEMİN METNİ.....	II
TUTANAK	III
Y.Ö.K. DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ TEZ VERİ FORMU	IV
ÖZET.....	V
ABSTRACT.....	VI
OUTLINE	VII
ABBREVIATIONS.....	IX
INTRODUCTION.....	X
I. CULTURE AND TRANSLATION	1
A. Culture: The Concept.....	1
B. Translation and Culture.....	3
II. A QUESTION OF EQUIVALENCE	6
A. Equivalence: The Concept	6
B. Cultural Equivalence in Literary Translation	8
III. CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION: “THREE PARALLEL DIMENSIONS”	13
IV. BEYOND THE MEANING OF WORDS: CULTURE, CONTEXT AND LEXICAL CHOICE.....	16
• Introduction: Cultural Context: “The Colour of Words”	16
A. Register	18
B. Markedness	20
C. Translator’s Disposition and Word Choice.....	25

V. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC TRANSFER	30
• Introduction	30
A. The Treatment of “Ottoman Turkish” Words	31
B. The Treatment of Culture Specific Items	46
C. Final Remarks on ‘The Transfer of Culture’ in The Translation	65
VI. TRANSLATION POLICY IN THE OTHER SIDE OF THE MOUNTAIN	70
• The role of <i>Skopos</i> in <u>The Other Side of The Mountain</u>	79
Conclusion.....	85
Bibliography	89

ABBREVIATIONS

ST: Source text

TT: Target text



INTRODUCTION

As a novel translated into English upon the appeal of The British Council, Erendiz Atasü's Dağın Öteki Yüzü must be considered as one of the milestones in Turkish literature that serves as a bridge between the Turkish and the English cultures. Portraying the history of Turkey and the political developments throughout the world from the final years of the Ottoman Empire to the recent 1990s, the book presents priceless offerings about a foreign culture to the British readers and the readers of English in many other countries around the world. As stated on the back cover of the translation of the book by Moris Farhi, "Literature ascends to great heights when a novelist portrays the spirit and the history of a nation with such unforgettable characters that the reader feels a native of that country." This quotation can easily give the impression that the translation, which is a co-product of Elizabeth Maslen and the authoress herself, achieved the task of reflecting the cultural environment of the Turkish nation to the English reader. But to what degree can the translation reflect its original? This is the question that is to be asked by any translation critic who inspects the loss in the translation of an original literary text. The aim of this study is not to reach rigid conclusions about the way that the translation of the book should have been, but to reach some conclusions about which aspects pertaining to the source culture and language are lost (or sacrificed) throughout the translation process in favour of "compensating" for some other aspect.

An overall analysis of the book may easily arouse the thought that the translation is coherent with its language but compared to the source text some deviations, nuances and shortcuts seem to be adopted by the translators. The main problems in the translation appear in the translation of the Ottoman Turkish words and the superficial approach of the translators to some culture specific items in the source text. It may be perceived by attentive readers that throughout the translation, fluency of reading and intelligibility appear as a dominant characteristic. Undoubtedly, to ensure the realization of fluency and intelligibility some aspects peculiar to the source language and culture are compensated. This is the result of the target-oriented strategies of the translators. However, this target-oriented approach of

the translators should not be condemned because of the several factors that are effective in the *skopos* of a translation. These factors are mainly economic, social and cultural. As the aim of this study is to shed light on the loss that took place through the translational process, we should firstly introduce the interdependencies between culture, language and translation and then analyse the text. Equivalence is taken as the basic criterion in comparative analysis along with many other translational means of comparison. After carrying out the comparative analysis, the dominant motives behind the translators' choices, which constitute the translation policy, are examined. This examination under the title "The Translational Policy in The Other Side of the Mountain" focuses mainly on the intercultural aspect of translation policy as well as the social and economic ones. Just as translating strategies are affected by the present conditions that surround the translator, translation critiques are valid in a given period and in the given conditions of this period. We should stress once again that the aim of this study is not to assess the quality of the translation but to point out to the cultural and linguistic deviations in the target text.

I. CULTURE AND TRANSLATION

A. Culture: The Concept

If a definition of culture is to be made apart from the linguistic and translational aspect, culture may be defined as the “norms” shared by a certain community.

Culture is a concept that is broad – it includes aspects of everyday life to cognitive and social structures - and complex. For this reason it is linked to the concept of socialization. In this broad sense, culture then refers to communities, which have different attitudes towards political and social issues, different cultural practices and references in their private, lives, different social background, etc. (Huber: 241).

What are the connotations of the word “kültür” in our country? In his book Sözün Ötesi Akşit Göktürk deals with the concept of culture and the word’s historical development under the title: “What is the concept of culture? And what it is not.” Göktürk points out that the concept of culture is one of the concepts that could not slip out of ambiguity in Turkish. As he states its semantic evolution English, French and German also followed many long and winding paths until today. In the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries its use in the field of philosophy pointed to “cultivating the minds and the thoughts” and in this era the word was closely associated with the education, politeness and the good manners of a person. The meaning of the word had acquired a new dimension by the 18th century, as “civilization” becomes a frequently used concept. Thanks to the historians and the philosophers of “the age of enlightenment”, *culture* became “a concept that determines the processes and the stages in the development of the human kind and in this age people begin to talk about “national or traditional culture(s)”. This new

perspective led to the word's contemporary meaning: "The intellectual, spiritual and aesthetical development" (dating back to the 18th century) and the way of living distinctive to a nation, society or historical period (as an heritage from the 19th century) (Göktürk: 182-183).

However, restraining the definition of culture only with "the way of living shared by certain communities" may not be enough. It should not be forgotten that, today there are languages on earth on the edge of extinction and spoken only by small groups of people (such as the language of Kayan Murik in Malaysia which is spoken today by a hundred families) Even this fact proves that culture is an abstract concept that is materialized through the practice of communities. Ward W. Goodenough, an American ethnologist defines the concept as follows:

As I see it, a society's culture consists of whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members, and do so in any role that they accept for any of themselves. Culture, being what people have to learn as distinct from their biological heritage, must consist of the end product of learning: knowledge, in most general, if relative, sense of the term. By this definition, we should note that culture is not a material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behaviour or emotions. It is rather an organization of things. It is the form of things that people have in mind, their models of perceiving, relating and otherwise interpreting them. As such, the things people say and do, their social arrangements and events are products or by-products of their culture; these things and events are also signs signifying the cultural forms or models of which they are material representations (cited in Snell-Hornby, 1988: 39-40).

B. Translation and Culture

“Translation is not a matter of words only: it is a matter of making intelligible a whole culture” (Burgess, 1984:4).

As Susan Bassnett sees it, a literary product can never be isolated from the socio-cultural environment in which it is produced: “A writer does not just write in a vacuum: he or she is the product of a particular culture, of a particular moment in time...” (Bassnett: 136). This inevitable relationship between the text-producers and the culture in which they are enmeshed is reflected in the work that is produced and the socio-cultural peculiarities in the literary work bring many challenges to the translator. These challenges may emerge from many aspects peculiar to the source text, such as language-specific idioms, culture-specific customs, differences in dialect, historical background, etc. The translator’s aim should be to focus on the substitution of these “culture-specific constructions” with the nearest equivalents by pushing the limits of the target language when necessary. This process of substitution (and compensation) is by no means stationary: “Translation is the **performative** nature of cultural communication. It is language **in actu** rather than language **in situ**.” (Bassnett: 137). As the translator is both a communicator and “performer” between two given languages, this specific position of him/her brings forth the necessity to be *bicultural*,

If language is an integral part of culture, the translator needs not only proficiency in two languages; he must also be at home in two cultures. In other words, he must be bilingual and bicultural. The extent of his knowledge, proficiency and perception determines not only his ability to produce the target text, but also his understanding of the source text (Snell-Hornby, 1988: 42).

Moreover, the result of the translation process itself may also be perceived as a “bi-product” because of its *bilateral*, *bilingual* and *bicultural* nature. It is Brian Harris who first introduced the concept of *bi-text* (a bi-text is not two texts but a single text in *two dimensions*, each of which is a language or, better still a construct of two or more related texts-italics added-) to the world of translation studies. Harris states, “Although they share the same author and content, a source text and its translation (which are usually viewed as semi-independent lives) are different in their readerships.” (Toury, 1995: 96). Undoubtedly, this difference originates from the differences in the cultural background as well as the idiosyncratic peculiarities of the translator him/herself. And so far as the society, culture and the environment that surrounds him inevitably shape the translator’s attitude and responses, the translator may choose a path that leads him to ignore objectivity and chose a subjective attitude under the influence of these factors. The translator is entrusted for transferring the messages of the source text, which is an entity that belongs to a different language and culture. As far as the culture is concerned, translation appears to be a process of “recreation”. As Mary Snell-Hornby puts it forward:

The text cannot be considered as a static specimen of language (an idea still dominant in practical translation classes), but essentially as the verbalized expression of an author’s intention as understood by the translator as reader, who then recreates this whole for another readership in another culture. This dynamic process explains why... the perfect translation does not exist (Snell-Hornby, 1988: 2).

The translator, as “the mediator” reshapes the source text codes in accordance with the codes of the target language and culture. These “transformed” codes are arranged according to the expectations and the dominant norms of the new community, the target audience:

This is why there will never be a common translation code for all cultures. What we can achieve, though, is agreement

on a general theory of translation which allows for specific variations when applied to particular cultures, taking into account the culture-specific conventions of translation and the expectations the members of a particular culture have of a translated text (Nord, 1991: 92).



II. A QUESTION OF EQUIVALENCE

A. Equivalence: The Concept

Today, the concept of “equivalence” is still a concept that linguists and translators intensely debate on the definition. Some definitions of the concept in the 60’s viewed it simply as “replacing the source language units with the closest textual material in the target language”. According to Catford:

The central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL translation equivalents. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translational equivalence (Snell-Hornby, 1988: 15).

Similarly, Nida and Taber wrote:

Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style (Nida, 1969: 12).

As the debates of equivalence reached their climax in the 70’s, (Koller’s five equivalence types appeared in 1979-denotative, connotative, text normative, pragmatic and formal equivalence), through the contributions of linguists, scholars and translators the term developed further and further. Beaugrande defined equivalence as a “representation of the original in the communicative act” whereas in 1981, Stephen Ross proposed to replace the term ‘equivalence’ with ‘similarity’ (according to Mary Snell Hornby it is even a vaguer term than ‘equivalence’). Snell-Hornby states that the German term ‘Äquivalenz’ is a static, narrow, and one-dimensional scientific constant whereas the English term ‘equivalence’ is ‘approximative, vague and insignificant’ (Hornby, 1988: 21).

Like Snell-Hornby, Andrew Chesterman touches on the “vagueness” of the term and states that “equivalence is a red herring, virtually unattainable and hence not a useful concept in translation theory”. According to Chesterman, “the only true examples of equivalence are those in which a ST item X is invariably translated into a given TL as Y, and vice versa” (Chesterman: 9). In Chesterman’s view, absolute equivalence can only be attained in the translation of “words denoting numbers, certain technical terms and simple isolated syntactic structures (e.g. in dem wasser, in the water) (ibid. 10). It is simply the crucial point in the notion of the equivalence. As absolute equivalence can only be attained between two different languages and cultures in a restricted domain, so the question to be asked in evaluating equivalence in a literary text should be: “To what extent the “sameness” of the effect (the “sameness” of image or conceptualisation-both stylistically and semantically-) in the source text could be recreated in the target text?” Nida defines this process as “creating an equivalent response in the target text”.

The role of the translator is to facilitate the transfer of message, meaning and cultural elements from one language into another and create an equivalent response from the receivers. The message in the source language is embedded a cultural context and has to be transferred to the target language (Nida 1964: 13).

In order to attain “the equivalent response” in the target language, the translator, naturally may deviate from the original for the “arbitrariness” of the sign may result in formal or stylistical shifts from the original. The sameness of effect may be reached by restructuring the “function” of the original in the target language. At this point, it may be claimed that the attempt of the translator to achieve this kind of equivalence between the two texts is an indicator of his/her faithfulness to the original. As Lefevere and Bassnet state it,

‘Faithfulness’ then, does not enter into translation in the guise of ‘equivalence’ between words or texts but if all in the guise

of any attempt to make the target text function in the target culture the way the source text functioned in the source culture. Translations are therefore not 'faithful' on the levels they have traditionally been required to be- 'to achieve functional equivalence' a translator may have to substantially adapt the source text (Lefevere and Bassnett:8).

This study aims to reveal to what degree the translators of Dağın Öteki Yüzü remained faithful to the source text culturally and linguistically in transferring the function of the source text items and its recreation in the target text. Evidently, the literary translation is a unique domain where faithfulness is a much more delicate process compared to all the other text genres. So, at this point it should be convenient to consider the locus of cultural equivalence in translation, as culture constitutes the main concern of this study.

B. Cultural Equivalence in Literary Translation

As the mere substitution of the ST items with their closest equivalents in the TL is not sufficient to ensure *equivalence* in a translation, the translated items should be analysed in "multi-dimensional layers". It can be claimed that the whole complex of these multiple layers form the "basis" of the source text that is not directly perceived but is known to exist theoretically just like the meridians that divide the world into many slices. The surface structure (that is formed of the grammatical units-from the simplest to the most complex-) is shaped in accordance with cultural norms.

As Mary Snell-Hornby states it,

The text for the translator is not purely a linguistic phenomenon, but must also be seen in terms of its communicative function, as a unit embedded in a given situation, and as part of a broader socio-cultural background (Snell-Hornby, 1988: 69).

The most crucial point that should not be overlooked is that the whole (text) is greater than its parts (grammatical and lexical units). The text is not simply constituted of words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs chained together but it is *a complex, a multi-dimensional structure* (ibid. 69). Surely, the *source culture* that labels the source text in many aspects is the major element for this multi-dimensionality, but a second factor-what Snell-Hornby names as “the given situation” should also be included. The text (the literary one as is our concern in this study) is a product of a given period and place (labelled by genuine socio-cultural *norms*), or may depict a given period and place in the past -or in the future as well as in the futuristic stories and novels- regardless of the time and space where the author is actually present. To illustrate, Orhan Pamuk’s novel, My Name is Red (Benim Adım Kırmızı) is based on a story that takes place in the 16th century Ottoman Empire. This information shapes the multi-dimensional structure of the novel. The characters in the novel should act according to the customs of the specified period and speak and write according to the *norms* of that period in the Turkish history. These points, if not taken in consideration, may result in severe criticism of the author. Beyond a doubt, ignoring at least some of these *deictic* aspects is possible for the author. Instead of using antiquarian or archaic words to betray the authentic ambience of the past, the author may tend to use contemporary and common words not to complicate the readership with the abundance of old words, which are not familiar to the majority of his/her readers. Atasü also stresses this fact: “In all the passages that took place in the past I consciously formed a mixed language. Using entirely the words used in that period (the early Republic years) had the risk of making the text unintelligible (Atasü, 1997: 20-21 writer’s translation). “Refining” the language in such a manner is dependent on the choice of the author, but if a member of the royal family from the 15th century England speaks with colloquial 20th century English, this would surely seem weird to any conscious reader. This is also valid for translation. Moreover, the intentions of the author in writing his novel are also important, the author may deliberately make some adjustments and sometimes in the field of his/her work’s translatability, especially when the literary piece is translated into a (relatively) more prestigious language. As Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar states it,

It is enough to think of writers who write in non-Western or 'minor' languages and whose international fame is largely due to translation. For instance, the Turkish novelist Orhan Pamuk, all of whose novels have been translated into major Western languages, may consciously or unconsciously, bear the translatability of his words in mind during the writing process of his new novels (Gürçağlar : 46-47).

Many texts from different cultures and from different ages of history (or those contemporary ones dealing with the past) require specific treatments in translation. The transfer of such texts needs a special touch that is able to preserve and maintain the multi-dimensional features that constitute the whole text in its unique and authentic form:

Literary texts especially those embedded in a culture of the distant past, tend to be less easily translatable than those texts dealing with the "universals" of modern science (Snell-Hornby: 41).

As a novel that "traces the lives of three generations of a Turkish family", that is from the final years of the Ottoman Empire to the recent 1990's, The Other Side of the Mountain involves many culture-specific elements, which demonstrate the rapid and fundamental changes experienced by the Turkish society. With the foundation of the republic, the people of a newborn country began adapting themselves to the western life-style to fill the gap caused by the reactionary inner politics of The Ottoman Empire that had hindered the development of the country for centuries. Motivated by the enthusiasm of the revolution, the Turkish people changed not only their apparel but also their world-view, their outlook. But the most impressive change that characterized the revolution was probably the change in "the language". The young republic assimilated the Latin alphabet and sensed quickly the advantage of reading Turkish easily compared to the burden of using Arabic letters. Heading towards the west that leads contemporary science, Turkish began to be freed from the

overwhelming influence of the Arabic and Persian languages, and a more “purified language” arose. Dağın Öteki Yüzü (the ST) reflects these dynamics successfully but does The Other Side of the Mountain (the TT) achieve to reflect the mutual and synchronic mobility of “culture and language” in the source text and acquire equivalence in that dimension”? Are the changes in the language, which is the consequence of cultural changes in the Turkish society reflected successfully in the translation? Is the parallelism between culture and language preserved in the target text? The language shift reflects the linguistic dynamism in the Turkish society, and the variations in the language throughout the book should be reflected in the TT in order to assure equivalence in the translation.

In texts, which reflect the past events with a historiographic realism, dynamism and equivalence appear to be in contradiction to each other. If equivalence is aimed between the ST and the TT, the language that is “marked” by antiquarism (Archaism is not used as it should refer to the language that should correspond to the translation of Homer, Aristotle or texts from medieval English) should hamper readership and reduce intelligibility. The dynamism and the fluency in translation necessitate the domestication of the ST, and this results in the loss of the linguistic effect of the ST.

In Dağın Öteki Yüzü, the Arabic and Persian oriented words must also be considered as “culture specific items” as they signify a “cultural change” through language. So, it may be claimed that the historicity of words in a text constitutes a problem of both formal and semantic equivalence. The “receiver-based” task of the translator may often lead him/her to sacrifice “value” as a linguistic feature pertaining to the source language and culture. The situation in Dağın Öteki Yüzü may well be defined as a problem of equivalence based on “the use of loan words in the source text”. Mona Baker gives the example of the use of words such as “au fait, chic and alfresco” in English for the use of such words and stress that, as used in the text, this kind of loan words are used for their prestige value, “because they can add an air of sophistication to the text or its subject matter”. On the other hand she goes on stating that “This is often lost in translation because it is not always possible to

find a loan word with the same meaning in the target language” (Baker: 25). The situation is not so different in Turkish for the Arabian-Persian words are often used today to add the same kind of flavour to speech. One main difference is that in the text their “value of prestige” goes hand in hand with their value of historicity (or antiquity), and the latter may be considered as more remarkable than the preceding one in their transfer to English. On the other hand, there is another striking difference that the hybridisation of these loan words with Turkish constituted a language called Ottoman Turkish.

According to Anthony Pym, Ottoman culture is an *interculture*. As Saliha Paker sees it, Pym uses the concept of *interculture* “to refer to beliefs and practices found in intersections or overlaps of cultures, where people combine something of two or more cultures at once” (Paker: 137). This definition perfectly suits the Ottoman culture as it is a combination of three cultures (Persian, Arabic and Turkish). The result of this intersection formed a language that effected Turkish for a long time, even after the foundation of the republic, and the remains of Ottoman Turkish are realistically reflected in Dağın Öteki Yüzü. Naturally, the translator cannot find a particular lexicon in the history of English language and culture which can be able to reflect the intercultural aspect of Ottoman Turkish, but what s/he can do should be transferring these words with their contextual features (which will be touched on later) and produce a similar effect in the target language.

Consequently, it may be assumed that the translator is at a turning point when culture specific items are to be transferred. To translate the text in an intelligible manner, which suits the policy of “domesticating the text” or “stressing the cultural differences” via “foreignizing” the reader. The choice of the translator determines the extent of his/her faithfulness to the source text/culture and of the extent of *equivalence* between the source text and its translation.

III. CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION: “THREE PARALLEL DIMENSIONS”

Culler states that languages are not “nomenclatures for a set of universal concepts”. He adds that if they were so, then replacing the “concepts” of the source language with those in another language would make translation and even learning a new language too easy. He then points out to the fact that it is the “concepts” that differ from one language to another. As he states it, “Each language articulates or organizes the world differently. Languages do not simply name existing categories, they articulate their own” (Baker: 10). This different “articulation” of concepts originates from the cultural differences of language communities and the different interpretations of the surrounding concepts.

The various conditions that shape the cultural characteristics of communities determine their way of organizing concepts; as a result the “model of reality” differs from one culture to another:

Language is not itself a model of reality; it is rather a signifier of a model of reality which any individual carries in his/her mind. Since every individual is a member in a given speech community, it follows that the model of reality differs according to the cultural conditions in the individual communities (McCarthy and Carter: viii).

So, as “reality” differs from one cultural community to another, how can translation be possible? According to anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, “language is not psychologically self-contained (not a closed system) and it “culture-dependent” and “situation-dependent”. He stresses the importance of “context” in the comprehension of a language’s mechanics and how the “meaning” is produced in that particular language (Birch: 131).

The nature of language may simply be defined as “organic”. Wilhelm von Humboldt who stressed the connection between language and culture for the first time. He stated that language was “dynamic” in nature; it was an activity (*energia*) rather than a static inventory of items as the product of activity. As Hornby sees it “a text’s translatability seems to depend on the extent to which it is embedded in its own specific culture, also with the distance that separates the cultural background of source text and target audience in terms of time and place (Snell-Hornby, 1988: 40-41). It can be said that the “deictic elements” are major factors that determine a text’s translatability. A simple phrase that is completely culture specific (in a certain period in the progress of culture) or a saying that means so much in the past may sound “foreignizing” to contemporary readers. Toury deals with this “cultural factor” under the term “variability” and stresses that anything that is “translational” should “fix the boundaries of an *object* which is characterized by its **variability**: *difference* across cultures, *variation* within a culture and change over time (Toury, 1995: 31). Amid these three branches of *variability*, “the variation within a culture” and “change over time” signify the dynamic nature of language in parallelism with changes in culture. Even two readers from two different generations do not read the same text in the same way. Harold Schiffmann explains the never-ending evolution of language as follows:

Language itself is a cultural construct; it is not inherited genetically from one’s parents. But neither is it reconstituted and reconstructed by every speaker anew in every generation. Language is transmitted to each generation with little change; language acquisition proceeds in much the same pattern in all societies we know of. And much of culture (if we still accept the notion that there is such a thing) is transmitted through language (cited in Birch: 9).

As culture gets reshaped just like water that transforms according to its surroundings, language mutates and new codes replace the preceding ones. To illustrate, the language register peculiar to the younger generation which includes

many computer terms (such as download, hack, upgrade, artificial intelligence, virtual reality etc...) may look alienating to the members of preceding generations while “the language” used by their elders may sometimes sound incomprehensible to the younger ones. In our country the vast majority of the young population does not use Arabic or Persian oriented words, but their parents and grandparents do. The ever-present debate on the substitution of these words with their Turkish “equivalents” (?) in favour of purifying the language still haunts the linguists and the men of letters in our country. Leaving aside the discussions on the limits of “pure Turkish” and the capability of the old words, our primary concern about the usage of these words is based on the fact that these “old” words were being used massively in the Turkish society until the reforms in language pioneered by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, and many words that are used mostly by preceding generations or recalled only in crossword puzzles constitute a “fact” of our history. This fact, which is a reality that constitutes a part of our history and “culture”, may also be noticed in Dağın Öteki Yüzü. The lexical differences between the early revolution period (the 30’s, 40’s), the 50’s and the following decades (that date until the recent 90’s) reveal this dramatic change in the language. The *language register*, and the *lexicon* demonstrate a fundamental evolution throughout the book’s original while this “evolution” (which is a multi-dimensional cultural fact of Turkish society) is even far from being implied in the translation. As the variation in language (reminding us of Toury’s “*variability*”) focuses on the lexicon and the choice of words, a lexical analysis in both the original and the translation should be carried out.

IV. BEYOND THE MEANING OF WORDS: CULTURE, CONTEXT AND LEXICAL CHOICE

Introduction: Cultural context: “The Colour of Words”

Apart from the actual setting and the participants involved in an exchange, the context also includes the co-text and the linguistic conventions of a community in general (Baker: 238). It should not be wrong to assert that every word has its certain “colour”, and even two words that refer to the same concept demonstrate differences in their tonality. As a literary work builds up its own context via the deictic elements (the time and place through which the story is transmitted to the reader), it constitutes a background, a canvas (i.e. a frame) on which certain colours with certain tones are present. This background gives ideas to the reader about the dominant cultural norms of the period in which the story is founded. Vermeer states that the reader of a translation is aware of the fact that what s/he reads is a translation, and the source text belongs to a different time and place. This consciousness of the TT reader results in a certain expectation that is specific to the translation reader: S/he considers the distance between the source text and the target text as one of the factors that determine the reception of the text. Someone who reads Homer is well aware of the fact that the time, place and the conditions in which he lived are different from the present day (S/he does not necessarily have to know what kind of a difference that is). For this reason, what s/he expects from the translation is that the historical distance should be transferred as an element of effect, but does not expect this effect to be ‘faithful’ in essence (Vermeer, 1991: 44). This statement supports the idea that historicity in a text, (i.e. historical authenticity) is a non-linguistic factor that has to be transferred in order to assure the multi-dimensional equivalence discussed above.

If the translator aims at such kind of a “multi-dimensional” equivalence, especially old words of antiquity that lost their common and frequent use throughout time or words that are even not used by the present generation need a special treatment in the translation process. An “extreme” example for this kind of a translation is Çiğdem Erkal İpek’s translation of Tolkien’s The Lord of The Rings.

İpek states that she managed to translate the book in two years and used a variety of dictionaries in order to translate the specific languages of many different races in the book. She adds that she had even referred to Anglo-Saxon language and Divan-1 Lügat-1 Türk! She gives the example of the word “Mirkwood” that is not used today in English and means “şeytani, karanlık, kötü orman” in Turkish. İpek states that the words “yaban ve yavuz” which may substitute “Mirkwood” at first hand lost their old meaning throughout time. She finds “kuytu” in Divan-1 Lügat-1 Türk that is defined as “scary, frightening” and derives an invented word: “kuyutorman” from this word which as she states, “gives the same effect” when used (Hürriyet, 2002: 6).

The multi-dimensional equivalence that the translator needs to attain is closely related with deictic factors, and each monem may have a specific role in betraying characteristics of a certain age and place. The characteristic traits of an era reveal themselves both in the formal and informal (even in slang) uses of language. To illustrate, Hulki Aktunç gives an example from Nabokov’s Lolita to show the mutual relation between culture and language use through time.

Lolita speaks: “If he’s really a cop”, the sentence is translated as: “Gerçekten aynasızsa,” by translator Fatih Özgüven in 1982. Aktunç reaches the conclusions stated below:

- Lolita is an adolescent girl.
- Lolita is first published in 1955, and the events that take place in the novel occur during World War Two.
- Lolita is a girl from the middle class and has an average educational level.

Aktunç states that if the speaker were a man with a different social status, and the event had taken place in some other time, the word “aynasız” should have been transferred differently, such as:

“Adam essahtan takozsa...”(at the end of the 1800’s)

“Zarvo ise herif gerçekten...” (during the 70’s)

“Ya paparonun biriyse...” (during the 80’s)
(Aktunç: 31-32)

This premise of Aktunç is based on the same idea that the transfer of lexical items should be executed in accordance with the speaker’s social status, the time and place where the speech takes place and the specific context that is present in the translated part of the literary piece.

The factors mentioned are closely related to some key-concepts in translation studies. Now these concepts that are useful to us in the analysis of the transfer of the old Ottoman Turkish words should be introduced.

A. Register

Register is defined as “the set of features which distinguishes one stretch of language from another in terms of *variation in context* to do with the language user (geographical dialect, idiolect, etc.) and/or language use (field (i.e. subject matter,), tenor (level of formality)and mode (Hatim and Mason: 222).

The way the characters communicate with each other (and the reader), how they use the language -the *register*, the *tenor* and the *idiolect* that is present in the ST- should be transmitted accordingly. As stated above, even two words, which “mean the same thing” in essence, may not hold the same “colour” in respect to the “context” that they are used in. In the glossary of their book: The Translator as Communicator Hatim and Mason define context as:

The extra textual environment, which exerts a determining influence on the language used. The subject matter of a given text is part of **register** and can thus determine, say the way the text presents who is doing what to whom (transitivity) (ibid. 214).

This “extra-textual environment” is the “canvas” stated above, and its “determining influence” brings the “rules” (or norms) of the use of language that must be present in the text (and its translation). The given *context*, “the extra-textual environment” is a determining factor on language use. It is the “first clue” to the reader about the *language register* that is “expected” from the characters in a story, novel or play. When, where and under which conditions does the event occur? The context may well be considered as the living background, the basis on which the story is built. In connection with the *deixis*, it implies the dominant *language register* used in a certain period of history.

Halliday defines *register* in his ‘semiotic system of macro-functions’ as follows:

Types of linguistic situation differ from one another, broadly speaking, in three respects: as regards what actually is taking place; secondly, as regards what part the language is playing; and thirdly, as regards who is taking part. These three variables, taken together, determine the range within which meanings are selected and the forms, which are used for their expression. In other words, they determine the ‘register’ (Halliday 1978: 31).

Variations in dialects, idiolects, sociolects, genderlects, language of science and technology, language used in different social communities may all be examined under a register analysis. Register, which is a key concept used to refer to variation according to the use of language-functional varieties- may help us to determine *shifts* between the original text and its translation.

In a text numerous types of register may function together. The registers, functioning in the text may demonstrate a great variety according to the style of language used (historical (archaic/modern), social, geographical, cultural etc). *Idiolect* is another aspect of *register*. It is based on “personal tendencies in the

language use” and naturally on the question: “Who is the speaker?” The idiolect, described as “the individual’s distinctive and motivated way of using a language at a given formality or *tenor*” (Hatim and Mason: 98) separates the characters from each other with hints of their *socio-cultural background*. A character in a literary piece may use a specific way of language that stands at any level of formality or informality. Even the character’s “hesitancy or confidence” may “find expressions in actual patterns of language use” (ibid. 101). Given this information, it would not be wrong to assume that the characters themselves assign to their speech a “distinctive”, “unique” colour. Let us suppose that a character raised on the streets tries to use a formal language in a gathering of wealthy people, or a noble man tries to act like a peasant, the changes in the register should be reflecting the traits of the language register that the character tries to “imitate”. The “deviations” from the natural language register are called *variations*, and these variations should carefully be handled and reflected in the target text by the translator. When these deviations appear as shifts (from the present register (as in the letters of Vicdan, Raik and Nefise written in the 30’s) lexical choices gain a considerable importance. It will not be wrong to suggest that such a vital difference in the history of a nation’s language should at least be “implied”. The reader may not perceive the dynamic changes as a Turkish reader but may at least feel that “the way people speak and write” has changed in Turkey when compared to the past. This change in the register is closely related with the notion of “markedness”.

B. Markedness

As a translator should aim not only to translate the ST message word for word but also to transfer it in “the same living context” of the original, the lexical choices conducted by the translator have a crucial function in translation. In order to stress what is “deviated from the current norms” in the original piece and to transfer what is found under the surface of a word deviations from the regular norm should be emphasized. This may be possible by preferring the “marked choice” instead of “the unmarked one”.

It may be claimed that The Ottoman Turkish words used in the book (mostly in the correspondences and dialogues belonging to the 30's) may well be designated as "items that demonstrate specificity". Toury stresses "a convenient way of approaching items revealing any kind of specificity is to refer their specificity to the notion of *markedness*" (Toury, 1995: 212). Toury's definition of the concept is as follows:

As is well known, in a pair of terms which are not in free variation, one of the terms tends to be marked and the other unmarked in relation to a certain contrast: the unmarked member A is neutral with respect to it whereas its marked counterpart B is not. From the point of view of the addresser in an act of communication it is therefore A which would be selected whenever there are no specific reasons for it not to be. From the complementary viewpoint of the addressee, this implies that whenever B is used, its markedness-and hence the reasons for choosing it- are part of the overall information conveyed by it (ibid. 212).

Toury also adds the following information: 1) Any wrong assumption of the reader that a marked term is in fact unmarked, is thus bound to yield wrong conclusions and causes insufficient and totally wrong interpretations. 2) The marked member of a pair occurs in a narrower range of contexts than its marked counterpart. 3) As long as an item is marked, it is bound to be functional, irrespective of the utterance in which it is embedded. (ibid. 213)

"Markedness" appears as a *register feature* too. As Hatim and Mason see it:

(...) A register feature, like any other instance of language use may be seen as unmarked when expectations are upheld and when the textworld is unproblematic and retrieved without difficulty (i.e. maximally stable): lawyers speak like lawyers, scientists like scientists and so on. Markedness, on

the other hand arises when expectations are defied... (Hatim and Mason: 101)

As our concern is markedness in lexical choices, Snell-Hornby's ideas on the subject should be mentioned here. According to Hornby in "literary translation and most other translation outside technical terminology", words cannot be taken straightforward from the dictionary and substitute the ST lexical units because the ST lexical units may contain more than what they seem to be superficially (Snell-Hornby, 1988: 105).

In Dağın Öteki Yüzü, the authoress Erendiz Atasü provides the Turkish readers with a little (three pages) supplementary glossary for the Arabic-Persian oriented words of the old Ottoman Turkish. With a closer look at the glossary it may be seen that, along with the words that can only be recognized by a very limited number of people (Specialists on Ottoman Turkish, experts and speakers of Arabic and Persian languages) the glossary also contains words that are used relatively more frequently or may not seem so "alienating" to most of the Turkish readers. To illustrate, the little glossary includes words such as harim-i ismet (özel hayat), teşrin-i sani (kasım ayı) , tevellüd (doğum) , hissi kablel vuku (sezgi) (etc.) along with the words like mazbut (düzenli) , müteşekkir(teşekkür duyan), mesuliyet(sorumluluk) , elim(acı), zümre(grup), bihaber(habersiz), (and even!) tahsil(öğrenim)...

Although, nearly all of the second group of words (the more familiar ones) are given above and the more foreignizing words are the majority, the presence of these words point out to the fact that the writer must have included this glossary as a countermeasure against the inadequate knowledge of the younger generation on such words of antiquity. Should the authoress have the opportunity of using these words with their "contemporary" equivalents given above? It would not be wrong to assume that if she did that, she would have betrayed the documentary style of the book that strives to assure linguistic historicity. The presence of the Ottoman glossary may be deemed just as a bonus gratified by the writer herself in order to ensure the fluency of reading without referring to an Ottoman dictionary, but beyond

that its presence indicates to a crucial cultural fact, the widening gap within Turkish that gets bigger and bigger each year. So, it can be said that the book itself becomes alienating to the average “native reader” of the source culture and the writer complemented it with a dictionary for that reason. This fact makes the cultural-linguistic change more dramatic than it is, and this situation brings forth the question: How far can the translator establish equivalent “alienating effects” of deviations present in the source text and how can he/she *mark* these deviations and make the target reader aware of their presence?

This question leads us back to the “notion of markedness”. In addition to the deviation from the expected (or the realization of the unexpected) markedness finds itself deeply in relation with the “frequency”(and infrequency) of the linguistic material that is marked. Marked usage of speech is less frequent compared to its unmarked counterparts. According to Basil and Hatim,

Conventionally, markedness is defined either as infrequency of occurrence (that is, less frequently occurring expressions are somehow more significant when they do occur) or as informativity (that is, the less predictable in context an item is the more information it potentially relays) (Hatim and Mason: 12).

It may be claimed that the first aspect of markedness; “the infrequency of occurrence” concerns both the ST and TT readers in our study as the markedness in the book arises as a result of “what is used infrequently”. The Ottoman Turkish words used in the novel are actually used so “infrequently” in Turkish. The latter, that is “the relation of markedness with “informativity” is the aspect that concerns directly the TT reader, and we these mutual relations can be explained like this: The infrequency of “the old words” used in the ST may be considered to be as lexically *marked* (to illustrate, “nikbin” is the marked form of “iyimser” for the Turkish reader) as they “alienate” Turkish readers with their infrequency of usage in contemporary Turkish, but on the other hand “these words do not defy their

“expectations”: A Turkish reader is well aware of the historical fact that Turkish people did use that “hybrid” language in the past, so it is “shared information” for the readers of the source culture. Therefore it might be thought that, what is marked in terms of *the lexicon* (as a change in the register is in question) may not be considered to be marked on the cultural level in the source text. Here, the second aspect: “informativity” is in function. The translators should have highlighted these passages in which old Turkish is used in order to make the TT reader perceive that there is a difference (or deviation) in the language used and that difference is valid for that certain period of Turkish culture. This means that these parts of the text belonging to Turkey of the 30’s and 40’s should be transmitted with a change in register, with a fundamental variation from the general language used in the book and even the target text readers who are “foreign” to the Turkish culture should be able to sense the cultural change that Turkey experienced through the decades. This is *sine qua non* as long as the transfer of cultural information is aimed at a literary translation. At this point, what is culturally “unmarked” in the source text and culture also becomes culturally “marked” for the readers of the target culture because what is “shared knowledge” for the ST readers is unfamiliar to the TT readers who are foreign to Turkish culture and history. As Hatim and Mason put it,

...Judgements and presuppositions, implicatures and markedness in general can only be made in relation to the sociocultural context in which they occur. Thus the translator’s intercultural judgement is inevitably brought into play in attempting to perceive and relay these extra layers of meaning. Indeed one might define the task of the translator as a communicator as being one of seeking to maintain **coherence** by striking the appropriate balance between what is **effective** (i.e. will achieve its communicative goal) and what is **efficient** (i.e. will prove least taxing on user’s resources) in a particular environment, for a particular purpose and for particular receivers (Hatim and Mason : 12).

C. Translator's Disposition and Word Choice

Word choice as a process closely related to the concept of *markedness* may provide many clues about the disposition and the standpoint of the translators of Dağın Öteki Yüzü. In his book Translation Into The Second Language Stuart Campbell carries out a study in order to “discover whether second language translators differ systematically in their textual competence as manifested through word choice” (Campbell: 103). The research he conducted was based on the difference between translators in the way they translated Arabic words into English.

The attitude of the translators in choosing the marked and unmarked equivalents of words is a clue about their disposition. Campbell states that the study on word choice “gives important insights into translation competence by providing a profile of translator's disposition and by determining which translators were able to make choices using information beyond the immediate sentence” (Campbell: 104-105).

In the sixth chapter of the book Stuart Campbell deals with the translators' competence in the use of lexis, in word choice and lexical transfers. As he examines lexis, he also mentions the psychological motivations and dispositions, which are hidden behind translation choices. His examinations bring out interesting results: some translators tend to omit more words, whereas others try to translate each part of the source text. He defines such kind of attitude towards omissions as a matter of persistence or capitulation. Another interesting result concerns similarity in translating solutions vs. unusual results. This variation can be accounted for with two alternative attitudes: risk-taking or prudence. These two poles – persistence / capitulation vs. risk-taking/prudence- supply information about the disposition profile of any translator. The author describes and comments on the four possible patterns of disposition and provides us with debatable examples of lexical choices in order to ascertain what happens during the actual process of translation and the different strategies applied by translators. These techniques clearly mirror the ability

subjects have to construct texts in the second language, especially in handling "sense." The four groups of dispositions are:

- 1) Persistent and risk taking
- 2) Capitulating and risk-taking
- 3) Persistent and prudent
- 4) Capitulating and prudent

As stated above, Campbell indicates that a translator who often resorts to omissions may be described as "capitulating" and one that evades omissions as "persistent". Meanwhile translators who make choices close to the norms of the target language are designated as "prudent" and those who choose "unusual" *marked* equivalents are defined as "risk-takers".

So, what is the significance of Campbell's analysis for our lexical analysis? Firstly, the comparative analysis of Campbell on the lexical choices of many second-language translators may provide a standpoint for us in examining the lexical choices in The Other Side the Mountain. Moreover the study on the chosen words and their alternative "equivalents" may help us to identify the *disposition* of the novel's translators. Before proceeding to the lexical analysis, examples should be given from Campbell's method of comparison that is also closely related with the two concepts that were described earlier: *markedness* and *register*.

As Campbell puts the Arabic to English translations into examination, it is possible for us to come across to some words, which may sound so familiar to us (from their usage in Turkish). In the first step, Campbell presents the various words choices of translators. He classifies their translational attitude (i.e. disposition) according to their attitude in their choices. To illustrate, as he puts the word "bina" (a Turkish word adapted from Arabic) into examination, firstly, Campbell comments on the *markedness* of the word in the dictionary: "The *unmarked choice* is *building*, while three subjects chose the stylistically more formal construction, and two subjects shifted the sense with growth and erection." (Campbell: 121) As it is seen,

markedness plays the essential role in the evaluation of the translational attitude of translators. Moreover he also delves into the field of *register* as he compares the words according to their *tenor* (i.e. level of formality which is a register feature).

Secondly, he lists the proportion of the words chosen amongst the 16 translators i.e. subjects (Building 11/16, construction 3/16, erection 1/16, growth 1/16, omissions 0/16). Then he classifies these choices systematically, that is what he calls “the network of choices”:

Preserve sense: Stylistically neutral: building

Stylistically more formal: construction

Shift sense: growth, erection

(ibid. 121)

In brief, Campbell’s network of (word) choices are classified under the following topics:

- 1) *Preserve sense*: The actor may be *fore grounded* (as in the word ‘operation’), and *back grounded* (as in the word ‘process’). *Stylistically* the choice may be *neutral, formal, appropriate, inappropriate*. The sense may be preserved but with *loss of metaphor* (which is present in the ST). The word may be translated in *word level* (that is the *unmarked choice* for a word, mostly the first equivalent provided by dictionaries). *More meaning* than what is intended in the original may have been supplied by the chosen word. The equivalent may have been chosen *without regard for connotation*.
- 2) *Shift sense*: In a shift sense, an (distantly related) equivalent may be chosen without regard for connotation, a new metaphor may be chosen to reflect connotation and the sense may be shifted with a more general equivalent (as in choosing “problem” instead of the word “crisis”).
- 3) *Reduce to sense*: the word may be reduced *to sense* (a common tendency in translation), concepts may be transmitted to the reader with a more general

equivalent, transferred into the TL with only their borderlines (i.e.using fire instead of disaster...)

- 4) *Mistranslate*: The most intolerable sin in translation that does not need an introduction.

As well as *markedness*, which was also used as a criterion in Campbell's study, *register* is another key concept that may serve us in determining the shifts (and/or deviations) in the meaning. The shifts from "one stretch of language to another" may be transmitted correctly (where the original text intends to create the effect) or may appear as "marked" in a segment erroneously, where the corresponding ST does not have the intention for such "markedness". As Toury comments on "the paradox" about markedness,

(...) Using a marked item in a context which it was designed to serve tends to blur its markedness, and hence renders the use itself 'normal'. By contrast, using that same item in a context (i.e. register as lexical choice is concerned) which is 'abnormal' for it would make its markedness stand out considerably. (Toury, 1995: 213)

In our case, the use of old words that appear as "marked" choices of the author (harim-i ismet, müteakit, muktedir, latif, nikbin, müteharrik etc.) may all be accepted as "normal" in accordance with the specific context in which they are used, but do they appear as "marked" in the target text? Another question arising is: Does the deviation in the language of the original have to be accentuated with a one to one correspondence (in the translation of words) when the shift in language is intended to be marked? That means, without being stuck in a word and trying to accentuate it with a "marked" equivalent, may the changes in register be reflected through the use of a considerable amount of marked words in transmitting the shift in the context? For instance, this exemplary sentence from Dağın Öteki Yüzü:

Kederli ruh hallerini müteakip, neş'e halleri zuhur ediyor (Atasü, 1997: 54-55).

In this sentence, the underlined words appear as “marked” as the authoress intends to reflect a difference (i.e. variation) from the accepted norm (what Toury defines as ‘normal’). At this point, the transfer of the two words with marked equivalents may be considered as “faithful” to the original text, whereas as “the transfer beyond the mere utterance” is taken in consideration, creating the same linguistic atmosphere in the TT may also be accepted as a token of “faithfulness”. Instead of ‘marking’ the two words, marking the remaining words in the sentence may change the register as well. The remaining words: ‘Kederli’, ‘ruh halleri’ or ‘neş’e halleri’, which do not appear as marked elements, may be marked by the translator “in purpose” to create the corresponding register when the alternatives for the originally marked words are scarce in the target lexicon. So, the main questions to be asked should be: “Does the translation mark the corresponding lexical items that are marked in the original?” and “Does the translation achieve to transfer the deviations in the register?”

V. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC TRANSFER

Introduction:

Before proceeding with sample sentences from the ST and the the basic elements on which we build our suggestion of a more “appropriate word choice” should be stated. As mentioned before, “equivalence” between literary texts might only be assured not only by transferring the same lexical items but also by transferring the multi-dimensions beneath which are determined by cultural norms and the context in which the literary piece develops. As Snell-Hornby states, dictionaries should not be regarded as indispensable suppliers of lexical alternatives:

Certainly the dictionary, both monolingual and bilingual, is an essential tool for the translator, but it should not be understood as an automatic supplier of a kind of ready-made coin that fits neatly to some imagined “slot” in the text. This statement makes clear what was described earlier as the “dynamic tension of “word against text,” whereby the dictionary indicates “the unmarked norm”, “the basic potential which the translator can use in creating his text as a coherent and organic whole” (Snell, Hornby,1988: 105).

Similarly, to Janet Fraser there are some concrete reasons for being sceptic about bilingual dictionaries. The first of these is that the range of the possible equivalents provided by the dictionary is limited. Secondly, “the context of the source language text must be borne in mind if the translator is to make informed choice from among the listed target language equivalents.” Fraser concludes that sometimes the translator may need to override the dictionary meaning and refer to the context and use his/her instincts (Fraser: 29).

The following lexical analysis is carried out in two dimensions: The treatment of old words: The Ottoman-Turkish old words which have a great contextual value and the culture-specific items peculiar to Turkish culture and the evaluation of the translators' choices are based on the factors stated above.

A. The Treatment Of "Ottoman Turkish words"

Every word (lexical unit) has...something that is individual that makes it different from any other word. And this is just the lexical meaning which is the most outstanding individual property of the word (Zgusta cited in Baker: 12).

According to Mona Baker, "the lexical meaning of a word or lexical unit may be thought of as the specific value it has in a particular system and the 'personality' it acquires through usage within that system" (ibid. 12).

Understanding the difference in the structure of semantic fields in the source and the target languages allows the translator to assess the value of a given item in the lexical set. If you know what other items are available in a lexical set and how they contrast by the item chosen by a writer or a speaker, you can appreciate the writer or speaker's choice. You can understand not only what something is, but also what it is not... (ibid. 19).

Nida stresses the significance of "message" in translation and even to the extent that equivalence of form is ignored. On the other hand, he also adds that "content and form cannot be separated". When dealing with the content of a text the translator must clearly distinguish between the discourse and the spatial-temporal background of the text. The translator has to decide whether s/he wants to use the less understandable cultural background of the source text or the more

understandable but anachronistic cultural background of the target text (Nida, 1976: 48-49)

The Arabic and Persian oriented words that dominated Turkish before the “language revolution” have their unique “personality” and their genuine “value” in the Turkish linguistic system. Atasü emphasizes this fact in Dağın Öteki Yüzü in her “letter to the reader” too:

It would definitely not be proper to write the fictional letters which were supposed to be written in the 40’s and 50’s with the present language. The inner monologues in that period such as what Mustafa Kemal thought in his mind. You may ask me: “Why? Should it not be my priority to reflect that period’s “essence?” In that case I would reply: “When language and thoughts, language and emotions are in question, form and style cannot be separated so easily. Talking, especially writing is not just communicating with someone else; it is a form of communication that functions with stimulations which are sent to our conscious and subconscious through words” (Atasü, 1997: 20 writer’s translation) This remark of Atasü is not present in her “letter to the reader” in The Other Side of The Mountain. Neither is this remark of hers: “As time passes and the times gets closer to our present time, I paid attention to reflect the purification in the language” (ibid. 21). This is natural as the two letters are written to different audiences, namely to the Turkish reader and the readers of the translation. On the other hand, it may also be concluded that if the intention of the translators were to emphasize the metamorphosis in the language, a corresponding passage should have been present in the letter for the target audience as well.

The metamorphosis experienced in the Turkish lexicon (according to some linguists, it is an impoverishment) is part of the cultural context, and context is a major determinant in the choice of words. As Nida suggests it,

The appropriateness of the message within the context is not merely a matter of the referential content of the words. The

total impression of a message consists not merely in the objects, events, abstractions and relationships symbolized by the words, but also in the stylistic selection and arrangement of such symbols (Nida, 1964: 168).

In spite of the fact that a one to one match on word level in “value” cannot be attained between the source text and the target text, at least the shift of language may be implicated. Mona Baker classifies “dialect” (the variety of language which has currency within a specific community or group of speakers) on three bases: Geographical, temporal and social. Amongst these the “temporal dialect” is made of words and structures “used by different age groups within a community”, or words “used at different periods in the history of language. Baker gives the example of the two words: “verily and really” (Baker: 15). The temporal dialect is closely related with this subject as Ottoman-Turkish words were being vastly used at a certain period “in the history of Turkish” and at present time they are being used only by a “certain age group in Turkey and their use of frequency gets reduced by each new coming generation. Just a concise study on the lexical choices in The Other Side of the Mountain may point out to the fact that, the specific Ottoman words used in the original ST are mostly overlooked and substituted with “unmarked” dictionary equivalents that are mostly the first entries in the dictionaries. This is the result of the tendency of the translators to overlook the formal and “lofty” usage of language where Ottoman Turkish is used in the book and to transform these certain passages into more “colloquial” and informal pieces of literature. The original dilemma lies in the infrequency and formality of these words. It is not a common occurrence that words such as *tahhayyül etmek*, *müteharrik* or *asude* appear in the papers or such words are heard in the daily spoken language. So, it may be convenient at first sight to translate these words with their English counterparts that contain the “similar” qualities with their originals. So what are these qualities? They may be summarized as: markedness, infrequency of use, formality and antiquity of words. Mary Snell-Hornby explains the three levels of lexical usage in the translation process as follows:

(The) demand for a dictionary of synonyms meeting the needs of the translator clearly reflects the necessity to integrate the three levels of system system (prototype, semantic field), norm (description of unmarked lexical usage) and text (marked usage in concrete expression)... (Snell, Hornby, 1998: 108).

Similarly, Nida points out to the importance of paradigmatic factors in the transfer of lexical items and adds that “the choice of a proper term depends so much on other *semantically related* terms”. As an example, he says that there are many possible semantic equivalents for the word “friendly” in Spanish (amigable, amistoso, amable, simpatico, cordial, listed as “synonyms” in Spanish dictionaries). He states that, there are “designative and associative” differences between these synonyms: Amigable is rarely used, amable suggests intimacy, cordial represents a higher register, etc. He concludes that, the choice shall be determined through the “contexts” of corresponding texts (Nida, 1999: 80).

In the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü, the use of some synonyms, essentially referring to the same concept semantically, end up with the contextual mismatch and the impoverishment of the words’ actual associative value in the target text. This is the dilemma that Peter Newmark defines as: “translating ‘communicatively’ or ‘semantically’”. In *communicative translation*, the aim of the translator is “to produce the same effect on the TL readers as was produced by the original on the SL readers”. Whereas, in *semantic translation*, the translator’s aim is just to reproduce *the precise contextual meaning* of the author within the bare syntactic and semantic constraints of the target language” (Neubert: 122).

As semantic translation aims to keep faithful to the “norms and constraints” of the target language polysystem (as an acceptable translation), the intelligibility of the translated text becomes the central motive of the translator; consequently, the end product appears as a replica of conveyed meanings of the source text in their purest

forms. Semantic translation is based on its target-oriented approach and its requirements are in parallelism with those of an *acceptable translation*.

Toury examines the translator's dominant motive in translation (his/her tendency towards domestication or foreignization of the source text) under the term: *initial norm*: "The translator may subject him-/herself either to the original text, with the norms it has realized, or to the norms active in the target culture or in that section of it which would host the end product". According to Toury, if a translator adopts the first stance then s/he subscribes himself to the norms of the source language and culture, as a result an *adequate* translation, that includes some "incompatibilities with target norms and practices" comes out. If s/he adopts the second stance, an *acceptable* translation, which includes "shifts from the source text", comes out. As Toury concludes, when the translator adopts "acceptability" and subscribes to the norms of the target language and culture "shifts from the source text would be an almost inevitable price" (Toury, 1995: 56). This "inevitable price" is the limitation of the translator in his "*faithfulness*" to the original text.

According to the Chinese translator Yan Fu, there are three difficult requirements the translator has to fulfill: "Faithfulness, comprehensibility and elegance." In his own words: "Faithfulness is difficult enough to attain but a translation that is faithful but not comprehensible is no translation at all. Comprehensibility is therefore of prime importance." (Chan: 64) As the translator oscillates between the two poles of faithfulness and comprehensibility, s/he always has to make sacrifice in favour of one. However as far as the translator gets away from the pole of adequacy, the effect in the source text is distorted. At this point, the question to be asked is: As far as the transfer of Ottoman words are concerned, how can similarities in the effect for the ST reader also be attained in the target language? The answer to this question lies firstly in three domains.

The first one is the field of *register*: These words are the remnants of a language used by an elite coterie of noble men, artists and the well educated part of the society. To Saliha Paker, the Ottoman Turkish was considered in the young

Turkish Republic as a literary language that was “wrought for the elite” and this isolated state of this genuine language was stressed by the republic in order to stress the “elitism of the Ottoman Empire and the populism of the Turkish republic” (Paker: 129). Undoubtedly, as a representative of elitism the counterparts of these words should be selected among a list of words of a *high register*.

The second aspect for the translator to highlight should be “markedness”. As stated previously, these words stand as “marked” in the source text, and their counterparts in the target language should also be marked in the given context.

Thirdly, the choices should be in compliance with “infrequency” as these words are used so “infrequently” today in the source language.

In Order to reach a variety of synonyms and connotations of words, two thesauruses and two dictionaries have been used in this study. They are Collins English Thesaurus, Webster’s Random House (Dictionary and Thesaurus), Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary (that includes Ottoman Turkish words) and The Oxford Dictionary of Word Histories (to classify the alternative words by their antiquity -and etymology in certain circumstances-).

To help support the thesis of linguistic/cultural dilemma that emerges as a cultural mismatch in the field of equivalence “segments” from the ST and the TT should be compared on a both formal and semantic basis. The words chosen to illustrate the cultural and historical layers of meaning ignored in the transfer of “old” words are given in full sentences in order to reflect the context in which these words are used (All the entries are not listed in order to not create an abundance of irrelevant words; instead the closest and most relevant choices are given).

- 1) Ancak, annemin asabiyetlerine tahammüle **muktedir** olduğumu zannetmiyorum (Atasü, 1997: 40).

Translation: But I do not think I could **cope with** my mother's neurosis (Atasü, 2000: 24).

In this example, the first point to remark is that there is skewing in the translation of *muktedir*. First of all, the following question should be asked, what is the reason that the translators did not preserve the word as an adjective and preferred skewing instead? There should be no doubt that *to cope with* does not catch the same effect with *muktedir* at first glance?

In Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary the entries for the word are: Able, Capable, powerful and mighty, which do not seem to be the best of alternatives. However, "cope with" does not give the same old word and formal language effect, so it is a choice that "overlooks the register" in the first analysis. Considering that the highest register is the literary language and the lowest register is the colloquial language, the choice of the translators serves only to restrain the word to its meaning and to ignore its *markedness*.

If alternatives for *cope with* are searched (and maintain the adjective to verb skewing in the translation), *contend with* appears as the first entry in both thesauruses. This word, less frequently used than *cope with* and originating from the late middle English (although the word to cope dates back to the Middle English, it's frequently used in English as the word "home", which dates back to Old English) may point out to the marked trait of the original word, *muktedir*.

But I do not think I could *contend with* my mother's neurosis.

2) Ne **latif** tesadüf... (Atasü, 1997 : 41)

Translation: It is a small world, my love, what a **delightful** surprise! (Atasü, 2000: 25)

Again, in this transfer, it may be realized that the meaning of the word is “reduced to sense” in Campbell’s terms. Moreover the translators omit *tesadüf*, which literally means “coincidence”, arbitrarily and substitute the word with *surprise*. But, as it is the word *delightful* which is our case of study, it must here be mentioned that even if *delightful* is a less unmarked (or “more marked”) alternative compared to nice or fine, it does not reflect the actual register; the communicative setting that is present in the original. *Latif*, an Ottoman word adopted from Arabic is not commonly used in Turkish, but *delightful* is a frequently used common word in English. Looking for a more formal word with less occurrence may be more convenient “to mark the actually marked” word as in the source text and maintain the equivalence equilibrium in the cultural transfer of the text. One of the synonyms of *delightful* is *congenial*, a word with less occurrence as in the source language and suiting better to the transfer of the register in the ST.

- 3) Kız, **harim-i ismetinize** bir yabancıyı, aile reisine danışmadan nasıl sokarsın... (Atasü, 1997: 41)

Translation: My girl, how can you bring a stranger into your home without asking the permission of the head of the house? (Atasü, 2000: 25)

In this sentence *harim-i ismet*, a collocation used as a formal piece of register in the source language, is transferred into the target language by reducing the word to its sense at the cost of ignoring many connotations that are found in the original word. The entries in Redhouse for the word are: *innermost*, *shrine* and *the very heart*. Actually, all these equivalents denote a place but also connote innocence, purity, decency and privacy... The word “home” may connote these properties superficially but the original word connotes much more than it as the authoress did actually mark the word and preferred using it instead of *ev* or *yuva* which are literal and unmarked equivalents for the word: *home*. This markedness and the stronger effect of the word should have been emphasized in a more formal register (as in the original) and by the connotations that are overlooked in the word: *home*. As the word *harim-i ismet*, is separated into two, *harim* means sanctuary and *ismet* means chastity, purity, honor

and innocence (Redhouse). It may be claimed that the word *home* that is chosen by the translators *without regard for connotation*. The word *harim-i ismet* refers to the concept of “sacredness” as in a temple or shrine, a connotation much stronger than *home* may refer to. Instead of heading towards a shortcut (as it is the most common tendency of the translators of the novel), the original word should have been “paraphrased” at the cost of lengthening the question phrase a bit and still using the word *home* for the ease of comprehension and emphasizing the connotations by using temple and chastity (that include the concepts decency, purity and innocence):

My girl, how can you bring a stranger into your home, *your very temple of chastity* without asking the permission of the head of the house?

This way, not only the formal register of the original word may be attained (chastity, an old word infrequently used and pertains to Middle English (Word Histories)) but also the connotations within the words may be better emphasized.

- 4) Son eserini yazarken pek neşeli, pek **nikbin** olduğunu yazmıştı (Atasü 1997: 42).

Translation: The newspapers reported that she had been very **optimistic** and cheerful while working on her last book (Atasü, 2000: 26).

Once again, in this sentence, although cheerful is a good substitution for *neşeli*, *optimistic* misses the crucial point that the word may correspond *iyimser* in Turkish but not *nikbin*, which is an Arabic oriented word. Moreover, as a word commonly used in colloquial language, the word does not seem to be marked in its context, and last but not least the word’s history dates back to the late 19th century, (Word Histories) so it’s a relatively new word when it’s compared to *nikbin*. In order to assure equivalence of this lexical item both in *register* and *markedness* an old and much less frequently used word should have been chosen. Some of the entries in The Collins English Thesaurus for the word are: assured, bright, buoyant, buoyed up, cheerful, confident, encouraged, expectant, hopeful, positive and sanguine. Leaving

aside the far relevant synonyms that may lead to wrong connotations, the word *sanguine*, which means “cheerfully optimistic” and which dates back to the 1300’s (Random House) may be a better counterpart compared to optimistic both in the register field and the field of markedness.

- 5) Kederli ruh hallerini **müteakip**, neş’e halleri **zuhur ediyor** (Atasü, 1997: 54-55).

Translation: Waves of misery **give way to** waves of joy (Atasü 2000: 36).

In the translation of the sentence, it can be noticed that the translators benefiting from the rich lexicon of English use *waves* instead of “mood, state of mind” or any other equivalent for the Turkish word *ruh hali* which serves well to the equivalence in the field of register as the language used in the ST is formal and the register becomes more formal as it gets closer to literary language and away from daily spoken language. However, *give way* may not be deemed as the perfect counterpart for *müteakip* and moreover the verb *zuhur etmek* is lost (omitted) in the process. If a one to one correspondence in the formality and markedness of words is aimed, some appropriate entries for these two words in Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary are successive and subsequent (*müteakip*) and to appear, to come to pass, to come to existence, to happen (*zuhur etmek*). Provided with the information that the dictionary is not the only indispensable tool in the transfer of a literary piece, it may be concluded that these unmarked equivalents that are “reduced to sense” for *zuhur etmek* may be substituted with more formal synonyms from the thesaurus. Using *subsequent upon* and *to loom*, in the sentence and still preserving the rest of the translation, the following sentence can be formed:

Subsequent upon the waves of misery *loom* the waves of joy.

- 6) Bilmem neden seni merkez-i hükümetteki mekteplerden birinde muallime olarak **tahayyül etmiştim** (Atasü, 1997: 55).

Translation: I **imagined** you would be teaching in one of the schools in our capital (Atasü, 2000: 37).

Here, the dilemma lies in the question, what would be the translation of this sentence if the authoress had used “hayal etmişim” instead of “tahayyül etmişim” in the source text? Without doubt, it may be claimed that the sentence would have been exactly the same with the above sentence. So as *imagine* is the unmarked equivalent for *hayal etmek*, should not the word *tahayyül etmek* be marked and emphasized in the TT? The main difference between the two Turkish words lies in the antiquity and formality. *Hayal etmek* is a common, frequently used word in Turkish, and *tahayyül etmek* is no longer used, it refers to a different field of register in contemporary Turkish. At this point a rarely used and old word may be used in order to mark the verb in its given context; some alternatives may be *conceive*, *envisage* and *fantasize* (Collins Cobuild), but among these *conceive* -that dates back to Middle English (Random House)- seems to be the most appropriate one:

“I *conceived of* you teaching in one of the schools in our capital.”

This way the marked verb in the ST may appear as marked in the TT too, and the formal register feature of the original verb may be attained in the SL.

7) Oysa senden bir eser bile yok. Öyle büyük bir **sukut-u hayale** uğradım ki!
(Atasü, 1997: 55-56)

Translation: No trace of you...I am so **disappointed** (Atasü, 2000: 37-38).

“Hayal kırıklığı”, commonly used in the quotidian/colloquial Turkish is the first choice unmarked equivalent for *disappointment* in English whereas it is not a *sine qua non* for *sukut-u hayal*. In accordance with the translational strategy of the translators, once again a word “marked” in the original ST appears as “unmarked” in the TT, and the word’s actual potential in the field of register and in its context are undermined. As the context, *the extra textual environment, which exerts a*

determining influence on the language used (Hatim and Mason: 214) determines the communicative tone of the language and as the context (including all deictic elements) necessitates the use of words in certain boundaries of register and markedness, it may easily be concluded that the word: *sükut-u hayal* is not an arbitrarily used word in the ST; it refers to a certain use of language with certain traits of register. The norms active in Turkish throughout the 1920's and the norms that dominate the language today are completely different. As Toury states it, "Inasmuch as a norm is really active and effective, one can therefore distinguish **regularity of behaviour** in recurrent situations of the same type, which would render regularities a main source for any study of norms as well." (Toury, 1995: 55) What is regular and recurring through the given period does not have validity in contemporary Turkish. Therefore, to assure equivalence in context, the word should be substituted with an older, formal word with fewer occurrences in contemporary English. Some alternatives are thwarted, disillusioned and disenchanted. "I'm disillusioned" may better reflect the given register of speech in the source text.

8) O narin gövdenden nasıl **intişar ediyor** bu cesaret? (Atasü, 1997: 268)

Translation: How can such courage **radiate** from such a slender body? (Atasü 2000: 260)

Although the word, *radiate* dates back to the early 17th century; its extensions to contexts of giving out an aura such as confidence or happiness began in the 19th century (Word Histories). Moreover, for the average contemporary reader, *radiate* brings "scientific" connotations into mind. The concept of radiation: a familiar concept for the post cold war society distracts the reader and results in "inconsistency" within the context. Instead of this word, *issue* or *emanate* may be used. The history of the word *issue* dates back to the 13th century whereas *emanation* dates back to 1780's (Random House). However *emanate* is a less frequently used word and may better reflect the high register and formal value of *intişar etmek*.

- 9) Şimdi senin, sende bir tek ve **mütecanis** bir Raik'in mevcudiyetini ve bu adamın da bana sevdalı olduğunu şiddetle savunduğunu görür gibiyim (Atasü, 1997: 275).

Translation: Now I can imagine you protesting that you are the one and only **homogeneous** Raik, and vehemently professing that this man is passionately in love with me! (Atasü, 2000: 268)

The same dilemma for the word “radiate” appears in this sentence too but in stronger proportions. Not only does the collocation homogeneous Raik sound “bizarre”, but also the “scientific” connotation that it arouses through the cognitive process is another point to remark. The word *homogeneous* surely appears to be marked in the TT context as it refers to a new field of register, “science”. The definition of homogeneous in Random House is:

ho-mo-ge-ne-ous adj.

1. composed of parts or elements that are all of the same kind; not heterogeneous: a homogeneous population
2. of the same kind or nature; essentially alike
3. Math.
 - a. having a common property throughout: a homogeneous solid figure
 - b. having all terms of the same degree: a homogeneous equation
4. Biology: Corresponding in structure because of a corresponding origin

The word homogeneous as “homojen” in Turkish quickly reminds us of biology, as the word’s contemporary use in English does not require a form of collocation as an adjective used with persons’ names such as “homogeneous Kathie”, “homogeneous Robert” as in Turkish: “homojen Raik”, “homojen Vicdan” etc... Although, homogeneous is one synonym given in Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary for the word *mütecanis*, the word *mütecanis* should not be intended to be used in the same field of register as “homojen” which is actually used in the field of

biology in Turkish. The use of “mütecanis” refers to the notion of “consisting of one piece” in the ST whereas the use of homogeneous brings out the markedness of the word but in a *wrong field of register*. Moreover, as mentioned before its use as a collocation with a person’s name does not sound right. As the word should appear as “marked” in accordance with the previous examples given above, it should once again be substituted with an old word characterized with low frequency in colloquial English; and it should also enter into a collocation with a person’s name without sounding odd. On a meaning based approach, it may be supported that, what is intended to be told by homogeneity is “singularity (of identity) versus multiplicity (of identities)” in the given phrase. So stressing the notion of “consisting of one piece”, the markedness and still preserving the antiquity of the word *mütecanis* may be countered with the word *monolithic* (the word is somehow “younger”(1815-25) compared to homogeneous, (1635-45) but its infrequency of use contributes to its historicity):

Şimdi senin, sende bir tek ve **mütecanis** bir Raik’in mevcudiyetini ve bu adamın da bana sevdalı olduğunu ve bu adamın da bana sevdalı olduğunu şiddetle savunduğunu görür gibiyim.

Now I can imagine you vehemently advocating the existence of one and *monolithic* Raik within yourself and professing that this man is passionately in love with me!

10) Benden ayrılacağını, nişanımızı bozacağını **vehmediyordum** (Atasü, 1997: 269).

Translation: I was **anxious** and imagined you would leave me, break off our engagement (Atasü, 2000: 262) .

The adjective “anxious” transmits the meaning in the ST but not the multiple contextual layers. If an alternative for the word in its original “verb” form is searched, the entries for *vehmetmek* in Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary are: to

forebode, to fear, to surmise, to conjecture. But an “old and not frequently used word” *dread*, may close this contextual gap.

- 11) Mektubu kutuda görür görmez, çılgın bir **saadetle** kalbim çarpmaya başladı (Atasü, 1997: 269).

Translation: The moment I saw your letter, my heart started to thud madly with happiness! (Atasü, 2000: 262)

Once again there is the old word-new word dilemma in the sentence. *Happiness*, as a word used frequently in colloquial language cannot attain the formality of the word “saadet” as it may only correspond to “mutluluk” in register. The words, felicity (1350-1400) and bliss (old English) may serve as better counterparts when contextual equivalence is in question:

The moment I saw your letter, my heart started to thud madly with *felicity*(or bliss).

- 12) Ancak **müşkülât** karşısında acaba Ankara tayini teklifini kabul etsek mi diye düşünmüyor değilim (Atasü, 1997: 274-275).

Translation: But after facing **so many obstacles**, I am driven to wonder from time to time whether we should accept posts in Ankara (Atasü, 2000: 268).

Müşkülât: difficulties, intricacies, doubts (Redhouse). Although “obstacles” is a better counterpart compared to “difficulties” in terms of register, it still cannot attain the formality and markedness level that is present in “müşkülât”. As defined in Collins Cobuild: “the intricacies of a situation are its complicated and subtle details”. The word *intricacies* (1595-1605) better reflects the word in complexity, tenor (level of formality) and antiquity.

Before ending this lexical analysis of Ottoman Turkish words, it has to be stressed that these examples from the source and the target texts are only a part of the whole as there are various similar translations in the book. However, it is the nature of a comparative analysis to work with a deductive method. Toury defines the nature of “comparative analysis” as follows:

- Every comparison is partial only: it is not really performed on the objects as such, only certain aspects thereof.
- A comparison is also indirect in its very essence: it can proceed only by means of some intermediary concepts, which should be relatable to the compared aspect(s) of both texts.
- These intermediary concepts should also be relatable to the theory in whose terms the comparison would be performed.

(Toury, 1995: 80)

B. The Treatment of “culture-specific items”

Previously, the language shift from Ottoman Turkish to contemporary Turkish has been defined as a specific cultural element as a whole, but there are also many culture specific items in the translation of the book that should be examined separately. The translation –as cultural transfer is in question- turns out to be an “imitation” of its original reshaped according to the norms of the target language. The question is “to what degree may this imitation be possible?” Vermeer defines the borderlines of this imitation process as follows:

I define translation as an information offer in a “z” language of the “Z” culture, which is imitated functionally (!) in a language “a” of the “A” culture. This means roughly that a translation is not the transcoding of words or sentences from one language but a complex process in which one transmits a text (from a foreign source) under new functions and cultural

and linguistic situations and tries to imitate it as formally as possible (cited in Snell-Hornby 1988: 46 writer's translation).

Language and culture, the two inseparable elements that complete each other through a symbiotic relationship strictly limit translators from time to time as the gap of linguistic and cultural differences may become gigantic in some circumstances. Some languages are closer to one another. As Virginia Saraçlıoğlu, a freelance translator, states it in a threesome interview with Talat Sait Halman and Suat Karantay,

The translations between Indo-European languages are easier. The sentence structures, the concepts and the terms do not demonstrate great differences. To illustrate, as Persian is an Indo-European language, the translations from Persian to English appear to be easier whereas the structure of Turkish is so different from that of English. In my opinion, this is the greatest of problems. On the other hand, there is the difference between cultures and religions. Depending on the piece of literature that is translated, these problems may be aggravated. The literary works that take place in urban life are easier to deal with whereas the literary works that depict suburban life are apt to bring out greater difficulties. Moreover, there is also this problem: The target audience of a considerable number of translations into English consists of academicians: the students of Turkish language and literature and the scholars who work in that department, etc. In these translations the translator is able to make explanations by using footnotes and to provide the reader with additional information. Whereas in a translation ordered by a big publishing company that addresses the general reader audience, this can't be possible. Above all this would bore the reader. (Karantay: 14)

In the circumstances that the target language/culture and the source language/culture are close to each other, the translation may be accomplished without facing too many obstacles as in translations between English and the Indo-European languages. In this kind of circumstance, the translation is more of a “transposition” as suggested by Carne Ross (Pedersen: 47-48). However, Turkish and English are distant from each other linguistically, and there are profound cultural gaps between the Turkish and British cultures. Last but not least, in translations produced for the general audience as in the case of The Other Side of the Mountain; the translator may tend to sacrifice some aspects of the source culture for the sake of intelligibility and fluency. S/he has to determine what to take and what to leave behind and the extent of domestication and foreignization to be applied in a translation.

According to Toury, through translation nothing that is completely new for the receiving culture is introduced, and there are limits of introducing something that is “new”. He compares the exchange of cultural items from one language to another to transplantation in medicine. In order to avoid the “rejection” of an organ by the body, there should be a “match” between the organ to be transplanted and the recipient’s system. Moreover, even if there is such an “initial matching”, this match should be “backed up and enhanced through constant medication to safeguard against alienation and delayed rejection”. Toury adds the following ideas,

Thus, much as translation always entails the retention of aspects of an ST (which forms a basis for many of the novelties it may introduce into the receiving culture), it also involves an element of **adjustment** of its requirements, and not necessarily in terms of language alone: alien models, and especially their most deviant features (from the point of view of the prospective target system), if retained, may be grounds enough for rejection (Toury, 1999: 161).

Working in the framework of the recipient culture and not violating the norms within the receiving system, the translator limits him/herself with “cultural distinctions. As Toury states it,

Adopting culture-internal distinctions as a starting point for the study of translation as it is conceived of, and executed within the conditioning framework of a culture thus has the big advantage of not imposing on its object any distinctions, which may prove alien to that culture. It thus allows one to proceed with as few assumptions as possible, which could be difficult to maintain, in the face of real-world evidence (Toury, 1995:26).

As the translator tends to adopt the cultural norms of the target language and culture, s/he gets away from the norms of the source culture and the source culture is undermined in the target text. This tendency of the translator is mostly based on the intention of not boring the reader with many explanations to introduce the source culture in detail. In The Other Side of the Mountain, the domesticating tendency is dominant throughout the text as omissions and even additions emerge throughout the target text. Moreover, the target reader (especially the monolingual one who does not have the advantage of comparing the translation with its original) is well aware of the fact that s/he reads a translation and his/her evaluation of the translated text is realized through a narrow perspective. As Gerard McAlester puts it forward,

(H)e (the monolingual reader) will not normally judge the translation from the point of view of its communicative effectiveness for its purpose in language, in other words by the same criteria as an original text. He will not normally have any explicit information about the skopos (of which he himself is, of course, a part), unless there is a translator’s commentary or a publisher’s statement of intent. If he finds

the TT lacking in some respect, he may condemn it and put the fault down to the fact that it is a translation (providing he is aware of the fact), or he may tolerate the deficiencies as being irrelevant to his needs. But lacking the original text and/or the ability to use it, he can normally go no further (McAlester: 172).

The target readers may find the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü intelligible and fluent. The translators steer clear of alienating the readers. It may even be suggested that the source text is at times more alienating to Turkish readers than the translation is to the target audience, in passages where Ottoman Turkish words are used (even a glossary for these words exists in the source text (!)). The translators' strategy leaves the reader unaware of cultural peculiarities, including the lingual transformation that is found in the original text. Naturally, readers of English who have limited or no knowledge on Turkish culture may accept the translation without questioning, "lacking the original text" as stated by McAlester above.

The primary motive of the translators seems to be refraining from alienating the target audience. It may be claimed that that the omissions (and additions) in The Other Side of the Mountain is a result of this motive and these interventions secure the ease of reading of the target text. To illustrate, the translators omit a name in one sentence:

ST: Şimdiki müfettiş Reşat Şemsettin Beyefendi, kendilerine bu evrakın **intikal etmediği** beyan etmekte (Atasü, 1997: 54-55).

TT: The man who holds the post now insists that these papers were not passed to him by his predecessor (Atasü,2000: 36).

Why did the translators prefer to omit the name? They may have thought that the abundance of Turkish names would have confused the reader. In a translation from English to Turkish, such kind of omissions would hardly appear.

It seems that omissions and additions appear mostly in the difficulty of translating *realia*. Douglas Robinson's definition of *realia* is: Words and phrases that are so heavily and exclusively grounded in one culture that they are almost impossible to translate into the terms –verbal or otherwise- of another (Robinson: 222). One of the words that appears in the source that represents *realia* is: “Millici”:

Vicdan'ın ailesi Milliciydi (Atasü 1997, 63).

This sentence is translated as:

Vicdan's family supported the nationalists (Atasü 2000, 45).

The word “Millici” in the source text refers to the people who supported the ideas and the cause of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the negative connotations of “nationalism” should have been kept away from the minds of the target audience. “Milliyetçi” which is some other concept is the exact counterpart of “nationalist” in English. Moreover the word “Millici” is used in Turkish as a proper noun, to refer to a particular group of people who support a particular idea. Instead of explaining the concept through a footnote, the translators' choice of referring to a familiar concept in the source culture results in an error.

Additions constitute another aspect of the translation's target-oriented approach. An example is:

‘Kız, harim-i ismetinize, bir yabancıyı, aile reisine danışmadan nasıl sokarsın...’ diye şaka yollu beni azarladı. ‘Lazuşağını kızdıracaksın’ dedi. ‘Yabancı mı, a Enişteciğim, sevgili dadım o benim,’ dedim (Atasü, 1997: 41).

The translation of this passage is:

‘My girl, how can you agree to bring a stranger into your home, without asking permission of the house? You are going to annoy your gallant Laz (you know every Black Sea Laz has a terrible temper).’ I replied: ‘She isn’t a stranger, but my beloved nanny...(Atasü, 2000: 25).

As it is actually seen, this ‘invented’ addition of the translators does not even exist in the source text. The additions made into the body of the text may well be tolerable in a “non-literary” text; the approach of Gregory Thomson to the question of “what should or should not be relegated to footnotes in translation” is as follows:

The study of implicatures may provide a practical solution to the well known problem of deciding what parts of the original shared context should be built into the text of the translation and what should be provided separately, for example in footnotes. Information essential to the success of conversational implicatures should be included in the text if the translation is to be coherent and sensible. It is unrealistic and working against the pragmatic nature of language to put such information into footnotes (cited in Baker: 248).

This kind of reasoning for “expanding the text” may well be acceptable in most of the text genres, but in literary texts this intervention causes distortion. As long as “information that is not shared between the source and target cultures” is the determining factor in the use of footnotes, a footnote should have been used at this point. Any reader with some background information on Turkish culture would find this addition odd, as there’s no need for stressing this shared information between two Turkish individuals. However, some translators may find the use of footnotes as a final choice in literary translation, which they mostly decline to refer or to resort to. This may be valid for a translator who does not have ambitions of satisfying his/her patronage. According to Andrew Chesterman, these kinds of additions via footnotes,

bracketed comments or added glosses draw the reader's attention and makes him aware of the translator's presence. This visibility of the translator (temporarily) backgrounds the author (Chesterman: 112). However this fact does not justify the interventions to the corpus of a literary text. It may be beneficent to touch on a debate on "the intervention of the translator within the target text". Özdemir İnce who translated Paulo Coelho's *The Alchemist* into Turkish was criticized by Mehmet E. Yavuz, a columnist in the newspaper Yeni Şafak, for translating "minaret" as "tower", "the azan" as song, and "Koran" as "requiem". Yavuz's standpoint was: "A Turk, and a probably Muslim Turk should not have translated these words as tower, song and requiem". However, what Mehmet Yavuz was unaware of was "the context". A Spanish youngster about 20 years old comes to a Muslim country and sees a "minaret" and hears "azan" for the first time in his life, so he names these phenomena with the closest equivalents in his own cultural repertoire: "tower", "song" and "requiem". Özdemir İnce's response to the criticism was simple:

What would a little boy, a villager from M.E.Yavuz's hometown who comes to Istanbul think, when a church bell in Taksim would toll? How would he interpret the situation? Firstly, he would think that there might be a fire somewhere; the sound of the bell may only be a sign of warning for him (Hürriyet, 2003: 7 writer's translation).

The answer of İnce clearly stresses the fact that the translator does not have the luxury of interfering with the text and causing distortion in the context. Similarly Şadan Karadeniz supports İnce with this remark:

"The protagonist in the novel is a boy who comes to a Muslim country from Spain. How would a boy taken from our country taken to the west describe the cathedrals that he had never seen before? A translator should show respect to the author and the text. S/he has no right to intervene the text" (ibid. 7 writer's translation).

The crucial point about this debate is not the ignorance of M.E. Yavuz on the subject of translation and his illogical thesis based on his fundamentalist thoughts. The key point is that, a Spanish boy with no background information is not supposed to know anything on Muslim culture and the translator may not distort this reality in his translation. Similarly (but oppositely), a translator should not have the right to distort reality when characters in a novel own and *share* the common background on a certain subject. When Vicdan says to Raik: “you know every Black Sea Laz has a terrible temper”, this would sound equally weird as the boy from Spain would use the word “minaret” instead of “tower”, as it is common shared knowledge for the two and most importantly, there is not such an utterance in the source text. The translator does not have the freedom of adding the background information that is not present in the source text arbitrarily when a literary piece is to be translated. This kind of interference results in a “distortion of reality”. Michael Holman and Jean Boase-Beier define this kind of “distortion of reality” as follows:

Leaving aside straightforward errors, a translation will be perceived as “wrong” by a particular reader if it does not fit the image that the reader prefers to associate with the original text. This judgement usually comes about at a moment in the text which jars, which draws us away from our immersion in the fictional or poetic world created by the work, and makes us realize we are reading a work created of words. If an author writes something which does not reflect reality as most of us perceive it, as readers we feel jolted back to reality and the illusion is lost. Similarly in translation, the moment an element in the text draws attention to himself, it will draw the reader’s attention to the fact not only that it is a translation but, consequently, that it is a piece of writing (Holman and Boase-Beier: 5).

The particular reader (that Holman and Boase-Beier refer to) in this situation may be a Turkish reader who reads the novel in English or a foreigner who is familiar with Turkish culture, going further, it may be claimed that some “particular” and attentive readers may “perceive” the unnaturalness of this kind of “explanatory additions”. The justification of the translators for their strategy is embedded in the tendency of addressing the average English reader with limited background knowledge on Turkish culture.

There are other additions made by the translators in order to bridge the cultural gap between the source text and the target audience. Another example is:

Hani, 1930’ların başında babam, parasız yatılılıktan yeni kurtulmuş gencecik bir riyaziye öğretmeni, burada ciddiyetle düşündürdü milli inkilabın üstüne, **Aşık Veysel’in sazını dinlerken** (Atasü, 1997: 265).

The translation of this sentence is:

The self-same town where my father, when he was a very young mathematician, fresh from the school of orphans, would earnestly reflect on Anatolian revolution, while listening to **the stringed saz of the great troubadour Veysel?** (Atasü, 2000: 257)

Leaving aside the tiny details (!) such as the omission of the date (1930) in the target text and the very fact one does not necessarily have to be an “orphan” in order to be a student in a “parasız yatılı” (without ignoring the fact that an orphan school covers both the orphans and the needy in the Anglophone culture), “the contributions” made by the translators should be pointed out. One of them is related to the subject of *identifying reference*. According to Mona Baker:

Identifying reference is not a question of identifying roughly who or what the referent is but, crucially, of knowing enough about the referent to interpret the particular associations it is

meant to trigger our minds in a given context. Referents are not featureless beings and entities; they have specific histories, physical and social features and are associated with particular contexts. It is the ability to interpret the significance of a given reference and the way it links with other features of the context and the co-text that contributes to the continuity of sense or coherence of a text and enables us to draw any intended implicatures (Baker: 232).

In the translation, the translators emphasize the “greatness” of Veysel, as the target audience may (naturally) not have the referential background information on him. Aşık Veysel, as an icon of Turkish music is a powerful image in the Turkish culture and what the translators attempt to do is bridging the gap through emphasizing Veysel’s importance in the source culture. Although “troubadours” and “aşiks” have common properties (they are both minstrels), information on Aşık Veysel should be best given through a footnote and most importantly without interfering with the original text. The “saz” of Veysel is treated the same way in the target text. However, this time the interference is even more unnecessary, as “the instrument’s quality of having strings” does not seem to be contributing to the target text at all.

This kind of “contributions” of the translators seem to be in contradiction with Grice’s “maxim of quantity”, which says:

(a) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

(b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

(cited in Baker: 225)

'The stringed saz' is just more informative than is required. As a result, another intervention disturbs the harmony of the original text once again.

In The Other Side of The Mountain, there are also instances where there is no explanatory contribution (and where the contribution is required for a proper transfer) made to make a cultural specificity intelligible. One example is the name 'Mehmet' which is transferred without any additional information to bridge the cultural gap. A journalist makes an interview with the soldiers in Korea:

- Albayım gazetemize neler söyleyeceksiniz?
- Ya siz, binbaşım?
- Siz üsteğmenim? Teğmenim?
- Ya sen, Mehmet?

(Atasü, 1997: 16)

This passage is translated into English as:

- Colonel, what have you to say to the papers?
- And you, Major?
- And you, First Lieutenant?
- What about you, Mehmet?

(Atasü, 2000: 151)

The translation of this passage causes the loss of a cultural detail. The target text reader may think (in view of his/her previous inferences that s/he made as s/he read the book) that Mehmet is the name of the soldier to whom the journalist is talking. However 'Mehmet' is used as a metaphor in Turkish, which is used to refer to all the soldiers in the Turkish army: "Mehmetler", "Mehmetçik" etc. On the other hand, it is also used more specifically in the text to refer to "private", the lowest rank of a soldier in the army. A Turkish reader who reads the source text may simply come to this conclusion as the ranks are hierarchically descending (binbaşı, üsteğmen, teğmen...). The journalist addresses the soldier as Mehmet because he

cannot ask the question as: “Ya sen, er?”. At this point, Mehmet appears as a *euphemism*, a figurative expression used to avoid a socially unacceptable expression. The question: “What about you, private?” may be acceptable in the target culture, but it is not appropriate for the Turkish culture. So, it may be claimed that this metaphor is ‘nullified’ in the target text. Toury lists the possibilities in translation of metaphors as follows:

- (1) metaphor into ‘same’ metaphor
 - (2) metaphor into ‘different’ metaphor
 - (3) metaphor into non-metaphor
 - (4) metaphor into 0 (i.e., complete omission leaving no trace in the target text)
- (Toury, 1995: 82)

In this case, it may be assumed that, the third alternative may best fit the translation of Mehmet. The word’s metaphorical sense is completely lost in the target text and it has become a non-metaphor, (a common name as the target audience does not possess the contextual background information to interpret ‘Mehmet’). On the other hand as the word’s figurative value is completely lost, it may also be claimed that this example lies somewhere between the third and the last alternatives (metaphor into 0).

A similar kind of loss is in the transfer of the word “Gazi”. The word is used in the book as a title of a chapter (Atasü, 1997: 148). In that chapter Vicdan’s brother Cumhur gets wounded in Korea and becomes a “veteran”. Naturally, the word is transferred to the target language as ‘veteran’ but what is missing in this transfer is that the connotations of the word ‘veteran’ do not cover ‘Gazi’, a substitution word that refers to Atatürk and used as a proper noun (the first letter is a capital, there are “veterans” (gaziler) but only one ‘Gazi’ in the Turkish culture). On the other hand, the word Gazi is also used to refer to Atatürk in the target text too. To illustrate:

But the conversation with this young woman had exhausted the Gazi (Atasü, 2000: 91).

Who could have looked on us during the Gazi's time? (Atasü, 2000: 143)

Moreover, the name "Gazi" (Atatürk) is repeated many times in the chapter that the "bilateral" use of the word justifies itself. Precisely, the title 'Gazi' holds a bilateral value in the source language. It stands as an allegory with a political standpoint in the context of the source text: Atatürk becomes a veteran for a right and noble cause: defending the country against the invaders, whereas Cumhur becomes a veteran as he is ordered to fight for the interests of some western countries in Korea). Instead of translating Gazi as 'veteran', Gazi should have been retained but with an explanatory note, thus its bilateral value could have been emphasized.

The omissions and additions examined up to this point, point to the free and comfortable style of the translators in changing (or interfering with) the *matricial norms* of the source text and in causing "deviations" from the "body" of the original text. Matricial norms, introduced by Gideon Toury to the field of translation studies refer to all the changes in the matrix (i.e. the body) of the original (source) text:

So-called **matricial norms** may govern the very **existence** of target language material intended as a substitute for the corresponding source-language material (and hence the degree of **fullness** of translation), its location in the text (or the form of actual **distribution**), as well as textual **segmentation**. The extent to which omissions, additions, changes of location and manipulations of segmentation are referred to in the translated texts (or around them) may also be determined by norms, even though the one can very well occur without the other (Toury 1995: 58-59).

In The Other Side of The Mountain, there is also another example of the violation of the matricial norms (apart from the traditional omissions and additions) that may be defined as "the omission of an hypothetical segment". The omission that

is mentioned above is realized in the transfer of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's "Bursa'da Zaman". In the source text the poem is transferred as follows:

Bursa'da bir eski cami avlusu

Küçük şadırvanda şakıyan su

Orhan zamanından kalma bir duvar

Onunla bi yaşta ihtiyar çınar

.....

Su sesi ve kanat şakırtısından

Billur bir avize Bursa'da zaman

.....

(Atasü, 1997: 227)

It may be noticed at first sight that the authoress has taken and used six verses from the original poem and placed two lines made of successive points in the poem in order to indicate the missing parts of the original poem and "marking" them with spaces that resemble "the silence" in music, no notes are played but the silence is an integral part of the whole, a part of the piece that ties parts to each other with a pause. The two lines placed by Atasü inform the reader (who has not read the original poem) that the given passage constitutes only a "partial representation of the poem". Thus, the original poem is much longer:

Bursa'da Zaman

Bursa'da bir eski cami avlusu,

Küçük şadırvanda şakırdıyan su;

Orhan zamanından kalma bir duvar...

Onunla bir yaşta ihtiyar çınar

Eliyor dört yana sakin bir günü.

Bir rüyadan arta kalmanın hüznü

İçinde gülüyor bana derinden.

Yüzlerce çeşmenin serinliğinden

Ovanın yeşili göğün mavisi
Ve mimarîlerin en ilâhisi.

Bir zafer müjdesi burda her isim:
Sanki tek bir anda gün, saat, mevsim
Yaşıyor sihrini geçmiş zamanın
Hâlâ bu taşlarda gülen rüyanın.
Güvercin bakışlı sessizlik bile
Çınlıyor bir sonsuz devam vehmiyle.
Gümüşlü bir fecrin zafer aynası,
Muradiye, sabrın acı meyvası,
Ömrünün timsali beyaz Nilüfer,
Türbeler, camiler, eski bahçeler,
Şanlı hikâyesi binlerce erin
Sesi nabzım olmuş hengâmelerin
Nakleder yâdını gelen geçene.

Bu hayâle uyur Bursa her gece,
Her şafak onunla uyanır, güler
Gümüş aydınlıkta serviler, güller
Serin hülyasıyla çeşmelerinin.
Başındayım sanki bir mucizenin,
Su sesi ve kanat şakırtılarından
Billûr bir âvize Bursa'da zaman.

Yeşil türbesini gezdik dün akşam,
Duyduk bir musikî gibi zamandan
Çinilere sinmiş Kur'an sesini.
Fetih günlerinin saf neşesini
Aydınlanmış buldum tebessümünle.

İsterdim bu eski yerde seninle

Başbaşa uyumak son uykumuzu,
Bu hayâl içinde... Ve ufkumuzu
Çepçevre kaplasın bu ziya, bu renk,
Havayı dolduran uhrevî âhenk..
Bir ilâh uykusu olur elbette
Ölüm bu tılsımlı ebediyette,
Belki de rüyâsı bu cetlerin,
Beyaz bahçesinde su seslerinin...
(Fuat: 81-82)

However, it is seen that that the two lines of dots placed by the authoress in the source text in order to refer to the missing verses and to constitute a “silence” that “fills” these verses disappeared in the translation:

TIME IN BURSA

An old mosque courtyard in Bursa
The small fountain splashing water
A wall from the time of Orhan
An ancient plane tree just as aged
Time’s a crystal chandelier in Bursa
Made of wings’ flutter and splashing water
(Atasü, 2000: 215)

It may easily be suggested that the lines of dots that refer to the “missing verses” of the poem are part of the overall matrix of the source text and this should give them a state of “immunity”. Despite the intention of the authoress to use the poem “partially” in the novel, the transfer of the poem without this crucial indicator is bound to cause a false reception of the poem by the target readers. A foreign reader who has never been introduced to Tanpınar may be misled about the actual length and structure of the original poem. As Tanpınar’s poem is an integral part of the

target culture, this choice of the translators may be considered as an “infidelity” if accurate cultural transfer is accepted as the primary criterion.

The strategy of the translators to transfer Tanpınar’s poem as if it is made of six verses may be motivated by the intention of not confusing the reader with little details of the source culture. The information that Tanpınar’s poem is longer than what is given in the target text must be deemed to be unnecessary by the translators and judged as “more informative than required” in Grice’s terms.

In The Other Side of the Mountain the intention of favouring “intelligibility” reaches such a degree that even correction of something that is “not false” appears in the translation. This situation comes out in the transfer of the name ‘Mickel Rooney’ and it constitutes a deviation from the source text that is related to “the identification of reference” as mentioned before. In one of the letters from Cumhur to Vicdan, Cumhur mentions the name “Mickel Rooney”:

Moral gecesi düzenlendi. **Mickel Rooney** “show” yaptı
(Atasü, 1997: 156).

This passage is translated as:

We had a ‘morale-boosting’ evening. **Mickey Rooney** put on
a show (Atasü, 2000: 139).

At this point, it should have been stressed that there is no printing mistake in the original book as “Mickel Rooney” is present in all the editions of Dağın Öteki Yüzü. The “mistake” in the original text is a “cultural detail”. It originates from the distance of Cumhur to American culture. He is not so familiar with American culture and he writes the name of actor Mickey Rooney with a wrong spelling. However, it is seen that the name is “corrected” in the translation with another intervention not to confuse the reader with a false referent. Here, it may be useful to remind once again the thoughts of Mona Baker on “identifying reference”

It is the ability to interpret the significance of a given reference and the way it links with other features of the context and the co-text that contributes to the continuity of sense or coherence of a text and enables us to draw any intended implicatures (Baker: 232).

The translators ignore the simple detail in the original and correct the name not to cause wrong inferences (such as a printing mistake). As a result, one more (cultural) detail gets lost through the translation process.

Another culture specific phenomenon that is not so properly handled by the translators is the “Black Sea accent”:

“Uy, ne cüzel döndünüz daa...Eferum, eferum...Ha biraz daa, ha biraz daa” (Atasü, 1997: 192).

“Eh, real nice, the way you spun round and round...Real nice, real nice! Give us another one, eh...’ (Atasü, 2000: 179).

It would surely be senseless to expect a perfect equivalent for the “Black Sea” accent of the source language, but it also cannot be supported that the accent shift is well implicated or it was intended to be implied in the first place. Yet, it should have been possible to lead to a remarkable shift in the accent. Talat Halman gives an example for this kind of situation:

About thirty years ago, I had translated a wonderful story of Orhan Kemal called “Doğum” into English. The story takes place in a Kurdish village and Kurdish accent is used. I pondered the way of transferring this accent so long. There were diverse alternatives. I could have transferred the

dialogues through Standard English. This was not a charming idea for me. I decided to try the black people's accent and I translated the story in that way. It seemed to be proper in my opinion. The translation got published, the editor liked the translation a lot –he was a well-known professor of literature. The Turkish villager in the east and the black people of Southern America had similarities in some aspects. On the other hand, some of my students criticized me about it –they said that I betrayed the story. I thought about that, they were right but whatever you do you will be betraying it (Karantay: 15-16 writer's translation).

As it is seen in this example, with a risk-taking translator's disposition, Halman preferred to domesticate the text but at the expense of making it less comprehensible for the TT reader. Toury comments on this question of "interference" as follows:

In translation, phenomena pertaining to make-up the source text tend to be transferred to the target text, whether they manifest themselves in the form of negative transfer (i.e. deviations from normal, codified practices of the target system), or in the form of positive transfer (i.e. greater likelihood of selecting features which do exist and are used in any case). This general formulation implies that interference is a kind of default, so that the establishment of an interference-free output (or even of an output where interference has been relegated to less disturbing domains) necessitates special conditions and/or special efforts on the translator's part (Toury, 1995: 275).

C. Final Remarks on ‘The Transfer of Culture’ in The Translation

According to the examples given out above (and more examples present in the book) the common motive of the translators in word choice (in Campbell’s terms) is transmitting words by preserving their sense via the unmarked choice. The result is stylistically inefficient words which lack the register features of the original (formal level, antiquity of words etc.). The words isolated from their contextual value transmit the message to the TT reader, but can not reflect the actual contextual scene. The translation of “hard words” with their *unmarked* dictionary equivalents resembles to the sight of a colour-blind person, the same objects are there but without their genuine colours, although they are like what they should resemble, the objects lack so much in their characteristic qualities.

As a result, in the light of the choices of the translators where can the translators’ disposition be situated? According to Campbell’s classification the translators’ disposition may be judged to be “persistent and prudent” as the words are conveyed with the right counterparts semantically but in such a prudent way that “no risks are taken” to *mark* the words in the TT and convey the words in their original register.

The attitude of the translators results in the tendency to choose unmarked equivalents of marked words of the ST and reducing these words to their sentences, overlooking the specific register features of the original words in context. As Albrecht Neubert suggests it, in transferring the meaning of a (ST) word is not transferring the dictionary entry, but it is an act of transferring the “word-in-text” meaning of the word:

Putting meanings across, then, becomes an exercise in dialectics. Words mean what the dictionary says they mean but, at the same time, they mean something else. Words carry over their semantic values while simultaneously giving them

up or at least transforming their seemingly immutable systemic properties. In exchange, words get immersed in a text. Their meanings receive a textual charge. They function as textwords deriving their meanings from the actual system of the text of which they form an integral part. The translator's frame of reference has shifted from word meanings to text meanings. And, as a result, text meanings percolate to 'word-in-text' meanings. Therefore, we should no longer speak of translating words but of translated texts, or rather words in texts (Neubert: 123).

The transfer of "old words" (or words of antiquity) with their unmarked counterparts, and the omissions and (explanatory) additions in the transfer of culture specific items strengthen the assumption that the overall translation is based on a "target-oriented" approach.

The translation is carried out with a strategy to make the translator (as Venuti calls it) "invisible" in the translation. The translators' aim appears to make the reader feel comfortable with a fluent reading and doing this without alienating him with details peculiar to the source culture. Such a target-oriented approach results in an "illusion" that Venuti defines as "the illusion of transparency",

The illusion of transparency is an effect of fluent discourse, of the translator's effort to insure easy readability by adhering to current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, fixing a precise meaning. What is so remarkable here is that this illusory effect conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made, starting with the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign text. The more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text (Venuti: 1-2).

As Venuti mentions it, this illusion of transparency “conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made”. Such a tendency of foregrounding the author and backgrounding the translator may only be a conscious decision of the authoress as she supervised the co-translation. This seems natural as the decisions of the translators point to their efforts of adopting *acceptability* as *initial norm* and introducing an acceptable translation and a translation in which the writer is more visible whereas the translator is backgrounded. This is a conclusion that can be reached by inspecting the overall choices in the translation. As Toury mentions it, the *initial norm* is an explanatory tool that serves to evaluate the tendencies even at micro-level decision and these micro-level decisions can still be accounted for in terms of adequacy vs. acceptability. He also adds that if an overall choice is made in a translation, every single lower decision (such as the transfer of a single lexical item) does not necessarily have to conform it (Toury, 1995: 57). In this perspective, it may be concluded that the overall choices of the translators in the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü reveals the target-oriented approach and the tendency of subscribing to the norms of the target language and culture, in order to produce an *acceptable* translation.

However, in judging the choices of the translators in this kind of a literary translation, one should not act strictly. It should always be kept in mind that the translator is restrained to some extent by various determinants. According to Holz-Manttari, the translator is a “cultural mediator who stands at the centre of a communicative chain running from the initial commissioner (requester) of the translation to the ultimate receivers” (Chesterman:34). The translator’s responsibility to the target audience and the commissioner restrains him to a considerable extent in the process of translation. Lefevere lists the ‘constraints’ (Both linguistic and non-linguistic) on translators as follows: Ideology, the power of patronage (the requester or commissioner of the translation and of course the natures of the source and target languages themselves (Chesterman: 39). Moreover when translations are carried out from peripheral cultures’ repertoires to the privileged ones’ (English as an example), a literary translation’s intelligibility gains more importance. As long as the third world literary piece tries to reach a considerable number of readers of the first world

target audience and tries to attain a “genuine” place in the “target repertoire”, *comprehensibility* appears to be the key factor. Although, being a best-seller is not a criterion for the literary value of a literary piece (as trivial literature (thrillers, romances and comics that reach a large number of readers), the first introduction of a foreign novel (via translation) to the target repertoire holds primary importance especially when it is transferred (translated) from a less prestigious language to a more prestigious one. It is possible that its first translation in the given first world language may be the last and the only one. Each year, new translations of classic (or canonical) literature are made in various languages, but the literary pieces produced in the third world and introduced to the first world may only have one chance to be translated in the high prestigious language. This fact may also obligate the translators to attach primary importance to *comprehensibility*

In these circumstances, creating “the same effect” of the source language gets even harder as the use of language in the translation has its certain constraints. These constraints are analysed in detail in the “translation policy in The Other Side of The Mountain.”

VI. THE TRANSLATION POLICY IN THE OTHER SIDE OF THE MOUNTAIN

Translation policy refers to those factors that govern the choice of text-types, or even of individual texts, to be imported through translation into a particular language at a particular point in time. Such a policy will be said to exist inasmuch as the choice is found to be non-random. Different policies may of course apply to different text groups, in terms of either text-type (e.g. literary vs. non literary) or human agents and groups thereof (e.g., different publishing houses), and the interface between the two often offers very fertile grounds for policy hunting (Toury, 1995: 58).

Toury's description touches mainly on the choice of texts to be translated, but there is one other aspect of translation policy that concerns the question: "How should a text be translated?" And this question is related to the general trends in translation and the translator's reactions to the mainstream. As an individual of the society that he/she lives in and as a mediator motivated to work in accordance with publishing companies' policies and the expectations of the reading audience, the translator cannot be judged to be free in his/her policy of translating. As Venuti states it, "the translator cannot avoid a fundamental ideological choice and what other writers had presented as simply a personal preference comes to be seen as a commitment, no doubt often in spite of the translator, to reinforcing or challenging dominant cultural codes" (Hatim and Mason : 145).

Holman and Boase-Beier suggest that the translator is sort of a filter that constrains the source text to a considerable extent:

Like the original author, the translator too, will have hierarchies of aims and agendas, some conscious, others less

so, and in different ways these will all constrain and colour the re-created SL text (Holman and Boase-Beier: 9).

The translator who cannot be considered apart from the cultural environment in which s/he is embedded, consciously or not, is under the control of the target audience. As Holman and Boase-Beier stress it:

Even if there is not always a client, there is always a client, there is always a perceived consumer, a targeted reader within a community of readers, whose needs translators ignore at their peril. The translator always has to calculate what will be acceptable in a political, cultural, social and moral sense to the TL reader- and those who for one reason or another wish to control what the target reader reads. (ibid. 12)

According to Toury, the interaction between the translator and the receivers of the translation to whom the translator holds responsibility are determined by *expectancy norms*. Andrew Chesterman adds the following comment:

Expectancy norms are established by the expectations of readers of a translation (of a given type) concerning what a translation (of this type) should be like. These expectations are partly governed by the prevalent translation tradition in the target culture, and partly by the form of parallel texts (of a similar text-type) in the target language, i.e. by the prevalent scenes and frames in the target culture. They can also be influenced by economic or ideological factors, power relations within and between cultures and the like. They cover a wide range of phenomena. Readers (who may or may not include the client) may have expectations about text-type and discourse conventions, about style and register, about the

appropriate degree of grammaticality, about the statistical distribution of text features of all kinds, about collocations, lexical choice and so on (Chesterman: 64).

Moreover, the commissioner (the “client” mentioned above, who is in charge of the translation’s “patronage”) is another determining factor in the translation process. As Chesterman puts it forward: “To the extent that patrons are also readers of the target texts, however their expectations will contribute to the expectancy norms.” (ibid. 78) The publisher appears in the translation process as a “specialist” who feels to have the right to impose some constraints on the translator in favor of the general target audience profile. S/he also appears as an authority that may incline to incite the translator to produce translations that give preference to “fluency” in reading. As Venuti states it:

A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or non-fiction, is judged as acceptable by most publishers, reviewers, and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer’s personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text—the appearance in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but “the original” (Venuti: 1).

André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett give the example of Kundera translations into English to illustrate the participation of the commissioner (or the publisher) in the translational process. They mention that Kundera uses such a language in his novels that the novels’ translations may be difficult for the average English reader to understand and they must therefore “be simplified, be made to read more like what the average reader is used to”. Lefevere and Bassnett define this chain reaction as follows:

The publisher who allows the translators to manipulate/mutilate the original does, at the same time, have the power to introduce Kundera to a new audience, albeit not in optimal conditions. And the conditions are not optimal because the publisher has to bow to another kind of power, that wielded by his banker(s): he will not be able to publish anything any more in the distant future if what he publishes does not sell (Lefevere and Bassnett: 6).

Accordingly, all the additions, the tendency of not referring to footnotes in any circumstance, omissions and other kind of deviations in the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü cannot be explained simply by the idiosyncrasies of the translators. Translators are “social beings” and they always have to bear on mind the audience that their translations are addressed to: the receivers of the target culture. In that respect, the end product of the translation process has its limits of alienating the reader. Venuti considers the influence of the target audience as a factor that should not be overlooked:

The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar; and this aim always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text, often in highly self-conscious projects, where translation serves an appropriation of foreign cultures for domestic agendas, cultural, economic, political. Translation can be considered the communication of a foreign text but it is always a communication limited by its address to a specific reading audience (Venuti: 18-19).

It is impossible for translators to eschew the dominant cultural tendencies that surround them so that a translation must not be assessed regardless of these diverse cultural factors. According to Douglas Robinson, “the social networks control, channel or influence the activity of translation in significant ways” and this is the

reason why the success of a translation may not be judged just with pure linguistic equivalence, but also with factors that seem secondary, peripheral or less important (Robinson: 193-194). Susan Bassnett points out to this mutual relationship between the translator and the governing cultural factors as follows:

Every step in the translation process—from the selection of foreign texts to the implementation of translation strategies to the editing, reviewing and reading of translations—is mediated by the diverse cultural values that circulate in the target language, always in some hierarchical order (Bassnett: 137).

Undoubtedly, the diverse cultural values mentioned above by Bassnett are not limited by the interaction between the translator, the commissioner and the target audience. There is another dimension in translation policy that covers national and international policies. The discrepancies between the prestige of languages and cultures constitute another factor that determines the translational policy. Accordingly, the translators may decide either to domesticate or to foreignize the target text. According to Michaela Wolf the power relations between cultures has a considerable effect on the translation process,

The consideration of the implications of power in the translational process have become an essential part of most (cultural turn' approaches. The asymmetrical relations between cultures intimate that power is constantly operating between cultures, be it in social, political or economic power manifestations. If we see power in line with Michel Foucault as a means of control, subjection and repression which in modern societies comes to surface as a network of practices internalised by human beings as part of socialization process and which becomes particularly vital in the interaction with other people, then various kinds of power relations at work in the process of translation are too clear. Power actually

operates at different levels, in the performance of translation, i.e. in all agencies responsible for translational production, as well as in the function of translation in the cultures involved (Wolf: 187).

Researchers and scholars in translations share the idea that deviations (in favour of the target culture) are more likely to be tolerated as far as the translation is carried out from a less privileged (or prestigious) language to the more privileged one. The less prestigious language polysystem is more inclined to deviations and violations of norms than the high prestigious one. To illustrate, there are many translations of canonized literature in Turkish. The novels of Dostoyevski, the sonnets of Shakespeare or the stories of Poe are translated into Turkish by different translators. This variety of translations helps the translators to feel more comfortable in trying out experimental approaches in translation (such as Can Yücel's translations of Shakespeare). Even if the translation is assumed to be 'wrong' or 'unsuccessful', this may not disturb the original work from the prestigious polysystem. It is still there, maintaining its constant global prestige in its original language. As there are multiple translations of the original in the target system, the reader (monolingual or not) always has the opportunity of comparing one translation to another. However a literary piece that is translated from the less prestigious language to the prestigious one, may (most of the times) not have the chance to be retranslated. This fact attaches great importance to the literary work's first introduction to the prestigious language polysystem. The intelligibility of the text has to be assured and this necessitates "acceptability" of the text and deviations from the norms of the source text. Moreover domestication appears as a "cultural tendency" of translation in the dominant cultures.

Although in some particular instances (such as Schleiermacher's foreignization strategy that was based on "nationalism" and aimed to emphasize the linguistic and cultural differences in favour of cultural purity), the general trend in the history of the western translation policy seems to adopt "domestication" in favour of the more privileged language. As Hatim and Mason put it forward,

(...) One can not help feeling that a general trend in translation seems regrettably to point in the direction of cultural hegemony and the prestige of certain languages at the expense of other, less privileged ones. The pull of a powerful target language such as English generally motivates the interventions made by translators... (Hatim and Mason: 35).

The (relative and somehow questionable) prestige of one language over another is the key factor in the translation of a text. Is the translation carried out from a more prestigious to a less prestigious language? This question determines the initial norm of the translator and governs his/her choices his translational style, and most of the time, the decisions made by the translator appear to be in favour of the dominant language and culture.

Today, English is widely used throughout the world and as it has become the “official second language” in most countries and it has become relatively the most prestigious language around the world. As Harold Schiffmann states it,

Outsiders to U.S. Anglophone culture (e.g. francophone Canadians) see English as an irresistible force, a vibrant, powerful linguistic culture that overpowers all other languages. The fact that English is not legally protected, promoted, etc. does not mean automatically that some other language might be able to mount a strong challenge to it, that is, one cannot assume that there therefore is a level playing field when it comes to competing for any of the domains now dominated by English (Schiffmann: 212).

In most countries English has become indispensable in order to assure technological and cultural advancement. The dominance of English reveals itself in popular culture and the works of art too. Movies and books published in English have the advantage of reaching a great number of audiences and readers around the

world. The difference between the accessibility of a book published only in the mother tongue of a certain country (such as Turkey) and a book translated and published in English is drastic. After a book such as Dağın Öteki Yüzü is translated into English, it is not only accessible to its native readers but also to readers from all over the world (ranging from Japanese to South America). This “privileged” status of English motivates the producers of art to present their work in English (in Turkey, this tendency is often witnessed in cinema, especially in movie posters and trailers, for example Sinan Çetin uses the phrase “A film by Sinan Çetin” in almost all of his movie trailers, the product labels of many native producers use English words: Kinetix, Advantage Card, The Marmara Hotel, Ticket-türk, Biletix etc.)

As far as the underlying reason for the enthusiasm for English is concerned, may this phenomenon be explained only by the willing submission of other countries outside the US (and British) Anglophone cultures? Today, after a number of studies, some researchers have come to the conclusion that; English is not only “dominant”, but also “hegemonistic” in nature, that it represents a kind of imperialism that rolls over other languages and subjugates them” (Schiffmann: 214).

The more, the underdeveloped countries feel this strong enthusiasm for using English, the more English becomes dominant. As English becomes more favourable in many aspects, the number of English-speaking people go up every day. Translation has its influential role in this process. As Susan Bassnett mentions it,

Translation is a sign of fragmentation, of cultural destabilisation and negotiation is a powerful image for the late twentieth century. And as English extends its international influence, so more and more people outside the English-speaking world actively participate in translational activity. Soon native speakers of English will be disadvantaged in a world that is predominantly multilingual (Bassnett: 137).

This dominance of English brings out the “domesticating tendency” in the translations made into English as the dominance of language brings the “dominance of the culture along with the language”. Yet the tendency to domestication may be at the cost of losing some cultural peculiarities. The cultural peculiarities of communities outside the Anglophone cultures are overlooked in many translations made into English. According to Lawrence Venuti, over the last centuries the domesticating tendency in Anglo-American translating “had a normalizing and neutralizing effect, depriving source text producers of their voice and re-expressing foreign cultural values in terms of what is familiar (and therefore unchallenging) to the dominant culture (Hatim and Mason: 145). This remark of Venuti runs parallel with Toury’s opinions on domestication mentioned earlier:

(...)not imposing on its object any distinctions which may prove alien to that culture thus has the big advantage of not imposing on its object any distinctions which may prove alien to that culture (Toury, 1995: 26).

On the other hand, it should also be mentioned that, as the voice of the world outside the first-world began to echo more and more inside the first-world countries, the illusion of “happy universalism of liberal humanist thought” which is imposed by the “hegemonic cultures” and its dominant maxim: “anything that can be said in one language can be said in another”, has begun to be severely criticized for the first time especially by the post-colonial and feminist theorists of translation since the mid-1980’s (Robinson: 226). Michaela Wolf also states that the view that is defined by anthropologists as “the persistence of an ideology claiming transparency of representation and immediacy of experience”, crumbled both in the field of ethnography as well as in the field of translation:

Meanings are no longer perceived as being roughly the same across different cultures, but something to be represented in codes and symbols linked to the translator’s and the ethnographer’s subjectivity and background (Wolf: 185).

Yet, as the target text is still produced for the target text audience, the central norms of the first-world translators are not to be easily shaken. Toury states that the more “prestigious” state of some languages in respect to other less prestigious ones is the key factor in the tolerance of interference (and this is a subject is profoundly related to “translation policy”):

Tolerance of interference –and hence the endurance of its manifestations- tend to increase when translation is carried out from a ‘major’ or highly prestigious language/culture, especially if the target language/culture is ‘minor’, or ‘weak’ in any other sense, ‘majority and ‘minority’, ‘strength’ and ‘weakness’ being relative rather than fixed, let alone inherent features of languages and cultures (Toury, 1995: 278).

According to Michaela Wolf, there is a similarity between ethnographers and translators: “Both can be called interpreters of culture”. The ethnographer interprets experiences and the translator interprets a “pre-given text”. The ethnographer, after interpreting the social discourse of his/her informants, represents his observations in accordance with the discourse strategies (and expectancies) of the intended (target) audience in the ‘First World’. Similarly, the translator transposes the pre-existing text in compliance with the target audience. As she states, “The Other’s voice is always filtered through the translator’s consciousness” (Wolf: 183). It may be suggested that the amount of filtration of the translator as an “interpreter of culture” may be determined by the *skopos*.

The role of *Skopos* in The Other Side of The Mountain

According to Vermeer the “communicative efficacy” of a translation is based on the degree of the fulfilment of its *skopos* (its aim or goal). He suggests that as a form of action, translation is governed by its “purpose”. The *skopos* of the translation is superior to the *skopos* of the original (even in cases when the two *skopoi* are identical in nature). According to Vermeer, (and Reiss as well) the literary

adaptations for children, linguistic-gloss translations, summary translations and other kind of adaptations (which deviate from the function and aim of the original) are produced in accordance with the *skopos*. As Chesterman suggests, according to the concept of *skopos*, the translations may turn into “various forms of adaptations” in accordance with their *skopoi* and in such circumstances “*equivalence* is no longer at premium (Chesterman: 33).

The translation connects a bridge between two cultures and the two sides of the bridge and the original text becomes something different at the other side of the bridge. The “ideal” of the artist is inevitably transformed at the end of the process. According to Vermeer,

They (translations) are not absolutely new creations; their creativeness is relative. But they “transpresent” a hetero-cultural ideal into an object of the artist’s own culture, which in turn means to translate the object, i.e. to change its form and meaning and “sense”, which again means a partial cultural transpresentation, an adaptation (Vermeer: 5).

As Vermeer states it, a translator has two tasks to fulfill: The first one is “conveying an intended meta-meaning” in such a way that the ultimate aim (*skopos*) of the communicative act is achieved (This meta-meaning is not in the source text, it is the result of the commissioner’s intention of establishing a communication by the help of the translator and is reshaped according to the cultural context of the target culture). The translator’s second task is “to transform the form and meaning of the message on its object level into a target text in such a way as to make this target text fit the intended *skopos*. Vermeer states that this second task may necessitate “a thorough change of form and content” (ibid. 11). The translator has the (cultural) responsibility of introducing “new aspects of form, content and meaning” into the target culture. So s/he has to make a decision about giving the priority to one of these aspects. As Vermeer stresses it: “One cannot serve two masters at the same time” (ibid. 13). This decision (which is primarily based on the initial norm of Toury) is

always affected by the present translation policy of the period, the intentions of the commissioner and the power relations between the two cultures. As Holman and Boase-Beier suggest it:

Translating decisions will depend to a great degree on the dimension of the entities: temporal, spatial, cultural, within which a match is sought, of what is thought of as “the text”. Translating a chapter in a novel or a whole novel, a single poem or a complete cycle of poems will provide different possibilities of matching texts and realizing their different potentials. No matter how the translator tries, no single work can stand for a whole culture and compromises always have to be found. These will be different at different times (...) the solutions will necessarily depend on the translator’s individual estimation of the different levels of perception and preparation in SL and TL audiences (Holman and Boase-Beier: 12).

Like any other translation, The Other Side of the Mountain has a certain skopos and an overall critique of the translation cannot be made without considering this factor.

In the light of the choices of the translators in the translation, it may be concluded that in the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü, the dominant motive of the translators appears to be the transfer of the messages and the literary style of the authoress –that sometimes tends to have poetic qualities- instead of alienating the reader with the idiosyncrasies of a “foreign culture”.

This attitude (or “disposition”) may justify itself in many occasions. As Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers state it:

(...) If the purpose is to shed light to the original, then a close translation even at word level is both acceptable and appropriate (as a translation of literature). If, however the purpose is to produce a text for a new literary audience (as a literary translation), then the degree of closeness (still a guiding principle) must be tempered by other factors to do with the TL and its culture and its match with the SL and its culture (Anderman and Rogers: 5).

As previously mentioned, the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü adopts *acceptability* as *initial norm* and as a result The Other Side of The Mountain appears as an acceptable translation that favours the norms of the target language and culture. The aim of the translators appears to be “producing a text for a new literary audience” instead of “shedding light to the original”. It may be suggested that, this aim of the translator is coming up with a translation that may be able to occupy a slot in the target literary system.

According to Toury, translation is an activity that involves at least two languages, two cultural traditions, in other words, “two sets of norm systems on each level” and the ‘value’ of a translation consists of two major elements:

- (1) being a text in a certain language, and hence occupying a position, of filling a slot, in the appropriate culture, or in a certain section thereof;
- (2) constituting a representation in that language/culture of another, pre-existing text , in some other language, belonging to some other culture and occupying a definite position within it.

(Toury, 1995: 56)

Toury places “literary translation” in a series that is “hierarchically ordered in terms of the specificity of the conditions imposed on the act, while also presenting basic homology” and states that any text that is considered (institutionally) as “literary” would be imposed to one of the translational strategies in this series:

- *Linguistic translation*: Any act yielding a product which is linguistically well formed, even if it does not conform to any model of text formation within the repertoire of the target culture. In this case, at least partial interference of the model underlying the ST is to be expected.
- *Textual Translation*: Such a translation would yield products which are well-formed in terms of general conventions of text formation pertinent to the target culture, even if they do not conform to any recognised literary model within it. Interference of the model underlying the ST may well be expected, namely, in terms of its literary-specific features.
- *Literary Translation*: It would involve the imposition of conformity conditions beyond the linguistic and/or general textual ones, namely, to models and norms which are deemed literary at the target end. It thus yields more or less well-formed texts from the point of view of literary requirements of the target culture, at various possible costs in the realm of the reconstruction of the ST’s own features (Toury, 1999: 166).

So, where should the overall product; The Other Side of the Mountain be situated in this hierarchical order? All the given symptoms may help us to reach the conclusion that it is a “literary translation” and rather a successful one as it is evaluated through the perspective of *skopos*. But it should also be not forgotten that the assessment of a translation is twofold. The *skopos* of the translation may be the primary criterion in its evaluation as a translation is prepared for a target audience and this audience determines the function and requirements of the end product. On the other hand, as long as literary translation is in question, the deviations from the source text become a crucial point in the assessment of a translation. However, in some instances the interference of the translators (and accordingly the deviations from the original text) reaches such an extent that the translation appears as a re-

writing with omissions, (paraphrasal) additions and peculiar “adjustments” which are all deviations from the original text. The translation may look acceptable and coherent in nature (as it is read as an independent text without any comparison with its original). On the other hand, these interferences of the translators, which serve the aim of producing an “acceptable” translation, cannot be considered as “acceptable” as they are signs of a serious infidelity to the original work. Nevertheless, the fact that the translation is a co-translation and all the deviations took place under the supervision of Erendiz Atasü, who is the writer of the original source text cannot be overlooked. The right of the author/authoress in transforming his/her work is not the subject matter of this study, but this fact strengthens our assumption that the novel is re-written for its new target audience and in accordance with the norms of this new community to whom the literary piece is introduced. Moreover, a translational error may not be justified even if the writer of the original is involved in the translation process.

CONCLUSION

Translation functions as a means of exchange between cultures. As Toury states it, translation arises out of the need of “filling in a gap” in case of a certain “deficiency” in the target culture (Toury, 1995: 27). The target culture gets enriched at the end of the process as something “new” is introduced to its repertoire. At this point, the translator’s mediating role becomes crucial. S/he undertakes a task of great responsibility: introducing one culture to another. As Jean-Marc Gouanvic puts it,

It is the image of a whole society which comes into view through translation. The image can be erroneous, fair or partial. Of course, no text offers a full view in society, not even Balzac’s panoramic *Comédie humaine*; a text holds up a partial image valid only for the section dealt with in the particular enunciation framework which the text itself establishes. The image created of a source society by means of translation taken in its entirety is worth a certain amount of symbolic capital, which circulates among those target social groups who use this literature in translation (Gouanvic: 100).

Naturally, the introduction of a society to another necessitates the careful examination of the source text and making the right decisions in the transfer in order to reflect the source culture accurately. The main problem in this act of transfer seems to be ‘the problem of non-equivalence’ between the source and the target cultures. There may be items in the source text that may seem untranslatable or some items that may seem to lose their genuine “value” and their original effect that they possess in the source language after being translated. Such problems appear in the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü as in the translation of all literary texts. These problems manifest themselves especially in the transfer of the ‘old’ Ottoman Turkish words and some culture specific items peculiar to the source culture.

As culture is an integral part of language, translation is a process is not only the transfer of the form in the surface structure but also the transfer of the culture within. The translator's task is to rearrange the codes in accordance with the target culture and the target audience's expectations. As the translator decodes the source text's message and encodes it for the target audience in a literary translation, ensuring 'equivalence' between the two texts appears as a tough challenge. As there can never be a "common translation code for all cultures", the target audience equivalence in the sense of "creating the equivalent response" from the target audience can be achieved by assuring "functional equivalence" between the two texts, that is making the target text function in a similar way that the source text had been functioning in the source culture.

In literary translation, the multi-dimensional structure of the literary texts must be transmitted along with the surface structure of linguistic forms. A literary text is greater than what is seen on its surface structure. The "organic" nature of language requires a delicate touch as the goal is to produce a literary translation. Creating the same effect (the same response from the target audience) may only be possible by preserving the "colour" of the lexical items (i.e. the features which make these items "unique" in the given context).

"Register" and "markedness" are two key concepts in revealing the features of the lexical items, in evaluating the transfer of these items and unveil what is lost through the transfer of these lexical items. "Register", which may be defined as the features that distinguish different fields of language use with clear-cut borderlines (formal/informal, archaic, modern etc.) may serve as a means of comparing the form/meaning relation between the source and target texts. As switches between the contemporary Turkish and Ottoman Turkish appear occasionally in Dağın Öteki Yüzü, this characteristic of the source text should have been emphasized in the target text by reproducing the similar (or equivalent) register features of the Ottoman Turkish words and transferring the attributes of these words through "marked" words. This way, the features of these "old words" such as formality, antiquity and infrequency should have been transmitted. A comparative analysis between the

source and target texts on the transfer of Ottoman Turkish words may indicate that, generally these words are not translated into English with words that reflect the same register features of the original and their genuine value is lost to a great extent. These words are mostly reduced to sense with their “unmarked” equivalents in the target text. It is evident that, the translators choose the easy path, however the principle of a translator should be pushing the limits of the translation, as “Nothing is untranslatable”. As Chesterman suggests it: “Translation is, after all, a form of language use; and from this point of view nothing is untranslatable: that is, everything can be translated somehow, to some extent, in some way – even puns can be explained” (Chesterman: 11).

The transfer of culture-specific items, especially those of *realia* (words and phrases that are so heavily and exclusively grounded in one culture) appears as another deficiency of the book’s translation. The dominant motive of the translators appears to be not alienating the reader and sticking to the norms of the target culture. As the translators neglected “foreignizing” the text and opted for domestication with a target-oriented approach, some cultural peculiarities in the source text are inevitably overshadowed in the translation. The translators act overconfidently in interfering with the corpus of the text and resort to omissions, additions and paraphrasal translation. However these choices of the translators are by no means ‘arbitrary’. The various conditions under which a translation is produced must always be taken into consideration as these conditions have a great influence on the translator’s overall strategy in the translation process.

The translational strategies of the translators are the result of a “translation policy” which is shaped by various external factors. Under the influence of these factors, the translators cannot be ‘genuinely creative’. They are restricted to the requirements of the commissioner (financially) and the target audience. As Holman and Hoase-Beier stress it:

The translator’s art (...) is creatively guided and controlled in a whole variety of different ways, and from this it might seem

to follow that the translator engaged in the business of guided text generation and therefore not properly in control, cannot be genuinely creative (Holman and Hoase Beier: 17).

In the assessment of a translation, it should always be kept in mind that the power relations that affect a translator's strategies in producing a new text for a new (literary) audience. Apart from the interdependencies between the commissioner and the translator, the power relations between cultures constitute a powerful determinant. The privileged status of one culture over another has a strong effect on the translation strategies of the translator, which start from the point of the determination of the "initial norm". In this respect, the adherence of the novel's translators to the norms of the source language and culture becomes more dramatic. As the flow of translations from English into Turkish (and the languages of many other "less prestigious" languages) outnumber the translations to the opposite direction, it becomes even a greater condition that the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü can occupy a "slot" in the target repertoire. This necessity arises out of the simple fact that "a novel in English has the advantage of reaching a greater number of readers" compared to a novel that is written in any other language. All these given factors are effective in the determination of the translation's "skopos". Aiming to reach a greater number of readers, the translators of the book opt for a translational strategy that is based on alienating the reader too much. Accordingly, fluency and intelligibility are features that are upheld in the translation.

The social constraints, the power relations between the translator and the commissioner and the discrepancy between the standing of the two languages regarding prestige have an undeniable effect on the translator's translation strategies. Moreover, the Turkish novels translated into English are numbered and a literary translation may naturally aim at occupying a certain 'slot' in the target repertoire. It is equally natural that a translation from Turkish to English may involve sacrifices for the interest of the target audience due to the privileged status of English. From this perspective, the translators may be deemed to have fulfilled their aim. As Newmark states it: "A good translation fulfils its intention" (Newmark, 1988: 192).

Moreover, the perfect translation seems to be an illusion. In Snell-Hornby's words: "(T)he translation *per se* does not exist, and neither does the 'perfect translation'. A translation is directly dependent on its prescribed function, which must be made clear from the start." (Snell Hornby, 1990: 82-83) *Traduttore traditore* is an unchangeable principle as no two cultures are identical in nature. On the other hand, translators should always try to push the limits of both languages in the given conditions in order to produce a translation that can create "the same effect" in the target language and they should do this without alienating the reader. At this point it should once again be reminded that the translation of Dağın Öteki Yüzü is a co-translation in which the authoress herself participated. As the deviations from the original text were realized under the supervision of the authoress, these can be overlooked to some extent. However, a literary translation is based on the transfer of texts with its "closest" representation. This is the reason why some deficiencies and deviations in the target text cannot be tolerated. The translator cannot limit him/herself to satisfy the average target reader and must take the people (literary critics, translation critics, etc.) into consideration in preparing his/her translation. Moreover, especially in co-translations, the aim should be transferring the cultural representation of the source text with its closest form in the target culture by the help of a second translator who is a member of the target audience. At this point the thoughts of Talat Halman about the co-operation of Turkish translators with English or American translators in the translations into English may be referred to:

"It is like a marriage. In some marriages there may be even a third person-who may sometimes save or ruin the marriage. There are very good examples of cooperation as well as the very unsuccessful ones. Once again, it depends on the product that comes out" (Karantay: 18).

It may be concluded that the translation of the text is an "acceptable" one in the target language and culture. With an overall view it reflects the literary quality of the original but there are some deficiencies in the transfer of some cultural elements that cannot be ignored and which originate from the skopos of the translation that is

based on ensuring intelligibility and fluency not to alienate the reader. Following the “marriage” example of Halman, it may be said that, it is Maslen’s family -the target audience- who leaves the wedding ceremony more pleased at the end.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aktunç, Hulki (1989) “Çeviride Argo Sorunu/Argo Katkısı”. *Metis Çeviri* 7: 31-33.

Anderman Gunilla and Margaret Rogers (1999) Introduction: Word, Text, Translation. Eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: *Multilingual Matters*: 1-17.

Atasü, Erendiz (1997) Dağın Öteki Yüzü. 3rd edition. Remzi Kitabevi: İstanbul.

Atasü, Erendiz (2000). The Other Side of The Mountain. Trans. Erendiz Atasü and Elizabeth Maslen. London: Milet.

Baker, Mona (1992) In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London and Newyork: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan (1998) “The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies”. Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: *Multilingual Matters*: 123-140.

Birch, David (1991) Language, Literature and Critical Practice: Ways of Analysing A text. London and New York: Routledge.

Burgess, Anthony (1984) “Is translation Possible?” *The Journal of Literary Translation* 12: 3-7.

Campbell, Stuart (1998) Translation into the Second Language. Harlow, Essex: Addison Wesley Longman.

Chan, Elsie (2002) "Translation Principle and The Translator's Agenda: A Systemic Approach to Yan Fu" Crosscultural Transgressions. Ed. Theo Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing: 61-76.

Chesterman Andrew (1997) Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary (1987) Ed. John Sinclair Harper. London: Collins.

Collins English Thesaurus (1995) Ed. Lorna Knight, Elspeth Summers et al. London: Harper Collins Publishers.

Fraser, Janet (1999) "The Translator and The Word: The Pros and Cons of Dictionaries in Translation". Word, Text, Translation. Eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 25-34.

Fuat, Memet (1999) Çağdaş Türk Şiiri Antolojisi: Vol 1. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.

Gouanvic, Jean M (2002) "A Model of Structuralist Constructivism in Translation Studies". Crosscultural Transgressions. Ed. Theo Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing: 93-102.

Göktürk, Akşit (2000) Sözün Ötesi (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Yapı Kedi Yayınları.

Gürçağlar, Şehnaz Tahir (2002) "What Texts don't tell: The Uses of Paratexts in Translation Research". Crosscultural Transgressions. Ed. Theo Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing: 44-61.

Halliday, M.A.K (1978) Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. Baltimore: University Park Press. 1978.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason (1997) Translator as Communicator. London and New York: Routledge.

Holman, Michael and Jean Boase-Beier (1999) "Writing, Rewriting and Translation Through Constraint to Creativity". The Practices of Literary Translation. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Huber, L. (1990) "Disciplinary cultures and social reproduction". European Journal of Education, 25 (3), pp. 241-261.

Hürriyet. 15. 12. (2002) "Yüzüklerin Efendisi'ni İki Yılda Çevirebildim": 6.

Hürriyet. 21. 2. (2003) "Roman Çevirisinde Kule Minare Olur mu?" : 7.

Karantay, Suat (1991) "Türkçe'den İngilizce'ye Yazın Çevirisinin Sorunları Üzerine". Söyleşi. Metis Çeviri 91 yaz Sayı 16: 13-19.

Lefevere, André and Susan Bassnett (1990) "Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights: The 'Cultural Turn' in Translation Studies". Translation, History and Culture. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Cassell: Newyork: 1-13.

Mcalester, Gerard (1999) "The Source Text in Translation Assessment". Word, Text, Translation. Eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 169-175.

Mccarthy, M. and Ronald Carter, R. (1994) Language as discourse: perspectives for language teaching. Essex: Longman Group Limited.

Neubert, Albrecht (1999) "Words and texts-which are translated? A Study in Dialectics". Word, Text, Translation. Eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 119-129.

- Newmark, P.P. (1988) A Textbook of Translation. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, Eugene A. (1964) Towards a Science of Translating. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber (1969) The theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, Eugene A (1976) "A framework for the analysis and evaluation of theories of translation". Translation: Applications and research. New York: Gardner Press: 47-91.
- Nida, Eugene A (1999) "The Role of Contexts in Translating". Word, Text, Translation. Eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 79-84.
- Nord, Christiane (1991) Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Paker, Saliha (2002) "Translation as Terceme and Nazire: Culture-bound Concepts and Their Implications for a Conceptual Framework for Research on Ottoman Translation History". Crosscultural Transgressions. Ed. Theo Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing: 121-143.
- Pedersen, Hjørnager V (1999) "Accuracy in Translation". Word, Text, Translation. Eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 47-56.
- Random House Dictionary and Thesaurus (1999) Ed. Fraser Sutherland. New York: Webster.

Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary (1997) Eds. V. Bahadır Alkım, Nazime Antel et al. İstanbul: Sev Matbaacılık.

Robinson, Douglas (2000) Becoming A Translator: An accelerated Course. London and New York: Routledge.

Schiffman, Harold F. (1996) Linguistic Culture and Language Policy. London and New York: Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1988) Translation Studies: An integrated Approach. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1990): "Linguistic Transcoding or Cultural Transfer? A Critique Of Translation Theory in Germany". Translation, History and Culture. Eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Cassell: Newyork: 79-87.

The Oxford Dictionary of Word Histories (2002) Ed. Glynnis Chantrel. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Toury, Gideon (1995) Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Toury, Gideon (1999) "How Come the Translation of a Limerick Can Have Four Lines (or Can It)?" Word, Text, Translation. Eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 157-168.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995) The Translator's Invisibility. London and New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, Hans J (1991) "Çevirmek ve Anlamak: Biçimle İşlev Arasındaki Bağımlılıklar ve Anlamanın Kültürel Ön Koşulları" Trans. Turgay Kurultay. Metis Çeviri 16: 41-49.

Vermeer, Hans J. (1994) "Translation today: Old and New Problems". Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline. Eds. Mary Snell-Hornby et al. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wolf, Michaela (2002) "Culture and Translation – and Beyond Ethnographic Models of Representation in Translation Studies". Crosscultural Transgressions. Ed. Theo Hermans. ManchesterSt. Jerome Publishing: 180-192.

