

75-INTRA¹ as a tool for comprehensibility**Aslı KALEM BAKKAL²****APA:** Kalem Bakkal, A. (2020). INTRA as a tool for comprehensibility. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö8), 964-978. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.827637.**Abstract**

This article aims to discuss intralingual translation based on the concept of comprehensibility. The framework of the study will be drawn by three articles: “Optimising comprehensibility in interlingual translation: The need for intralingual translation” by Matilde Nisbeth Jensen (2015), “Retranslation (re)visited” by Isabelle Desmidt (2009) and “Intralingual translation: An attempt at description” by Karen Korning Zethsen (2009) which will serve as the reference point. The idea of intralingual translation as a tool that optimizes comprehensibility in interlingual translation put forward by Matilde Nisbeth Jensen will be used as the starting point, whereas Isabelle Desmidt’s study, which questions the retranslation hypothesis developed by Antoine Berman (1990), will serve as the point of departure for the discussion in this paper. This article which argues that each intralingual translation following the very first translation is a retranslation, just like in the case of interlingual translation, is based on the view that comprehensibility, which is considered mainly within the framework of functional texts, can be said to be also one of the main factors driving intralingual translation of old Turkish classics. The paper that selects *Gulyabani* by Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar (1912) as its object of study discusses the intralingual translation in Turkey from the perspective of retranslation hypothesis, taking comprehensibility as the benchmark to evaluate the ‘distance’ between a literary source text and its retractions.

Keywords: Intralingual translation, comprehensibility, retranslation hypothesis, interlingual translation, *Gulyabani*

Anlaşırlık için kullanılan bir araç olarak DİLİÇİ**Öz**

Bu makale diliçi çeviriyi anlaşılrlık kavramı üzerinden ele almayı amaçlıyor ve bu bağlamda tartışmanın çerçevesini şu üç çalışma üzerinden çiziyor: Matilde Nisbeth Jensen imzalı “*Optimising comprehensibility in interlingual translation: The need for intralingual translation*” (2015); Isabelle Desmidt imzasını taşıyan “*Retranslation (re)visited*” (2009); Karen Korning Zethsen’in yazdığı ve bir dayanak noktası işlevi görecek olan “*Intralingual translation: An attempt at description*” (2009). Matilde Nisbeth Jensen’in ortaya koyduğu diliçi çevirinin dillerarası çeviride anlaşılrlığı eniyileyen bir araç olarak ele alınması fikri makalenin çıkış noktasını oluşturuyor; çalışmadaki tartışma ise Isabelle Desmidt’in Antoine Berman (1990) tarafından geliştirilmiş olan yeniden çeviri önsavını masaya yatan makalesinden hareket ediyor. Tıpkı dillerarası çeviride olduğu gibi diliçi çeviride de ilk çeviriyi izleyen her diliçi çevirinin bir yeniden çeviri olduğunu öne

¹ Karen Korning Zethsen and Aage Hill-Madsen (2016) refer to intralingual translation as INTRA in their article entitled “Intralingual translation and its place within translation studies: A theoretical discussion.” In this paper, INTRA will be used either as an adjective clause meaning ‘intralingual translation’ or as an adjective meaning ‘intralingual,’ depending on the context.

² Öğr. Gör., İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çeviribilim Bölümü (İstanbul, Türkiye), aslibakkal71@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3952-1394 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 13.09.2020-kabul tarihi: 20.11.2020; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.827637]

süren bu makale, daha çok işlevsel metinlerin çerçevesinde değerlendirilen anlaşılabilirlik kavramının eski Türkçe yazılmış klasik yapıtların diliçi çevirisine de yön veren ana unsurlardan biri olduğu düşüncesini temel alıyor. Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar'ın 1912 yılında yazmış olduğu *Gulyabani* yapıtını araştırma nesnesi olarak seçen bu çalışma, yazımsal bir kaynak metin ile onun yeniden çevirileri arasındaki 'mesafe'yi değerlendirmek için anlaşılabilirlik kavramını ölçüt alıyor ve Türkiye'deki diliçi çeviri olgusuna yeniden çeviri önsavı penceresinden bakıyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: Diliçi çeviri, anlaşılabilirlik, yeniden çeviri önsavı, dillerarası çeviri, *Gulyabani*

1. Introduction

INTRA has often been a debate topic in the field of translation studies. While some scholars regard INTRA as 'off-field,' some others see it as an integral part of the field and work for its full inclusion into translation studies, Roman Jakobson ([1959] 2000) being the first to include it in his famous tripartite classification. The position and the name of INTRA both in the academic milieu and outside of it have been recently discussed in another paper by this author, in which the role INTRA "plays today as a practice widely used not only in literary works but also in other disciplines where the jargon rules (e.g. medicine and law)" has been emphasized (Kalem Bakkal, 2019b). The present article can in fact be seen as an extension of that understanding. In this regard, this study will first discuss INTRA and the role it plays from the perspective of comprehensibility. Then, based on the first section, it will discuss INTRA in Turkey from the point of view of retranslation hypothesis, taking comprehensibility as the benchmark in the evaluation of the 'distance' between a literary source text and its retranlations.

Three articles in the field, namely "Optimising comprehensibility in interlingual translation: The need for intralingual translation" by Matilde Nisbeth Jensen (2015), "Retranslation (re)visited" by Isabelle Desmidt (2009) and "Intralingual translation: An attempt at description" by Karen Korning Zethsen (2009) will constitute the framework of the study. In line with this objective, at the outset, the concept of comprehensibility will be reviewed within the scope defined by Jensen (2015), and the discussion will go on to look at INTRA from the perspective of Desmidt (2009). Zethsen's (2009) article, on the other hand, will serve as the reference point.

The object of study is *Gulyabani*³, a famous Turkish classic written by Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar in 1912, which has become popular with numerous intralingual retranlations as well as one well-known intersemiotic translation.^{4,5}

2. The concept of comprehensibility

Jensen (2015, 164), in her article which deals with PILs – patient information leaflets – within the framework of interlingual translation, adopts a functionalist approach to define the concept of comprehensibility. What lies behind this approach is the 'functional' nature of these texts that serve to

³ The work has been also used as the object of study in my previous paper which discusses the name and position of INTRA in Turkey (see Kalem Bakkal, 2019b). It should be underlined that using the same object also for this study has not been a coincidental or arbitrary decision but a deliberate one taken with the intent of providing a complementary nature to the studies in question and also exemplifying a case where the same object is used to highlight different aspects of an issue observed from different perspectives.

⁴ *Süt Kardeşler*. [Milk Siblings] Dir. Ertem Eğilmez. Arzu Film, 1976. Movie.

⁵ For a study which discusses *Gulyabani* within a different context and with reference to the movie *Süt Kardeşler*, see Boy 2018.

make “the receiver [...] act upon the information provided” (163). According to this view, comprehensibility is not a quality “inherent in text itself” but “contingent on the receiver” (165), an outcome of the “interaction between a set of particular text characteristics and the target text receivers” (166). Comprehensibility is a “continuum” that is determined by “receivers’ prior knowledge,” “motivation” (Anderson/Davison, Stahl 2003 in Jensen 2015), and “expectations” (Rapp 2006, *ibid.*).

Although the concept of comprehensibility is also called by some other names (cf. Jensen 2015, 165), knowing the difference between these terms may help to better understand the upcoming discussion.

Jensen (2015, 165) states that “intelligibility” (Elgebaly 2012) as a term related to “translation technology and machine translation” (Daelemans/Hoste 2009) and “accessibility” (Burns/Kim 2011) are two terms used “as synonyms of comprehensibility” or comprising an “aspect” of it. The concepts of ‘explicitation’ defined as “adding information and linguistic material [...] explanatory lexis” and ‘simplification of lexis’ (Baker 1996), on the other hand, are said to be seen as elements of comprehensibility (all in Jensen 2015, 165).

Some other terms are also used within this framework. Sascha Wolfer (2015, 34), for example, underlines the distinction between ‘comprehension’ and ‘comprehensibility.’ The scholar defines comprehension as “the process of understanding a text by building up a mental representation” and comprehensibility as “how easy a text can be comprehended.” Based on these definitions, it can be deduced that while ‘comprehension’ refers to a fact related to receivers, comprehensibility relates to a feature of a text. ‘Readability’ and ‘legibility’ are two other terms used in relation with comprehensibility. The former, which refers to “the purely physical dimension of perceiving written text,” is considered as “a first step towards measuring comprehensibility” (*ibid.*). The latter, on the other hand, deals only with “easily observable surface characteristics” of a text, “like font size and width” (35). What is of interest to the scope of this paper, though, is that Jensen (2015) considers comprehensibility within the framework of functional texts and sees INTRA “as a useful approach to comprehensibility operationalization” (167).

The concepts underlined by Jensen (2015) are also emphasized by Zethsen (2009). Zethsen (2009, 808) argues that ‘comprehension’ – based on the above discussion, the term can be thought of as being used as a synonym for ‘comprehensibility’– “is a central aim in both kinds of translation,” namely INTRA and interlingual translation. Following this, similarities between the two in terms of strategies used are also emphasized by the scholar, the difference lying on the “degree and motivation rather than kind” (809). Another argument made by Zethsen is that “functional translation theory has narrowed the gap between intralingual and interlingual translation” (*ibid.*). When considered together, all these claims form the ground which this paper is based on.

The discussion sets out with an article on “interlingual translation of functional texts” and arrives at “intralingual retranlations of literary texts.” The vehicle used in this journey is INTRA, a vehicle which is depicted as first ‘serving’ interlingual translation as a means of optimizing comprehensibility and then as a translation type *sui generis* serving its recipients not only with first translations but also with retranlations.

3. INTRA in service of interlingual translation

Jensen (2015, 169) claims that for maximum comprehensibility, regardless of the complexity level of the source text, “the translator needs to tailor the text intralingually.” She also stresses that this necessity is primarily true in the case of functional texts where source texts written by experts are hardly comprehensible to lay people (ibid.). This is the situation Zethsen (2009, 806) categorizes under ‘knowledge,’ one of the four parameters in INTRA, the other three being ‘time,’ ‘culture,’ and ‘space.’ It should be noted that Zethsen (ibid.) also indicates that “more than one factor will have an impact in any given instance of intralingual translation.” This is just the case for functional texts where the ‘space’ factor is also prominent since ‘explanatory translations,’ which are defined as “intralingual translations instigated by the parameter of knowledge” (ibid.), may necessitate “reduction” or “extension” to make the translation ‘comprehensible’ to the target reader.

At this point, it is worth discussing the concept of Plain Language (PL) elaborated by Jensen (2015, 169) within the framework of INTRA strategies. Among the strategies mentioned by Zethsen (2009, 808) are “omission, objective addition, explicitation, restructuring and paraphrase,” and they all serve comprehensibility. It is true that these strategies can also be used by PL, which is defined by Wicklund/Ramos (2019 in Jensen 2015, 169) as “communication that an audience can understand the first time they read or hear it” or as “the writing and setting out of essential information in a way that gives a co-operative, motivated person a good chance of understanding it at first reading” by Cutts (2009 in Jensen 2015, 169). Jensen also draws attention to various uses of the term ranging from “a reference to the work conducted by PL movements” to a much broader one as “communicating in a comprehensible manner”⁶ (ibid.).

It would also be beneficial for the upcoming discussion to underline the distinction between the two concepts. As Jensen argues, PL “can be viewed as a type of intralingual translation, because the aim of Plain Language is to *translate* a complex monolingual text into language which is plainer and easier to read and understand for lay people” (2015, 169; original emphasis). The scholar also refers to Jakobson (1959) and Zethsen (2007, 2009) stating that optimizing comprehensibility “also requires intralingual translation competence” (in Jensen 2015, 167). Used by Jakobson ([1959] 2004) in defining INTRA, almost as a synonym, the term “rewording” (Jakobson 1959 in ibid.) has also naturally been mentioned by Jensen in this respect, together with its definition as “replacing a linguistic element belonging to a certain language with another linguistic element belonging to the same language” (ibid.). In the case of PL, that “another linguistic element” is always aimed to be simpler, plainer, less complex to achieve its goal of being a “writing that is clear, concise, well-organized, and follows other best practices appropriate to the subject or field and intended audience” (<https://plainlanguage.gov/about/definitions/>).

The main – presumably the sole – aim of PL is making a text plain to render it comprehensible to the lay people. On the other hand, although it is true that achieving comprehensibility may be – and most of the time is – one of the main aims of INTRA – as will be exemplified by the case studied in this article – intralingual translation may also serve various other objectives.⁷ It may be useful to emphasize here once again that comprehensibility as a quality is “contingent on the receiver” (Jensen 2015, 165) and this fact illustrates more explicitly the distinction between PL and INTRA. For PL,

⁶ For further information on Plain Language and Plain Language movement, see <https://plainlanguage.gov>.

⁷ A detailed analysis of this subject goes beyond the scope of this paper and deserves a study of its own. On the other hand, a situation which exemplifies one of those other possible aims of INTRA is given in this paragraph.

comprehensibility ‘equals to plainness’ whether the target receiver is “the public” – when PL refers specifically to PL movements – or the machine – in the case of machine learning. Nevertheless, in an INTRA situation, what is ‘replaced’ is not always necessarily more complex, older, technical or difficult to understand than what ‘replaces.’ In other words, an intralingual translation product may be incomprehensible to a layperson, the reason being that in the case of INTRA the target receiver is not always a layperson. Such a case is mentioned by Hill-Madsen (2015, 197) as “the opposite ‘direction’ of interregisterial INTRA” and described as “the rewriting of laymen’s language into an expert-oriented register,” and the case is exemplified by “doctors’ consultation rooms, where the GP translates the patient’s descriptions of his/her symptoms into the proper medical terms in the patient’s record” (ibid.). PL has one aim and that is to render a text plain for the layperson (or for the machine, in the case of machine translation); INTRA has many aims as it has various target receivers. Thus, INTRA tailors its strategies according to its aim, just like interlingual translation does. Hence, in line with Jensen (cf. 2015, 169), it is possible to argue that this distinction between PL and INTRA makes the latter encompass the former.

4. Interlingual translation from the perspective of retranslation hypothesis

Desmidt (2009), in her article in which she discusses the extent the re-translation hypothesis^{8,9} (Berman, 1990) “is supported by empirical evidence” (669), reaches the conclusion that “the global impact of the hypothesis should be toned down as well as the need for a longer maturing process” (679).

As the scholar summarizes, the retranslation hypothesis puts forward that retranlations, “new translations of earlier translated texts” (Desmidt 2009, 670), “tend to be more source culture oriented than first translations” because first translations “determine whether or not a text (and its author) is (are) going to be accepted in the target culture” and thus they “deviate from the original to a higher degree than subsequent, more recent translations” (669). Analyzing her corpus from the perspective of this claim, she concludes that “there was no overall tendency to go back to the original and produce a source text oriented text”¹⁰ (678).

With translating seen as “the solving of a social, communicative problem” caused by “language barriers,” (Desmidt 2009, 670) she states that what “the retranslation hypothesis is based on” is “the implication of change” (673) since “changes in social context will lead to changes both in translations and in the way translations are looked upon” (670).

The nature and extent of that change are determined by various factors (Desmidt 2009, 670), among which “the message to be transferred,” “the partners involved,” “the intended function of the translation,” and “norms” (ibid.) come to the forefront as the main ones shaping the (re)translation. With these factors in mind, it becomes evident that retranlations are not limited to classical works only; “more recent and/or less canonical texts” and even “technical texts are often subject to retranlations” (Desmidt 2009, 670). Underlining the importance of the “text type” (678), the scholar calls for a “broader vision that would include various text types and genres and which would not only

⁸ The scholar adopts the term of ‘(re)rewriting hypothesis’ aiming “to broaden the perspective” so as to include in her study “not only interlingual [...] (re)translation in the narrow sense of the word (from one language to another), but also other forms of (re)rewriting” (Desmidt 2009, 672). The present study will stick to the term of “retranslation hypothesis,” except for quotations.

⁹ See also Bensimon 1990 and Rodriguez 1990.

¹⁰ For a full discussion on the findings, see Desmidt 2009.

take into account [...] direct interlingual (re)rewriting, [...] but also indirect and intralingual and intermedial (re)rewriting” (679-80). This paper is hoped to be seen as an attempt to give an ear to that call.

5. Turkish INTRA retranlations from the perspective of retranlation hypothesis

In the current Turkish literary system, INTRA of old Turkish classics is a very common trend.¹¹ This situation may, in fact, be explained by all four parameters, i.e. ‘knowledge,’ ‘time,’ ‘culture,’ and ‘space,’ put forward by Zethsen (2009, 805-7). The Turkish language reform in 1928, through which Arabic alphabet was replaced by Latin alphabet, can be considered as the main trigger of this tendency in Turkey,¹² as a contemporary average Turkish reader who wants to read and comprehend an old Turkish classic written a century ago (time parameter) may not be knowledgeable (knowledge parameter) about Ottoman Turkish as well as the culture of that time (culture parameter) and an intralingually translated text may require more (in the case of added footnotes or dictionaries) or less (in the case of omissions of words, sentences, chapters) space (space parameter).

What is striking in the Turkish INTRA case, though, is that, as exemplified by the corpus herein, almost none of the works is called ‘translation’ by their publishers¹³. As one would naturally expect, since they are not considered to be ‘translations’ in the first place, their subsequent translations are not considered as ‘retranlations.’ Nevertheless, it is my belief that not only in the case of interlingual translation but also in the case of INTRA every translation – direct or indirect – of the same source text that follows the first translation is a ‘retranlation,’ or more specifically, an ‘intralingual’ retranlation, i.e. an INTRA retranlation. Today, in the Turkish literary system the INTRA tranlations and retranlations of old Turkish texts abound. The main drive behind this effort seems to be the desire to make these works accessible to contemporary Turkish reader, the main ‘problem to be solved’ being ‘comprehensibility’ of these old texts as their peritexts suggest:

Some parts of the language used by Ömer Seyfettin have also become obsolete [...] many Arabic and Farsi words are no longer in use.¹⁴

[...] In order to make it possible for today’s young people to read and understand this great author of ours more easily, we simplified some parts of this new edition and adapted it to contemporary Turkish.¹⁵ (Seyfettin 2018, 5)

In adapting the book to contemporary Turkish, we tried, with least interference with the author’s language, to find the most appropriate equivalents for Arabic, Farsi words and compounds that were almost completely removed from Turkish dictionaries; even if they would be the exact equivalent of the word in the book, we did not use new words that could harm the text harmony.¹⁶ (Gürpınar 2019b, 9)

¹¹ For further information and discussion on intralingual translation in Turkish, see also Berk Albachten 2005, 2012, 2014, 2015, 2019; Birkan Baydan 2011; Canseven 2017; Karadağ 2017, 2019.

¹² For information on INTRA of old Turkish classics see Abir 2012; Berk Albachten 2005, 2012, 2014, 2015, 2019; Baydere 2019; Baydere & Karadağ 2019a/b; Kalem Bakkal 2019b; Karadağ 2017, 2019; Öztürk Baydere 2019; Paker 2002, 2014.

¹³ The study has been carried out on the basis of publishers and not translators since in the examined works it is the publishers that explain the translation strategies, either in publisher’s notes or on back covers, by using the first-person plural pronoun “We” and thus making the translator invisible, even though her/his name is given in some of the works on the inner cover, but with a title other than ‘translator.’ The translator has been made even non-existent in some other cases where her/his role has not been mentioned specifically but just been ‘embedded’ into the title of ‘editor.’ This is a very important issue which deserves a study of its own (For a study on editing, see Birkan Baydan 2011).

¹⁴ All translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

¹⁵ Ömer Seyfettin’in dili de zamanla yer yer eskimiş, [...] birçok Arapça, Farsça sözcük kullanılmaz olmuştur [...] Günümüz gençlerinin bu büyük yazarımızı daha rahat okuyup anlayabilmesi amacıyla bu yeni baskıyı yer yer sadeleştirip günümüz Türkçesine uyarladık.

¹⁶ Kitabı günümüz Türkçesine uyarlarken yazarın diline en az müdahaleyle artık Türkçe sözlüklerden neredeyse tamamen çıkmış Arapça, Farsça kelimeler ve terkipler için en uygun karşılıkları bulmaya çalıştık; kitaptaki kelimenin tam karşılığı olsa bile metnin ahengini bozacak türdeki yeni kelimeleri metinde kullanmadık.

After its fifth edition, the work [*Çahkuşu*]¹⁷ was republished in 1939, with some changes made by Reşat Nuri Güntekin himself. This book has been prepared for publication in accordance with the original, taking the mentioned edition as the basis.¹⁸ (Güntekin 2015, 4)

This book [*Dokuzuncu Hariciye Koşusu*] has been prepared for publication taking young generations into consideration, thus contemporary orthography has been used and some Arabic and Farsi words have been replaced by their Turkish equivalents.¹⁹ (Safa 2004, 5)

There have always been a few versions of Ömer Seyfettin's stories published by different publishers. However, as some of them [...] were prepared twenty-thirty years ago – as partially simplified – they are cumbersome for today's elementary school students, because especially the stories written before 1913 by Ömer Seyfettin are quite rich in terms of Ottoman Turkish phrases and Arabic, Farsi words.

The ones recently published as simplified, on the other hand, have been made so different from the author's original language and style that it can be said that they have been falsified.²⁰ (Seyfettin n.d., 9-10)

All the stories in this series have been simplified by the experts and they preserve the author's style.²¹ (Seyfettin 2016, back cover)

These notes have been taken from some randomly chosen retranlations of old Turkish classics, and their number can easily be increased. Their 'random selection' is intentional though; it serves to emphasize that the aim, i.e. the 'raison d'être' of these retranlations does not change: the main drive behind almost all current INTRA retranlations in Turkey is to render these works comprehensible to contemporary Turkish reader, mainly young readers as many of these works are also used within the curriculum. As illustrated by the above notes, simplification via replacement of old Turkish words – mostly Arabic and Farsi words – with the new ones is a prominent intralingual strategy, and almost all of the works claim to be faithful to the source text. Nevertheless, it should be underlined that what many of them refer to as the source text is in fact the first INTRA of the 'original source text'²² as exemplified by one of the works in the corpus of this paper.

For this book we took the 1938 edition as the basis; that edition was published when the author was still alive, and it was prepared with Latin letters in a simplified language. We compared that edition with the first edition of the book. We noted the changes regarding meaning and sentence structure in footnotes. When necessary, we also referred to later editions.²³ (Gürpınar 2019b, 9)

Apart from clarifying the use of the first INTRA translation as the 'main' source text, the above note also indicates that what Desmidt has observed in her corpus has a counterpart in this study which deals with Turkish INTRA retranlation. Desmidt refers to "a combination of indirect, intralingual revision with direct, interlingual revision" (2009, 674) in her study; similarly, the present case portrays a combination, but this time of direct intralingual translation – since the 'original source text' has also been used – with indirect INTRA retranlation – since subsequent INTRA retranlations have

¹⁷ For studies on *Çahkuşu*, see Abir 2012, Baydere & Karadağ 2019a/b.

¹⁸ Beşinci baskısından sonra eser [*Çahkuşu*], 1939 yılında bizzat Reşat Nuri Güntekin tarafından ele alınıp bazı değişiklikler yapıldıktan sonra tekrar yayımlanmıştır. Bu kitap söz konusu baskısından yararlanılarak aslına uygun olarak yayına hazırlanmıştır.

¹⁹ Bu kitap [*Dokuzuncu Hariciye Koşusu*], genç kuşaklar dikkate alınarak günümüz imlasıyla ve kimi Arapça, Farsça sözcüklerin Türkçe karşılıkları temel alınarak yayına hazırlanmıştır.

²⁰ Ömer Seyfettin'in hikâyelerinin değişik yayınevlerince basılmış birkaç versiyonu her zaman var olagelmıştır. Ancak bunların bir kısmı [...] yirmi-otuz yıl kadar önce -kısmen sadeleştirilerek- hazırlanmış oldukları için, bugün ilköğretim düzeyindeki çocuklara dil bakımından ağır gelmektedir. Çünkü Ömer Seyfettin'in özellikle 1913'ten önce kaleme almış olduğu hikâyeleri Osmanlıca tamlamalar ve Arapça, Farsça sözcükler bakımından hayli zengindir. Son dönemlerde sadeleştirilerek yayımlananlar ise yazarın özgün dil ve üslubundan o kadar uzaklaştırılmıştır ki, adeta tahrif edilmiş denebilir.

²¹ Bu seride yer alan bütün hikâyeler alanın uzmanlarınca sadeleştirilip yazarın üslubu korunarak yayımlanmaktadır.

²² For a similar discussion also see Karadağ 2019.

²³ Elinizdeki kitabı yayına hazırlarken yazar hayattayken yapılan, dili sadeleştirilerek hazırlanmış, Latin harfli 1938 baskısını esas aldık. Bu baskıyı kitabın ilk baskısıyla karşılaştırdık. Anlama ve cümle düzenine dair değişiklikleri dipnotlarda belirttik. Gerek gördüğçe daha sonra yapılan baskılara da başvurduk.

been referred to – although they are said to be used in the process for comparison purposes, presumably to check the ‘faithfulness’ of translation. The claim of being ‘faithful’ to the original is also accentuated in another edition by the same publisher:

In preparing this book, we did not interfere with the author’s language, style, word choice; we only adapted his spelling to contemporary rules.²⁴ (Gürpınar 2019a, 9)

Whether what is claimed in these peritexts is really reflected on the INTRA or not will be analyzed on the basis of *Gulyabani* by Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, first published in 1912 in Ottoman Turkish. The corpus of the study covers one translation and eleven retranslations of the work. It should be underlined that while in two of the retranslations (Can Yayınları, 2019a and 2019b) it is clearly indicated that the first INTRA of the work, which was published in 1938 in Latin letters in “a simplified language,” has been taken “as the basis” (2019b, 9), i.e. as the source text, three of them state that their source text is the original work itself. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları (2019, ii) refers to the original text as “the source of the adaptation;” Kırmızı Kedi Yayınları (2016, 2) uses the phrase of “simplified from the Ottoman Turkish by;” and İnkılâp Yayınları (2017, 3) designates it as “transcription and simplification.” The rest does not provide any explanation as to their source text. Although one of them, Palet Yayınları, very severely criticizes the “attitude of hastily transferring the examples of Turkish literature written before 1928 into new letters,”²⁵ (2015, 7) it seems that it does not feel the need to indicate its source text. It is important to note that the INTRA retranslations that form the corpus of this study will be analyzed based on the section titled “Introduction: Letter from the dame to the author.”²⁶

It should be remembered that the aim of this study is to see to what extent what Desmidt observes in interlingual translation in terms of retranslation hypothesis applies to the current Turkish INTRA retranslation trend specifically, which by a majority claims – through peritexts – to make the ‘source text’ more comprehensible to the current Turkish reader. Within this framework, this study can only be taken as a minor simulation of Desmidt’s in terms of its corpus size. Whereas the scholar’s corpus includes 70 versions of “a Swedish children’s classic” published in 1906-1907 “covering a period of little more than 90 years” (672), the present corpus includes only eleven retranslations of an old Turkish classic published in 1912, covering a period of only five years, from 2015 to 2020. It goes without saying that much more detailed studies with a more comprehensive corpus that covers a much larger period of time may give a clearer picture of the case.

The quantitative analysis model based on determining the “changes” adopted by Desmidt (2009, 674) will also be used in this study, but with a modification. While the scholar takes chapters as units of analysis, the analysis in this study will be based on words, not only because just one section of a chapter is subject to analysis but also because the common translation strategy adopted in the corpus is mainly at lexical level. The examples given in the quantitative analysis will provide the opportunity to focus on characteristics of the changed items, and this will enable us to see what a Turkish literary INTRA retranslation does at lexical level in order to ‘function’ as a tool for comprehensibility. The figures, on the other hand, will reflect the ‘changes’ the editions include, and this will serve as an

²⁴ Bu kitabı hazırlarken yazarın diline, üslubuna, kelime tercihlerine müdahale etmedik; sadece imlasını günümüz kurallarına uyarladık.

²⁵ 1928 öncesi Türk edebiyatının örneklerini yeni harflere aktarma işinde [...] çalاکalem bir tutumun sergilendiđi [...]

²⁶ Mukaddime: Hanım Nineden Muharrire Mektub (Transliterated from Gürpınar 1912, 4). This part has been transcribed by Osman Çeviktay (instructor at Yıldız Technical University; e-mail: ocevik@yildiz.edu.tr.) from the original book, i.e. the one published in 1912, in order to make it possible to compare both the first translation and the retranslations with the ‘original source text’ to determine the ‘changes,’ if any.

indicator of their ‘distance’ to the source text, which, in turn, will allow evaluating the retranslations from the perspective of retranslation hypothesis.

5.1. The quantitative analysis

In this analysis, any word omission, addition, replacement or any phrasal change is considered a “change,” and a change is regarded as a sign pointing to the distance between the source text and the retranslations. Contrary to the publishers stating that they take the first translation (published in 1938) as the basis, the source text in this analysis refers to the original text published in 1912. The source text’s first section transcribed for this study comprises 268 lexical items, of which a total of 70 have been changed in the first and/or subsequent translations. While some of these 70 items have been changed in almost all editions, some others have been replaced by new items only in a few.

The findings will be categorized based on three criteria, namely lexical items, publishers, and years.

5.1.1. Analysis based on lexical items^{27, 28}

Twenty-one items out of 268 have been changed in 11 editions, including the first translation. Among them are *usul-ü tefekkürümüz* (way of thinking), *terbiye-i dimağgiye* (mental training), *isad* (elevation), *ibraz* (submission), *mütezelzil* (shaken), and *lerzedar* (trembling), to name a few. The majority of contemporary Turkish readers are most probably not familiar with these old lexical items, some of which also reflect the different compound structure of Ottoman Turkish. It is quite likely that the average contemporary Turkish reader does not know the meanings of these words, probably except only one, *ibraz*, as this is a commonly used term in Turkish legal language.

Another large group of words changed in nine editions include words like *elan da* (also now), *baptaki* (on this subject), *hemsinim* (my peers), *münbasit* (pleasant), and *müfekkire* (thinking skill); these words can be considered as equally incomprehensible for the target reader, if the person is not specifically knowledgeable about Ottoman Turkish. On the other hand, although some words in this category may be familiar to some audience, such as *muharrir* (author), *malik olmak* (to own) and *tenzil* (degradation), it seems that publishers of the retranslations have preferred not to take any risks that could harm the comprehensibility of their work.

A third group of almost equal size as the first two (a total of 18 items) can be created by combining two groups of lexical items that have been changed by almost the same number of publishers (one half changed by seven publishers and the other half by eight). Among them are *ilmi* (scientific), *fenni ve içtimai* (technical and social), *mevzu* (subject), *tertip* (organization), *vaka* (case), *mertebe* (grade), *ümme* (illiterate), *ihhlas ve iktidar* (expertise and potency), and *mukayese* (comparison). What mainly defines these items is the fact that they are Ottoman Turkish words that would most likely sound familiar and even be comprehensible to at least a certain age group in the target readership. Still, they have been changed in more than half of the editions, presumably with the same concern of comprehensibility.

The last group contains the items changed only in half of the editions or less. *Tasdik* (confirmation), which is very frequently used in legal settings, has been replaced by *kabul* (acceptance) or *onaylama* (approval) in six of the retranslations; *müsaade ediniz* ([please] permit [me]) has been intralingually

²⁷ Punctuation and spelling differences have been disregarded in the analysis unless they result in a difference in meaning.

²⁸ In just one of the editions in the corpus, İskele (2017), a change at sentence level has been done by omission.

translated as *izin veriniz* ([please] allow [me]) in just one of them whereas the word *yardım* (help) has replaced *lütuf* (favor) just in two editions. These are all lexical items used in contemporary daily Turkish, which may suggest that the more comprehensible a lexical item is, the less likely it is replaced by a newer one. One can deduce that what matters is not whether the item is old or not; what matters is comprehensibility.

5.1.2. Analysis based on publishers²⁹

The first translation of *Gulyabani* by Gürpınar (1912) was published in 1938 by Hilmi Kitabevi. According to the retranslation hypothesis as summarized by Desmidt (2009, 671), this first translation is expected to “deviate from the original to a higher degree than subsequent, more recent translations.” Based on the lexical analysis, the work is found to have changed 23 lexical items out of 268. Compared with the retranlations that have been carried out much later, namely between 2015 and 2020, the first translation does not seem to be in line with the hypothesis in question; except two retranlations, all the rest, namely nine of them are observed to ‘deviate’ from the source text to a much higher degree, as the figures below indicate:

Publishers	Number of changed items
1938 Hilmi	23
2015 Everest	68
2015 İthaki	65
2015 Palet	0
2016 Kırmızı Kedi	47
2017 İnkılâp	59
2017 İskele	68
2017 Parga	68
2018 Bilgi	65
2019 Can (Orijinal)	18
2019 Can (Günümüz Türkçesi)	59
2019 İş Bankası	53

Table 1: Number of changed items based on publishers

Taking a closer look at the exceptional two retranlations, i.e. the ones by Palet and Can *Orijinal*, it becomes evident that their targeted aim differs from the aim of the others in the list.

Can *Orijinal*, as the name suggests, claims to be the retranlation of the original work; however, as quoted earlier, the publisher’s note explains that 1938 edition – which is in fact the first translation of the work – has been taken as the basis and the original work published in 1912 has been referred to only for comparison purposes. The publisher’s note goes on to clarify the translation strategies applied, i.e. “preparing a dictionary at the end of the book for Arabic, Farsi words,” “[writing] the foreign words also in their original form,” “[trying] to give the meanings of some Turkish origin words, folk sayings

²⁹ Henceforth Can Yayınları 2019a will be referred to as Can *Orijinal* (Original) and Can Yayınları 2019b as Can *Günümüz Türkçesi* (Contemporary Turkish).

that are not frequently used today”³⁰ (9). That exactly the same lexical items in the 1938 edition have been changed in *Can Orijinal* can be taken as a confirmation of the fact that the first translation has served as the source text – a point already clarified by the publisher – and that the intralingual retranslation is actually an “indirect translation” (Gambier 2003, 57).

In the other exceptional case, the intralingual retranslation published by Palet is observed to be the only one that does not contain any changes. The strategy used seems to be mere transcription, i.e. in this case, the ‘translation’ of Arabic letters into Latin ones.³¹ In this regard, this edition can even be argued to be the most ‘faithful’ to the source text, even more than the first translation, a point signaling the validity of the retranslation hypothesis for this specific, single case.

What these two cases suggest in terms of comprehensibility, though, can be said to differ. In the case of *Can Orijinal*, although it is written on the back cover that “[they] present this masterpiece after a comparative work done on the first publications and with explanatory footnotes, without interfering with its original language,”³² the changes indicate that comprehensibility has not been put aside altogether and has still been considered to be an issue to be taken into account. Palet, on the other hand, is a totally different case in which comprehensibility has almost been regarded as something to avoid:

Although transferring texts written in old letters into new ones and being faithful to the original work while doing this raise an apparent difficulty in terms of inviting young generations that have turned into lexically poor people to read and understand the book [...] we will settle for pointing out to the importance of dictionary-human relationship and for reminding that everyone has to face with this difficulty.³³ (2015, 8)

It is obvious that the first and foremost aim of the publisher is not comprehensibility. It seems that it is rather to ‘teach what is old to the young.’ A point disregarded by the publisher, though, is that the strategy chosen, i.e. giving the meanings of the incomprehensible old words in footnotes, is a way also adopted by many other publishers. Again, what comes out is a question of degree. While others prefer to keep some of the old words – the ones that are currently in use or relatively easier to understand – in the text and explain some others in footnotes or in a dictionary at the end of the book, Palet prefers to keep every such word in the text and to give the meanings in footnotes. The same strategy ‘used in different degrees’ lays different degrees and types of responsibility on the target reader. That 9 – even 11 if *Can Orijinal* and the first translation are also included – out of 12 editions opt for a ‘lesser degree’ of the ‘footnote and dictionary strategy’ and choose to replace the old lexical items with newer ones can be said to indicate the target reader’s tendency and the need for ‘easy’ comprehensibility.

At this point, it is worth mentioning the use of a word by Palet since it contradicts the ‘mission’ it undertakes. Based on both its intralingual translation strategy discussed earlier and its back cover note in which it questions in a severe tone the ‘simplification’ strategy and the way it is carried out by many other publishers, Palet, as mentioned before, can be seen as the one claiming to be the most ‘faithful’ to

³⁰ Arapça, Farsça kelimeler için kitabın sonunda bir sözlük hazırladık. Yabancı kelimeleri de özgün şekilleriyle yazmaya çalıştık. Bugün sık kullanılmayan Türkçe kökenli bazı kelimelerin, halk deyişlerinin anlamlarını [...] dipnotlarda vermeye çalıştık.

³¹ For a discussion on transcriptions, see Durmaz Hut 2019.

³² [...] bu eşsiz başyapıtı[mı] ilk baskıları üzerinde yapılan karşılaştırmalı çalışma ve açıklayıcı dipnotlarla, özgün diline müdahale etmeden sunuyoruz.

³³ Eski harfli metinlerin yeni harflere aktarılması, bu aktarma yapılırken de eserin orijinaline sadık kalınması; kelime fukarası haline getirilmiş genç nesilleri, kitabı okumaya ve anlamaya davet noktasında bariz bir zorluğu karşımıza çıkarsa da [...] sözlük-insan ilişkisinin önemine atıfta bulunup bu zorluğu herkesin göğüslemesi gerektiğini hatırlatmakla yetinelim.

the source text with the aim to introduce the old texts to the young in the most ‘correct’ way. Thus, it is striking to see that a publisher that “asks everyone to face with this difficulty” (of “reading and understanding the book”) uses the word *ziyâ*, which means ‘light’, instead of *zıyâ* meaning “loss” (Özön, 1989) in the text and gives its meaning as “loss” in footnote. Moreover, that the first translation also uses the wrong word raises question marks over the text taken as the source text.

It should be noted that the same mistake has also been made by Kırmızı Kedi (2016); the word *ziya* is used in the text and its correct meaning, ‘light’, is given in footnote. Nevertheless, using *ziya* instead of *zıya* damages the flow of the text as the tiny dot on the letter ‘i’ leads to a loss of meaning.

5.1.3. Analysis based on years

The final part of the analysis focuses on years with the hope to get an idea about the ‘distance’ between the source text and its retranslations. To put it differently, in the specific case studied where comprehensibility taken as the aim and the change in lexical items as an indicator of that ‘distance’ – the more the changes, the more the distance – is it possible to say that the longer the time span between the source text and retranslations, the less the ‘distance’ between the two? It should be remembered at this point that this study focuses only on the very recent retranslations of a work, i.e. on the retranslations that have been produced in the last five years. Although this can be seen as a limitation of the study since the corpus does not lend itself to a comparison of retranslations done in different and larger periods of time, it is believed that this ‘sample group’ pertaining to more recent times could still provide an idea about the topic.

Year	Number of changed items
1938 – tr.	23
2015	0 / 65 / 68
2016	45
2017	59 / 68 / 68
2018	65
2019	23 / 53 / 59

Table 2: Number of changed items based on years

According to the table, it would not be wrong to conclude that this one sample taken from the Turkish INTRA of old Turkish classics presents a direction opposite to the one put forward by the retranslation hypothesis so that the answer to the question in the previous paragraph seems to be a ‘no.’ Instead, when what is aimed is comprehensibility, namely making old Turkish classics written more than a century ago comprehensible to the ‘average’ Turkish reader of the 21st century, it can generally be said that the longer the time span between the source text and retranslations, the more the distance between the two. Based on the table, it is not possible to argue that the first translation is the one that deviates from the source to the greatest extent either.

6. Conclusion

This paper has set out with the aim of discussing Turkish INTRA in terms of comprehensibility. In this respect, two articles have served as ‘triggers,’ one by Jensen (2015) approaching INTRA as a tool to benefit from in interlingual translation to optimize comprehensibility and the other by Desmidt (2009)

discussing the validity of retranslation hypothesis in different genres and types of translation. The theoretical framework of the present study has been drawn by Zethsen's article (2009) which presents knowledge, time, culture and space as four parameters for INTRA.

In this regard, first the concept of comprehensibility has been reviewed in terms of its definition and as an aim also targeted by PL, which is presented as a type of INTRA in Jensen's article (2015, 169). Then INTRA has been discussed as a tool in service of interlingual translation. The discussion by Jensen on interlingual translation of functional texts has been followed by Desmidt's study (2009) on interlingual retranlations within the framework of retranslation hypothesis, in which the inclusion of different text and translation types has been 'called for' in order to achieve a "broader vision" (679).

As a humble and partial – since not a different text type but only a different translation type has been studied – response to that call, a corpus containing the first INTRA translation and eleven INTRA retranlations of *Gulyabani*, an old Turkish classic by Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar first published in 1912, has been analyzed through a quantitative method in which lexical changes have served as criteria indicating the distance between the source text and its translation and retranlations. The findings have been interpreted based on three factors, namely lexical items, publishers, and years.

Based on the described corpus, the study has revealed that in the case of Turkish INTRA of old Turkish classics, although the peritexts claim to be 'faithful' as much as possible to the source text and author, what has taken place is mostly an 'indirect' translation in which the first translation serves as the source text. As to the retranslation hypothesis, the high percentage of lexical changes observed in the retranlations indicate a direction opposite to the one foreseen by the hypothesis. In other words, newer retranlations do not necessarily "choose to go back to the primary source text" (Desmidt 2009, 674) in the case of Turkish INTRA when comprehensibility is the main drive. It can be argued that in this specific study, the more comprehensible the retranslation, the more distant from the source text, even if the source text is in fact the first intralingual translation of the original work in most of the cases.

The findings of this study can be said to be in line with Desmidt's (2009). It is true that different types of translation may yield different data for the retranslation hypothesis in particular and for translation studies in general. It is my hope that this article can act as an example to inspire other studies on different text and translation types.

References

- Abir, Nihan. 2012. "Çalıkuşu'nun Hikâyesi." [The story of Çalıkuşu.] MA thesis, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University.
- Baydere, Muhammed. 2019. "Çalıkuşu'nun Çeviri Serüveni." [The translational adventure of Çalıkuşu.] PhD Thesis, Yıldız Technical University.
- Baydere, Muhammed and Ayşe Banu Karadağ. 2019a. "Çalıkuşu'nun Diliçi Çeviri Serüveni Üzerine Betimleyici Bir Çalışma." [A descriptive study on the intralingual translation adventure of Çalıkuşu.] Paper presented at the 2nd International Rumeli (Language, Literature and Translation) Symposium, Kırklareli, 12–13 April.
- Baydere, Muhammed and Ayşe Banu Karadağ. 2019b. "Çalıkuşu'nun Öz-çeviri Serüveni Üzerine Betimleyici Bir Çalışma." [A descriptive study on the self-translation adventure of Çalıkuşu.] Special Issue, *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, no. 5, 314–333. doi:10.29000/rumelide.606165.
- Bensimon, Paul. 1990. "Présentation." *Palimpsestes*. 4: iv-xiii.

- Berk Albachten, Özlem. 2005. "Diliçi Çeviriler ve Mai ve Siyah." [Intralingual translations and Mai ve Siyah] *Dilbilim* 14:139–149. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/iudilbilim/issue/1083/12247>.
- Berk Albachten, Özlem. 2012. "Intralingual Translation as 'Modernisation' of the Language: The Turkish Case." *Perspectives* 21 (2): 257–271. doi:10.1080/0907676X.2012.702395.
- Berk Albachten, Özlem. 2014. "Intralingual Translation: Discussions within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 573–585. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Berk Albachten, Özlem. 2015. "The Turkish Language Reform and Intralingual Translation." In *Tradition, Tension and Translation in Turkey*, edited by Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Saliha Paker, and John Milton, 165–180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Berk Albachten, Özlem. 2019. "Challenging the Boundaries of Translation and Filling the Gaps in Translation History: Two Cases of Intralingual Translation from the 19th Century Ottoman Literary Scene." In *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*, edited by Helle V. Dam, Matilde Nisbeth Brogger, and Karen Korning Zethsen, 185–199. London: Routledge.
- Berman, Antoine. 1990. "La retraduction comme espace de la traduction." *Palimpsestes* 4: 1-7.
- Birkan Baydan, Esra. 2011. "Editing as Rewriting." *I.U. Journal of Translation Studies* 2 (3): 53–78. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/iuceviri/issue/1231/14424>.
- Boy, Hülya. 2018. "Oyun Çevirilerinde Benimsenen Yerleştirme Stratejileri Bağlamında Gulyabani." [Domesticating Strategies in Game Translation: The Case of Gulyabani.] In *Çeviribilimde Güncel Tartışmalardan Kavramsal Sorgulamalara*, edited by Seda Tas, 415–440. İstanbul: Hiperlink.
- Desmidt, Isabelle. 2009. "(Re)translation Revisited." *Meta*, 54 (4): 669–683. doi.org/10.7202/038898ar.
- Durmaz Hut, Aytül. 2019. "Çevirinin Yansımaları Olarak 'Çeviriyazıların' Farklı Adlandırılışları Üzerine Bir Çalışma." [A Study on Different Classification of 'Transcriptions' as Reflections of Translation.] In *Çeviribilimde Araştırmalar*, edited by Seda Tas, 225–241. İstanbul: Hiperlink.
- Gambier, Yves. 2003. "Working with Relay: An Old Story and A New Challenge." *Speaking in Tongues: Language Across Contexts and Users*, edited by Luis Pérez Gonzalez, 44–66. Valencia: Universitat de Valencia.
- Güntekin, Reşat Nuri. 2015. *Çalığıuşu*. İstanbul: İnkılâp.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 1938. *Gulyabani*. İstanbul: Hilmi.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2015. *Gulyabani*. İstanbul: Everest.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2015. *Gulyabani*. İstanbul: İthaki.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2015. *Gulyabani*. Konya: Palet.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2016. *Gulyabani*. İstanbul: Kırmızı Kedi.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2017. *Gulyabani*. İstanbul: İnkılâp.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2017. *Gulyabani*. 2nd ed. İstanbul: İskele.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2017. *Gulyabani*. Ankara: Parga.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2018. *Gulyabani*. 2nd ed. İstanbul: Bilgi.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2019a. *Gulyabani Açıklamalı Orijinal Metin*. [Annotated Original Text]. İstanbul: Can.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2019b. *Gulyabani Günümüz Türkçesiyle*. [In Contemporary Turkish]. İstanbul: Can.
- Gürpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi. 2019. *Gulyabani*. 2nd ed. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası.

- Hill-Madsen, Aage. 2015. "Lexical Strategies in Intralingual Translation between Registers." *Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication in Business* 27 (54): 85–105. doi:10.7146/hjlc.v27i54.22949.
- Jakobson, Roman. (1959) 2000. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 113–118. London: Routledge.
- Jensen, Matilde Nisbeth. 2015. "Optimising Comprehensibility in Interlingual Translation: The Need for Intralingual Translation." In *Translation and Comprehensibility*, edited by Karin Maksymski, Silke Gutermuth, and Silvia Hansen-Schirra, 163–194. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Kalem Bakkal, Aslı. 2019a. "From the 'Real' Author to the 'Real' Reader: Manipulation in Translation." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 2 (1): 85–101. doi:10.29228/transLogos.2/1.5.
- Kalem Bakkal, Aslı. 2019b. "Intralingual Translation Has No Name in Turkey: Conceptual Crowdedness in Intralingual Translation." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 2 (2): 48–69. doi:10.29228/transLogos.13.
- Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. 2017. "Çeviri, Tarih ve Bellek: Diliçi Edebi Çeviriler Bağlamında Bir İnceleme." [Translation, history, and memory: An analysis within the context of intralingual literary translations.] Paper presented at the 5th International Western Cultural and Literary Studies Symposium, Sivas, 4 October.
- Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. 2019. "Türk Edebiyat ve Kültür Dizgesinin Konukseverliğinde Çeviri Roman Deneyimi." [Experience of translated novels with the hospitality of the Turkish literary and cultural system.] *Doğu Batı* 22 (88): 9–25.
- Özön, Mustafa Nihat. 1989. *Osmanlıca Türkçe Sözlük*. [Ottoman Turkish-Turkish Dictionary.] 8th ed. İstanbul: İnkılâp.
- Öztürk Baydere, Hilal. 2019. "Türk Edebiyatını Diliçi Çevirilerden Okumak: Osmanlıcada ve Günümüz Türkçesinde Refik Halid'in Guguklu Saat'i." [Reading Turkish literature through intralingual translations: Refik Halid's Guguklu Saat in Ottoman and Modern Turkish.] In *Çeviri Üzerine Gözlemler* [Observations on translation], edited by Seda Tas, 225–241. İstanbul: Hiperlink.
- Paker, Saliha. 2004. "Türkiye Odaklı Çeviri Tarihi Araştırmaları, Kültürel Hafıza, Unutuş ve Hatırlayış İlişkileri." [Turkey centered translation history research, relations between cultural memory, forgetting, and remembering.] *Journal of Turkish Studies* 28 (3): 275–284.
- Paker, Saliha. 2014. "Terceme, Te'lif ve Özgünlük Meselesi." [The issue of terceme, te'lif and originality.] In *Metnin Hâlleri: Osmanlı'da Telif, Tercüme ve Serh* [The states of text: original, translation and commentary in the Ottoman tradition], edited by Hatice Aynur, Müjgân Çakır, Hanife Koncu, Selim S. Kuru, and Ali Emre Özyıldırım, 36–71. İstanbul: Klasik.
- Rodriguez, Liliane. (1990). "Sous le signe de Mercure, la retraduction". *Palimpsestes*. 4:63–80.
- Seyfettin, Ömer. 2016. *Yüksek Ökçeler*. 2nd ed. Ankara: Kurgan.
- Seyfettin, Ömer. 2018. *Yüksek Ökçeler*. İstanbul: İnkılâp.
- Wolfer, Sascha. 2015. "Comprehension and Comprehensibility." In *Translation and Comprehensibility*, edited by Karin Maksymski, Silke Gutermuth, and Silvia Hansen-Schirra, 33–51. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Zethsen, Karen Korning. 2009. "Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description." *Meta* 54 (4): 795–812. doi:10.7202/038904ar.
- Zethsen, Karen Korning, and Aage Hill-Madsen. 2016. "Intralingual Translation and Its Place within Translation Studies: A Theoretical Discussion." *Meta* 61 (3): 692–708. doi:10.7202/1039225ar.