

# Retranslation Hypothesis Revisited for *The Jungle Book*: Time versus Context in Retranslation

ÖĞR. GÖR. DR. ÖZGE BAYRAKTAR-ÖZER\*

## Abstract

Rudyard Kipling was first introduced to Turkish literature with the first translation from his children's literature work titled *The Jungle Book* in 1936, which was followed by a good number of retranslations up until today. This study aims to test the main assumptions of the retranslation theory with five different Turkish translations of *The Jungle Book*. The retranslations were compared with each other, along with the first translation in terms of text-bound and culture-specific items, as well as the historical and contextual background in which the translations were produced. To this end, the study can be divided into two main parts as regards the method adopted. In the first part, a diachronic analysis was conducted with a specific focus on the socio-contextual conditions of the translation periods. In the second part of the study, a synchronic analysis was made to re-test the hypothesis. Based on the comparative examples provided, it was found that there was no linear progression to a more target-oriented approach among the first and retranslations as asserted in the retranslation hypothesis. Instead, contextual factors of the time when the translation was produced and published were found to be more determinant in the translation choices of the translators. The selection of case studies also seems to affect the approval or refusal of the hypothesis in the literature. In this sense, it is suggested to apply both synchronic and diachronic analysis to obtain more reliable findings on the concept and nature of retranslation.

**Keywords:** retranslation hypothesis, diachronic analysis, synchronic analysis, *The Jungle Book*, children's literature, the Turkish translation

## YENİDEN ÇEVİRİDE ZAMANA KARŞI BAĞLAM: *THE JUNGLE BOOK* ÜZERİNDEN YENİDEN ÇEVİRİ HİPOTEZİNİN YENİDEN İNCELENMESİ

### Öz

Rudyard Kipling Türkçeye ilk olarak bir çocuk edebiyatı eseri olan *The Jungle Book*'un 1936 yılında yayınlanan çevirisi (*Cengel Kitabı*) ile kazandırılmıştır. Söz konusu ilk çeviriyi günümüze kadar pek çok yeniden çeviri takip etmiştir. Bu çalışma, *The Jungle Book* eserinin beş farklı Türkçe çevirisi üzerinden yeniden çeviri hipotezinin temel varsayımlarını yeniden sınamayı amaçlamaktadır. Yeniden çeviriler hem birbirleriyle hem de ilk çeviriyle metne bağlı ve kültüre özgü unsurlar açısından karşılaştırılmıştır. Bu doğrultuda benimsenen yöntem açısından, çalışma iki kısımdan oluşmaktadır. İlk kısımda, incelenen çevirilerin yayımlandığı dönemlerdeki sosyo-bağlamsal koşulları odağına alan artsüremli bir inceleme yer almaktadır. İkinci kısımda ise yeniden çeviri hipotezini yeniden sınamak üzere eşsüremli incelemeye yer verilmiştir. Sunulan

\* Atılım University-Dep. of English Translation and Interpretation, ozge.ozer@atilim.edu.tr, orcid: 0000-0001-9684-570X  
Gönderim tarihi: 8.10.2022 Kabul tarihi: 24.12.2022

karşılaştırmalı örneklere dayanarak, yeniden çeviri hipotezinde öne sürüldüğü gibi ilk çeviri ve yeniden çeviriler arasında, erek odaklı yaklaşıma yönelik doğrusal bir ilerlemenin bulunmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Bunun yerine, çevirinin üretildiği ve yayımlandığı dönemin bağlamsal faktörlerinin, çevirmenlerin çeviri seçimlerinde daha etkili olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca, hipotezin doğrulanması ya da yanlışlanmasında, vaka analizi yöntemindeki örnek metin seçimlerinin de etkili olabileceği gösterilmiştir. Bu bağlamda, yeniden çeviri kavramı ve yapısına ilişkin daha güvenilir bulgular için artsüremli ve eşsüremli incelemenin bütüncül bir anlayışla bir arada yapılması önerilmiştir.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** yeniden çeviri hipotezi, artsüremli inceleme, eşsüremli inceleme, *The Jungle Book*, çocuk edebiyatı, Türkçe çeviri

## INTRODUCTION

**R**etranslation refers to “the act of translating a work that has previously been translated into the same language” (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2019, p.484). The phenomenon of successive translations following the first translation made into the same target language and culture is asserted to be the consequence of some linguistic and social renewals in the receiving culture as well as the so-called incompleteness of the first translation. In the conceptual model of retranslations, the first translation is considered only as an initial attempt to initiate a process that needs to be completed and the desired cycle of this process can only be completed through retranslations (Berman, 1990). In this sense, Berman considers retranslations as the ultimate way to reach canonical translation since first translations tend to be more assimilating while the “later translations tend to be closer to the original” (Chesterman, 2000, p.26). For Berman, the early translations are clumsy and retranslations are considered to be paving way for “*grande traduction*” (Deane, 2011, p.8). In this sense, the primary motive for retranslation can be counted as a desire to create a more ethical translation in Berman’s terms. Target culture’s acquaintance with the source text and culture increases over time, hence subsequent translations can renew the domesticated elements of earlier translations and opt for the foreignizing strategy. As another motive for retranslation, Berman (1990) also suggests that the aging of translations leads to a need for new translations, based on the assumption that translations cannot escape the linguistic and cultural aging process unlike the frozen and stable position of the original work.

In the literature, studies testing the retranslation hypothesis conclude that the hypothesis cannot be tenable or generalized for every case (Deane, 2011; Desmidt, 2009, Van Poucke, 2017). From a contextual perspective, Massardier-Kenney (2015) challenges the assumption that ‘retranslations represent progress’ embedded in the hypothesis as this assumption leads to a “discourse of lack” regarding former translations (p.74). Instead, Massardier-Kenny (2015) points out that the concept of retranslation should be addressed from broader perspectives of sociocultural, political, religious, and economic forces. Likewise, instead of drawing a simplistic framework for the retranslation phenomenon, Brownlie (2006) draws attention to the specific conditions in which retranslations are produced, which is overlooked in the hypothesis. According to Brownlie (2006), “it is those conditions which can explain the similarities and differences

between the different translations” by underscoring the importance of “linguistic, literary and translational norms” as well as “specific situational conditions: the particular context of production and the translator’s preferences, idiosyncrasies, and choices” (p.167). Her call for a broader context to analyze retranslations is also asserted by Paloposki and Koskinen (2010) who reaffirm that “it is the local context that is often conclusive in the final make-up of the retranslation” (p.46).

In the Turkish context, Boğaziçi University hosted two international conferences organized on the theme of retranslation in 2013 and 2015<sup>1</sup>, and undertook a large-scale project named *The Bibliography of Retranslations in Ottoman and Modern Turkish Societies* in 2011-2016<sup>2</sup>. Testing the retranslation hypothesis has also been a well-documented research topic among graduate theses as well. To name a few, Özcan (2017)’s thesis on Turkish retranslations of a detective novel by Agatha Christie concludes that critical reviews on earlier translations and publishers’ consideration of these reviews; shift in the canonical position of the crime fiction genre in the Turkish literary polysystem; changes in translational norms in different periods of translation and publishing are all effective factors for the translation strategies employed. Similarly, in another thesis conducted on two dystopic novels by Taş (2015), the retranslation hypothesis was found insufficient to explain the complex and multidimensional aspects of the retranslation phenomenon. In this study, Taş (2015) highlights the translator’s individuality as a key factor in the retranslations of intertextual texts particularly (p.226). Another example can be given from the research on a Turkish retranslation of Roald Dahl’s novel in children’s literature (Hatipoğlu, 2020). Analyzing the retranslation of *Charlie and The Great Glass Elevator* published in 2006 compared to the first translation in 1991, Hatipoğlu (2020) reports the main motive for the retranslation was renewing the aging and incomplete first translation and conforming to the norm change in children’s literature (p.95). Apart from the studies based on the validation or refutation of the retranslation hypothesis mainly through textual analysis, the literature also has copious conceptual studies conducted on transformative retranslations in introducing, establishing, and reinforcing the repertoire and popularity of the science fiction genre in Turkey (Koçak & Aydın, 2017); the concept of self-retranslation examined through retranslation of a coursebook on psychological counselling (Geçmen, 2018); combining the nationalism concept with retranslation research through a biography (Sayın, 2020), and the analysis of paratextual elements on retranslations of a political book on social liberation of women (Taş, 2018), among others.

As is seen through these examples, the expansion of the conceptual framework of retranslation along with the plethora of studies investigating the phenomenon of retranslation led to the emergence of “retranslation studies” (Berk Albachten & Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2019, p.1). Such studies have demonstrated “the complexity of the phenomenon and the need to embed it within a broader discussion of historical context, canonization processes, norms, ideology, the translator’s agency, and intertextuality” (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2019, p.485).

Against this background, this study aims to test two main premises of the retranslation hypothesis with a specific focus on both the contextual and linguistic aspects of the translations:

<sup>1</sup> see. <http://www.retranslation-conference.boun.edu.tr/callpaper2.html>

<sup>2</sup> see. <https://retranslation-turkey.boun.edu.tr/content/about-bibliography>

1- Does the first translation aim to naturalize foreign work through domestication while retranslations adopt a more source-oriented translation approach?

2- Is aging of language/translation a decisive factor in retranslation? Do retranslations contribute to renewing the aging language of previous translations?

To this end, three Turkish translations of Rudyard Kipling's *The Jungle Book* were diachronically analyzed with an emphasis on historical phases of Turkish society and language, and three recent retranslations were synchronically analyzed to test what these retranslations published within the same temporal and spatial boundaries offer new other than the so-called aging nature of translation.

In this sense, both text-bound and culture-specific items were analyzed to question the validity of the retranslation hypothesis which puts forth that retranslations are closer to the source text compared to the earlier translations. It is also discussed whether this phenomenon is related to the reception of the genre and translation in the target culture, and how contextual conditions affect this process.

## 1. METHOD

A canonical children's literary book was particularly selected to discuss the main premises of the retranslation hypothesis. Rudyard Kipling was first introduced to the Turkish context with his salient book *The Jungle Book*. The book was first translated by Nurettin Artam as *Cengel Kitabı* in 1936 and retranslated 38<sup>3</sup> times since then. The retranslations actively started in the 1970s, continued in the 1980s and 1990s, and intensified particularly after the 2000s. The high number and intensity of the retranslations are noteworthy to test the retranslation hypothesis.

*The Jungle Book*, on the surface, narrates the story of a young boy named Mowgli who was raised by wolves in an Indian jungle. Allegorically, on the other hand, this literary work can be read as the tale of a white British born and raised in India, like Kipling himself, dealing with the concepts of identity, belongingness, in-betweenness, and colonialism (Randall, 1998). In this sense, the book entails a dual readership nature as in other tales of Kipling (Bayraktar-Özer, 2018, p.130), which was taken into consideration for the selection of cases to be analyzed. Of 38 translations, only those which did not deliberately and explicitly target young readers were included within the scope of this research. To this end, those published by specific children's literature publishers, carrying expressions such as Children's Literature Classics, Shortened/Simplified Version and translated by the adapted versions of the original work were excluded from the analysis.

For the diachronic analysis of the retranslations, Kezban Akcalı's retranslation (1973) was selected since it was the first retranslation following Artam's translation. Besides, Gökçe Yavaş's retranslation *Orman Kitabı* (2016) being the most recent retranslation was involved in the diachronic analysis. As for the synchronic analysis, *Orman Kitabı* was compared to *Orman Çocuğu*

---

<sup>3</sup> This number is based on the researcher's search through publishing houses and bibliopoeple. Revisions and republishing of the text translated by the same translator were excluded. More retranslations might have gone unnoticed by the researcher.

translated by Esen Saba (2016), and *Cengel Kitabı: Ormanın Öyküsü* translated by Kamer Mengütürk (2009) that are two other recent retranslations.

## 2. DIACHRONIC ANALYSIS

The diachronic analysis seeks the traces of sociocultural and contextual conditions on text-bound and culture-specific items found in the first translation and two subsequent retranslations. The periods when the three selected translations of *The Jungle Book* were published correspond to three historical phases of the Turkish language. The nearly ninety-year time span between the first translation (1936) and the most recent retranslation (2016) can be divided into three main periods.

The first phase is the period when the impacts of the Turkish Language Revolution, which was announced upon the proclamation of the Republic of Turkish. In the 1930s, Turkish Language Reform was declared in parallel with the regime change following the establishment of the Turkish Republic, which can be evaluated as a period of endeavors to create a national identity. In this period, the major purpose was to replace the Ottoman language with the Turkish alphabet and educate people about the Turkish language within the scope of the revolution. The second is the 1970s when the Turkish language underwent a purification process that extended to liquidation when it targeted eradicating all foreign-originated words and forming a pure Turkish language with deviation from the main principles of the Language Reform. And the third is the modern Turkish language which is under the impact of Western languages, particularly English, due to globalization and the advancement of technology from the 2000s to our day.

Pym (2014) discourages diachronic analysis of retranslations, “passive retranslations” in his terms for “historical changes in the target culture could have been obtained without translation history” and suggests that the outcome of the analysis would serve to but the general assumption that “target-culture norms determine translation strategies” (p.83). On the other hand, if it were not for the analysis of historical changes in the target culture of the translation, as commonly carried out in translation studies research so far, the general theory explaining the relation between socio-historical context and translation norms would not have been well-grounded. Diachronic analysis is also useful to test the main arguments of the retranslation hypothesis which is presumably “a diachronic, linear progression” and whose “premise is increased closeness, with this concept of aging, its premise is updating” (Deane, 2011, p.11).

Instead of abandoning the linear perception towards the retranslation hypothesis, it can be integrated with synchronic analysis. Pym (2014) suggests that synchronical analysis on “active retranslations which share virtually the same cultural location or generation” (p.82) is fruitful for such an analysis can “yield insights into the nature and workings of translation itself, into its own special range of disturbances” (p.84). An integrated approach including both diachronic and synchronic analysis of retranslations, as employed by Koskinen and Paloposki (2019), can offer insightful perspectives on historical, social, cultural, and literary contexts into which retranslations are produced as well as the idiosyncrasies of each retranslation.

In the light of the foregoing, this study initially puts the socio-political conditions into perspective to examine the motivations behind the publishing of the first translation of *The Jungle*

*Book*. Two retranslations published in the following years are compared with each other and the first translation with a specific focus on contextual conditions of the receiving target culture, and the retranslation hypothesis is tested particularly through aging translation discussions.

### 2.1. The Motivation for the First Translation

The proclamation of the Republic in Turkish history initiated a multidimensional modernization process that also included cultural and sociological perspectives beyond the sole political revolution. The founder of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk set the fundamental goal of the Republic of Turkey to raise it to the level of contemporary civilizations<sup>4</sup> and undertook the pioneering role for many political, economic, social, cultural, and educational reforms. There was a need to create a new modern and national identity to make these reforms deep-rooted for the modernization of the Turkish nation as well as to help people adopt these multi-layered and comprehensive reforms. As the major principle that unified people in the multinational Ottoman Empire was religion and Pan-Islamism, efforts to create a national identity based on nationality in the new Republic of Turkey gained momentum (Korkmaz, 1995a). One of the most significant efforts among them was undoubtedly Turkish Language Reform. Although language reform was carried out by the intelligentsia of Tanzimat and Meşrutiyet eras, Alphabet Reform in 1928 and Turkish Language Reform in 1932 were initiated under the auspices of state authority for the first time (Tekin, 1988). Language, which can be regarded as a magical box that contains the cultural codes of a nation and ensures the transmission of these codes between generations (Arı, 2016), also shapes nations' world of thought. Atatürk puts forward the relation between cultural identity and language as "the bond between national sense and language is very strong. The national and rich language is the primary factor for developing a national sense" (cited in Korkmaz, 1973, p. 107, my translation). In line with this maxim, Turkish Language Reform was initiated with aims such as purifying Turkish from foreign words, bringing a more unifying form to the language, enriching the vocabulary of the language, acknowledging the Turkish language as a respected language of literature and science among world languages mainly targeted at achieving the nationalization process of young Republic (Özdoğan, 2015). In this sense, to disyoke Turkish from the dominance of Arabic and Persian languages, which were prevailing in the official language of the Ottoman Empire, brought a great contribution to the acquisition of a national identity bearing a consciousness of national language and history, and ensured Turkish people to adopt their own cultural components.

In this process, the dynamic relationship between culture and language, which nurture each other, was taken into consideration and the effect of literature was not underestimated to reach the contemporary education and cultural level. On the path of modernization, the translation of literary works, which reveal cultural life and social mind map of contemporary civilizations, not only served to uphold the literary and aesthetic perceptions of people but also to reproduce similar literary genres in the Turkish language as original and native literary works. In addition to Turkish language education, the translation of literary works can be seen as the literary and cultural dimension of Turkish Language Reform since it contributed to the intellectual levels of people.

---

<sup>4</sup> see. Speech for the 10th Anniversary of the Republic, 29th September 1933.

Literary translation served as a valuable tool to this end as “the cultural transfer of Western humanist values was prioritized in the young republic’s path towards modernization” (Bayraktar-Özer, 2022, p.145). Considering that new literary genres such as the novel, short story, and theatre genres were introduced to the Turkish literary system through translations only as of the Tanzimat era (Aksoy, 2010), there was the death of national literature. As asserted in Polysystem Theory by Even Zohar (1978), “when a literature is young, in the process of being established”, translation occupies a primary position (pp.23-24). Therefore, translation was needed from these new literary genres in the early years of the Republic for original literary works to occupy the central position in the Turkish literary polysystem. In this scope, exemplary literary works were prioritized for translation.

In the early years of the Republic, newspapers undertook the task of contributing to the language and cultural structure of Turkish society. To this end, literary works were published in the form of *tefrikas* (serials) in state-supported newspapers (Çıkla, 2009). One of these, *Ulus* newspaper started its publishing life under the title *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* during the War of Independence. The newspaper replaced the name with *Ulus* in 1934 and adopted a Republican and revolutionary approach throughout its publication life (Yetim, 2006). The newspaper published hardback copies of twelve works, which were translated as *tefrikas* before, in 1934 under the serial named *Tercüme Kütüphanesi* (Library of Translations).

The editor-in-chief, R.F. Atay (1936) expressed the purpose of the serial despite the high cost of publishing in the country as follows: “We are already translating for our newspaper. Our job is to select our translation serials among first-class artworks which could enrich the taste of our youth and people or prefer a book which discusses the major thought trend of our day.” (p.3, my translation). The serial including translations published as hard copies rather than *tefrikas* aimed to uphold the cultural level of society whose cultural identity was reshaped with the young Turkish Republic with the help of the translations of significant works from Western literature. In this sense, this serial can be regarded as a pioneering step towards a larger translation mobilization later initiated by *Tercüme Bürosu* (Translation Bureau) affiliated with the Ministry of National Education in 1940.

Within the scope of this serial, the only children’s literature book selected was Rudyard Kipling’s *The Jungle Book*, which was first written in 1894, and the translation was published under the name *Cengel Kitabı* in 1936. Atay (1936) states that the Turkish language was deprived of this famous book in the last forty-two years and it was aimed to fulfill the need of publishing this book as a hardcopy in his short introduction to the translation serial of the newspaper. Reassessing the purpose of the serial, political, and social dynamics of the given period, it can be suggested that the particular book was selected with the certain assumption that it would contribute to the Turkish target audience’s intellectual and cultural life.

*Cengel Kitabı* was also Rudyard Kipling’s first book translated into Turkish. According to the main premise of the retranslation hypothesis, first translations “naturalize foreign works” (Bensimon, 1990:ix) with the purpose of introducing them to the receivers of the target culture and ensuring their well-reception. Although this assumption is expected to be valid for *Cengel Kitabı* as

it is the first translation of the given book, the author and a rare example of translated children's literature in Turkish culture, the socio-political conditions of the early Republic years also have impacts on translation strategies employed in the translation. The first translation includes a good number of foreign cultural elements as well as idiosyncratic Turkish idioms, and phrases. So much so that, no consistent translation strategy can be identified for the book. Paloposki and Koskinen (2001) touch upon the possibility of using foreignizing strategy even in the first translation and suggest that foreign elements may be left unclear to the audience. As in our case, the preference of the main translation strategy employed in the first translation can be explained by the prevailing social, cultural, and political norms in the given culture. It is believed that *Cengel Kitabı* included culture-specific Turkish idioms and phrases to bring the text closer to the receiving culture for its easier reception in line with the retranslation hypothesis. On the other hand, the translator seems to be conscious of culture-specific items of the source text and foreignized most of them. In other words, foreignization was preferred as the main strategy for culture-specific elements of the original work while cultural Turkish expressions were also integrated into the translation for easier reading of the text. Although these two approaches seem to contradict each other from solely textual analysis, socio-cultural norms that were impactful on the translation of the given text can easily explain the motives behind these two strategies. The involvement of cultural Turkish expressions seems to contribute to an easier reception of the translation with a target-oriented approach to attract Turkish readers to read Western literary work. Besides, the source-oriented approach adopted to preserve culture-specific items of the original work is in line with the overall purpose of the publishing authority; to raise Turkish society's cultural level by introducing new cultural elements of another society.

## 2.2. The First Retranslation in the 1970s: Liquidation Period of the Turkish Language

A 37-year time span between the first translation and retranslation of *The Jungle Book* in the Turkish context and the simplification of language in the retranslation are suggestive of the aging translation phenomenon as the primary motive for the retranslation. For in our case, the most prominent difference between the two books is the use of simplified language with more Turkish-origin word choices. However, restricting the main cause of the retranslation with the time factor as asserted by Berman is questionable. The year 1973 corresponds to the Liquidation Period in the Turkish language, a significant socio-political transformation in Turkish culture.

The liquidationism (*tasfiyecilik*) movement deviated from the Turkish Language Revolution's aim of purifying the Turkish language and started to remove all non-pure Turkish elements from the language. The liquidation movement accelerated following the death of Atatürk, particularly between 1960-1980 (Korkmaz, 1995a, p. 916). Endeavors towards pure Turkish and liquidationism were sustained through the Turkish Language Journal, and even by the Ministry of National Education and Turkish Radio and Television Association, on which Turkish Language Institution had authority (Özdemir & Dağtaş, 2014, p.33). This process also included the complete removal of Arabic- and Persian-originated words, which are regarded as undesirable traces of the legacy of Ottoman Turkish, and replacing them with pure-Turkish words. In the middle of this period, when liquidationism and pure Turkish discussions were held most intensely, *The Jungle Book* was

retranslated with the title *Orman Masalı* in 1973. The retranslation carries every peculiarity of the language approach as imposed by the Turkish Language Institution.

What most prominently distinguishes this retranslation from the first translation (*Cengel Kitabı*) is the avoidance of Arabic-, Persian-originated words and the use of pure Turkish equivalences of these words provided. For example, Arabic- and Persian- originated words such as *şikâr, hür, and sual* (prey, independent, and question) were replaced with their pure Turkish equivalences such as *av, özgür, and soru*, respectively. The change in preference of words cannot be explained with the aim of replacing the aging translation. In our case, the transformation of language includes not only spatial and historical change but carries a certain state ideology that was prominent in the given literary system. This effort not to use a foreign-originated word was not only towards Arabic and Persian languages. Western proper names in the original work were also neutralized even more than in the first translation. Here, the names were written as read in the Turkish language rather than keeping the foreignness of the names. The original character names such as Bagheera and Tooami, for instance, were brought closer to the Turkish pronunciation and translated as *Bağera* and *Tomay* in this translation while these names were translated as *Baghira* and *Tumai* in the first translation. In this sense, the retranslation Turkifies character names significantly more than the first translation.

Another significant difference between these two translations from two different periods is the different spelling of the same words. For example, a Persian-originated word *tenbel* (lazy) found in the first translation is written as *tembel* in the retranslation based on the language rule that the *-n* sound is transformed to *-m* if it comes before the *-b* sound. Verbs such as “*Unutmuyacaksınız, avlıyacak*” (you will not forget, (he) will prey) translated as found in a more public way of speaking of vernacular language were replaced with words “*unutmayacaksınız*” and “*avlayacak*” to comply with then-spelling rules asserted by Turkish Language Institution. Comparing these two translations only in terms of language use, we can suggest that the first translation was aging, thus a retranslation emerged. On the other hand, the concept of aging cannot be discussed only within the framework of the course of time. In our case, the decisions in the state and institutional language policy have a substantial impact on this transformation. It also shows the efforts of the state to set up the boundaries of a language, which is newly introduced to people with a new Latin alphabet, and the effort to set up rules for writing with this new alphabet. The 37-year time span between the two translations also indicates three times the renewal of the Spelling Book which was first published in 1929 by the Turkish Language Institution in 1941, 1965, and 1970<sup>5</sup>. Against this background, the historical development that the target language has been going through, norm-changing development in social context, ideological and political factors in the given literary system of the receiving culture may also lead to retranslations which could be misinterpreted as the consequence of aging solely. The factors which lead to the aging translation can thus be related to “changing social contexts and the evolution of translation norms” (Brownlie, 2006, p. 150) and “the aging character of translations includes not only linguistic and idiomatic aspects but also translational and cultural ones” (Van Poucke, 2017, p.92).

<sup>5</sup> <http://tdk.gov.tr/icerik/yazim-kurallari/sunus/>

### 2.3. Modern Turkish Language

Discussions regarding the Turkish language in the post-20<sup>th</sup> century intensified on reproducing Turkish-originated words as alternatives to words originating from Western languages, particularly French and English similar to liquidation efforts mentioned in the previous section. Although some may posit that the encounter of the Turkish language which lacks some concepts and might fill this gap with foreign words can eventually enrich the language, Korkmaz (1995a, p.856) gives a voice to the adverse impacts of foreign words on the Turkish language as follows:

"For instance, replacement of "buhran, bunalım" with "kriz", "sargı" with "bandaj"... does not bear any enrichment opportunity for the language... If only these words were transferred into Turkish by means of translation, each of these words would have acquired a plethora of senses and concepts to truly enrich our language rather than new concepts. As this was not achieved, Western-originated words restrict the enrichment of the Turkish language that could have been achieved through inner developments, in other words, via creativity" (my translation)

The polemical impact of English in specific and Western languages in general on the Turkish language is not limited to loanwords. Another foreign language impact as frequently encountered in public areas from media to the names of streets and shops is the use of letters that are not involved in the Turkish alphabet. Examples of words written as *fax*, *maximum*, *show* instead of *faks*, *maksimum*, *şov* in accordance with the Turkish alphabet are encountered anywhere now.

This global effect of English can be traced in the retranslation published in 2017 as well. For example, some proper names of the characters such as Shere Khan, Tabaqui, Raksha were written in the Turkish alphabet in both 1936 and 1973 translations. On the other hand, foreign spelling style including letters and sounds of "-w, -q, -sh" is preserved in the most recent retranslation. Here the question is whether this particular example confirms the retranslation hypothesis or not. The most recent retranslation is the closest translation to the original work in this sense. Accordingly, it can be argued that character names were literally preserved in Turkish translation because the target audience's acquaintance with the source text increased, as asserted in the hypothesis. Turkish audience is naturally more acquainted with this form of writing than those back in the 1970s. However, historical developments and social transformations of the given culture and lingua franca position of English had a more decisive role in increasing this acquaintance compared to the contribution of previous (re)translations.

### 2.4. Translation Method

According to the main premise of the Retranslation Hypothesis, first translations, particularly if they are foreign to the target culture, are domesticated to be brought closer to the target culture and language while retranslations are mostly carried out with foreignization method as the knowledge and proximity of target audience increase (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2001). On the other hand, the lines between foreignization and domestication can be blurred as in the examples presented below.

Table 1. Translation examples from the diachronic analysis

Example No.	Source Text (1936)	Nurettin Artam (1936)	Kezban Akçalı (1973)	Gökçe Yavaş (2016)
1.	'Arre! Arre!' said two or three women together. (p.64)	"Arre arre" dediler. (p.92)	"Vah, vah!" ...diye bağıştılar. (p.115)	"Aman! Aman! dedi iki-üç kadın birden. (p.66)
2.	wait for me in the ravine by the <b>dhak</b> tree... (p.71)	çukurun yanındaki <b>dâk</b> ağacının yanında bekleyin... (p.102)	o <b>ulu ağacın</b> dibinde bekle. (p.128)	<b>dhak</b> ağacının yanındaki....bekleyin. (p.72)
3.	<b>Ahai!</b> He is taking his meals with the others. (p.6)	."Allah allah! Ötekilerle birlikte yemek de yiyor. (p.13)	<b>Bakın, bakın!</b> Şimdi de yavruların yemeğini paylaşıyor. (p.15)	<b>Ayy!</b> Diğerleriyle beraber besleniyor. (p.11)
4.	I will not give thee one <b>anna</b> of the reward...	Öyle ise bir Rupye değil, sana bir <b>Anna</b> bile verecek değilim. (p.112)	Alacağım ödül den bir <b>kuruş</b> bile vermeyeceğim işte. (p.142)	Sana ödül den bir <b>anna*</b> bile vermeyeceğim. (p.80)
5.	'He has <b>missed,</b> ' said Mother Wolf. 'What is it?'. (p.5)	"Pusulayı <b>şaşırdı</b> " dedi. "Bu da ne?" (p.12)	"Yakalayamadı!" dedi. "N' oluyor?" (p.14)	" <b>Kaçırdı</b> " dedi Anne Kurt. "Ne oluyor?" (p.10)
6.	<b>Fare you well,</b> children of men... (p.82)	İnsan çocukları, <b>Allaha ısmarladık.</b> (p.116)	Ey insan-oğulları, <b>hoşcakalın!</b> (p.148)	<b>Sağlıcakla kalın</b> insanoğulları. (p.82)

As mentioned above, Rudyard Kipling was first introduced to the Turkish polysystem of literature and audience with the first Turkish translation of *The Jungle Book* in 1936. Considering

the dearth of original works of children's literature in the 1930s and the colonizer-colonized motifs involved in the text, the source text was obviously at a great distance from the target culture. According to the Retranslation Hypothesis, this translation could be expected to be domesticating all cultural, and ideological elements for the sake of bringing it closer to the Turkish audience including children. However, some culture-specific terms were foreignized by keeping the source text's cultural peculiarities while domestication was preferred for non-cultural items. In this sense, no generalization can be made regarding the main translation approach for the first translation.

The neutralization of cultural elements can be hardly found in the first translation. For example, the Indian exclamation phrase "*Arre, arre!*", "used to express annoyance, surprise, or interest, or to attract someone's attention" according to the Oxford dictionary, was not translated in the first translation while it was translated with Turkish exclamation equivalences "*Vah vah*" in the first retranslation and "*Aman aman*" in the latest translation. As a support to the Retranslation Hypothesis, the first retranslation of the book replaced all phrases that are specific to Turkish-culture and idioms preferred in the first translation such as "*Pusulayı şaşırđı*", "*Allah Allah*", "*Allahısमारलदık diyeyim*", "*damarına basarcasına*", "*haybahasil kalacađız*", "*Hanya ile Konya'yi anlayacak yařta*" with culture-neutralized phrases such as "*yakalayamadı, bakın bakın!,son bir kez görüőeyim, hınç dolu, bizlere kaçmak düşecek, her şeyi anlamaya başladığı yařta*", respectively.

In the second example, an endemic species to India, *dhak* tree was translated as "*dak*" in the first translation without any footnote while it was domesticated as "*ulu ağaç*" (great tree) in the retranslation. In the third example, contrary to the previous examples revealing the foreignization strategy adopted in the first translation, the translator domesticates another cultural exclamation. As for the fourth example, on the other hand, the Indian currency "*anna*" was foreignized both in the first translation and the most recent retranslation which also adds a footnote to explain this foreign currency. It was domesticated and translated as Turkish currency "*kuruş*" in the second translation. As presented in the fifth and sixth examples, some Turkish expressions and idioms are used in the first translation such as "*Pusulayı şaşırđı*" (missed it), and "*Allah'a ısमारलदık*" (goodbye) although the phrases in the source text do not carry a culture-specific meaning.

Bearing all these in mind, can we conclude that the first translation aims to bring the first-time-translated text and author closer to the target culture through domestication? There is no fixed or stable translation strategy for either domestication or foreignization in this sense. For, some cultural terms were foreignized while domestication was preferred for non-cultural items. No generalization can be made regarding the main translation approach for the first translation. The second translation predominantly domesticated cultural concepts such as *arre*, *dhak*, and *anna*. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that the retranslation is closer to the source culture in this sense.

The use of the foreignization method towards culture-specific items and idioms and the use of the translator's notes in the most recent translation, on the other hand, is in line with the main assumption of the Retranslation Hypothesis. Foreign concepts, such as currency unit *anna*, are kept as they are and related information is provided in the translator's notes. The only deliberate domestication method used in the translation is the domestication of the Indian phrase "*Arre arre*" with its Turkish equivalent "*Aman aman*". With this exception only, it is clear that the most recent

retranslation is the closest one to the original text in terms of spelling proper names and foreignization of cultural terms.

The diachronic analysis of the retractions supports the aging claim of the retranslation hypothesis since the most recent retranslation rejuvenates the language in accordance with the developments in the modern Turkish language. On the other hand, the aging of language in the present case resulted from the sociocultural developments in the related epochs, rather than the time factor. Besides, the newest translation brings readers closer to the text by adopting the foreignization method while the second translation resorts to the domestication method. Once again, the movement from a target-oriented to source-oriented translation method applied in these cases is more related to the historical and ideological developments that occurred in the language rather than seeking to improve the translation quality of the previous one in terms of cultural proximity.

### 3. SYNCHRONIC ANALYSIS

To find more sound evidence for the approval of the hypothesis in question, we can re-test the question “Do retractions challenge the previous ones in terms of aging language and cultural proximity?” based on the three most recent retractions published.

The synchronic analysis of retractions lays grounds to analyze what steer translators take varying decisions and adopt different approaches in retranslation within the same spatial and temporal sphere carrying similar social and cultural norms. To this end, the three most recent retractions published in 2009 and 2016 were selected for the synchronic analysis of *The Jungle Book*.

#### 3.1. Aging Language Re-Tested

The assumption of every retranslation’s challenging nature towards the previous translations suggests that retranslation arises from the need to renovate the former one. Susam-Sarajeva (2003) asserts, “retractions are not necessarily the consequence of ‘aging’ translations or ‘changing times’ since more than one translation of the same source text may come about within a very short time span” (p.5). In a similar vein, in the present case, the boom for the retractions intensified in a short period of time can be associated with the non-literary and non-linguistic conditions.

In 2016, the Disney remake of *The Jungle Book* appeared with the same name. The live-action movie included celebrities such as Scarlett Johnson, Bill Murray, and Lupita Nyong’o, and received an Oscar reward. In the same period, Andy Serkis declared the synopsis of the same movie with another title *Mowgli* and another famous cast for voicing including Christian Bale, Cate Blanchett, and Benedict Cumberbatch. Both movies were later purchased by Netflix. These two movies are believed to have hugely contributed to the popularity of the book since seven of the retractions detected in the study were published as of 2016.

Very minor changes were found in these retractions in terms of lexical, stylistic, and cultural choices made by the translators. Thus, this can serve as evidence of the idea that retractions come up in a very short period and bring almost nothing new to the text. In this

sense, the retranslation phenomenon is more related to publishing institutions' financial concerns rather than the will of translators to renew the language.

Even before the broadcasting of the movie, the retranslation *Cengel Kitabı: Ormanın Öyküsü* was published by Yapı Kredi Publishing in 2009. This translation does not approve of the aging translation phenomenon either, since the language in use in this retranslation is closer to a more archaic use of Turkish rather than modern, every-day usage. Lexical choices made by the translator in this retranslation (2009) throughout the text indicate that older versions of words are preferred rather than their modern equivalences. Contrary to the main aging premise of the retranslation hypothesis, this specific example of retranslation contradicts the assumption that aging language is restored and renewed in recent retranlations.

### 3.2. Cultural Proximity

The following examples are offered to test the cultural proximity premise of the retranslation hypothesis by comparing the first translation with the two most recent retranlations.

#### Example 1: Jungle

George Orwell (1937) claims that “the scenery is the real subject matter” (p.101) in novels written about the East. In this manner, the landscape of *The Jungle Book* is not unmotivated considering the colonial period Rudyard Kipling lived and wrote. The selection of the jungle as the main scenery bears certain colonial implications to emphasize the foreignness and the otherness of what is on the other side of European colonization. Weisberg (2015) asserts that the book “encapsulates the symbolism of the tropical forest in European adventure literature...forming a part of the symbolic lexicon of the literary landscape that signifies colonial otherness” (p.4). The dictionary meaning of the literal translation of the word jungle (*cengel* in Turkish) corresponds to ‘wide Indian forest’. The only repercussion of the colonial gaze on this landscape in translation can be found in the first translation. The title of the translation offers a totally foreignized environment for readers. All other retranlations were published with titles such as *Forest Book*, *Forest Child*, and *Forest's Child* with the neutralization of the colonial gaze of the author to the forest landscape as a “natural environment, with its fascinations and dangers and its extreme difference from home” (Kerr, 1997, p.149).

In the hypothesis, it is asserted that the target-orientedness of earlier translations is often replaced with source-orientedness in following retranlations as the receiving culture gets more acquainted with the source culture norms as well as the lexical and stylistic peculiarities of the text and author (see Chesterman, 2000; Paloposki & Koskinen, 2004). In the present case, the following examples can be analyzed to test this argument.

**Table 2. Translation examples from the synchronous analysis**

Example No.	Source Text (1936)	Kamer Mengütürk (2009)	Esen Saba (2016)	Gökçe Yavaş (2016)
1.	'Arre! Arre!' said two or three women	"Aman! Yazık" dedi kalabalığın içinden iki üç	'Arre! Arre!' dedi iki, üç kadın aynı anda. (p.70)	"Aman! Aman! dedi iki-üç kadın birden. (p.66)

	together. (p.64)	kadın. (p.86)		
2.	the arrival of <b>white men</b> on elephants, with guns, and hundreds of <b>brown men</b> with gongs and rockets and torches. (p.5)	Fillere binmiş silahlı <b>beyaz adamlar</b> ve ellerinde fişekler, gonglar, meşaleler olan yüzlerce <b>koyu derili adam</b> ormana dalar (p.15)	filler üzerinde silahlarıyla birlikte <b>beyaz adamları</b> , füzeleriyle ve meşaleleriyle gelen yüzlerce <b>siyahi adamın</b> sonrasında... (p.12)	Silahlarıyla fillerin üstünde <b>beyaz adamların</b> ve okları, patlayıcıları ve meşaleleriyle <b>kahverengi adamların</b> gelişi... (p.10)
3.	And Mowgli had not the faintest idea of the difference that <b>caste</b> makes between man and man. (p.68)	Maugli insanlar arasındaki ' <b>kast</b> ' denilen sınıf farklılıklarının bilincinde değildi. (p.91)	Mowgli'nin insanlar arasındaki <b>sınıf farkı</b> hakkında en küçük bir fikri yoktu. (p.74)	Mowgli'nin insanlar arasındaki <b>sınıf farkı</b> hakkında da hiçbir fikri yoktu. (p.69)
4.	But the sweetmeat seller in the camp lent him a little <b>tom-tom</b> —a drum beaten with the flat of the hand—(p.116)	Neyse, kampın şekerlisi ona küçük bir <b>tamtam</b> ödünç verdi; hani şöyle elinizin ayasıyla vurup çalınan cinsten... (p.189)	Ama kamptaki şekerlemeci ona <b>tespih</b> ödünç Verdi. (p.151)	Ama kamptaki tatlı satıcısı ona küçük bir <b>tamtam</b> , avucun içiyle çalınan bir davul ödünç verdi. (p.148)
6.	Certainly this is <b>dewanee</b> , the madness. (p.50)	"Hepsi de ' <b>divane</b> ' (deli) olmuşlar. Evet kesinlikle divane bunlar! (p.71)	"hepsi akıllarını kaçırmış. Kesinlikle bu <b>aşk</b> , bu delilik... (p.56)	"Hepsi delirmiş. Bu kesinlikle <b>dewanee</b> , çılgınlık... (p.58)

Indian exclamation phrase "*Arre, arre!*" is uttered by an Indian woman living in a colonized village where Mowgli was born as opposed to the jungle where he grew up is a deliberate choice of the author to emphasize the colonized other. The phrase is kept as it is in the second retranslation and enables the reader to experience the otherness in the text while it is domesticated

with Turkish exclamation marks “*Aman! Yazık*” in the first retranslation and “*Aman! Aman!*” in the latest one. Only the second retranslation preserves this effect.

In the second example, “*White men on elephants with guns*” is a clear reference to the British colonizers in India while local Indians are referred to as brown men with more primitive tools to fight rather than guns. The expression brown-skin is not commonly used as a racial or ethnic term in the Turkish context. The first translation uses “*koyu derili*” (dark-skin) term to describe brown men to comply with Turkish norms. The second translation emphasizes the distinction between white men and the others with the use of “*siyahi adam*” (black men) which adds to the text more than what is actually meant. The last retranslation translates the term literally and adopts a source-oriented approach.

The earlier translation opts for a source-oriented translation by preserving the word “*kast*” as it implies a more strict division between members compared to the class system. The translator also uses the expansion method to briefly explain caste concept. The following retranslations, on the other hand, neutralize the Indian-specific class system caste, in this sense, these two retranslations do not adopt a source-oriented approach.

The receipt taken in the fourth example is followed by a song dedicated to Hindu God Shiva. The instrument tom-tom used for performing the song indicates a religious ritual. In the second translation analyzed in this example, the instrument is domesticated as “*tespîh*” (prayer beads) as it can be more familiar to Turkish readers since it is used in Muslim praying rituals while two other translations are source-oriented.

In the last example, madness is used with its Indian synonym “*dewanee*” in the source text. The second translation erroneously translates the word as “*aşk*” which refers to romantic love. On the other hand, the first and third translations adopt a source-oriented approach. Despite the presence of the same word in Turkish, the most recent retranslation opts for writing the word as it appears in the source text, assumably to emphasize the foreignness as stated in the original work.

There is no stable pattern showing that newer translations are more source-oriented as opposed to more target-oriented early translations. The examples given above indicate that the target culture’ and readers’ acquaintance with the source culture, author, and literary genre over time are not highly decisive factors in adopting certain translation approaches in retranslations.

## CONCLUSION

Five different Turkish translations of *The Jungle Book* showed more complex and multifaceted translation methods employed by translators within eight decades than the explanations offered for the retranslation concept in the retranslation hypothesis. As presented in the examples, there is no linear progress to the so-called *grande traduction* or a stable pattern through which we can identify source-orientedness or target-orientedness of the earlier and later retranslations in the present case study. Despite certain improvements and corrections in some recent retranslations, these changes may not necessarily result from the nature of the retranslation concept as “errors may be corrected in a retranslation in much the same way as in the second edition of a book” (Brownlie, 2006, p.148). Instead, the sources of explanation for the variations between

retranslations in the present study can be related to sociocultural, political, ideological, and historical transformations that the source culture and source language went through over 80 years, translators' personal choices, and publishing houses' financial concerns. The main domesticating translation method employed throughout translations can be disrupted with specific examples of cultural translation. In this sense, the translator's interpreting of the text is as decisive as the target culture norms, the agent's role in the translation process and the translator's wish to complete, fix or contribute to previous translations.

The validation or refutation of the hypothesis may also depend on the methodology since different sets of case studies may lead to varying and contradictory findings. As Koskinen and Paloposki (2019) suggest, the comparative studies conducted on the retranslations may support related claims since the examples were chosen by the researchers to approve the hypothesis in the first place. In the present case, diachronically analyzed three different Turkish translations of *The Jungle Book* approves the main premises of the retranslation hypothesis, newer translation is closer to the source text. On the one hand, although more recent retranslations seem to renew the previous ones' language, it is concluded that socio-contextual conditions have a more significant role than the mere aging language factor. On the other hand, the synchronic analysis of the three recent retranslations did not exactly conform to the assumptions of retranslation. Therefore, it can be concluded that the analysis of retranslations on a chronological basis needs to be supported with a synchronic analysis to test the retranslation hypothesis. In this sense, it is suggested to adopt a more holistic approach to case studies on retranslation for further studies.

## REFERENCES

- Aksoy, Nüzhet Berrin (2010). "The Relation between Translation and Ideology as an Instrument for the Establishment of a National Literature". *Meta*, 55(3), 438–455. doi: 10.7202/045064ar
- Arı, Sevinç (2016). *Çeviri ve Kültürel Semboller*. İstanbul: Değişim Yayınları.
- Atay, Falih Rıfkı (1936). "Introduction". *Cengel Kitabı*. Ankara: Ulus Basımevi.
- Bayraktar-Özer, Özge (2018). "Translating the Sound: A Case Study on Turkish Translations of Just So Stories". *Journal of Translation Studies*, 24, 124-144.
- Bayraktar-Özer, Özge (2022). "Translation Movements in the Modernization Processes of Turkey and China". *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies*, 21, 132–152.
- Bensimon, Paul (1990) "Présentation", *Palimpsestes XIII* (4), ix–xiii.
- Berk-Albachten, Özlem & Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz (Eds.). (2019). *Studies from a Retranslation Culture: The Turkish Context*. Singapore: Springer.
- Berman, Antoine (1990). "La Retraduction comme Espace de la Traduction". *Palimpsestes XIII* (4), 1–7.
- Brownlie, Siobhan (2006). "Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory". *Across Languages and Cultures* 7 (2), 145–170, doi: 10.1556/Acr.7.2006.2.1
- Chesterman, Andrew (2000). "A Causal Model for Translation Studies". Olohan M. (Ed.) *Intercultural Faultlines* (pp.15-28). Manchester: St Jerome.
- Çıkla, Selçuk (2009). "Tanzimattan Günümüze Gazete-Edebiyat İlişkisi". *Türkbilig*, 18, 34-63.

- Deane-Cox, Sharon (2011). *Confronting the Retranslation Hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British Literary System*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Desmidt, Isabelle (2009). "(Re)translation Revisited". *Meta*, 54(4), 669–683. doi: 10.7202/038898ar
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1978). *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Israel: Tel Aviv University Press
- Geçmen, Kerem (2018). "Retranslation and Shifting Constraints". *transLogos Translation Studies Journal*, 1(1), 25-40.
- Hatipoğlu, Merve (2020). *A Comparative Analysis of Turkish Translations of Roald Dahl's Novel, Charlie and The Great Glass Elevator, within the Framework of Retranslation Hypothesis*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. İstanbul: Okan University.
- Kerr, Douglas (1997). "Colonial Habitats: Orwell and Woolf in the Jungle". *English Studies*, 78(2),149-161. doi: 10.1080/00138389708599069
- Kipling, Rudyard (2004). *The Jungle Books*. New York: Barnes & Noble Classics
- Kipling, Rudyard (1936). *Cengel Kitabı*. Nurettin Artam (Trans.). Ankara: Ulus Basımevi
- Kipling, Rudyard (1973). *Orman Masalı*. Kezban Akcalı (Trans.). İstanbul: Neşriyat Anonim Şirketi
- Kipling, Rudyard (2009). *Orman Çocuğu*. Kamer Mengütürk (Trans.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları
- Kipling, Rudyard (2016). *Orman Çocuğu*. Esen Saba (Trans.). İstanbul: Dante
- Kipling, Rudyard (2016). *Orman Kitabı*. Gökçe Yavaş (Trans.). İstanbul: İthaki
- Işıklar Koçak, Müge & Aydın, Elif (2017). "Science Fiction in Turkey: Survival of a Genre Through Retranslations and Reprints". *Dokuz Eylül University Journal of Humanities*, 4(1), 31-42.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep (1973). "Dilde 'Doğal Gelişme' ve 'Devrim' Açısından Türk Dil Devrimi". *A.Ü.D.T.C.F. Türk Dili ve Ed.Araş.Ens. Türkoloji Dergisi*, 4(1), 97-114.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep (1995a). "Cumhuriyet Devrinde Türk Dilindeki Gelişmeler". *Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep (1995b). "Batı Kaynaklı Yabancı Kelimeler ve Dilimiz Üzerindeki Etkileri". *Türk Dili Dergisi*, 524, 843-858. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Koskinen, Kaisa. & Paloposki, Outi (2019). "New Directions for Retranslation Research: Lessons Learned from the Archaeology of Retranslations in the Finnish Literary System". *Cadernos de Tradução*, 39(1),23-44.
- Massardier-Kenney, Françoise (2015). "Toward a Rethinking of Retranslation". *Translation Review*, 92 (1), 73-85. doi: 10.1080/07374836.2015.1086289
- Orwell, George (1989). *The Road to Wigan Pier*. London: Penguin Modern Classics
- Özcan, Esra Gül (2017). *A Descriptive Analysis of the Turkish Translations of Agatha Christie's Murder on the Orient Express within the Framework of Retranslation Hypothesis*. Unpublished master's thesis. Ankara: Hacettepe University.
- Özdemir, Mehmet and Dağtaş, Abdullah (2014). "Dilde Sadeleşme Tartışmaları: 1970 Yılı "Türk Dili" Dergisinde Arapça, Farsça ve Batı Dillerinden Gelen Kelimelere Karşı Takınılan Tavir". *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(26), 27-51.
- Özdoğan, Mehmet (2015). "Türkiye'de Ulus İnşası ve Dil Devrimi (1839-1936)". *Journal of the Academic Elegance*, 2(3), 227-262.

- Paloposki, Outi and Koskinen, Kaisa (2001). "A Thousand and One Translations: Revisiting Retranslation". Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjar, Daniel Gile (Eds.) *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Library.
- Paloposki, Outi and Koskinen, Kaisa (2004). "A Thousand and One Translations: Revisiting Retranslation". Hansen, G., Malmkjaer, K. & Gile, D. (Eds.) *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Palaposki, Outi and Koskinen, Kaisa (2010). "Reprocessing Texts: The Fine Line between Retranslating and Revising". *Across Languages and Cultures*, 11(1), 29-9. doi: 10.1556/Acr.11.2010.1.2
- Pym, Anthony (2014). *Method in Translation History*. London & New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Randall, Don (1998). "Post-Mutiny Allegories of Empire in Rudyard Kipling's Jungle Books". *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 40(1), 97-120.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem (2003). "Multiple-Entry Visa to Travelling Theory: Retranslations of Literary and Cultural Theories". *Target*, 5(1), 1-36.
- Tahir- Gürçağlar, Şehnaz (2019). "Retranslation". M. Baker & G. Saldanha. (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 484-490). London & New York: Routledge.
- Taş, Seda (2015). *Retranslations in the Light of Paratextuality and Intertextuality: Two Dystopian Novels*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik University.
- Taş, Seda (2018). "August Bebel'in Kadın ve Sosyalizm'i Bağlamında Yeniden Çeviri ve Çeviri Eleştirisi: Bir Üst-Eleştiri Çalışması". *RumeliDe Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 4, 292-306.
- Tekin, Talat (1988). "Atatürk ve Türk Dilinde Reform". *Erdem*, 5(12),1023-1044.
- Van Poucke, Piet (2017). "Aging as a Motive for Literary Retranslation: A Survey of Case Studies on Retranslation". *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 12(1), 91-115.
- Weisberg, Meg Furniss (2015). "Jungle and Desert in Postcolonial Texts: Intertextual Ecosystems". *The Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literary Inquiry*, 2(2),171-189. doi:10.1017/pli.2015.12,171-189.
- Yetim, Fahri (2006). *Ulus ve Zafer Gazetelerinin Karşılaştırmalı İncelenmesi: 1957-1960*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

# BATI

## EDEBİYATINDA AKIMLAR

editör  
**OKTAY YİVLİ**

HATİCE FIRAT  
YASEMİN MUMCU  
OKTAY YİVLİ  
OĞUZHAN KARABURGU  
BERNA AKYÜZ SİZGEN  
NİLÜFER İLHAN

ÜMMÜHAN TOPÇU  
SEFA YÜCE  
HANİFİ ASLAN  
METİN AKYÜZ  
MEHMET SÜMER  
YAKUP ÖZTÜRK



Prof. Dr. Önder Göçgün

# TİYATRO DENEN HAYAT SAHNESİ



PROF. DR. ÖNDER GÖÇGÜN

## Türk Tasavvuf Şiiri

AÇIKLAMALI VE YORUMLU ÖRNEKLERLE



# MODERN TÜRK EDEBİYATI

editör  
**OKTAY YİVLİ**

MUHARREM DAYANÇ  
OKTAY YİVLİ  
MACİT BALIK  
MAHMUT BABACAN  
SEVİM ŞERMET

YASEMİN MUMCU  
BEDİA KOÇAKOĞLU  
NİLÜFER İLHAN  
MAKSUT YİĞİTBAŞ  
SELAMİ ALAN

