

44. On "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation": The case study of a historical novel *The Turks* and *Türkler* by David Hotham

Dilşen ÇAKMAK¹

APA: Çakmak, D. (2022). On "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation": The case study of a historical novel *The Turks* and *Türkler* by David Hotham. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (S11), 622-639. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1146743.

Abstract

Literary works are representatives of their own culture whereas translations generally represent cultures of others. There are indeed some exceptional situations that compel translation as a discipline to interact with some other disciplines like history and cultural studies. When a literary text introduces its readers to another culture and represents a foreign culture through translation, things get complicated in terms of translation. It becomes more intriguing if the translator "find himself writing his own history" while translating a historical novel on his people and homeland (Karadağ, 2019: 32). This study aims to make a descriptive study of David Hotham's historical novel *The Turks* and its Turkish translation *Türkler* by Mehmet Ali Kayabal, in the light of "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation". The findings of the research highlight the choices of various translation methods used in the translation of a historical novel, the switch of roles in between translator and writer, and unveils the emergence of some critical questions by virtue of distinctive representations of the same literary text. The research in this respect tries to describe the outcomes of "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation" in historical texts and through the questions it puts forward it calls for further research in the field.

Keywords: Foreign language creation, rootless/textless back translation, translation of historical texts, translation studies

"Yabancı dil yaratımı" ve "Metinsiz Geri Çeviri": David Hotham'ın *The Turks* ve *Türkler Tarihi* romanı üzerine örnek olay incelemesi

Öz

Edebi eserler kendi kültürlerini, çeviri eserler ise genellikle başkalarının kültürlerini temsil eder. Ancak bir disiplin olarak çeviriyi, tarih ve kültürel çalışmalar gibi diğer disiplinlerle etkileşime zorlayan bazı özel durumlar söz konusudur. Çeviri bağlamında edebi bir metin, okurlarını başka bir kültürle tanıştırdığında ve yabancı bir kültürü çeviri aracılığıyla temsil ettiğinde işler karmaşıklaşır. Çevirmen, halkı ve vatani hakkında tarihi bir romanı çevirirken "kendisini kendi tarihini yazar konumunda bul[duğunda]" ise durum çok daha ilgi çekici bir hal almaktadır (Karadağ, 2019: 32). Bu araştırma David Hotham'ın tarihi romanı *The Turks* ve Mehmet Ali Kayabal tarafından yapılan Türkçe çevirisi *Türkler* üzerine "Yabancı Dil Yaratımı" ve "Metinsiz Geri Çeviri" kavramları ışığında betimleyici bir çalışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın bulguları, tarihi roman çevirisi yapılırken kullanılan çeşitli yöntemlere, çevirmen-yazar arasındaki rol değişimlerine ve aynı edebi metnin farklı temsilleri sonucu ortaya çıkan kritik sorulara ışık tutmaktadır. Bu bakımdan araştırma, yeni

¹ Doktora Öğrencisi, 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çeviribilim (İngilizce) Bölümü (İstanbul, Türkiye), dilsencakmak@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1089-316X [Araştırma makalesi, Makale kayıt tarihi: 21.06.2022- kabul tarihi: 20.07.2022; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.1146743]

araştırmalara çağrı niteliğindeki sorularla, tarihi metinlerde "Yabancı Dil Yaratımı" ve "Metinsiz Geri Çeviri"nin doğurduğu sonuçları betimlemeye çalışır.

Anahtar kelimeler: yabancı dil yaratımı, kökensiz/ metinsiz geri çeviri, tarihi metin çevirisi, çeviribilim

1. Introduction

Literary works inherently convey the cultural components of the culture they are created. By all means, it is inconceivable to detach literary creations from the culture they originated because directly or indirectly, contingent on the genre, they present their root culture to the reader. As for translation, these presentations turn into representations of cultures through the translated literary works. In historical narrations, for example, cultural elements appear more explicitly in the texts and thanks to the translation they are represented in foreign cultures via certain translation methods chosen by translators. However, things get complicated when texts concentrate on "representing another culture" than its root. Sun explains it as "travel of cultures" and "cultural transnationality" in which various interactions take place between texts, contexts, and cultures they originated from (Sun, 2014: 107). There occurs a cultural dichotomy bringing in problems of classification and conceptualization of such literary texts as well as their translations in the scope of translation studies. Along with the existing concepts of "cultural translation" and "back translation", the invention of the terms "foreign language creation" and "rootless/textless back translation" points out to the ambiguity in describing and classifying these literary texts as well as their translations within the framework of translation studies (Avşaroğlu & Karadağ, 2020: 107). Therefore, it is possible to say that translation of such literary works needs to be researched further to reveal the cultural and multidimensional relations between their source and target texts and to describe the methods and approaches generally adopted in their translation process. In this respect, this study aims to make a descriptive study of David Hotham's historical novel *The Turks* and its Turkish translation *Türkler* by Mehmet Ali Kayabal, in the light of "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation". The research takes the methodology of the article "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation": A Case Study on Turkish Translations of Jason Goodwin's Ottoman-Themed Works Written in English" (Avşaroğlu & Karadağ, 2020) as its basis. In addition, the following questions will be examined throughout this study.

- 1) How does an English historical novel represent Turkish culture in English via Foreign Language Creation? What methods are used and what linguistic preferences are made?
- 2) What methods are preferred when an English historical novel returns to its root culture "Turkish" through Textless Back Translation?
- 3) Do these representations reflect the same point of view or do they show any difference (depending on their implied reader/ culture)?

David Hotham's historical novel *the Turks* written in 1972 and published by John Murray Publishers has become a well-known novel in Turkey with its Turkish translation *Türkler* by Mehmet Ali Kayabal published by Milliyet Publishing in 1973 Yeni Gün News Agency Publishing in 2000 divided into two books *Türkler I* and *Türkler II*. On the back cover of the first translation, there is brief information about Hotham and his novel as in the original but with an omitted part. In that part, the writer explains some positive aspects that Turkey and Turks were admired by Europe as well as mentions the curiosity of

Western people on Turks and their negative attitude that goes back to the wars of religions. (Hotham, 1972;1973, covers). *Türkler* translated by Mehmet Ali Kayabal instead has a different note of the publisher added especially for the target readers as follows. “When you read TÜRKLER you will also agree how successful David Hotham is in this work where he **described his impressions with an unbiased eye** after he returned to England” (Hotham, 1973, back cover; my emphasis). The latter translated version (published in two books) distributed by Cumhuriyet Newspaper and published by Yeni Gün News Agency Publishing, also have a similar commentary with slight lexical changes. This version also has some additional information taken from the Author’s Note in the source book but does not include the omitted part that exists in the source book’s cover as well. The reason is quite comprehensible. Because the source text reader and target reader may have different cultural backgrounds it might be probably publishers’ advertising policy to present a book in a way that the reader would feel like to read it.

In addition, through the research, findings pointed out that some prominent columnists and online newspapers like Milliyet², Yeniçağ³ and Cumhuriyet⁴ have made references to this historical novel on Turks from time to time. These references are mostly about Atatürk’s success and outstanding abilities in leading the Independence War and the positive characteristics of the Turks which prove the book is generally well accepted by the Turkish people and their media. The investigation of the current research questions gains prominence at this point to see whether the translation of the book that was approved and perceived as **unbiased** reflect the same point of view and how an English book on Turks is represented in its root culture.

2. Theoretical framework

Before elaborating on the concepts of “Foreign Language Creation” and “Textless Back Translation” it may be useful to explain the root term “back translation”. The Dictionary of Translation Studies defines “back translation” as “a process in which a text which has been translated into a given language is translated into SL and has been used for different purposes” (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2004: 14-15). As per the definition, particular objectives lead to back translation such as Gloss Translation which refers to a comparison of source and target text in many aspects including morphological, syntactic, or lexical (15). It is also used in the same manner in contrastive linguistics to compare the semantic features of the source and target texts and find examples of formal correspondence (15).

Moreover, Brislin defines some other purposes of back translation such as translation quality check and evaluating the degree of equivalence (1970: 185). He remarks that back translation may result in many semantic errors and should be revised and reviewed to provide a high-quality translation in cross-cultural research (212). One may think that Brislin’s research dating back to the 70s recalls the past equivalence debates whereas some current studies support the use of back translation for testing accuracy and adequacy. For instance, Feng and Li define “back translation” as “the re-translation of the original translation” and assert that it can help to test the original translation’s accuracy (cf. Tu & Li, 2017: 1). Tu & Li as well classify the use of back translation and puts it into two categories: Back

² Pular, Hasan. 2003. “Eğer David Hotham bugünleri görseydi”. Milliyet. 27 February, 2003. <https://www.milliyet.com.tr/yazarlar/hasan-pular/eger-david-hotham-bugunleri-gorseydi-5188330>

³ Yeniçağ. “Atatürk ve Liderlik”. 7 March, 2014. <https://www.yenicaggazetesi.com.tr/-95510h.htm>

⁴ Cumhuriyet. “Çanakkale Geçilmez”, 17 March, 2017. <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/canakkale-gecilmez-701406>

Translation for Testing and Back Translation for Research (Tu & Li, 2017: 2). Though, in my opinion, testing accuracy via back translation recalls structuralist approaches and sounds mechanical.

Being aware of these classifications we shall delve into the nature of back translations and their relations with their source texts. When translations go through a retro process it moves away from the target culture to its homeland, that's to say its source and, meet its inherent cultural codes in the source literary system. The semantic, morphological, and lexical features may diverge from the real source as the studies aforementioned express, but the cultural ground is common.

On the other hand, Avşaroğlu and Karadağ (2020: 107) explain if a text is generated on the basis of another culture and language it is presented, it can be perceived as "a representation of a specific culture it narrates". The culture rendered in a foreign language is "brought back to its land through translation" and this move triggers the birth of another concept which is "textless back translation" (107-108).

The term was first used as "rootless back translation" by Wang in 2009 (Guo, 2017: 1355). It refers to the "a special kind of back translation" of the texts with Chinese culture theme but written in foreign languages like English (Tu & Li, 2017: 3). Later, Wang has modified the term as "textless back translation" since these translations have a source culture but no source text such as literary works on China written in English (2-3).

In addition, Wang suggested another term "foreign language creation" referring to the source texts of textless back translations and defined it as penning a literary work on one's domestic culture while using a foreign language. (Guo, 2017: 1354). He has also made a classification for this type of text as follows:

- Works of domestic writers
- Works of overseas Chinese writers
- Works of foreign writers of Chinese origin (Tu & Li, 2017: 3).

The first class consists of the works of Chinese writers in foreign languages such as English (3) The second is the class of literary products on China written by Chinese authors who live abroad and the third represents the texts of foreign writers of Chinese origin (3-4).

In line with this classification, Öztürk Kasar who has suggested the Turkish terms⁵ "özde çeviri" (watermark translation) and "aşlına çeviri" (retro-translation) that respectively correspond to Wang's "foreign language creation" and "textless back translation" also put these literary works into two categories:

- Watermark translations from home to abroad⁶,
- Watermark translations from abroad to home (Öztürk Kasar, 2020: 1-7).

These categories meet Wang's first two classes and represent the same type of literary works in order.

In brief, we can infer that these terms and classifications bring a new perspective to the literary works and their back-translation which have a sort of cultural dichotomy and create a kind of conceptual role conflict in the field. The literary works regarded as original turn out to be "translated representation(s)

⁵ English translations of the terms belong to Öztürk Kasar.

⁶ The words home/abroad are Öztürk Kasar's suggestion for translation of öz bağlam/yabancı bağlam.

of the specific culture(s)” narrated in a foreign language while their translations as well change into back translations (Avşar & Karadağ, 2020: 107).

This situation can be considered as a redeal of cards because the act of “writing” is perceived as “translation” and hence the “translation” of the text which was previously a source text is now considered as “a textless back translation” (107). Furthermore, “the writer” of its ex-source is now referred to as the “translator” (ibid.).

On the other hand, we can say that genres of literary texts add further dimensions to this complexity. Since they are influential in the “travel of cultures” (Sun, 2014: 107). The case study of the current research is as it is mentioned before on a historical novel namely the *Turks* and its translation *Türkler*, therefore a brief literature review on the relationship between history and translation may be beneficial as well to understand the additional dimension brought by this genre to the study.

History and language have a tight bond according to conceptual historians White and Kosselleck. White who accentuates the “disparity between language and reality” explains how history is reconstructed via language as various representations of reality by different agents (cf. Kosselleck & Presner, 2002: xiii). He also remarks that “The critical historian must proceed on the basis of the realization that she has to invent a language adequate to the representation of historical reality of her own time and place of work”. (cf. Kosselleck & Presner, 2002: xiii).

At this point, the representation problem of history draws much attention while White signals the “danger of distortion” in them due to the subjective orientation of the historian (White, 1973: 272). We can say that representations of history are constructed and interpreted by the experience and cultural background of people, in Huyssen’s words “all representation-whether in language, narrative, image, or recorded sound-is based on memory” and the memory itself is dependent on the culture it is shaped (Huyssen, 1995: 2).

As for history translation, we can say that the translator is an influential agent in the representation of history as well as the representation of culture. Because not only do the memory and the cultural background of the historian affects the construction of the representation of reality but also do the memory of the translator and the target culture, he addresses have a significant effect on this (Paker, 2004: 282). What is expected from the translator is

“to establish the context of culture, literature and language of the translation history of the historical period we research and to associate it with the present time based on the accumulations while taking into account the power relations and the dominant views of the period as well as their position in the target system, in Huyssen's words to remember them within the representation (Paker, 2004: 282; my translation).

From this point of view, being aware of the representation problem of history with its various aspects, we can say that translation as the representation of historical narratives gains further dimensions especially if the source text is focused on a culture other than its own. So, once again the translation process faces a dichotomy that may cause the source text and target text conflict. We can observe this conflict more evidently in the case of “foreign language creation” and “textless back translation” which comprises the role conflict of the translator as well. Karadağ defines it as a transformation of “the other” to “the self” and adds “Since a text in the target language will be written by the translator, it will

inevitably become 'the writer's self-translated work'. In other words, the translator will find himself writing his own history: **a translator writing his own history**" (Karadağ, 2019: 32; my emphasis).

What happens if a translator writes his own history? The case study of this research will try to provide valuable data for the answer to this question as well as its research questions, so it might be appropriate here to move on to the case study and see what happens.

3. The Case Study of *The Turks* as "Foreign Language Creation" and "*Türkler*" as Textless Back Translation

David Hotham is a journalist who after spending 7 years in Turkey wrote down his observations in a book called *The Turks* (1972). In Author's Note, he explains that he wanted to share his experiences in Turkey and describe Turks whom the West is curious about. On the other hand, he presents to the reader some key events that occurred in Turkey in chronological order and describes important issues like the religious question, Kemalism, the 1960 military coup and westernization of Turkey as well as the characteristics of Turkish people and culture. In this context, we can call the book a historical novel that reflects a particular period of a nation's history and as well as providing insights into its people, culture and lifestyle.

The book was translated by Mehmet Ali Kayabal who was also a journalist (like the author) and it was published by Milliyet Publishing in 1973. Later in 2000, it was published again in the form of two books "Türkler I" and "Türkler II" by Yeni Gün News Agency Publishing. In this version, there were only slight differences from the first translation especially in paratextual elements such as visuals used in covers and commentaries of publishers placed on them. In this research, the first translated version of the book will be taken as the object of the study since the other version apart from paratextual differences has the identical text with the first.

In the translation compared to its source book we realize that the in-text visuals are completely excluded, and footnotes are mostly omitted from the book. Still, the target text is quite longer than the source (possibly because of the linguistic differences in language couples) and creates an image that the source book's wholeness is preserved. However, the study of methods used in translation draws us a quite different picture than what we expected.

3.1. Translation methods of the writer/translator in "Foreign Language Creation"

3.1.2. Literal translation:

The Source Text which turns into a target text in terms of "Foreign Language Creation" contains a various number of literal translations of its source culture elements. The following examples all exist in the source culture, which the text has taken as root, with little changes in their letters to provide correct pronunciation of the words or at least close ones to their sound in the source language.

Dervish (27), Mahomet (14), Hafiz (13), Turkesh (33), Koran (10), Seljuk (160), charshaf (147), Caraosman (78), junta (48) Hodja (149).

In addition, the translation of Atatürk's famous saying "Ne mutlu Türküm diyene!" can be accepted as a literal translation of the source as follows "He is a lucky man who can say 'I'm a Turk'" (123).

3.1.3. Literal translation with explanation:

Some literal translations are provided with their explanations in the book to make sure the reader who is unfamiliar with the Turkish culture get a brief idea.

- “Dervish orders-The Tarikat as they were called” (27)
- “*Devrim*” (“revolution”) (88)
- “Arkadaşlık” (“Comradeship or friendship”) (132)
- “Samimi” (“literally ‘sincere’ but here roughly translatable as ‘having honest intentions’”) (134)
- “Yok” (“Turkish negative”) (127)
- “Nazar”: “the look” (146)
- “(..) adding the saving word Mashallah” (146)
- “minstrels”, “called “*Ashiks and Ozans*” (147)
- “*Saz*” (“many-stringed lute”)
- “Gumuşova” (“The Silver Plain”) (156)
- “Medreshes*⁷” explained in footnote “old Muslim colleges” (162)
- “Tekkes or Dervish convents” (28)
- “Yunus Emre” (Pronounced as Emreh* footnote) (147)
- “Big Landowners known as *Aghas*” (78)
- “*Yaban*’ means ‘the foreigner’ or ‘the outsider’” (138)
- Winds like “the *Yildiz* or ‘star’ because it blows from the pole-star”, “The *Meltems* are a series of light pleasant breezes which blow offshore in summer” (173).

3.1.4. Substitution:

The writer/translator prefers to use target concepts that may correspond to the meaning of the concepts in its source culture so that they may sound more meaningful to the reader.

- “büyücü”: “magician” (147)
- “müritler”: “followers” (148)
- “Yüce Hakanım”: “Your Majesty” (149)
- “Karagöz oyunu”: “shadow plays” (Laurel- Hardy) (151)
- “namus”: “honor” (133)
- “namussuz”: “dishonorable” (133)
- “ayip”: “shameful” (133)
- “coffehouse”: “kahvehane” (132)

3.1.5. Free translation

Especially when translating the cultural components that do not exist in the source culture, the writer/translator prefers free translation method and provides some details that he thinks necessary.

⁷ The symbol “*” illustrates that the explanation of the word it is used with appears in the footnotes of the text.

For example, the worship rituals of Muslims is explained exhaustively in the text which does not even exist in the back translation.

“Muslim may worship on any piece of ground, provided it is clean” (11).

“He kneels and presses his forehead to the ground, then stands with his head bowed in a reverent posture, kneels again, or sits for minutes on end apparently rapt in contemplation of the Ineffable”. (11).

Another example is about Bride Price. The translation includes the writer/translator’s own ideas presented with a simile.

“In many parts of Anatolia men pay cash for their wives, as if they were buying a buffalo or ox. This is the ancient Turkish custom of Bride Price” (142).

The case of blood feud is also translated in the same manner which involves subjectivity of the writer/translator “The blood feud still hangs over rural Turkey like the wrath of God” (143).

3.1.6. Integrated translation

Many instances can be easily found where the writer/translator uses more than one translation method in the text.

- “Dolmuş taxis: which fill up with passenger before moving(...)” (175).
- “Poplars are the most common trees here, tall and lissom against a summer sky as Blue as a Perugino Virgin’s robe” (169).
- “Water mansions known as Yalis” (173).
- “There were great local families, almost dynasties, known as the Derebeys, (...)” (78).

3.1.7. Exoticism and cultural borrowings

Exotic elements are immensely involved in the text as exemplified below. The reason might be to make the target reader as familiar as possible with the source language and culture.

Ramazan (12), Kurban Bayram (12), Hafız (13), Kismet (38), Ozan (147), local winds like (173) Karayel, Poyraz, İmbat, Keşişleme, Meltem, Mevlevi (163), Muz Palas (156). Imam (143), Allah (30), Muezzin (11), Nazar(146), Yalis (, Odacı (room-man)(73), Yassıada (43) The Meltem , “Yok” (127), Arkadaşlık (132), Muskas (146).

3.1.8. Additions:

The translator/writer generally likes to add comments on Turkish culture and historical background. For instance, he explains his opinions on the underlying reason for the birth of Pan-Turkist ideas and Atatürk’s famous saying he translates as “He is a lucky fellow who can say ‘I’m a Turk’” (104).

He also states that

“under the Ottoman empire, the word ‘Turk’ had been an object of scorn and contempt to Ottoman upper classes, for whom it meant a ‘yokel’, a ‘bumpkin’, or a ‘clod’. In those times anybody of importance called himself not a ‘Turk’ but an ‘Ottoman’. ‘Turk’ meant an ignorant peasant. The Turks under the empire had lost all pride in their race; they were so used to being called stupid by the Ottoman general classes (...), that they had come to believe it themselves” (Hotham, 1972, 104).

There are many other examples in which he makes connections with the target culture he addresses as well.

- "Great numbers of peasants, exasperated by the poverty and boredom of villages, migrate to the big cities hoping to get a job or like Dick Wittington to find gold under streets" (73).
- "Karagöz was a sort of between Punch and Judy, Laurel and Hardy and the chansonniers of Montmartre" (151).
- "Karagöz is more subtle than he seems and will sometimes assume ignorance for purposes of Socratic irony" (151).

He also comments on how Turks display their sensitivity to the environment and adds it rather reflects the regrets of being lost in the past than being a drive for protection.

"Lofty sentiments, emphasizing the importance of trees to nations, are often to be seen inscribed in gigantic letters on bare hillsides in Turkey: they read more like a lament for the past than an exhortation for the future." (82)

The writer/translator gives detailed information on how Bride Price works with an ironic simile.

"In many parts of Anatolia men pay cash for their wives, as if they were buying a buffalo or an ox" (142).

Last but not the least, in the chapter titled "The Land" Socialism is defined as a virus by the writer/translator of the book and for him, Turks have not yet gone under its influence. He adds his commentary on the results of a possible socialist wind in Turkey.

"The Turkish people are getting the message at last. The Turks are like Southsea islanders, never yet exposed to disease, who if once they catch the germ, might well fall victims to a ranging epidemic. Islam may protect them; but only a little, and probably not for long." (85).

3.1.9. Pronunciation notices

The writer/translator provides the reader with the pronunciation of authentic words very often either in footnotes or within the text. Especially, one example attracts more attention since the explanation extends over the sentence level (see the second from the top). The ones with a star show that their pronunciation is given in the footnote.

- Yunus Emre* pronounced Emreh (147).
- "Biz bize benzeriz" * Pronounced Bizz beezeh benzérriz (123).
- Dr. Fazıl* Küçük Pronounced Fuzzle (117).
- Yashar* Kemal pronounced Yaşar (88).
- Çetin* Altan pronounced Chetin (88).
- Doğan Avcıoğlu* Pronounced Avjioglu (88).
- Odacı pronounced odaji (73).
- Major Fethi Gürcan* Pronounced Gurjan
- Celal* Bayar Pronounced DJELAL (37)
- Side* Pronounced Seede (160)

The writer/translator gives so many details as if he sacrificed himself to introduce Turks and The Turkish culture in every aspect to his readers in the West.

3.2. Translation methods of the writer/translator in “Textless Back Translation”

3.2.1. Omission

There is a huge amount of omission not only at the words or sentences level but also at paragraphs and pages level. However, there is no explanation about the reasons for his choices by the translator in the form of a foreword or footnote. For instance,

ST: Mahomet openly liked women, and had a great many wives, while limiting the Faithful to four; and the story told by Muslim apologists that he married only the ugly ones in order to be kind to them that seems hardly to correspond the truth. (12)

TT: “Hazreti Muhammet de, açıkça söylemek gerekirse, kadınları severdi. Müminleri dört kadından çoğunu almamakla sınırlarken, kendisi pek çok eş seçmişti”. (29) (It is rendered as “Prophet Mohamet openly liked woman. While limiting the Faithful to four, he had great many wives.” The left is omitted). Moreover, the part about the ugly women that the prophet chooses to protect is omitted for some reason that was not explained.

In addition, in the ST details of performing prayer is given exhaustively in the source whereas it is quite short as a result of the omitted parts.

ST: “His prayer may last fifteen minutes or so. He kneels and presses his forehead to the ground, then stands with his head bowed in a reverent posture, kneels again, or sits for minutes on end apparently rapt in contemplation of the Ineffable. He is quite unembarrassed”.

TT: “Namaz on beş dakika sürer” (23). (It is rendered as “Prayers last fifteen minutes.” The left is omitted)

Some details related to Ramazan and Kurban Bayram are omitted in the TT and some footnotes explicating religious issues related to Islam are left out as well.

About Atatürk’s revolutionary acts there is a striking sentence which we think may offend many Turkish citizens.

ST: “One might think this was enough for a man to do a brief fifteen years of rule, but Atatürk went further. Even he, though a complete autocrat, could not convert the whole Turkish people to Christianity but he did the best thing. He abolished the Koranic law and replaced it by codes of law taken from western Europe” (19).

The translator omits most of the parts and renders this sentence as

TT: “Atatürk bununla da yetinmemiş, Şeriat’ı kaldırıp yerine Batı hukukunu getirmiştir” (32).

(It is rendered as “Atatürk went further. He abolished the Koranic law and replaced it by codes of law taken form western Europe”).

Another example is a memory that author tells that take part in a military headquarter.

ST: I once saw an extra ordinary example of the latter in a military headquarters in İstanbul. I was waiting in the hall of the building, and some soldiers were loafing about nearby. I don't know what they had done wrong, but suddenly an officer rushed downstairs from the floor above, his face purple with rage, and laid about those man with appalling ferocity. He used his outstretched arm, with the first clenched, as a sort of battering-ram, with which he struck the soldiers repeatedly on the sides of their heads. Anyone absolutely impassive, like blocks of wood. When it was over, they drifted sheepishly away, while the officer walked calmly upstairs again in high good humour (54-55).

Following this paragraph, the author remarks on Turkish officers fame for intelligence, enlightenment and some positive social aspects. TT involves this part of the description of Turkish officers whereas the previous part is eliminated by the translator.

Omissions not only occur within the texts, but they may also take place in the titles of chapters which indicate the translator's choice to eliminate certain subjects from the book. When the contents pages of both ST and TT are compared one can easily notice that the titles of chapter 16 are a bit different. In the target text, one word is excluded from the title which exists in the source.

ST: “Byzantium, Kurdistan, Armenia” (176)

TT: “Bizans ve Ermenistan” (241)

Moreover, at the beginning of this chapter, the author states that some specific problems are “highly sensitive” related to Turks and Anatolia which are namely Kurds, and Armenians. He even states “I shall certainly offend many Turks” by referring to these minorities and tries explaining “the atmosphere inside Turkey”. In the rest part, he gives some detailed information and his comments on these minorities living in Turkey but in TT the pages that he explains about Kurds between 178 and 182 (nearly 4 pages) are omitted as a whole. The translator eliminates these pages on this issue and this change is reflected in the title of the chapter as well.

Some parts in the same chapter related to the Armenian issue are also omitted in TT especially the ones about the “massacre” or “genocide” allegation as in the following example.

ST: “Apart from the difference of religion, there had grown up something of the same network of jealousy and envy which in other countries surrounded the Jews, when the order came from above to ‘eliminate’ Armenians, it unchained in Turks the same dreadful passions which Hitler evoked in the Germans- only with more justification.” (184).

In addition to this, the part in which the author deepens the subject by referring to Macbeth's words is left out in the target as well.

“...I am in blood

Stepp'd in so far that, should I wade no more,

Returning were as tedious as go o'er” (185).

However, the TT involves the part about “the question of historical prejudice” which explains some other nations like Russians and even his own nation had similar actions in the past, but Turks had been an old

enemy for Europe since the Crusades and that might be the reason why this issue is deepened in European's point of view while others are not.

In this large number of omissions there is no sign of declaration that those parts are omitted and neither an explanation that they were excluded because of this and that. Therefore, the target reader reads it as if the wholeness of the original text is preserved and unaware of any omissions or other methods used in the target text.

3.2.2. Substitution

The author mentions the Persian influence in Turkish culture and quotes one of Omer Khayyam's rubai translated by Edward Fitzgerald.

ST:

"The grape that can with Logic absolute
The two-end-seventy jarring Sects confute:
The sovereign Alchemist that in Trice
Life is leaden metal into Gold transmute" (161).

TT:

"Ey gafiller! Madem ki dünyanın bütün hallerini
bilirsiniz, onun işvelerine de aldırmayın!
Bu aziz ömrünüzü boş yere harcamayın... Haydi,
haydi...
Gönlünüze bir dost seçip şarap için!" (223).

(It is rendered as

"Oh, the heedless ones! Now that you are aware of all the situations in life, do not be fooled by its ups and downs!

Don't waste your precious life in vain... Come on!

Come on, choose a friend you like and drink wine! [my translation])

When compared it can be easily noticed that TT and the ST are quite different from each other. Fitzgerald's translation in the first example may not be the same as the rubai translated in TT. In fact, Fitzgerald's translation method on Khayyam's works are generally known as free translations and therefore the translator might have had difficulty finding the source text as we had during this research. However, the two keywords in Fitzgerald's work made us think that the rubai in Turkish might probably be that one. Because we think some concepts match with Fitzgerald's text. For example, "the two-end-seventy jarring sects" is explained in Fitzgerald's endnotes (2009, 92) as seventy-two different religions that were regarded to divide the world. So, the we chose corresponds to this explanation with its fifth line. Moreover, the word "alchemist" and "nakış" (embroidery) have similar connotations since they both require talent. Therefore, we can say that Khayyam's rubai that Kayabal has included in his translation is a substitution compared to the rubai which is translated by Eyüboğlu.

TT:

Benim varlığım senin yaptığın bir nakış;
 Türlü garip renklerini hep senden almış;
 Kendimi düzeltmeğe nasıl varsın elim;
 Senden güzelini yapmak bana mı kalmış!
 Yetmiş iki ayrı millet, bir o kadar da din!
 Tek kaygısı seni sevmek benim milletimin;
 Kafirlik müslümanlık neymiş, sevap günah ne?
 Maksat sensin, araya dolambaçlar girmesin.

(Eyüboğlu, 2003, no page)

(It is rendered as

“My existence is embroidery you made
 With various strange colors taken from you,
 How dare I correct myself!
 How dare I create a better me?
 Seventy-two different nations and as many religions!
 The only concern of my nation is to love you,
 So what is infidelity and what is Islam?
 What is good deed and sin?

The only real cause is you, no need for twists and turns” [my translation].)

In addition, there are also substitutions of certain concepts in two languages as in the following example.

ST: “Nevertheless the Swiss code in Turkey has remained something of an unattained Nirvana” (140).

TT: Herşeye rağmen İsviçre Medeni Kanunu, Türkiye’de erişilmesi hayal edilen bir cennet olarak kalmıştır (57).

In this example, “connect” is used instead of Nirvana in the target text the reason might be that the target reader is more familiar with the former concept.

ST: “In another show, it was suggested that a close relative of Sultan was a homosexual.” (152)

TT: “Bir başka oyunda Sustanın akrabalarından birinin cinsel sapık olduğu çitlatılıyordu.” (212)

Here in this example the word “homosexual” is rendered as “cinsel sapık” which in fact corresponds to “a pervert” in English. The book was written in the 1970s thus the translator’s lexical choice may be under the effect of the cultural attitude towards homosexuality.

Moreover, in Chapter 3 “Kemalism and Reaction”, Hotham comments on Atatürk’s image among his people and mentions their dilemma between admiring him for his military success against Greek forces

and having difficulty understanding his passion to adopt the civilization of nations which known as the enemies of Muslim so far.

ST: "As for the popular view of Atatürk, it is really a mixed one. The people see him part-saviour, part-monster." (24).

The translator renders the first part of the sentence but prefers to omit the expressions in the rest which defines Atatürk as part-saviour and part-monster for Turkish people and the love of Atatürk is not as sincere as it seems.

TT: "Atatürk'ün halk gözündeki hayali çok karışıktır." (43).

(It is translated as "Atatürk's image in the eye of public is a very mixed one.")

The omissions often create a gap between what the author really mentions and what the target reader receives as a message whereas neither any explanation nor any mention of what is done by the translator or the publisher of the book. Therefore, 43the target reader reads it as if it is the whole original text and cannot be aware of the missing parts unless she/he can read the source text and make a comparison.

3.2.3. Additions

There are not many additions in the text and possibly it is because the translator has made many omissions in the translation of foreign cultural elements which do not belong to Turkish culture. So, generally no reasons left to put footnotes or in-text explanations. Source text involves the following elements whereas the target excludes them or leave them without additional explanatory information.

Footnote on "H.V. Morton" (157)

"as Burkhart must have seen Petra" (169)

"Sir James" and "Golden Bough" (204)

"peraguna virgin's robe" (169)

While rendering some sentences the translator makes additions as if he wants to soften the meaning of utterances by the author.

ST: "It is a strictly monotheistic cult. Atatürk, like Allah, is One, and none can be associated with Him." (21).

TT: "Atatürkçülük, tek tanrılı bir din **gibidir**. Atatürk de tıpkı Allah gibi, tektir." (39, my emphasis).

The translator omits "strictly" from the text and inserts the word "gibi" within the sentence which means "like or similar to" so the meaning becomes softer compared to the ST. "It is **like** a monotheistic cult" in translators' words.

Similarly, in the very beginning of the book, Hotham asks if a Turk is European and assumes that many people would reject it "instinctively". However, he remarks that "They might be wrong". Kayabal

translates this statement as "**Pekala** aldaniyor olabilirler."(11, my emphasis) which involves an additional expression "pekala" that makes the possibility of wrongfulness stronger.

In another context in which the author explains the reason for Greek's failure against the Turkish army in the Independence War, he makes a commentary as follows.

ST: Greek general were not much good (...) and they were up against military genius (22).

TT: "Yunan generallerinin iyi **ve usta** olmadıkları, askeri dehadan yoksun buldukları bir **gerçektir**" (40, my emphasis)

Translator prefers to add some words "usta" and "gerçektir" which does not exist in the source text. With these additions, the idea that Greek generals were not so good as their Turkish rivals is emphasized.

There is brief information given about the land of Turkey and the animals living in pastures. The number of animals is given in detail such as "water-buffaloes by 400.000", "Only camels have gone down by 50.000" (82) in the ST. In TT these expressions are rendered as "mandalar 400.000 baş", "Yalnız develerin sayısında 50.000 başlık bir azalma olmuştur." (124). The word "baş" means "head" in the target language and it is used as a unit of measure.

3.2.4. Literal translation

There are many examples of literal translations in the target text. We can say that except for the omissions, the general attitude of the translator is keeping the text literally as it is. For instance, the rendering of King Lear's words is as literal as it can be.

ST: "Who loses who wins; who is in and who is out" words of Lear." (45)

TT: "Kim kaybeder, kim kazanır, kim girer, kim çıkar" (73)

The second example might be the dialogue between Adnan Menderes, the Turkish Prime Minister and Celal Bayar the President of Turkey when the 1960 coup occurred. They were both sent to prison and the writer reports a dialogue he claims that they had on the way.

ST: "Menderes, deeply demoralized and in fear of his life, was bemoaning his fate: 'Kismet! Kismet!*' 'Don't you believe it', snorted old Bayar, 'it's not Kismet, it's İsmet!'(38).

TT: "Morali çok bozuk olan ve hayatını kaybetmekten korkan Menderes, acı alın yazısını, 'Kismet, Kismet!' diyerek dile getirir. Yaşlı kurt Bayar is, yanı başında homurdanır: "İnanma, kismet filan değil, düpedüz İsmet, İsmet!" (63).

The dialogue is literally translated with some small additions, possibly in order to make it sound more authentic: "yaşlı kurt" (old wolf) instead of "old" and "düpedüz" (outright) instead of repeating "İsmet" once again. Moreover, the author defines the word "kismet" in the footnote as "fate" to make it clear for the translator whereas the translator doesn't include any footnotes probably assuming that the source text reader is already familiar with this concept.

The examples can be duplicated since one can realize that literal translation is mostly a prevalent method in the translation process unless the translator prefers to make a summary of a part or omit some parts completely.

3.2.5. Established equivalent

If any concept in the source text has an equivalent in the target text, the translator generally uses them as established equivalent in his translation. For example, “bride price” (142) and “başlık parası” (59), “wanderer” (148) and “garip” (207), “Nirvana” (140) and “cennet” (198).

ST: “Nevertheless the Swiss code in Turkey has remained something of an unattained Nirvana.” (140).

TT: “Herşeye ragmen İsviçre Medeni Kanunu, Türkiye’de erişilmesi hayal edilen bir cennet olarak kalmıştır” (198).

In this example “cennet” is used instead of Nirvana in the target text the reason might be the target reader is more familiar with the former concept.

4. Concluding remarks

The case study of this research unfolds how various translation methods are used in “Foreign Language Creation” and “Textless Back Translation” through the work of Hotham and its Turkish translation by Kayabal. What we discover is also the multi-role of Hotham as a translator translating culture and an author -pretending like a historian- writing his experiences and expressions about the Turks and Turkish culture through his English point of view. We also observe the traces of the multi-role of Kayabal as a translator and “cultural spokesman” who “tends to take the liberty with the original” to decide especially on what parts are to be involved and what parts need to be left out (Sun, 2014: 115-116).

The dichotomies and conflicts in the translation process generated by the differences between cultures, languages and the agents involved in the translation process of a historical novel mentioned at the very beginning of this paper seem to be highly effective in its representation. In the case of *the Turks*, taking on the roles of translator/writer and a historian Hotham draws a profile of a typical Turk and describes the Turkish culture, history, and issues of its country by filtering them from his own cultural background and experiences. He also makes decisions on what/how to write/translate and report (as a historian) and what/how not. We realize a “danger of distortion” in his means of dealing with the subjects (White, 1973: 272). Turks sometimes may like what he tells or get angry with him as he states himself (Hotham, 1972: 176).

On the other hand, in the case of *Türkler* which is the Turkish translation of Hotham’s work we see the traces of distortion with the omission of not only words or sentences but paragraphs and pages that are most probably effective in target reader’s getting the same message as the source reader. Although some of them might happen because the translator found the explanation of some cultural components unnecessary or wanted to make a summary of events that do not change the general gist of the source text. Unfortunately, we are not provided with any clues on why certain methods have been applied in the translation. However, some extensive use of methods like omissions, remind us of Hotham’s words on offending Turks. Those parts he mentioned might be therefore excluded by the translator to prevent possible reactions by the target reader, but this is not anything other than anticipation. When we recall the question “What happens if “a translator finds himself writing his own history”” (Karadağ, 2019: 23)?

The translator at this point seems to take on the role of "cultural spokesman" by becoming the decision-maker of what to tell the Turks and how (Sun, 2014: 116). On the other hand, we cannot find any traces of those decisions he made, solely looking at the target text.

Finally, we may come up with the answer to the last research question of this paper. The one about whether these two representations reflect the same point of view or have any difference depending on their reader and cultural background that affects translator's choices of those specific translation methods. The answer to this question may be found out by answering the two following questions: Would the publisher's note on the back cover of *Türkler* be changed in case the methods described in this research had not been applied in translation and the texts had been translated in its wholeness? At this point, it might be helpful to remind you what the note states: "When you read TÜRKLER you will also agree how successful David Hotham is in this work where he **described his impressions with an unbiased eye** after he returned to England" (Hotham, 1973, my emphasis). Or would the translation of Hotham's book *Türkler* have been well-accepted and become popular in Turkey to the extent which prominent newspapers tend to make references to it especially around national days in case of a full-text translation? We got some answers as a result of this study, and we believe that the findings of the current research and the questions that emerged through it points out the need for further studies in "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation".

References

- Avşaroğlu, M. & Karadağ, A. B. (2020). "Foreign Language Creation" and "Textless Back Translation": A Case Study on Turkish Translations of Jason Goodwin's Ottoman-Themed Works Written in English. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(5), 107-119.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for Cross-cultural Research. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.
- Fitzgerald, E. (2009). *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guo, T. (2017). On Foreign Language Creation and Rootless Back Translation: A Case Study of Snow Flower and the Secret Fan. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies* 7(10), 1354-1364. doi:10.17265/2159-5836/2017.10.017
- Hotham, D. (1972). *The Turks*. London: John Murray.
- Hotham, D. (1973, [1972]). *Türkler*. (M. A. Kayabal. Trans.). İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları.
- Hotham, D. (2000, [1972]). *Türkler I*. (M. A. Kayabal. Trans.). İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık.
- Hotham, D. (2000, [1972]). *Türkler II*. (M. A. Kayabal. Trans.). İstanbul: Yeni Gün Haber Ajansı Basın ve Yayıncılık.
- Huyssen, A. (1995). *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. Newyork: Routledge.
- Karadağ, A. B. (2019). Çeviri Yoluyla Geçmiş, Şimdi ve Gelecek arasında Köprüler Kurmak. *Çeviribilimde Araştırmalar: Research in Translation Studies [electronic resource]*.
- Kasar, S. Ö. (2020). Çeviri Göstergibilimi ile Kent Göstergibiliminin Bütünleşik Bağlamında Özde Çeviri Kavramının İncelenmesi. *Dünya Dilleri, Edebiyatları ve Çeviri Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 1-25.
- Koselleck, R. & Presner, T. S. (2002). *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Paker, S. (2004). Türkiye Odaklı Çeviri Tarihi Araştırmaları, Kültürel Hafıza, Unutuş ve Hatırlayış İlişkileri. *Journal of Turkish Studies* 28(3), 275-284.

- Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (2004). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Sun, Y. (2014). Translation and Back Translation: Transcultural Reinventions in Some Chinese American Literary Works. *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies* 1(2), 107–121. doi: 10.1080/23306343.2014.908563
- Tu, Q. & Changbao, L. (2017). A Review on Textless Back Translation of China-Themed Works Written in English. *Studies in Literature and Language* 14 (1): 1-7. doi: 10.3968/9177.
- White, H. (1973). *Meta History: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.