transLogos 2022 Vol 5 Issue 2
Baydere, Muhammed, and Ayşe Banu Karadağ, pp. 27–59
https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/transLogos.46

Revisiting Self-Translation and Indirect Translation in Intralingual Context

Muhammed BAYDERE* and Ayşe Banu KARADAĞ**

This study aims to provide a descriptive account of the translational aspects of Reşat Nuri Güntekin's (1889–1956) *Gizli El* (The secret hand) (1924/1954). Given its publication history from the Ottoman Turkish alphabet into the Latin alphabet and the claims on it in the Turkish cultural and literary system, the study is set to explore what *Gizli El* could offer new regarding the concepts of self-translation and indirect translation in intralingual context, which it encompasses altogether. Employing a descriptive target-oriented, historical approach to the translational phenomena in question, the study uses "textual" and "extratextual sources" (Toury 2012, 87–88). While the textual analysis involves intralingual comparison of the Ottoman Turkish and the Latin-alphabet versions of *Gizli El* published in book form in 1924 and 1954, respectively, the extratextual analysis mainly covers Reşat Nuri's prefaces. Through such analyses, Reşat Nuri's "assumed" (Toury 2012) intralingual translations of *Gizli El* yield a new conceptualization of self-translation in terms of the source and (in)directness of self-translation: 'direct self-translation' and 'indirect self-translation.' Reframing many aspects of self-translation and indirect translation in terms of their natures, scopes, categorizations, motives, and functions, as well as the longtime debates on 'authority' and closeness to 'original,' the study concludes by highlighting the historicity and relativity of any work, phenomenon, and concept in nature and scope, reiterating the call "to possess the problematic facts but to disown the problematic definitions" (Bengi 1990, 230).
Keywords: self-translation; indirect translation; intralingual translation; history of translation; Reşat Nuri Güntekin; *Gizli El*

1. Introduction

Following the Turkish Language Reform introduced in 1928, Turkish cultural and literary system has abounded with intralingual translations, though this is not a phenomenon unique to that period in Turkish history (Berk Albachten 2013, 257), with a wide range of intralingual practices in previous centuries as well. The 1928 Language Reform following the proclamation of the Republic led to many rewritings both by authors themselves and by

* Instructor at Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon.
E-mail: muhammedbaydere@ktu.edu.tr; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6827-2027.
** Professor at Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul.
E-mail: aysebanukaradag@gmail.com; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0974-8053.
(Received 9 August 2022; accepted 12 December 2022)

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

others as a result of the transition from the Ottoman Turkish alphabet into the Latin alphabet,[1] bringing a great richness to the Turkish history of translation (Karadağ 2019) within the context of the transfer of the works written in the Ottoman Turkish alphabet in the late 1800s and early 1900s to the Latin alphabet. Among the well-known figures producing such rewritings was Reşat Nuri Güntekin (1889–1956).

Reşat Nuri was a prominent author and intellectual[2] of Turkish literature and society in a revolutionary period abounding in great social, political, and cultural changes among others. He engaged in a wide array of intralingual and interlingual translational actions besides his numerous indigenous works including novels, stories, theatre plays, and travel writings.[3] He rewrote both his own works and some others' works (e.g., Namık Kemal's 1874 *Akif Bey*) in the same language—Turkish. *Gizli El* (The secret hand) (1924/1954) was one such work rewritten by Reşat Nuri. It was first serialized in *Dersaadet*, a newspaper, in 1920. Yet, when Reşat Nuri submitted the first chapter of his novel to be published, he was confronted with Şemsi Efendi's censorship, demanding him to 'rewrite' the plot he covered. Reşat Nuri accepted it, changed the plot, and had his novel serialized in the new version. In 1924, that new version was published in book form in the Ottoman Turkish alphabet by İkbal Kütüphanesi. Then, in 1954, Reşat Nuri republished the same work in the Latin alphabet. The discussions about the rewritten versions of *Gizli El* were incited by literary critic Fethi Naci, who made the following argument: "The novel *Gizli El* that we read today is not the novel serialized in *Dersaadet* in 1920!"[4] (2003, 33), referring to a second rewriting process reamending the plot to produce the *Gizli El* version published today. Likewise, Özlem Nemutlu describes the 1924 and 1954 versions as "two different Reşat Nuri novels that should be read separately" (2020, 439).

[1] For various studies addressing intralingual translations of this sort in the Turkish cultural and literary system from a translation studies perspective, see Berk Albachten 2005, 2013, 2015, 2019; Boy 2019; Kalem Bakkal 2019; Karadağ 2019; Öztürk Baydere 2019a.
[2] Besides his literary identity, Reşat Nuri also served and played significant roles as a teacher, educational administrator, member of the Language Committee, Chief Inspector of the Ministry of Education, deputy to the parliament, National Education Attaché for the French Region, and board member of the UNESCO (Kanter 2019, 24–28).
[3] See Kanter 2019 for a comprehensive bibliography of Reşat Nuri's works, which includes both indigenous and translated works, though categorized under different designations like "uyarlama" (adaptation) besides "çeviri" and "tercüme," denoting 'translation.'
[4] Translations from non-English sources are ours, unless otherwise indicated.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

In this regard, this study[5] 'assumes' the 1924 and 1954 versions of *Gizli El* as (i) 'translation' since they are in a transfer relationship with a different source text each and fulfill the postulates of "source text," "transfer," and "relationship" (Toury 2012, 28–31), (ii) 'intralingual translation' because they involve rewriting in the same language (Jakobson 2021, 157),[6] and (iii) 'intralingual self-translation' (Canlı 2018, 59) for the rewriting was done by Reşat Nuri himself, and it takes the 1954 version as 'indirect translation' since it is "based on a translated version of the original text" (Gambier 2003, 57). Thus, giving due consideration to the aspiration "to relate the concept(s) of indirect translation with other (currently disparate) concepts (such as . . ., censorship, . . . and self-translation),"[7] the study attempts to explore what the case under scrutiny could offer new regarding the concepts of self-translation and indirect translation in intralingual context, which it encompasses altogether. Accordingly, the next section explains and justifies the methodological perspective adopted in this study. Then the third section presents the conceptual framework under the sub-headings of "self-translation" and "indirect translation." The fourth section presents the case study involving a comparative textual analysis of the 1924 *Gizli El* in the Ottoman Turkish alphabet and the 1954 version in the Latin alphabet. The fifth section covers a discussion of the findings from the case study to reframe self-translation and indirect translation in intralingual context. Lastly, the paper is finalized with the concluding remarks.

2. Methodology

The main methodological basis of this study is Gideon Toury's descriptive approach to translation, suggesting that any research on translation "should start with observational facts, i.e. the translated utterances themselves (and their constitutive elements, on various levels), proceeding from there towards the reconstruction of non-observational facts, and not the other way around" (1985, 18). Toury highlights the need to "work bottom–up, that is *inductively*" when one aspires to "account for real-life phenomena in the specific

[5] This article is derived from the first author's PhD dissertation titled "Betimleyici Çeviribilim Araştırmalarında Yeni Açılımlara Doğru: Reşat Nuri Güntekin'in Diliçi ve Dillerarası Çeviri Eylemlerindeki Çeşitliliğin Kavramsallaştırılması" (Toward new insights into research in descriptive translation studies: Conceptualizing diversity in Reşat Nuri Güntekin's intralingual and interlingual translational actions) (Baydere 2021) submitted at Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul under the supervision of the second author.
[6] Roman Jakobson defines 'intralingual translation' as "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language" (2021, 157).
[7] "About IndirecTrans 2 Project," *IndirecTrans*, accessed December 10, 2022, https://www.indirectrans.com/about-us/about-indirectrans-2-project.html.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

circumstances under which they have come into being and have been introduced into a hosting culture, or to generalize this basis" (2003, 51; italics in the original). Otherwise, it may not be possible to go beyond "speculation within a rigid frame of reference" (Toury 2012, 27). In parallel with that, departing from a priori definitions would mean "an untenable pretense of fixing once and for all the boundaries of a category which is characterized precisely by the huge **variability** of its possible realizations: *difference* across cultures, variation within one culture at a single point in time, as well as *change* over time" (Toury 2003, 51; emphasis and italics in the original). In such a case, the study object will be what is alleged to "fall *within* the domain covered by that definition, and its study will tend to reaffirm previous knowledge rather than generate any new understanding [—] unless one is willing to transcend the boundaries set by the definition and admit some incompleteness in one's knowledge" (52; italics in the original).

Thus, Toury proposed the notion of "assumed translation" as a methodological tool to define the object of translation research. Stating that when the purpose is to explain real-life phenomena in their contexts of occurrence rather than holding to discussions on "idealized notions," sticking to "restrictive definitions" is likely to "block rather than encourage and foster research" on translation (2012, 26), Toury grounds the notion of "assumed translation" on three postulates "designed to give rise to *questions*, to be addressed by anyone wishing to study translation in context" rather than "constituting answers" (28; italics in the original): (1) source-text postulate, (2) transfer postulate, (3) relationship postulate. Given the interdisciplinary nature of translation studies and the significance of nourishing other disciplines through theories developed in it (cf. Culler 2000, 14), it may be highly productive to include in translation research the phenomena that are detected to involve translation, although they are not presented under the designation of 'translation' as a whole. Accordingly, this study applies the abovementioned postulates to the 1924 and 1954 versions of *Gizli El* and thus assumes them as translations so as not to stick to 'restrictive definitions' but to 'give rise to questions,' 'encourage and foster research' on translation, 'reconstruct non-observational facts,' and discover the 'huge variability of the realizations of translation—its difference across cultures, variation within one culture at a single point in time, and change over time.'

Adopting a descriptive approach to the translational phenomena at hand, this study also embraces a history of translation perspective, as such research may contribute to

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

contextualizing the "practices and ideas of the past," "relativiz[ing] those of the present," and "identify[ing] regularities, interconnections, and paradigm shifts" (Wakabayashi 2020, 547). Departing from this perspective, the study seeks to discover the historicity of the works, concepts, definitions, and categories and lay a starting ground to identify the 'regularities' and 'interconnections' of the translation concepts through (Turkish) history of translation.

For this, the study employs "textual" and "extratextual sources"[8] (Toury 2012, 87–88). While the textual analysis involves intralingual comparison of the Ottoman Turkish and Latin-alphabet versions of *Gizli El* published in book form in 1924 and 1954, respectively, the extratextual analysis mainly covers Reşat Nuri's prefaces.[9]

3. Conceptual Framework

3.1 Self-Translation

Self-translation is mainly defined as "the act of translating one's own writings into another language and the result of such an undertaking" (Grutman 2009, 257). Evidently, this definition, which is widely acknowledged in the self-translation literature, takes self-translation as an interlingual phenomenon. Yet, its intralingual forms have also been revealed. Gülsüm Canlı (2018, 2019), for example, in her research focusing on William Faulkner's *Sanctuary*, argued that the rewritten version of *Sanctuary* which was produced in English by Faulkner himself could be considered as an "intralingual self-translation" (2018, 59; 2019), like Magdalena Anna Kampert describing "intralingual self-translation" as "self-translation mediated within the same linguistic system" (2018, 162).

Because of its nature as an author's undertaking of his/her own work and the accompanying (alleged) authority and freedom s/he holds over it, the concept has also been subject to a wide array of discussions in the frame of the 'translation' vs. 'rewriting' dichotomy, which may be argued to be standing against André Lefevere's (1992) theory of

[8] Toury describes extratextual sources as "semi-theoretical or critical formulations such as prescriptive 'theories' of translation, statements made by translators, editors, publishers, and other persons involved in or connected with the event, critical appraisals of individual translations, or of the activity of a translator or 'school' of translators, and so forth" (2012, 87–88).

[9] According to Toury, there is a fundamental difference between textual and extratextual sources. "Texts are primary products of norm-regulated behaviour [and …] can therefore be taken as immediate representations thereof." On the other hand, "normative pronouncements, by contrast, are merely by-products of the existence and activity of norms. Like any other attempt to formulate a norm in language, they are partial and biased, and should therefore be treated with every possible circumspection, all the more since – emanating as they do from interested parties – they are likely to lean toward propaganda and persuasion" (2012, 88).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

'translation as rewriting' and 'translators as rewriters.' It is considered by some as "a translation, but a very special one" (e.g., Castro, Mainer, and Page 2017, 13), and Brian T. Fitch, taking it as 'translation,' describes it as "the recasting or reordering of pre-existing textual matter to form a new text which happens to be in another language" (1988, 77). On the other hand, for example, Umberto Eco was not for the label 'self-translation,' questioning whether "pure self-translation" exists and Raymond Federman noted that he could use one of the verbs "*rewrite, adapt, transform, transact,* [or] *transcreate* . . . but *certainly not translate*" (cf. Kampert 2018, 24–25; italics in the original).[10]

Another point of elaboration has been around the notions of 'translation' and 'original.' While Anton Popovič opposed the idea of taking self-translation as a "variant" of the original because it is a "true translation," Werner Koller made a distinction between self-translation and "true" translation on the basis of "faithfulness," as the author translating his/her own text is not likely to have hesitations in situations where an "ordinary" translator could hesitate (cf. Shuttleworth and Cowie 2014, 13). This distinction seems to be grounded on the perception of authority attributed to self-translator, which, it is argued, derives from his/her better access, compared to ordinary translators, to what is intended to be told in the original (Jung 2002, 30) and his/her capability to readdress them (Fitch 1988, 125). In this regard, the self-translator is claimed to have a "real freedom [that] would reside in this unique possibility of carving out a niche, a possibility that stems largely from her doubly privileged status as an author(ity) and as an authorized agent" (Grutman and Van Bolderen 2014, 324). In a way illuminating what has been addressed above, Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson note that self-translation "escapes the binary categories of text theory and diverges radically from literary norms: here the translator *is* the author, the translation is an original, the foreign is the domestic, and vice versa" (2007, 161; italics in the original). This also points to a special power of self-translation, according to Julio César Santoyo, that changes the condition of the translated text from being "subordinate," "secondary," and "substitute" to being "original" (Grutman and Spoturno 2022, 236). Apart from such 'originality,' self-translation is, at the same time, taken by Santoyo as a "complement," "as a text 'added' to the

[10] Muhammed Baydere and Ayşe Banu Karadağ (2019, 331) highlight that whether a self-translated text is 'rewriting' or 'translation' is not about the quality and/or quantity of the changes/interventions made by the self-translator in his/her source text, as any translation is 'rewriting' (Lefevere 1992, 9). The designation of translations that are considered to be outside the scope of traditional definitions of translation as 'rewriting' instead of 'translation' is relatable to a prescriptive and restrictive perspective on the rewriting–translation relationship (Karadağ 2018).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

original, which complements and completes it," providing "a second vision of the same text, **not opposed or opposite to it, but complementary to it**" (231; emphasis ours). All these peculiarities of self-translation have pushed researchers to call it "extreme" (Tanqueiro 2000, 58), "striking" (Hokenson and Munson 2007, 1), and "unusual" (Ehrlich 2009, 243), among others. This is stated as the main reason why it was, at least until a point in history, "somewhat neglected in Translation Studies and theories" (Montini 2010, 306).

Various types of self-translation have been put forward by researchers so far, some typology attempts accompanying as well. Rainier Grutman provides the labels "'simultaneous self-translations' (which are produced even while the first version is still in progress)" and "'consecutive self-translations' (which are prepared only after completion or even publication of the original)" (2009, 259) as well as 'horizontal self-translation,' which involves "transfers between symmetric pairs of widespread, well-established languages of international prestige," and 'vertical self-translation,' involving transfers between asymmetric pairs, in which one can be considered as "the dominant language" and the other as "the dominated language" (2013, 202–203). Santoyo, "set[ting] out to draw a first 'map' of several types of self-translation" (2013, 205) proposes the following binary categories: "intralinguistic/interlinguistic," "intratextual/intertextual,"[11] "direct/inverse,"[12] "unidirectional/multidirectional,"[13] "individual/shared," "simultaneous/delayed," "explicit/implicit," "horizontal/vertical," as well as the concepts of "pseudo-self-translation"[14] and "re-self-translation" (206–220).[15] Xosé Manuel Dasilva introduces the dichotomy of 'opaque self-translation' vs. 'transparent self-

[11] Santoyo describes "intratextual self-translation" as a self-translation in which "the self-translator does not generate a *second* text, distinct and diverse from the first, but a *singular* text, a textual singularity in linguistic duality, in which the poetic discourse is developed in two languages, one a translation of the other, with a presence that can be alternate or successive," as opposed to "intertextual self-translation" involving two different texts (2013, 209–210; italics in the original).

[12] Santoyo takes "direct self-translation" as a self-translation towards "the foreign language" and "inverse self-translation" as the one towards "the mother tongue" (2013, 213).

[13] The distinction is based on whether the self-translator generates a self-translation in a single other language or several target texts in two or more languages, the former denoting unidirectionality and the latter referring to multidirectionality (Santoyo 2013, 215).

[14] The concept is used by Santoyo to refer to cases in which "the self-translated text, presented as that, chronologically precedes the original from which it claims to be derived; or, in other words, cases in which the self-translation (in fact, pseudo-self-translation) precedes in time, and in the creative process, its own 'original'" (2013, 217).

[15] Santoyo also touches upon cases of self-translation which do not merely occur from one source text in one language to another in another language but come out as a self-translation of one's previous translation (2013, 212) of a work that was not his/hers (i.e., the first translation is not a self-translation as it is a translation of another person's work), without attributing a label designating directness/indirectness to that type of self-translation.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

translation,' besides the concept of 'semi-self-translation.' He defines "opaque self-translation" as "a translation made by the author himself/herself in which there is no indication of the existence of a previous text written in another language, so as to give to the recipient of the self-translated text the impression that the text he/she reads is the original work" and "transparent self-translation" as "a self-translation that makes explicit that there exists a source text" (Dasilva 2015, 171), while "semi-self-translation" is described by him as a translation in which "there is either a collaboration between auto-translator and translator or the latter [sic] has bequeathed some authority towards the allograph translation (e.g. the author revises the target text) or the translator (e.g. he/she is part of the author's entourage)" (Maia, Pięta, and Assis Rosa 2018, 78). Josep Miquel Ramis also provides a binary categorization, stating that "*direct self-translation* (also known as *individual self-translation*) is done exclusively by the author on her/his own, while *indirect self-translation* (or *shared self-translation*) is done by the author with someone else's help or advice" (2017, 113; italics in the original).

With all those multifaceted aspects of it, research on self-translation can be "theoretically productive" to a great extent given "its problematic status in relation to the binary categories by which translation is often defined: original/translation; author/translator; source text/target text" (Shread 2009, 51). In this regard, "questioning some of the core facets of translation studies," self-translation research both introduces a "powerful tool for their deconstruction" and offers "productive possibilities into further research into . . . translation as regular human activity" (Castro, Mainer, and Page 2017, 14). What is more, Santoyo emphasizes that self-translation research has been transforming to "deal with the phenomenon of self-translation per se," after a long period of research mainly focusing on individual translations and translators, which had "a limited epistemological horizon,"—"the greatest change [occurring] from the particular to the general" in addition to from being almost non-existent as an object of study to "the forefront of translation interest" as "a phenomenon that turns out to be universal" (Grutman and Spoturno 2022, 230). Accordingly, the phenomenon of self-translation is now stated to have given rise to a "new discipline called 'self-translation studies' (Anselmi 2012)" (Gentzler 2017, vii), which should be taken as a subdiscipline of translation studies (Grutman and Spoturno 2022, 235) and could also entail "'de-westernization' of the history of self-translation" through studies exploring self-translation practices across the world and the time (232).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

3.2 Indirect Translation[16]

To start with three basic reference works in translation studies, in *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, indirect translation is defined as "the procedure whereby a text is not translated directly from an original ST, but via an intermediate translation in another language" (Shuttleworth and Cowie 2014, 76). In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, on the other hand, it is defined as "the translation of a translated text (either spoken or written) into a third language" (St. André 2020, 470). In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Martin Ringmar defines it as a "chain of (at least) three texts, ending with a translation made from another translation" (2012, 141). Given a large number of definitions and descriptions of indirect translation in the literature, Alexandra Assis Rosa, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia gather them under three titles in terms of the number of languages involved: (i) "those whereby the number of languages is not imposed"; (ii) "those whereby ITr involves (at least) three languages"; (iii) "those whereby ITr involves at least two languages" (2017, 120).

While Toury relates indirect translation to "translating from languages other than the ultimate SLs" (2012, 82), Yves Gambier describes it as "translation of literary works based on a translated version of the original text" (2003, 57)—a definition that allows attributing a quite broad coverage to the concept (i.e., as "translation of a translation") (Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 113).[17] Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia note that defining the concept as "translation of a translation" represents a "particularly flexible, inclusive approach" (2017, 120) and brings no "restriction" and stress the importance of this approach for indirect translation research as follows:

> As such, when compared to definitions that are restrictive in their coverage, this approach seems more likely to reflect and keep up with the complex and fast-evolving practice of ITr. It thus seems a more convenient entry point for the launching of this still undertheorized field of research from a scientific basis. An additional advantage is that the definition of ITr as a translation of a translation is clear and concise (thus avoiding ambiguous interpretations) and builds on an existing proposal (thereby

[16] For clarity and consistency concerns, only the term 'indirect translation' is used in this paper. For a comprehensive coverage and discussion of other names that are used to refer to indirect translation as part of terminological issues, see Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017.

[17] Ernst-August Gutt uses the term "indirect translation" in a different meaning from translating a text through another text and/or language. He addresses it as a type of translation involving "looser degrees of resemblance" compared to "direct translation" (Gutt 1990, 135).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

> helping to optimize current definitions and control their excessive proliferation). (2017, 120–121)[18]

Indirect translations tend to be treated as "poor copies of poor copies" as a result of the perception that original texts are privileged over translations (St. André 2020, 470).[19] It is assumed that translating from the original is always preferable to translating from a translated text, just as reading the original is preferable to reading a translation, and it is even claimed that studying indirect translation "will add nothing to the total sum of human knowledge" (471). According to James St. André, the first thing that indirect translations make us understand is "the extent to which the devaluation of translation has been internalized within the translation community itself, where the disdain and mistrust of translation has been replicated in a disdain and mistrust of relay translation" (ibid.). As a matter of fact, stating in *Handbook of Translation Studies* that indirect translation has been subject to various negative connotations including "a very unfortunate procedure," Ringmar notes: "Admittedly, relay translation is likely to (further) remove the end TT from the original ST, and case studies, intent on showing how (much) the former differs from the latter, normally bear this out" (cf. 2012, 142).[20]

Main reasons for resorting to indirect translation are listed in *Handbook of Translation Studies* as the lack of competent translators in the source language, the desire to control the contents of the target text in religious, moral, or political terms, "authorial rewriting in the primary translation process," that shifts and adaptations introduced by the indirect translations may appeal to the target audience, the saving provided by the indirect subtitling translations, and the use of interlingua in machine translation (cf. Ringmar 2012, 141–142). In their work *Indirect Translation Explained*, Hanna Pięta, Rita Bueno Maia, and Ester Torres-Simón

[18] A negative aspect of "such a radically open approach" is indicated as its possibility of causing "the questioning of ITr as an autonomous concept given that such a degree of flexibility may raise the problem as to where exactly ITr ends and, for example, retranslation begins" (Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 121). The literature also suggests that the "complex and multifarious" nature of indirect translation makes it difficult to "establish any universals or even norms across the entire range of practices" (St. André 2020, 470).

[19] Hülya Boy and Ayşe Banu Karadağ (2020, 41) addressed a case proving against the negative attitude towards indirect translation within the context of the intralingual translation process of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in the English source system. They attributed "the glorification, but not disparagement," of indirect translation to that "the work was produced in the same language by the author himself, that is its status as 'intralingual self-translation' (Canlı, 2019)."

[20] For a very recent study proposing a corpus-based "textual approach" complementing the "cultural approach" in indirect translation research that is "focused on the linguistic context in which CRs [cultural references] or CSIs [culture-specific items] are likely to occur" in order to investigate, for example, the treatment of cultural references in indirect translation, see Buts, Hadley, and Aboomar 2022.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

indicate the possible factors leading to indirect translation, besides the typical one of "complete lack—or temporary unavailability—of translators with the necessary competence," (2022, 9) as follows: "availability of the source text," "price," "time," "prestige," "risk," "difficulty," and "access" (9–10).

According to Toury, stating that indirect translations governed by norms should not be considered as a mere result of lack of knowledge of the source language[21] but can be widespread depending on the tolerance of target languages towards such translations (cf. 2012, 178), "the recurrence of this practice, especially if regular patterns can be detected, should be taken as evidence of the forces which have shaped the culture in question, including its concept of translation" (161). He emphasizes that descriptive translation studies does not take indirect translation as "aberration" and notes that indirect translation "forms much more than a mere *legitimate* object for research . . . [and] presents a convenient means of moving from observable facts to their underlying motivations" (161–162; italics in the original). To make his claim "stronger," Toury notes:

> I would go so far as to argue that no *historically* oriented study of a culture where indirect translation was practised with any amount of regularity can purport to ignore this fact and waive the need to examine what it stands for. This is in fact how mediated translations as texts, and the practices which give rise to them, should be approached, along with whatever changes may have occurred in them: not as an issue to be tackled in isolation, but as a **juncture** where systemic relationships and historically determined norms intersect and correlate. (2012, 162; italics and emphasis in the original)

At a conceptual level, "How does indirectness correlate with various translation types (adaptation; back-translation; interlingual, intralingual and intersemiotic translation; non-translation; pseudo-translation; re-translation; revision; self-translation)?" is highlighted as a possible future agenda for indirect translation research (Pięta 2014, 26), along with some specific questioning into how to "deal with intralingual translation," whether "to classify it as ITr" (Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 122), and whether to consider "the use of an auto-translation as an intermediate text still . . . indirect translating" (Maia, Pięta, and Assis Rosa 2018, 78).

[21] Hilal Öztürk Baydere, examining the intralingual and interlingual translation processes of *The Canterbury Tales: A Retelling* (2009) in English and in Turkish, respectively, highlights that indirect translation should not be regarded "as a mere facilitator of interlingual translation," and it may serve any function that cannot be classified a priori but is to be shaped by the target system (2019b, 120).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

4. *Gizli El* as a Case in Point

4.1 Publication History

Reşat Nuri declared *Gizli El* as his 'first novel' (Güntekin 1954, 5). The novel was first serialized in *Dersaadet*, a newspaper, in 1920, and it was published in printed form in the Ottoman Turkish alphabet in 1924 by İkbal Kütüphanesi. The work in the Latin alphabet was first published in 1954 by Çağlayan Yayınevi. With his statement, "The novel *Gizli El* that we read today is not the novel serialized in *Dersaadet* in 1920!" Naci (2003, 33) paved the way for various discussions regarding the publication process and the nature of *Gizli El*. As a matter of fact, Nemutlu describes the 1924 and 1954 versions as "two different Reşat Nuri novels that should be read separately" (2020, 439). These evaluations are illuminated by the prefaces written by Reşat Nuri. In his preface titled "Bir Romanın Romanı" (The novel of a novel), included in the 1924 book version of the serialized novel, Reşat Nuri describes the process as his "first experience in the valley of novels" and states that he started to write his novel to be serialized in *Dersaadet*, but the columns where the novel was supposed to appear were blank, as the novel was censored, with the following notification on the relevant page: "Our novel series is postponed by the censor" (Güntekin 1954, 5). With that, Reşat Nuri "rewrote his novel" in such a way that his novel which he had designed to describe "politicians' secret hand" was transformed into a love novel where women undertake the role of a secret hand:

> 'Gizli El' is my **first pen experience in the valley of novels**. The protagonist of this novel which I wrote in the beginning of the armistice was a 'war tradesman.' He was a simple-spirited, modest, and clean man of medium intelligence, who started war trade–as the events pushed him–, got involved in political intrigues, and turned out to be one of the poor, spoiled, and depraved war profiteers, whom we saw many examples in those days. **My main goal** was to try to show some states and peculiarities of the period and write a *moeurs* novel. However, the events **changed** it into something **completely different**. **The 'Secret Hand' belonging to somebody who executed many works without being seen at that time turned into the hand of a woman who was trying to recover the happiness in her home**. . . . The novel was originally starting with the sentence, 'I went to visit the minister to talk about some **wood** issue today.' Sansür (Censor) Efendi changed that into 'I went to visit the minister to talk about some **opium** issue today.' **It turned out that I had, unknowingly, touched *zülf-i yâr*.**[22] **Damat Ferid Pasha had a wood issue at that time as well**. Likewise, it was not right for ministers to be included in the novel. It

[22] Referring to 'the hair of the beloved' and at the same time, metaphorically, to 'interest,' 'benefit,' 'profit.'

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

> was supposed to be changed into a General Director. . . . More strangely, the words 'Nişantaşı' and 'Bebek' below were converting into 'Beyoğlu' and 'Çapa'. . . . I had got the truth: Today's government did not agree to the mention of the impertinence of the former one. This is because it had taken the same path. . . . Now, I had to **rewrite almost completely** and **change everything** through the pages that I had started amending. (1924, 3–5; italics in the original, emphasis ours)

Thus, Reşat Nuri highlights that he rewrote *Gizli El* as the first version of the novel he had started submitting for serialization was censored in accordance with Sansür Şemsi Efendi's demand appearing to be shaped by the political conditions of the period. As this process is assumed as an (intralingual self-) translation, the version of *Gizli El* claimed to be published after being rewritten by Reşat Nuri in 1954[23] is taken as a case of indirect translation in this paper. In the preface he included in the 1954 Latin-alphabet version, Reşat Nuri notes that the censorship was appraised as a "chance, not a scandal" and "promotion" for a "first novel" by his friend Sedat Simavi[24] and that he submitted to the process because of Simavi's insistence (Güntekin 1954, 6).

4.2 Textual Analysis

Naci notes that the 1954 *Gizli El* published in the Latin alphabet is different from the 1920 serialized version and the 1924 book version; while approximately the first two-thirds of the present-day version is in the same line as the said serialized version and the first book version,[25] the rest includes a rewriting performed by the author himself (2003, 31).

The first finding from the comparison of the 1924 version (ST) and the 1954 version (TT) is about the prefaces. The title of the preface in the ST, "Bir Romanın Romanı" (The novel of a novel), was changed into "İlk Romanımın Romanı" (The novel of my first novel) in the TT. In the TT, the criticisms about the primary factors leading to the censorship are not as detailed as in the ST. In the preface of the TT explaining how "the secret hand of one of the

[23] Reşat Nuri did not make any statement on the 1954 rewriting of *Gizli El*, to the best of our search. Though he amended the preface from the 1924 to the 1954 version, he did not give any information indicative of a change in the new version. All his statements in the 1954 preface, just like the ones in the 1924 preface, are about the process of serialization in *Dersaadet*.
[24] An important figure and patron of Turkish press at that time.
[25] It is reported based on a detailed textual analysis that the serialized text and the first book version are the same except for "minor changes," with a few preferential differences at the word and sentence levels (e.g., "daha içerileri" (further interiors) in place of "daha derin yerler" (deeper parts), "dizanteri" (dysentery) in place of "kanlı basur" (bloody hemorrhoids), "fiske vurdum" (I flicked) in place of "buse verdim" (I gave a kiss), and "Öyle ya Seniha bu kadınla mukayese edilebilir miydi?" (Clearly, Seniha was not comparable to that woman) in place of "Öyle ya Seniha'nın bu kadından ne korkusu olabilirdi?" (Clearly, Seniha had no reason to be afraid of that woman) (Nemutlu 2020, 423–424).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

men of affairs" turned into a "woman's hand" in the 1920 serialization process of the novel, which Reşat Nuri had planned to publish as a satirical novel, criticisms about the government of the period were given less space (e.g., statements such as "It turned out that I had, unknowingly, touched *zülf-i yâr*," "Likewise, it was not right for ministers to be included in the novel," and "Today's government did not agree to the mention of the impertinence of the former one. This is because it had taken the same path" [Güntekin 1924, 3–5] were completely omitted), with the emphases shifted towards how Reşat Nuri had decided to write that novel with Simavi's encouragement, the development of the censorship process, the amendment of the neighborhood names, and the dialogues with Sansür Şemsi Efendi:

> The novel was originally starting as follows: 'I went to see the Minister to talk about some wood issue today…' Şemsi Efendi said, 'It can't be wood. We'll put something else there.' . . . It turned out that Damat Ferid government had a wood scandal then. The reason was that! 'Then the word Minister is not permitted. It'll also be changed, you can say something like general director. What's more, the words Nişantaşı and Bebek will be changed… As is known, Bebek is close to Damat Ferid Pasha's mansion in Baltalimanı. As to Nişantaşı, it's the neighborhood of deputies and ministers…' (Güntekin 1954, 6)

The comparative textual analysis between the ST and the TT (i.e., covering the second [intralingual self-] translation process of *Gizli El*) showed Reşat Nuri to have made many changes in terms of structure, plot, characters, stylistics, and various details. The structural analysis demonstrated, as indicated by İsmail Yelaldı (2010, 31), that while the ST is made up of 28 diaries, the TT is composed of diary sections of four different dates: 20 April, 29 April, 5 May, and 20 May. While the plot is covered in 28 diary sections in the ST, it is predominantly narrated in the diary sections dated 5 May and 20 May in the TT.

Reşat Nuri made a change in the plot of the novel, as well. First, considerable differences were observed even in details in the first approximately two-thirds of the novel that had a parallel plot (e.g., descriptions of Şeref's dinner meeting with guests in Aziz Pasha's mansion, depictions of Şeref that evening, Şeref's throwing himself off the bridge vs. falling off the bridge drunk when returning his home from Aziz Pasha's mansion, details about the person who was considered for Seniha to marry before Şeref, the way Şeref learned it, and the newspapers and the works referenced through addition in the TT [e.g., the addition

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

of "*İkdam* gazetesi" (*İkdam* newspaper),[26] "Namık Kemal'in *Cezmi*'si" (Namık Kemal's *Cezmi*), and Tevfik Fikret's poem titled "Süha ile Pervin" (Süha and Pervin)]). In these parts, there are also stylistic changes at the word and sentence levels, which can be observed throughout the text. The introduction of the novel reveals this tendency of the author:

> **TT:**
>
> Bugün bir afyon meselesini **konuşmak için Umum Müdürü**[27] **görmeye gitmiştim**.[28] **Vekili bulunduğum**[29] şirketin şartları ile **idarenin teklifleri** arasında **ehemmiyetli** bir fark vardı. **Umum Müdürün** beni **kandırmak**[30] için sarf ettiği o güzel sözlere **ret cevabı vermek**, müzakereyi kesmek mecburiyetinde kaldım. (Güntekin 1954, 9)
>
> (I **went to see the General Director to talk** about some opium issue today. There was a **substantial** difference between the conditions offered by the company **I represented** and **the offers of the administration**. I had to give a **rejective reply** to the nice words the **General Director** uttered to **convince** me and ceased the negotiation.)
>
> **ST:**[31]
>
> Bugün bir afyon meselesi hakkında **görüşmek üzere Müdür-i Umûmîye'yi ziyaret etmiştim**. **Temsil ettiğim** 'şirket' şartları ile **Ali Süreyya Bey'in teklifi** arasında **mühim** bir fark vardı. **Binaenaleyh Müdür-i Umûmîye'nin** beni **ikna** için sarf ettiği o güzel sözlere **ret ile cevap vermek**, müzakereyi kesmek mecburiyetinde kaldım. (Güntekin 1924, 7)
>
> (I **visited the General Director to discuss** some opium issue today. There was a **considerable** difference between the conditions offered by the 'company' I **represented** and **the offer of Ali Süreyya Bey**. **Therefore,** I had to **reply with a rejection** to the nice words the **General Director** uttered to **convince** me and ceased the negotiation.)

In terms of the general plot, the ST covers Şeref's getting to know Seniha, their marriage, his seek for having a business area after leaving Gemlik, his extramarital relationship adventure, and reunion with Seniha, where Seniha undertook the role of a 'secret

[26] It was a "reformist" newspaper published in Istanbul between 1894–1928 whose founder and editor-in-chief was Ahmed Cevdet for many years. In its first issue, Ahmed Cevdet defined the task of the newspaper as "educating, informing, and apprising the public." *İkdam*, in which Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu also joined, published pieces of writing supporting the National Struggle. Being among the pioneers of the simplification of language as of the years it started to be published, the newspaper also "made a big effort for the republican revolutions and the new way of living to become rooted" (İbar 2018, 46–52).
[27] Changed from 'Müdür-i Umûmîye' to 'Umum Müdürü,' both meaning 'General Director.'
[28] In the extracts from the ST and the TT, the bolds are ours for emphasis.
[29] Changed from 'temsil ettiğim' to 'vekili bulunduğum,' both meaning 'which I represented.'
[30] Changed from 'ikna' to 'kandırmak,' both meaning 'to convince,' with the latter referring to 'deceiving' as well.
[31] The transcriptions of the extracts in the ST from the Ottoman-Turkish alphabet into the Latin alphabet are ours.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

hand.' Though the TT has a similar beginning to the ST, it involves extensive changes particularly as of the diary section dated 5 May (Güntekin 1954, 12). Particularly with the appearance of Colonel Murat (Güntekin 1954, 101), "who tries to become a power by himself independent from the army, independent from the politics" (Güntekin 1954, 104), towards the end of this section and through the diary section dated 20 May (Güntekin 1954, 113), the novel focuses on the war trade of the period involving Şeref's delivery and carriage jobs in which politicians are also engaged.

As to the start of the series of events that were censored when Reşat Nuri wrote *Gizli El* first but then were reincluded in the work in the process of intralingual self-translation into the Latin alphabet, while Şeref leaves Gemlik as he receives a letter from Seniha's uncle upon Seniha's initiative (Güntekin 1924, 69) in the ST, he decides to join the army as a result of the declaration of mobilization (Güntekin 1954, 92) and is appointed as a clerk in the army in the TT (Güntekin 1954, 95). In the TT, Şeref meets Colonel Murat through Doctor. From that time on, Colonel Murat is featured as the 'secret hand' playing the key role in Şeref's life and underhandedly steering dirty trade work during the war period.

TT:

Süleyman bana:
— Böyle sıkı zamanlarda sakatlık tanırlar mı? Gideceğiz Bey, demişti. Fakat benimkini tanıdılar; hattâ ben söylemeden aradılar. . . . Bursa'daki Ahz-ı Asker şubesi yazıcı neferi oldum. . . .
Doktor bana karşıdan el etti; oturmamak niyetiyle yanlarına gittiğim zaman:
— Şeref, dedi. Sana bir zamanlar bir ordu arkadaşımdan bahsetmiştim. Miralay Murat Bey Meşrutiyet hareketinde büyük hizmetleri olmuş ve sonra politikaya geçmiş bir asker... Sana maliye müfettişliği yolunu açmak için bana yardım vadetmişti. Hatırlarsın... Muhakkak yapacaktı. Fakat hacet kalmadı. . . .
— Aslanım, dedi, Doktora verdiğim sözde duruyorum. Sizinle meşgul olacağım. Sonra gözleri daha yakın, daha evvel baş başa birçok şeyler konuşmuşuz gibi:
— Sizin gibi iyi okuyup hazırlanmış bir genç için ne yazıcı neferliği, ne de Aziz Paşa damatlığı bir kariyer olamaz, dedi. Anlaştık mı? (Güntekin 1954, 95–103)

(Süleyman had told me:
— Would they care disability in such tough times? We'll go in any case.
But, they cared mine; they even called me without me telling about it. . . . I became a clerk for Ahz-ı Recruiting Office in Bursa. . . .
Doctor waved to me; when I went to them with intent not to sit, he said:
— Şeref, I had told you about an army friend of mine at one time. Colonel Murat is a soldier who greatly served in the Constitutional movement and then got into politics... He had promised me to open the way for an auditing position for you. You may remember... He would definitely do it. But, now, there's no need for that. . . .

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

> [Colonel Murat] said:
> — My lad! I'm keeping my promise to Doctor. I'll be dealing with you.
> Then his eyes were closer, as if we had talked about many things tete-a-tete before:
> — For a young man who is well-educated and well-prepared like you, neither clerkship nor being Aziz Pasha's son-in-law can be a career. Deal?)

ST:

> Bir ay sonra Seniha'nın Ankara'da ticaretle meşgul bulunan dayısından bir mektup aldım. Bir sene evvel birkaç gün Gemlik'e uğramış olan bu zat benden bazı hizmetler talep ediyor (O vakitler harp ticareti, vagon alım satımı adam akıllı kızışmıştı). İstanbul'da emniyetli bir memuru yokmuş... Bazı mühim şahıslarla bazı müzakerelere girişmek lazım geliyormuş. Bunları benden başka becerebilecek kimse tanımıyormuş... Sonra yağ nakil etmek için Ankara ile İstanbul arasında birkaç sefer yapmak iktiza ediyormuş.. Reşit Bey bu hizmetlerime mukabil mühim istifadeler gösteriyordu. (Güntekin 1924, 75)
>
> (One month later, I received a letter from Seniha's uncle engaged in trade in Ankara. That person, who was in Gemlik for a couple of days one year ago, was demanding some services from me [At that time, war trade and carriage business were well and truly up]. He said there was no secure officer in Istanbul... There was a need to engage in some negotiations with some important people. He didn't know anybody who could manage it other than me... Also, there was a need to move between Ankara and Istanbul to transfer oil several times.. Reşit Bey was showing significant benefits in return for such services to be provided by me.)

Following that substantial transformation in the plot, Reşat Nuri intensively incorporated a critical treatment of the circumstances of the period in the TT. The following statements in the TT, for instance, do not exist in the ST: "Ahalinin aç olduğunu söylüyorlardı. Buna doğru değil denemezdi. Fakat fakir mahallelerde, fakir köylerde halkın aç olmadığı ne zaman görülmüştü?" (They were saying that the public were hungry. Nobody could say that it was wrong. However, when were the public not hungry in poor neighborhoods, in poor villages?) (Güntekin 1954, 97) and "Memleket içinde günden güne arttığını dehşetle gördüğümüz yokluk, hakikî yokluk, ihtiyaç maddesi yokluğu değil, teşkilât yokluğuydu" (The deprivation, the true deprivation in the country increasing day by day as we dreadfully observed, was a lack of organization, not a lack of necessaries) (Güntekin 1954, 102–103). Before this extensive transformation in the plot, a directly critical reference was also made to ministers in the TT, reminiscent of Sansür Şemsi Efendi's statement that "the word Minister is not permitted" (Güntekin 1954, 6):

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

TT:

— **Lüksü** sevmezmiş... Bana mı anlatıyorsun bunu? Bir gün İstanbul'da bir **Nazır otomobiline** hasetle bakan, **sen de nazır olsaydın bana da alırdın değil mi baba**, diye âdeta ağlayan sen değil miydin? . . .
—Ben **Nazır** değilim, devlet kapısından defedilmiş bir adamım ama şimdi inadıma araba yerine bir otomobil getirteceğim sana... **Yalnız hangi yollarda yürüteceğiz, Allah cezasını versin?** (Güntekin 1954, 28–29)

(— You don't like **luxury**, huh... Are you saying this to me? Wasn't it you who was looking at a **Minister's automobile** in jealousy and almost crying by saying, '**if you were a minister, you would also buy one for me, dad, wouldn't you?**' . . .
— I'm not a **Minister**, I'm a man packed off the government office, but now I'll, out of obstinacy, have an automobile brought for you instead of a carriage... **But, what roads will we drive it on, damn it?**)

ST:

— Senin hoşuna gitsin diye öyle diyorum kızım... Evet her ne ise tabii misafirsin maalteessüf... Bu bunak babanla ilanihaye kalmayacaksın ya... Bir iki sene sonra evlenip gideceksin... Demek istiyorum ki bu zaman zarfında çiftlik senden çok şey bekler... Evvela son süratle sana zarif, mini minicik tek bir fayton getirteceğim… Bir mektep hediyesi.. (Güntekin 1924, 36)

(— I'm telling this for your pleasure, my daughter... Anyway, you're surely a guest, unfortunately... Of course, you won't live with your senile dad forever... You'll marry and leave in a couple of years... I mean that the farm will expect a lot of things from you in this period... Before anything, I'll have an elegant, tiny single phaeton brought for you quickly… As a school gift..)

While Aziz Pasha says he will bring 'an elegant, tiny single phaeton' in the ST, the TT addresses the issue through reactions over 'liking luxury,' 'being a minister,' and 'looking at a Minister's automobile in jealousy.' Reşat Nuri's decision here could serve demonstrating the alleged contrast between 'luxurious' conditions enjoyed by higher officials and 'lack of roads to drive on' for the public. Likewise, while there are no parallel contexts in the ST, the TT mentions "operet artistine banknotlardan yapılmış bir yorgan hediye eden çılgın harp zengin[leri]" (crazy war profiteers presenting a duvet made from banknotes to an operetta artist) (Güntekin 1954, 36) and "tertip tarzları itibariyle . . . zabıta romanlarından daha esrarengiz ve meraklı . . . bir kısım devlet adamlarının da içinde eli bulunan . . . ustalıklı oyunlar ve anaforlar" (masterful games and whirlpools . . . some of the statesmen are also involved in . . . that are more mysterious and curious than detective novels . . . in terms of organization" (Güntekin 1954, 100). Those kinds of elements, which can be associated with the reaction Reşat Nuri took from Sansür Şemsi Efendi in the *Dersaadet* serialization process

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

(i.e., "they wouldn't let anybody tell such ['hazardous'] things in this day") (Güntekin 1954, 6–7), were included in the TT in long descriptions from place to place:

> O eğlenmekten, içmekten, oyun oynamaktan başka bir şey düşünmez gibi görünen insanların bir kısmı işadamlarıdır, bir kısmı devlet adamları, fırka adamları, mebuslar vesaire ki onlarsız iş yapmak ve hattâ soluk almak mümkün olm[az] . . . Bazılarıyla sadece bir kalabalık içinde beraber görünmeniz, ellerinizle birbirinizin omuzlarına vurmanız bile size ummayacağınız servetlerin, ikballerin kapılarını açabilir. (Güntekin 1954, 116)
>
> (Of these people who seem to think of nothing but entertaining, drinking, and playing games, some are businessmen, some are statesmen, political party's men, members of parliament, and so on, without whom it's impossible to do a business and even take a breath . . . If you are seen together with some of them in a crowd, if you put your hands on each other's shoulders, this can open you the door of fortunes and prosperity you wouldn't expect.)
>
> İş hayatımda ilk tekliflerde reddettiğim fakat sonradan, birtakım makul düşüncelerle kabul ettiğim vagonlar gibi, altın kaçakçılarına karşı duyduğum tiksinti ile ne kadar namuslu bir adam olduğumu kendime ispat ettikten sonra gümrük kanununun tanıdığı haklara dayanarak dışarıdan getirdiğim nadide şahsî eşyalar gibi, kimin çalacağını düşünmeden ve yine birtakım makul muhakemelerle kendi malım olduğuna kanaat getirdikten sonra yüksek bir fiyatla sattığım antika bir keman gibi birçok Olga'lara ve Nezihe'lere de alışacağım. (Güntekin 1954, 139)
>
> (I'll get used to many Olgas and Nezihes, like the carriages that I rejected in the initial offers but then I accepted with some reasonable thoughts, the rare personal effects that I brought from abroad in accordance with the rights by the customs law after I proved myself how honorable I was with the disgust I felt towards gold smugglers, and an antique violin which I sold at a high price after I concluded to be mine without considering who would play it but still based on certain reasonable judgments.)

Apart from such choices that can be regarded as direct reflections of his endeavor to make his text close to its initial original version, Reşat Nuri also made various changes relatable to the changing and transforming social conditions and the intended 'civilized'[32] mentality of the period when rebuilding the characters in the novel. The differentiation in several dialogues involving Aziz Pasha, Şeref, and Seniha can be related to this:

> **TT:**
>
> Başımı önüme eğdim ve çekingen bir selâm ile geçmek istedim. Fakat o beni yolumdan çevirdi:

[32] For research involving 'civilization-oriented' observations on 'translating the West' within the context of Turkish history of translation, see Karadağ 2008, 2014.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

> — Kaçma Şeref Bey, yabancı değil, benim prenses. . . . Niye öyle **yabani** gibi duruyorsun? Sana kızımı takdim ediyorum. Seni ona **medenî bir adam** diye tanıtmıştım. (Güntekin 1954, 26)
>
> (I lowered my head and attempted to pass by giving a shy greeting. However, he stopped me from going on:
> — Don't flee, Şeref Bey, she isn't a stranger, she's my princess. . . . Why are you standing like a **savage**? I'm presenting my daughter to you. I had mentioned of you as **a civilized man**.)

ST:

> Başımı önüme eğdim, çekingen bir selam ile geçmek istedim. Fakat Paşa yolumu kesti:
> — Kaçma Şeref Bey.. Yanımdaki o kadar ürkmeye değer bir mahluk değil... Benim prenses Seniha... . . . Neye başını indiriyorsun Şeref Bey… Ayol sana kızımı takdim ediyorum... **Amma tuhaf iş ha**... (Güntekin 1924, 32)
>
> (I lowered my head and attempted to pass by giving a shy greeting. However, the Pasha stopped me from going on:
> — Don't flee, Şeref Bey.. She who is standing next to me isn't that worthy of fear... She's my princess, Seniha... . . . Why are you lowering your head, Şeref Bey? … Hey! I'm presenting my daughter to you... **This is extremely odd**...)

While Aziz Pasha describes Şeref's abstention from establishing a dialogue with his daughter as 'odd' in the ST, such abstention is attributed to being 'savage' and not being a 'civilized man' in the TT, which involves some examples of challenging the social and cultural practices of the past over dressing as well:

TT:

> Seniha, belki sahiden de istemiyordu. **Çarşafını** bahane etti, bana:
> — İstemediğimden değil, efendim; fakat paşa babam beni o kadar azarladı; şaşırttı ki, yola çıkmadan **çarşafımı değiştirmeyi** düşünemedim. . . .
> Paşa:
> — **Atarsın sırtından olur biter**, dedi, **çarşafını tutkalla vücuduna yapıştırmadın ya**... . . .
> Seniha, babasının yanında kalarak **çarşafını çıkardı**; sonra sarı zemine yeşil ve kırmızı çiçek resimleri serpilmiş, ipekli bir ev elbisesiyle yanımıza geldi. . . . köprünün sakat bir yerini geçerken Adnan'a yaptığım gibi ona da elimi uzatmaktan çekinmedim. **Çarşafını çıkarmamış olsaydı buna cesaret edemeyecektim**. (Güntekin 1954, 30–31)
>
> (Maybe, Seniha truly didn't want it. She used her **charshaf**[33] as an excuse:
> — It's not because I wouldn't like, sir; but, my pasha dad scolded me so much; he made me so confused that I couldn't think of **changing my charshaf**. . . .
> Pasha:

[33] A loose caped outer garment also covering the head worn by women.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

— **You'll remove it, and that's all. Your charshaf is not stuck on your body with glue**... . . .
Seniha stayed with her dad and **removed her charshaf**; then, she came to us with a silky home dress having green and red flower images sprinkled on a yellow background. . . . I didn't hesitate to give her, just like Adnan, my hand when passing over a hazardous part of the bridge. **I couldn't have dared it if she had not removed her charshaf**.)[34]

While he was including such elements belonging to the 'new' ways of life and behavior in the TT, Reşat Nuri also made some additions involving religious elements and practices. In the TT, after Şeref's meeting with guests from Istanbul, it is questioned—or readers are made to engage in some questioning—based on Şeref's appearance: "Bu kıyafette bu kadar zarif tavırlı ulûmu diniye hocası olur mu?" (Is it ever possible to see religious studies teachers dressing that well and behaving that graciously?) (Güntekin 1954, 73), with parallel derisive dialogues on religious practices and conventions added in several other parts of the TT, too:

TT:

Kadın, onu eline alarak:
— **Ulûmu diniye hocasına** soracağım meselelerden biri şu, dedi. **Şeriata göre, şarap haramdır. Hattâ bir damlası dahi haramdır.** Fakat aksi gibi ben onsuz yapamıyorum. İçmezsem hasta oluyorum. **Siz ne fetva vereceksiniz?**
— Mazereti kendiniz söylediniz hanımefendi... Mademki onsuz hasta oluyorsunuz... O halde içeceksiniz... Yalnız, doktor beyin rapor vermesi lâzım...
Elimle doktoru gösteriyordum. Doktor, her zamanki şakacı tavrıyla:
— İyi yere havale ettin Şeref, dedi, teşekkür ederim. Nevnihal Hanımefendi'yi birazdan güzelce bir soyup muayene edeyim. Bakalım ne göreceğiz. . . .
— **Mademki damlası harammış, o halde o damlayı çıkarıp atıyorum. Gerisi helâldir**, ... (Güntekin 1954, 69–70)

(The woman took it:
— One issue I will ask to **religious studies teacher** is this. **According to the sharia law, wine is haram. Even a single a drop is haram.** However, as if to spite me, I can't go without it. I'm sick when I don't drink it. **What fetwa will you give on this?**
— You've already told your excuse, lady... Insomuch as you get sick without it... Then you'll drink... But, the doctor must issue a report for it...
I was pointing at the doctor. The doctor adopted his usual joking attitude:
— You referred the issue to somewhere good, Şeref, thank you. I'll undress Ms. Nevnihal and examine her thoroughly soon. Let's see what's there. . . .
— **Insomuch as a drop of it is haram, I send that drop off. The rest is halal**, . . .)

[34] The part involving this scene in the ST (Güntekin 1924, 37) makes no mention of the dressing issue; it merely includes Aziz Pasha's encouraging Şeref to ask Seniha to accompany them as well.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

The preferences creating a perception of contrast between 'past'/'tradition' and 'progress'/'modernity' are prevalent in the TT. Differently from the ST, the TT involves Aziz Pasha's references to Tevfik Fikret, stating that there is no "fenalık" (harm) in reading poems making mention of "kadın" (women) and "çalgı" (instruments) and presenting this as a thought contrasting with "medrese mollalarına teslim" (surrendering [his daughter] to madrasah mullahs) (Güntekin 1954, 41). Likewise, various arts elements pointing to novelty and difference from the tradition were included in the TT (e.g., "Avrupa operetleri" [European operettas] [Güntekin 1954, 58], "gramofon" [gramophone], and "alafranga plâk" [a European record] [Güntekin 1954, 72]).

5. Discussion of Self-Translation and Indirect Translation in Intralingual Context

Reşat Nuri's *Gizli El* seems to have come into life and survived through intralingual translation. In this study, the first version of *Gizli El* starting to be serialized in 1920 was taken as an intralingual self-translation as it was a rewritten version by Reşat Nuri for the first text was censored. *Gizli El* had a two-stage intralingual self-translation process. While the first one was initiated upon Reşat Nuri's submission to censorship, the second was aimed at freeing the censored text from censorship, with the author writing what he had wanted to express in the very beginning, thereby, in a sense, back translating into its original, resulting in an indirect translation, as a translation of a translation. With all this, the intralingual translation process of *Gizli El* allows, indeed calls for, revisiting many aspects of and previous claims on self-translation and indirect translation.

First, with the two different self-translation processes it underwent in terms of the source text—one from the original text and the other from its intralingual translation—*Gizli El* yields a new conceptualization as to the directness of self-translation. The study proposes the concepts of 'direct self-translation' based on Reşat Nuri's self-translation directly from the original text in 1920 and 'indirect self-translation' based on his self-translation from an already translated text in 1954[35]—also noting that the issue of directness in self-translation

[35] For how 'directness' is handled in different contexts in the self-translation literature, please see the section 3.1 Self-Translation in this paper.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

could be relevant to any type of translation (e.g., intralingual, interlingual, intersemiotic).[36] Occurring under the control factors (Lefevere 1985, 226–229) during and in the aftermath of the Republic period, when big political, social, and cultural changes took place, *Gizli El*'s intralingual self-translation highlights a rare character of indirect translation, which is predominantly discussed, as a phenomenon, in contexts involving at least one interlingual translation. Reşat Nuri's censorship-induced 'direct' intralingual self-translation resulted in a text that was more distant to the original text and had a largely different plot from it, and his 'indirect' intralingual self-translation got closer to the original text, challenging the arguments in the literature that indirect translations result in larger distances to the original (cf. St. André 2020, 470–471; Pięta 2014, 16–17; Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 113–114), which is mainly because they just take interlingual processes as a basis.

Second, in opposition to what is argued with regards to complementary and non-opposing quality of self-translation (cf. Grutman and Spoturno 2022, 231), *Gizli El*'s two self-translations, the first in 1920 as evidenced by Reşat Nuri's remarks in his prefaces and the second in 1954 as illustrated through textual analysis above, proved that self-translation does not necessarily function as a complement to the source text to make it complete in a non-opposing way. As a matter of fact, Reşat Nuri's first self-translation endeavor was initiated, due to censorship, to make his work free and far from what was presented in his 'own' source text, rather than complementing or completing it in a non-opposing way. Even the initiating factor in that self-translation was opposing what was included in the source text as they would not be permitted to be published. And the second self-translation, as demonstrated by textual analysis, served for remanifesting what could not be included in its source text, thereby opposing what was imposed on the previous version. Thus, as the findings suggest, self-translation functioned as a tool for opposing what was produced by 'self.'

Third, the intralingual quality of *Gizli El*'s self-translation could offer a new perspective on the issue of horizontality and verticality in self-translation. While these two aspects of self-translation are suggested on the basis of the prevalence, well-establishedness, dominance, and prestige of the languages involved—i.e., horizontality referring to self-

[36] Hülya Boy proposes the term 'indirect self retranslation' to refer to "a target text that is produced, intralingually or interlingually, as an author retranslates his/her own work through a previous translation produced by him/her or by another person into the same language and to a target text that is produced as a translator translates the work of another author through a previous translation produced by him/her into the same language, with the emphasis of 'self' on the author-translator in the former and on the translator in the latter, where the author and the translator are different people" (2022, 171).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

translation occurring between two symmetric languages and verticality to self-translation occurring between two asymmetric languages, one being the more dominant, the more prestigious, and the better-established than the other (cf. Grutman 2013, 202–203)—this study suggests reconsidering it in intralingual context. In the case under scrutiny, the self-translation process involved a single language; however, the alphabet the work was translated into in 1954 was the new, the authorized, and the acclaimed one following the Language Reform in 1928, contrary to the other one which was old, non-authorized, and abolished. Hence, in terms of the possible representations of horizontality and verticality at the intralingual level, the 1920 *Gizli El* involved, arguably, a horizontal self-translation, whereas the 1954 *Gizli El* involved a vertical one, pointing to a difference of dominance, establishedness, prestige, and prevalence between the forms from/into which the text was translated. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the definitions of horizontality and verticality in self-translation involve subjective notions such as 'symmetric,' 'well-established,' 'prestige,' and 'dominant,' and it can be claimed that verticality in self-translation is not a matter of kind, but a matter of degree.

Fourth, *Gizli El*'s two-stage self-translation process brings forward opaqueness vs. transparency in self-translation. While the difference between opaque self-translation and transparent self-translation is constructed within the context of transfers between different languages, this study showcases that it can be relevant within the same language as well. From the very first book print of *Gizli El*, Reşat Nuri made it explicit that he had a prior text serving as a basis for his rewritten text. Hence, thanks to Reşat Nuri's preface, the 1924 book print explicitly indicates its nature as a self-translation with the changes in the translation process explicated, allowing it to be designated as a 'transparent self-translation.' On the other hand, opaque–transparent distinction gains a distinct quality in the 1954 version. This version also contains Reşat Nuri's preface informing that it had a prior text as a basis for his rewritten text, but the rewriting indicated in the preface is about the one performed in the serialization process of the 1920 version, not the current 1954 version. Therefore, although the existence of the 1954 version in the Latin alphabet makes it self-evident as a version of a previous version in the Ottoman-Turkish alphabet, thus making it a 'transparent self-translation' in one sense, the nature and quality of the self-translation is not revealed—actually concealed—in its presentation and designation. All the changes made by Reşat Nuri in the self-translation process to produce the 1954 version go unmentioned, thus making it an

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

'opaque self-translation' in another sense, with even the preface itself being amended, alleviating the tone of criticism. Therefore, the 1954 *Gizli El* can be considered, as a self-translation, both opaque and transparent all at the same time rather than representing a strict dichotomy, or a pseudo-transparent self-translation, concealing the character of self-translation in effect. Here, albeit in an opaque mode, indirect self-translation functions as a liberating act saving Reşat Nuri's work from censorship and remanifesting his stance and perspective on the period under scope, by demonstrating, at the same time, how ideological tensions are entailed in self-translation. Such contradictory character of opaqueness in *Gizli El* also indicates the manipulative nature of prefaces in specific and extratextual sources in general, which, as Toury articulates, are "partial and biased, and should therefore be treated with every possible circumspection" (2012, 88) even when it is the author himself presenting his 'own,' 'authorized' text.

Fifth, the motive underlying the 1954 indirect translation seems to be beyond the lists of possible reasons/motives for indirect translation suggested in the literature by taking it mainly at interlingual level. Reşat Nuri engaged in indirect translation to free his work from censorship and bring it back to its original, in which he attempted to reveal the political corruption of the period among others. With this finding, this study is not in favor of adding a new reason/motive to the non-exhaustive lists on this subject. Rather, it suggests that since indirect translation—"as a phenomenon whose nature and borders are [not] given once and for all" (Even-Zohar 2021, 196)—may occur at all levels (i.e., interlingual, intralingual, intersemiotic, intergenre, etc.) and it cannot be limited in terms of the reasons/motives leading to it, any list of reasons/motives for indirect translation is far from being definite, final, and generalizable, and the nature of indirect translation, as a time- and culture-bound activity, is not fixed.

Last but not least, the authority and a high degree of closeness to the original attributed to self-translation and the lower status and a higher degree of deviation from the original ascribed to indirect translation find a ground of clash, or compromise, or deconstruction in *Gizli El*'s intralingual translation history as it encompasses both self-translation and indirect translation. As a matter of fact, it involved a self-translation in 1920 resulting from a lack of authority in the self-translator and a self-translation in 1954 getting far from its source, while it witnessed an indirect translation in 1954 turning out to be the standard version of publication and maximizing closeness to and thus minimizing deviation

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

from the original. With this, *Gizli El* reveals the culture-bound and historical nature of both self-translation and indirect translation, which is not surprising, as they are all translations produced in certain historical and sociocultural contexts, shaped by specific control factors including professionals and patronage with such components as 'ideology,' 'economy,' and 'status' (Lefevere 1985), and governed by norms (Toury 2012), which are not fixed once and for all as well, besides the self-translator's personal choices.

6. Concluding Remarks

Setting to explore what *Gizli El* could offer new regarding the concepts of self-translation and indirect translation in intralingual context and adopting an enlarged ground as reference for definitions of 'self-translation' and 'indirect translation' (i.e., covering an intralingual case), this study suggests reframing of the phenomena under scrutiny, with the two concepts/phenomena mainly associated with two opposite extremes of authority, closeness to original, acceptability, and even legitimacy coming together in a single intralingual case.

With all the enlarging findings and discussions it presents, the study highlights the importance and gains of comprehensiveness—in terms of covering practices in different languages, histories, and countries across the world and different types/forms of translation—in self-translation and indirect translation research that allows merely intralingual translation processes and cases be treated as objects of study, too. In this way, as in the present case, it becomes possible for self-translation and indirect translation research to explore both new conceptualizations accounting for translational phenomena and facts and new aspects of the existing ones. In addition, in this way, self-translation and indirect translation research may contribute to a better understanding of the processes of social, literary, and cultural transformation and novelty and the function of translation as a regular, shaping activity, study of which can manifest agents, their transforming natures, and power relations as well as the transforming continuance of cultures, languages, authors, and translation (studies) itself.

In terms of the (Turkish) history of translation, research of a similar nature and conceptual approach may help to explore the new multifaceted aspects and regularity of these time- and culture-bound activities of translation, contributing to building a knowledge of the forms, ways, functions, characters, and processes of translation through history, opening up

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

new perspectives for research in these fields, and, most importantly, paving the way for systemic endeavors, rather than a repetitive, narrow look on individual cases. All in all, the more history is unearthed, the more different causes, forms, modes, goals, strategies, norms, functions, and effects of translation may be detected, enlarging the boundaries of translation (studies). Such coverage of the intralingual indirect self-translation cases in Turkish or any other history of translation may, in turn, contribute to the fundamental typologies, conceptualizations, and determinations in self-translation and indirect translation research.

Departing from the idea that research on self-translation and indirect translation should not be confined to unproductive debates of gains, losses, (non-)authority, closeness to original, and what kind of a copy self-translations and indirect translations are and rejecting the allegation that study of indirect translation brings no contribution to the human knowledge (cf. St. André 2020, 471), the study illustrates how they may function as a way of revealing/concealing—along with 'how's and 'why's—reality, making the ideas, ideologies, authors, and works survive, showing the regularities and power relations, tracing historical and social transformation, manifesting what forms and characters translations may take under certain conditions, challenging what is 'definite' and what is 'original,' how 'self' self-translation is, how 'authorized' author is, and discovering the numerous correlations with adjacent concepts of translation. What is more, attributing an explanatory function to intralingual self-translation and intralingual indirect translation in attempts to give accounts of national literature could be highly generative in terms of conceptualization and understanding of what is 'national,' what is 'self,' and how they are constructed and at the same time shape the world. If the longtime debates of gains, losses, authority, and closeness to original in relation to the source are abandoned in self-translation and indirect translation research, endeavors focusing on their goals, functions, and roles within the indeterminate nature of translation could manifest their potentials for both translation theory and translation practice.

With all its findings, the study concludes by highlighting the historicity and relativity of any work, phenomenon, and concept in nature and scope, reiterating Işın Bengi's call "to possess the problematic facts but to disown the problematic definitions" (1990, 230).

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

References

Assis Rosa, Alexandra, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia. 2017. "Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues Regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview." *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 113–132. doi:10.1080/14781700.2017.1285247.

Baydere, Muhammed. 2021. "Betimleyici Çeviribilim Araştırmalarında Yeni Açılımlara Doğru: Reşat Nuri Güntekin'in Diliçi ve Dillerarası Çeviri Eylemlerindeki Çeşitliliğin Kavramsallaştırılması." [Toward new insights into research in descriptive translation studies: Conceptualizing diversity in Reşat Nuri Güntekin's intralingual and interlingual translational actions.] PhD diss., Yıldız Technical University.

Baydere, Muhammed, and Ayşe Banu Karadağ. 2019. "*Çalıkuşu*'nun Öz-Çeviri Serüveni Üzerine Betimleyici Bir Çalışma." [A descriptive study on the self-translation adventure of *Çalıkuşu*.] In "2nd International Rumeli Symposium [Language, Literature, Translation]," edited by Yakup Yılmaz and Fatih Başpınar. Special Issue, *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, no. 5, 314–333. doi:10.29000/rumelide.606165.

Bengi, Işın. 1990. "A Re-evaluation of the Concept of Equivalence in the Literary Translations of Ahmed Midhat Efendi: A Linguistic Perspective." PhD diss., Hacettepe University.

Berk Albachten, Özlem. 2005. "Diliçi Çeviriler ve *Mai ve Siyah*." [Intralingual translations and *Mai ve Siyah*.] *Dilbilim*, no. 14, 139–149. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/iudilbilim/issue/1083/12247.

———. 2013. "Intralingual Translation as 'Modernization' of the Language: The Turkish Case." *Perspectives* 21 (2): 257–271. doi:10.1080/0907676X.2012.702395.

———. 2015. "The Turkish Language Reform and Intralingual Translation." In *Tradition, Tension and Translation in Turkey*, edited by Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Saliha Paker, and John Milton, 165–180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. 2019. "Challenging the Boundaries of Translation and Filling the Gaps in Translation History: Two Cases of Intralingual Translation from the 19th-Century Ottoman Literary Scene." In *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*, edited by Helle V. Dam, Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger, and Karen Korning Zethsen, 168–180. London: Routledge. PDF e-book.

Boy, 2019. "(Re)Positioning of Inter- and Intra-Lingual Translational Adventures." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 2 (2): 70–101. doi:10.29228/transLogos.14.

———. 2022. "*The Picture of Dorian Gray*'in Diliçi ve Dillerarası Çevirileri Üzerine Kavramsal Sorgulamalar." [Conceptual reflections on the intra-/inter-lingual translations of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*."] PhD diss., Yıldız Technical University.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

Boy, Hülya, and Ayşe Banu Karadağ. 2020. "*The Picture of Dorian Gray*'in Kaynak Edebiyat Dizgesindeki Serüveni Üzerine Betimleyici Bir Çalışma." [A descriptive study on the adventure of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* in the Source Literary System.] In "Translation Studies Special Issue," edited by Ayşe Nihal Akbulut and Oktay Eser. Special Issue, *Amasya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17–45. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1066505.

Buts, Jan, James Hadley, and Mohammad Aboomar. 2022. "Keyness, Context, and Cultural Specificity in Indirect Translation." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 5 (1): 1–21. doi:10.29228/transLogos.40.

Canlı, Gülsüm. 2018. "Relocating Self-Translation from the Interlingual to Intralingual: Faulkner as a Self-Translauthor." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 1 (1): 41–63. doi:10.29228/transLogos.1/1.8.

———. 2019. "William Faulkner'ın *Sanctuary* Adlı Romanının Kaynak ve Erek Dizgedeki Çeviri Serüveni: Diliçi Çeviri, Öz-Çeviri, Yeniden Çeviri ve Dolaylı Çeviri Kavramları Işığında Bir İnceleme." [The translational adventure of William Faulkner's *Sanctuary* in source and target systems: An analysis in the light of intralingual translation, self-translation, retranslation and indirect translation.] PhD diss., Yıldız Technical University.

Castro, Olga, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page. 2017. "Introduction: Self-Translating, from Minorisation to Empowerment." In *Self-Translation and Power: Negotiating Identities in European Multilingual Contexts*, edited by Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page, 1–22. London: Palgrave Macmillan. PDF e-book.

Culler, Jonathan. 2000. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dasilva, Xosé Manuel. 2015. "La opacidad de la autotraducción entre lenguas asimétricas." [The opacity of self-translation between asymmetric languages]. *TRANS: Revista De Traductología* 2 (19): 171–182. doi:10.24310/TRANS.2015.v2i19.2070.

Ehrlich, Shlomit. 2009. "Are Self-Translators Like Other Translators?" *Perspectives* 17 (4): 243–255. doi:10.1080/09076760903404050.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2021. "The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 191–196. London: Routledge. PDF e-book.

Fitch, Brian T. 1988. *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gambier, Yves. 2003. "Working with Relay: An Old Story and a New Challenge." In *Speaking in Tongues: Language across Contexts and Users*, edited by Luis Pérez Gonzalez, 47–66. Valencia: Universitat de Valencia.

Gentzler, Edwin. 2017. "Foreword." In *Self-Translation and Power: Negotiating Identities in European Multilingual Contexts*, edited by Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page, v–viii. London: Palgrave Macmillan. PDF e-book.

Grutman, Rainier. 2009. "Self-Translation." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 257–259. London: Routledge. PDF e-book.

———. 2013. "Beckett and Beyond: Putting Self-Translation in Perspective." In "Special Issue on Self-Translation," edited by Michael Boyden and Lisbeth De Bleeker. Special Issue, *Orbis Litterarum* 68 (3): 188–206. doi:10.1111/oli.12022.

Grutman, Rainier, and María Laura Spoturno. 2022. "Veinte años de estudios sobre la autotraducción: una entrevista con el profesor Julio-César Santoyo." [Twenty years of studies on self-translation: An interview with professor Julio-César Santoyo.] *Mutatis Mutandis, Revista Latinoamericana de Traducción* 15 (1): 227–239. doi:10.17533/udea.mut.v15n1a13.

Grutman, Rainier, and Trish Van Bolderen. 2014. "Self-Translation." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 323–332. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gutt, Ernst-August. 1990. "A Theoretical Account of Translation - Without a Translation Theory." *Target* 2 (2): 135–164. doi:10.1075/target.2.2.02gut.

Güntekin, Reşat Nuri. 1924. *Gizli El* [The secret hand]. Istanbul: İkbal Kütüphanesi.

———. 1954. *Gizli El* [The secret hand]. Istanbul: Çağlayan Yayınevi.

Hokenson, Jan Walsh, and Marcella Munson. 2007. *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

İbar, Gazanfer. 2018. "Ahmet Cevdet'in Yenilikçi Gazetesi *İkdam*." [Ahmet Cevdet's reformist newspaper *İkdam*.] *Atlas Tarih*, no. 54, 46–53.

Jakobson, Roman. 2021. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 156–161. London: Routledge. PDF e-book.

Jung, Verena. 2002. *English-German Self-Translation of Academic Texts and its Relevance for Translation Theory and Practice*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Kalem Bakkal, Aslı. 2019. "Intralingual Translation Has No Name in Turkey: Conceptual Crowdedness in Intralingual Translation." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 2 (2): 48–69. doi:10.29228/transLogos.13.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

Kampert, Magdalena Anna. 2018. "Self-Translation in 20th-Century Italian and Polish Literature: The Cases of Luigi Pirandello, Maria Kuncewiczowa and Janusz Głowacki." PhD diss., The University of Glasgow.

Kanter, M. Fatih. 2019. *Bir Kültür Romancısı: Reşat Nuri Güntekin*. Istanbul: Kesit.

Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. 2008. *Çevirinin Tanıklığında 'Medeniyet'in Dönüşümü* [Transformation of 'civilization' in the witness of translation]. Istanbul: Diye.

———. 2014. "'Batı'nın Çevrilmesini 'Medeniyet' Odağıyla Yeniden Okumak: Tanzimat Dönemi/Sonrası Çeviriler ve 'Çekinceli' Cesur Çevirmenler." [Rereading the 'translation of the West' with a focus on 'civilization': Translations in/after the *Tanzimat* and 'hesitating' brave translators.] *Tanzimat ve Edebiyat: Osmanlı İstanbulu'nda Modern Edebi Kültür* [Tanzimat and literature: Modern literary culture in Ottoman Istanbul], edited by Mehmet Fatih Uslu and Fatih Altuğ, 481–504. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

———. 2018. "Türkçeye Çevirmek 'Türkçe Söylememek' mi Demek?" [Does translating into Turkish mean not 'telling in Turkish'?]. Paper presented at the 5th Asoscongress International Symposium on Philology, Istanbul, October 25–27.

_____. 2019. "Türk Edebiyat ve Kültür Dizgesinin Konukseverliğinde Çeviri Roman Deneyimi." [Experience of translated novels with the hospitality of the Turkish literary and cultural system.] *Doğu Batı* 22 (88): 9–25.

Lefevere, André. 1985. "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm." *The Manipulation of Literature*, edited by Theo Hermans, 215–243, London: Croom Helm.

_____. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

Maia, Rita Bueno, Hanna Pięta, and Alexandra Assis Rosa 2018. "Translation and Adjacent Concepts." In *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, Concepts, Effects*, edited by Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier, 75–83. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Montini, Chiara. 2010. "Self-Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 1:306–308. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Naci, Fethi. 2003. *Reşat Nuri'nin Romancılığı* [Reşat Nuri's novelism]. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi.

Nemutlu, Özlem. 2020. "Reşat Nuri Güntekin'in *Gizli El* Romanının Tefrikası ile Kitap Baskıları Arasındaki Farklılıklar." [The differences between feuilleton version and the book edition of Reşat Nuri Güntekin's novel *Gizli El*.] In "Prof. Dr. M. Orhan Okay Special Issue," edited by Kemal Timur. Special Issue, *Hikmet – Journal of Academic Literature*, 418–439. doi:10.28981/hikmet.830396.

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

Öztürk Baydere, Hilal. 2019a. "Türk Edebiyatını Diliçi Çevirilerden Okumak: Osmanlıcada ve Günümüz Türkçesinde Refik Halid'in *Guguklu Saat*'i." [Reading Turkish literature through intralingual translations: Refik Halid's *Guguklu Saat* in Ottoman and modern Turkish.] In *Çeviri Üzerine Gözlemler* [Observations on translation], edited by Seda Taş, 223–241. Istanbul: Hiperyayın.

———. 2019b. "What Could the Translation of a 'Retelling' Imply for Translation Studies?" *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 2 (2): 102–133. doi:10.29228/transLogos.15.

Pięta, Hanna. 2014. "What Do (We Think) We Know about Indirectness in Literary Translation? A Tentative Review of the State-of-the-Art and Possible Research Avenues." In *Traduccio Indirecta en la Literature Catalana* [Indirect translation in Catalan literature], edited by Ivan Garcia Sala, Diana Sanz Roig, and Bozena Zaboklicka, 15–34, Barcelona: Punctum.

Pięta, Hanna, Rita Bueno Maia, and Ester Torres-Simón. 2022. *Indirect Translation Explained*. London: Routledge. PDF e-book.

Ramis, Josep Miquel. 2017. "The Failure of Self-Translation in Catalan Literature." In *Self-Translation and Power: Negotiating Identities in European Multilingual Contexts*, edited by Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page, 95–117. London: Palgrave Macmillan. PDF e-book.

Ringmar. Martin. 2012. "Relay Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 3:141–144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Santoyo, Julio-César. 2013. "Autotraducción: ensayo de tipología." [Self-translations: A typology essay.] In *Al humanista, traductor y maestro Miguel Ángel Vega Cernuda* [To the humanist, translator and teacher Miguel Ángel Vega Cernuda], edited by Pilar Martino Alba, Juan A. Albaladejo Martínez, and Martha Pulido, 205–222. Madrid: Dykinson.

Shread, Carolyn. 2009. "Redefining Translation through Self-Translation: The Case of Nancy Houston." In *Translation in French and Francophone Literature and Film*, edited by James Day, *French Literature Series* 36:51–66. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Shuttleworth, Mark, and Moira Cowie. 2014. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

St. André, James. 2020. "Relay." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 470–473. London: Routledge.

Tanqueiro, Helena. 2000. "Self-Translation as an Extreme Case of the Author-Translator-Dialectic." *Investigating Translation: Selected Papers from the 4th International Congress on Translation, Barcelona, 1998*, edited by Allison Beeby, Doris Ensinger, and Marisa Presas, 55–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon. 1985. "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies." *The Manipulation of Literature*, edited by Theo Hermans, 16–41. London: Croom Helm.

———. 2003. "Assumed Translation: A Methodological Concept and Its Implications." *Translation Studies in the New Millennium: Proceedings from the 1st International Conference on Translation and Interpreting*, edited by Barbara Blackwell Gülen, İsmail Boztaş, and Christoph Veldhues, 43–59. Ankara: Bizim Büro Basımevi.

———. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies — and Beyond*. 2nd expanded ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wakabayashi, Judy. 2020. "History of Translation." In *The Concise Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, edited by Carol A. Chapelle, 547–555. Singapore: Wiley-Blackwell.

Yelaldı, İsmail. 2010. "Reşat Nuri Güntekin'in İki Kez Yazdığı İlk Romanı: 'Gizli El.'" [Reşat Nuri Güntekin's first novel written by him twice: 'Gizli El.'] *Hürriyet Gösteri Sanat Edebiyat Dergisi*, no. 302, 28–35.