


Political Dynamics of Transfer: Said's Islamist *Orientalism* (1982)*

Aktarımın Siyasal Dinamikleri: Said'in İslamcı *Orientalism*'i (1982)

Atalay Gündüz¹ 

¹Assoc.Prof., Dokuz Eylül University, Faculty of Letters/Department of Translation and Interpreting, İzmir, Türkiye

Corresponding author/

Sorumlu yazar : Atalay Gündüz

E-mail / E-posta : atalay.gunduz@deu.edu.tr

*This article draws heavily on author's Project "Edward Said'in Oryantalizm Adlı Eserinin Türkçe Çevirileri ve Yarattığı Etki Dalgaları" ("The First Turkish Translations of Edward Said's Orientalism and Its Waves of Influence") 2020.KB.SOS.004 sponsored by Dokuz Eylül University and his book İslamı çeviriyle savunmak: Orientalism'in ilk Türkçe çevirisi (1982), Bourdieucu bir analiz çalışması (2020) (Defending Islam Through Translation: The First Turkish Translation of Orientalism (1982), A Bourdieusian Analysis)

ABSTRACT

Few works in the humanities have wielded the influence of Edward Said's (1935–2003) *Orientalism: Western perceptions of the East* (1978) within the Turkish academic landscape. The first Turkish translation of *Orientalism* was published in 1982 by Pınar, an Islamist publishing house devoid of scholarly pedigree. While Said attributes his motivation for writing the book to his sense of alienation as a Palestinian exile in America and the lack of recognition he experienced as an Arab, his methodology and critical approach bear the hallmarks of an academic field. Said's work is a deconstruction of the academic field of oriental studies. According to Bourdieu, the field of origin alone cannot fully determine the meaning and function of foreign works; the receiving field is equally crucial. The significance and impact of the work in its original field are often unclear, and the process of transfer unfolds through different mechanisms. This transfer process involves multiple variables, including the selection of a title for publication, choice of the translator, labeling and classification, selection of publication series, and the translator's influence. Within this framework, this paper aims to uncover ideological, cultural, and historical factors that contributed to Said's *Orientalism*'s influence on Turkish political, intellectual, and academic fields.

Keywords: Orientalism, receiving field, translation sociology, agents of translation, Islamism in Turkey

ÖZ

Beşeri bilimlerdeki çok az akademik çalışma, Edward Said'in (1935-2003) *Oryantalizm: Batının doğuya ilişkin alguları* (1978) başlıklı eserinin Türkçedeki etkisini yaratmıştır. Oryantalizm'in ilk Türkçe çevirisi, akademik bir habitusa, yani ön eğilimlere sahip olmayan İslamcı yayınevi Pınar tarafından 1982'de *Oryantalizm (doğubilim): Sömürgeciliğin keşif kolu* başlığıyla yayımlandı. Said, Amerika'da Filistinli bir sürgün olarak yaşadığı yabancılaşma duygusunun ve bir Arap olarak yaşadığı tanınma eksikliğinin kendisini bu çalışmayı yapmaya sürüklediğini ifade etse de Said'in metodolojisi, eleştirel pratiği akademik bir alanın izlerini taşır. Politik bir ajandayla yola çıkmış izlenimi vermektan kaçınmayan Said, akademik bir alan olan şarkiyatçılık bu alanın siyasal bağlantılarını, emperyal kurumlarla olan ilişkilerini yapı sökülümüne uğratar. Bourdieu'ya göre yabancı eserlerin anlam ve işlevini belirlemek için kaynak alan bilgisi ve uzmanlığı tek başına yeterli değildir, kaynak alan kadar alıcı alan konusunda da yetkin olmak önemlidir. Eserin üretim alanındaki anlamı ve işlevi hakkında bilgimiz çok sınırlıdır, aktarımın yüklediği anlamlar ve işlevler farklı süreçlerle ortaya çıkmaktadır. Yayımlanacak eserlerin seçilmesi, çevirmenin kim olacağı, etiketleme ve sınıflandırma, hangi diziden çıkacağına kadar karar verilmesi gereken pek çok değişken söz konusudur. Bu çerçevede bu makale, Said'in Oryantalizminin Türk siyasi, entelektüel ve akademik alanlarında yarattığı etkinin ideolojik, kültürel ve tarihi unsurlarını ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Şarkiyatçılık, alımlayan alan, çeviri sosyolojisi, çeviri özneleri, Türkiye'de İslamcılık

Submitted / Başvuru : 14.09.2023

**Revision Requested /
Revizyon Talebi :** 07.01.2024

**Last Revision Received /
Son Revizyon :** 29.02.2024

Accepted / Kabul : 07.03.2024



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

1. Introduction

Beginning in the 1960s, as right-left conflicts began to escalate in Turkey, adherents of Islamist movements, who opposed the dominant Marxist currents, found themselves lacking adequate response within the existing Islamist literature to counter the critiques leveled against Islamic tradition and national history by leftist factions. To counter these “attacks,” they embarked on an intense translation activity, seeking to import answers from other Muslim-majority countries (Ocak, 2013, pp. 94-95). During this period, Islamist publishers prioritized the publication of copyrighted and translated texts over religious books, aiming to respond to leftist arguments that denigrate Islam, Ottoman history, and national identity (Ocak, 2013, pp. 96-98). Any discourse challenging the fundamental tenets of modernity held significant appeal for these Islamist publishers.

At this point, intellectuals within Islamist circles began to take notice of figures such as Fanon, Said, and Bhabha. Post-colonial theory, which emphasizes the political functions of texts within the intellectual field, has engendered the emergence of a new critical discourse. As articulated by Tymoczko (2007, p. 190) “It is telling that positivism became the dominant Western epistemological posture at the height of European imperialism, as European empires were consolidating their dominion throughout the world. Empire involves more than physical control: it is also a matter of cultural assertion and control of meaning and knowledge.” Within this positivist paradigm, imperialism legitimizes itself through claims of superiority, defining technological advancement as the sole measure of “civilizations” and equating the lack of such advancement with a lack of civilization. This narrative coalesced in the concept of “la mission civilisatrice,” which asserted the hegemonic notion that bringing “civilization” to nonwestern peoples was necessary, even from the perspective of the colonized. Translation, serving as the conduit for the transfer and manipulation of foreign ideas, assumes a significant role within this struggle for “cultural assertion and control of meaning and knowledge.”

As an active agent within the intellectual field, the translator plays an extremely vital role, possessing the capacity to exert significant influence at the center of consent production across various fields. In line with the paradigm shift observed in other humanities disciplines, translation studies in the 1980s began to pivot from a focus solely on the text to include the translator and the contextual elements surrounding them (Milton and Bandio, 2009, p. 2-3). Toury posits that cultures, upon recognizing gaps, rely on translation to bridge them. Often, these gaps can be filled by texts originating from other languages, with those sourced from prestigious cultures perceived as advantageous due to their high symbolic capital (2012, p. 22). Within society, the individuals' involvement in the creation of cultural repertoires does not uniformly assume an active role in this process. Instead, only a select few actively contribute to repertoire creation, whether through a commission by the community or through self-initiated endeavors, thereby introducing new options (Toury, 2002, p. 151).

In line with Cevat Özkaya's definition of Islamism as a form of “self-defense,” the journal “Yeniden Milli Mücadele” (National Struggle Again) similarly utilizes the perception of external threats as ideological pillars to unite individuals with Islamic sensitivities. The movement's agenda rests on the premise that historical adversaries such as Judaism, Communism, and Christianity, viewed as “external forces,” have continuously threatened Islam and Muslims. Subscribing to this doctrine leaves little room for ambiguity; individuals are faced with clear options and an imperative to act. They must either succumb to these perceived threats and risk the erosion of their identity or rise and defend their faith. As implied by its name, *Yeniden¹ Milli Mücadele* embodies the journal of a group that has chosen the path of struggle. Building upon Toury's observation that no translation should be divorced from its contextual backdrop (2012, p. 22), this study aims to elucidate how Özkaya and his political milieu shape his habitus, with Özkaya both being structured by and contributing to the structuring of this environment.

2. Culture Planning and the Creation of Hegemony

As noted by Kara (2001), the genesis of the Islamist movement in Turkey can be traced back to the need to assume a defensive stance against the surge of Westernization initiatives that gained momentum in the 19th century, exerting profound transformative influence across all societal levels and within the cultural field. Intellectuals within the Islamic World remained largely oblivious to the magnitude of this transformation until they were confronted with the portrayals of Islam propagated within the Orientalist repertoire. This paper contends that the widespread adoption and utilization of Said's *Orientalism* in the Turkish context can be attributed to its fulfillment of a longstanding need to “defend” the Islamist identity against Orientalist critiques. To understand the precise exigency to which Said's work responds, it is instructive to examine premises.

¹ The journal gave the movement its name and was published from 1970 to 1980 in 1525 issues. For further information on the journal and the movement see (Yalçın, 2019 and Aydın, 2005).

During an era when the term “Islamist” had yet to denote as a descriptor for the political movement, Namık Kemal challenged Ernest Renan’s assertion in his 1883 work “Defense against Renan,” contesting Renan’s depiction of Islam as a religion that hindered progress. Although Namık Kemal’s text did not gain significant acclaim upon its initial publication, it gained prominence decades later, particularly in 1910 during the rise of the Dozy controversy (Yenilmez, 2015). Anticipating Edward Said’s later critique of Western scholarship’s careless approach to the East (288), Namık Kemal observed that European universities and scholars, while meticulously focused on other fields of study, displayed a notable lack of precision and sensitivity when it came to Islam (p. 16). Similarly, Ahmet Mithat’s *Nizâ-ı İlm ü Dîn* (1897–1900), an annotated and adapted translation of John William Draper’s *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1874), serves as a defense against Orientalist attacks on Islam’s contributions to scientific advancement. Joining Namık Kemal and Ahmet Mithat in this defense, Şehbenderzade Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi (1865–1914) countered Abdullah Cevdet’s translation of the Dutch Orientalist Reinhart Peter Anne Dozy’s (1820–1883) work titled *History of Islam*, which hit the bookshelves in Istanbul.²

On the opposite end of this critical stance lies a faction that admired the technological advancements, economic prosperity, and scientific achievements in Europe. Tevfik Fikret (1867–1915), one of the leading proponents of modernization, expressed his admiration and reverence for European civilization in his poem “Promete,” where he exclaimed, “How sweet it is to rise and laugh!” (Translation). Upon recognizing the lagging status of their own country, proponents of modernization immediately turned to introspection to discern the underlying causes of this lamentable condition. Some modernizers attributed responsibility to their civilization and advocated for its rejection in favor of adopting European values and customs. This stance, which sometimes escalated to outright denial, faced criticism not only from Islamist groups but also from left-wing and modernist writers (İlhan, 2002, p. 23). Rooted in a stark comparison between Western economic and living standards as well as those of Turkey, this rejectionist attitude often concluded that Turkey would never attain Western standards, particularly gaining traction during periods of significant economic downturns. According to this narrative, proponents of Westernization lack faith in their own country and people, rendering them unreliable and unworthy of trust, as they are perceived to harbor disdain for their own culture and heritage. Influential in propagating the Orientalist approach, these elites are viewed as local collaborators of colonialists seeking to strip Muslims of their religion, identity, and culture (Süphandağı, 2017, p. 54).

These agents of change, who employ an idealized Western standard to evaluate and critique their own countries, often harbor criticism toward local culture, politics, and customs, viewing reforms as the sole means to liberate their countries and people from “poverty,” “backwardness,” and “dependence.” The reforms they advocate typically entail severing ties with historical legacies perceived as the root causes of societal issues, advocating instead for a fresh start based on new principles. This necessitates the relinquishment of established positions across all sectors of society to accommodate the proposed reforms. Such radical changes and demands inevitably provoke instigated resistance from entrenched positions. The establishment of the republic not only entails a shift in the political system but also necessitates the reorganization of Islamic institutions, roles, and the role of religion in state affairs. The religious habitus and social capital of Islamic sensitivities have found new avenues of expression within the political field. Resistance, in dialectical opposition to the reforms, encompassed various ideologies, including socialism, Darwinism, capitalism, and materialism, all viewed as Western concepts undermining the sanctity of Islam. According to the Islamist narrative, Islam was under attack, denigrated by these emerging waves, and required defense. Within this framework, any criticism directed toward Islam and Muslims was perceived as part of a broader project aimed at undermining Islam. Considering the historical context of Western imperial operations in the Islamic lands, this perspective does not appear as a far-fetched conspiracy theory. Özkaya, the first patron of *Orientalism*’s Turkish translation, aligns with this resistance to Western ideas, advocating for the reinstatement of Islam’s influence across all areas of life and promoting Islam as the sole standard in state and society.

3. From the Political to the Cultural (Battle)Field

The Islamic revolution of 1979 marked a momentous occasion for the young publishers Özkaya, whose early endeavors with the newly established Pınar imprint saw the release of two seminal titles: *İslam Devrimi*³ (1981) and *Tevhidi Dünya Görüşü*⁴ (1981), authored by Murtaza Motahari (1919–1979) and translated by Ali Emiroğlu. However, novice publishers overlooked the disparity between the Shia worldview and the Sunni world, resulting in the lukewarm reception of these initial publications within Islamist circles. Özkaya (2018) reflects that it was not until the third book

² For a detailed discussion of the connection between the resistance to the Orientalist discourse and the emergence of Islamist movements see (Gündüz, 2020, p. 53-79).

³ *Islamic Revolution*

⁴ *Tawhidi Worldview*

that they achieved the success they had envisioned. Fortuitously, Özkaya encountered Nezh Uzel, the translator of the book, while perusing Sahafklar, the second-hand book market. Uzel shared his aspiration to translate a particular book that had left a profound impression on him, expressing his eagerness to make it available to readers if only he could find a publisher. Özkaya, who had been deeply involved in political ventures since the 1970s, seized the opportunity and took on the role of publisher. He remained a steadfast participant, firmly believing in the outcome of the game to a large extent.

Pınar, the publishing house associated with the National Struggle Movement (Milli Mücadele Hareketi), prioritizes the dissemination of translated works over copyrighted ones. Özkaya elucidates that they deem it appropriate to circulate texts they believe will help their position in the cultural field, particularly as they encounter difficulty in finding arguments to counter opposition within the local culture (2019). Engaging in constant contestation and rivalry against leftist groups since their high school years instilled in the movement the recognition that securing intellectual hegemony over culture was paramount (2018). Özkaya emphasizes that their primary effort was to challenge the cultural dominance of Western civilization and restore Islam's hegemony across all areas of life. According to Özkaya's account, the leadership of the National Struggle Movement concluded that the struggle in the cultural field was equally significant as the physical political confrontations in the streets and schools. Consequently, they resolved to launch a cultural journal alongside the weekly publication *Yeniden Milli Mücadele* (National Struggle Again) (1970–1980), which lent its name to the movement they spearheaded. Thus, in 1972, the *Pınar Monthly Culture and Art Journal*, initially published by the student union of the Çapa Higher Teacher Training School, came under the complete control of the National Struggle Movement.

Pınar Publication recognized a significant opportunity in appropriating the works of an academic of Edward Said's stature. Said, who hails from one of the most prestigious universities globally and whose writings are esteemed within scholarly circles, mentions ideas that align closely with the objectives of the National Struggle Movement. Said's scathing critique of Israel's actions, including violence, unlawfulness, and the displacement of the Palestinians, as well as his condemnation of the Orientalist discourse that perpetuates narratives legitimizing imperialism and colonialism, resonates strongly with the movement's ideology. Furthermore, Said's linkage of criticisms directed toward Islam with the intellectual milieu of imperialist countries precisely reflects the new connection sought by the National Struggle Movement. By embracing Said's critical framework and lexicon, rich with symbolic capital, Pınar Publication has equipped the movement with potent tools to fight against the hegemony of Western culture.

4. Accumulating Cultural Capital: A Constructing Agent Cemil Meriç

While *Yeniden Milli Mücadele* embraced discourses based on conspiracy theories circulated by figures like Cevat Rifat Atilhan and Ziya Uygur in the early 1970s, particularly revolving around the Israel-Zionism-Freemasonry conspiracy, the journal *Pınar* attempted to distance itself from such topics whenever possible. However, as the movement experienced a schism in the mid-1970s, the faction associated with *Pınar* was bolstered by the addition of intellectuals like Cemil Meriç rapidly amassing the cultural capital necessary to establish a publishing house. Meriç's influence extended beyond mere participation; he attracted young individuals to *Pınar*, urging them to shift their focus from street activism to a more intellectually oriented approach (Özkaya, personal interview, 15.11.2019).

Özkaya, while listening to Uzel discuss Said's book in the second-hand bookstore, recognized a familiar argument presented in a more scholarly and methodological manner. In this context, the subtitle of Pınar's first translation in 1982, "The Vanguard of Colonialism" ("Sömürgeciliğin Keşif Kolu"), was borrowed from a text by Cemil Meriç whose⁵ influence and guidance⁶ played a crucial role in expanding Pınar's repertoire, as evidenced by his facilitation of Alev Alatlı's translation of *Covering Islam* (1981) a mere three years after its English publication under the title *Haberlerin ağında İslam* (*Islam in the Net of the News*) (1984). As exemplified by Meriç, Said, and Uzel, contrary to expectations,

⁵ Grandchildren of the old Ottoman State, Meriç and Said shared much in common in terms of their intellectual formation. Both went to foreign schools, Said in Cairo, Meriç in Hatay which was a part of Syria back in the twenties and thirties. Both were heavily influenced by the French intellectual tradition. Meriç like Said draws on Vico, Gramsci, Zola and Benda when he wrote a series of essays published in *Pınar* "Aydın Denen Meçhul" (1977) ("That Unknown Called Intellectual") adumbrating Said's *Representations of the Intellectual* (1994), which carries uncannily similar references to French intellectual history, despite the disparity in their conclusions and treatment of their subject. Although Meriç admires Said's work and promotes him, he is not willing to renounce orientalist like Renan at once. On that Meriç thinks that Said's work is "too ruthless" and causes a "laziness of ideas", causing as much harm as good (Koçak, 2018, 55). Like Meriç, Mardin (2002; p.113) states that Said's thesis was too abruptly adopted by the intellectuals, which is because such a discourse is the result of a historical trend. Mardin states that there is a reaction to the West's discourse on Turkey and Turks from both the right, the left and the "centre" of the country, and that these representations are approached with suspicion. Said did not focus enough on the tradition of criticizing the representations of the West about the East, which preceded him. Ortaylı (2006) argues that Said's work ignores many achievements of Oriental science, should be read as a part of a fight for a seat in American universities, and does not concern Turkish intellectual life (115). In that we can see that though there is a general applaud for Orientalism, there is also a vein of criticism which approaches Said from a more cautious standpoint.

⁶ Özkaya states that it was thanks to Meriç that he learned the leftist worldview against whom he struggled in the highly agitational atmosphere of the seventies. He adds that he had seen the people in the opposite camp as a treacherous group that fed on evil and acted with evil intentions, over time he began to better understand what caused the differences between them (2008).

colonial⁷ education catalyzed the development of individuals with heightened awareness and anti-imperialist individual sentiments.

In his introduction to his translation titled *Oryantalizm: (doğubilim): Sömürgeciliğin keşif kolu (Orientalism, the vanguard of colonialism)*, Uzel reveals his motivation for undertaking such a huge task: he seeks to dismantle the prevailing narrative that fails to acknowledge any civilization beyond its own. While Said points out the origins of the disparaging image of Islam and Arabs, Uzel takes a step further, utilizing the opportunity to defend Islam. He reminds his readers that Islamic civilization created original syntheses and propelled them into the future by integrating with the civilizations it encountered over more than a thousand years. Contrary to the orientalist depiction of Islam as a destroyer of cultures and traditions, Uzel tends to portray Islamic civilizations as tolerant toward the cultures they encountered. Within this narrative, foreign cultures are embraced with respect and readily assimilated. One of the key points emphasized by Said, the French imperialist policy of “*la mission civilisatrice*” is the focal theme that Uzel urges Turkish readers to discern from the text. According to Uzel, Said’s main achievement lies in unveiling the imperialist agenda concealed behind the discourse of bringing civilization to barbarians who lack civilization. Within this paradigm, civilization is prescribed and measured solely based on the technological and economic progress of societies (1982, p. 9).

For Uzel, the enduring success of Islamic civilization, which has thrived for 14 centuries and fostered connection among people from diverse traditions across vast geographies, serves as a testament to its profound and inclusive nature (1982, p. 10). However, Uzel mourns the current state of Muslim societies, which, despite historically establishing formidable states and exerting influence over vast territories, have fallen victim to European imperialism since the 19th century. While he acknowledges internal factors contributing to this situation, Uzel assigns a more significant role to the conspiracy of foreign powers in intensifying the situation. Unlike Said, who aims to confront imperialism on a global scale and critiques colonialism in all its manifestations, Uzel focuses solely on the Turkish and Muslim world, which has endured relentless attacks by other civilizations, particularly over the past century and a half. According to Uzel, it is through Said’s work that the intellectual legitimization of this imperialist and colonial world order is laid bare (1982, p. 11).

5. The Hysteresis of Habitus: Discursive Traumas

In Bourdieusian terminology, hysteresis denotes a state in which individuals lack the dispositions necessary to recognize and effectively utilize emerging opportunities. It signifies a deficiency in the tools required to succeed within one’s habitus and field of operation, an inadequacy of competencies and capital essential for success. Bourdieu describes hysteresis as the fundamental mismatch between available opportunities and the dispositions needed to capitalize on them, often resulting in missed opportunities and a reluctance to approach historical crises with new perspectives, even if they are revolutionary (Bourdieu, 1972, p. 173). When mobilizing collective action, it is crucial to consider the individual dispositions and circumstances of each agent, including the habitus hysteresis, as it can impede historical thinking and lead to missed opportunities. It is important to consider the objective alignment of dispositions based on shared objectives. Tyulenev defines Bourdieu’s concept of hysteresis as the extreme incompatibility between an individual’s habitus and the demands of the field (2014, p. 178). The translation process resulting from the pronounced disparity and foreignness between the field presented by Said’s text and Uzel’s predispositions will undoubtedly reflect the profound impact of this gap.

Uzel, deeply steeped in the 8-century-old Mevlevi tradition, was profoundly influenced by its habitus, encompassing everything from its music and literature to its sacred ceremonies. With a Turkish-Islamic cultural background, he possessed a mastery of the French language and culture, enabling him to showcase Sufi music not only in France but in various European countries. He embodied the essence of an intellectual: a musician, translator, and columnist. Uzel’s journey into the Mevlevi lodge commenced during his studies at Galatasaray High School in the 1950s, where like many Mevlevi dervishes, he began playing the *ney*. His passion led him from Istanbul to Konya while still a high school student to participate in the revered *Şeb-i Arus* ceremonies. His enthusiasm at a young age gained the attention of prominent Mevlevi elders, particularly Ney player Ulvi Ergüner, who took him under his wing and served as his mentor. Uzel’s career was initiated on Istanbul radio as a kudümzen , marking the inception of his musical journey. Subsequently, in 1966, he was recruited by TRT as a professional performer and became an esteemed member of the Sufi Ensemble. Despite his significant contributions, Uzel faced criticism, being derogatorily labeled as a “rhythmist,”

⁷ The Islamist media tend to claim that these schools have missionary activities and aim to convert Turkish students to their country’s sympathizers (Erdoğan, 1969, p.18; *Yeniden Milli Mücadele*, 1977, p.4).

a term denoting a musician of lower status who performs tasks deemed less intricate or musically nuanced. However, in the 1970s, he ventured into translation, using his proficiency in French to undertake this endeavor.

Uzel's intellectual and artistic inclinations are deeply influenced by his affiliation with the Mevlevi order (Oğuz, 2019). His source of authorities, including figures such as Mevlana, Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, Islam, Sufi music, Tanpınar, Ahmet Yesevi, Şeyh Galip, Yunus Emre, İtri, Mimar Sinan, and Ahmet Rasim epitomize Uzel's habitus and political perspectives. The reverence he holds for the Turk-Islamic Ottoman heritage reflects his affiliations in Turkish politics during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Conversely, Cumhuriyet Newspaper, Melih Cevdet Anday, Sadeddin Aral, Westernization, Tanzimat writers, and Çetin Altan represent opposing concepts and symbolic figures that Uzel employs to shape his identity. These symbolic figures share a common attribute: they view Western European intellectual and cultural heritage as a superior alternative to the Turkish-Islamic tradition.

Evidently, Said and Uzel inhabit separate fields distinguished by substantial lines not only in habitus but also in *conatus*. They adhere to distinct sets of beliefs, doctrines, and illusions, resulting in a very limited intersectional zone between them. As agents, they possess divergent expectations, presuppositions, modes of thought, linguistic patterns, perspectives, and inherited norms from the movements and ideologies they represent. This disparity is exemplified in the second sentence of Uzel's translation, which highlights the profound differences between their respective frameworks.

Said's methodology is based on the works of theorists such as Vico, Auerbach, Gramsci, Raymond Williams, Althusser, Nietzsche, Freud, and Foucault, whose ideas and propositions are fundamentally at odds with Nezh Uzel's discursive lexicon. This discord has led to significant discursive trauma for Uzel, who is unfamiliar with Said's scholarly theoretical framework. The habitus that shaped Uzel failed to equip him adequately for Said's scholarly theoretical habitus, resulting in a visible hysteresis during the translation process. Özkaya acknowledges Uzel's admission of the challenges he faces, quoting him as saying, "If I had known it would be this difficulty, I would never have undertaken this task." Pınar Publishing House, in response to criticism of the initial translation, commissioned a second translation from Selahattin Ayaz. Uzel's translation began to fail as early as the second sentence of the "Introduction" section.

He was right about the place, of course, so far as a European was concerned. (s. 1)

Pour ce qui est du lieu, il a bien raison, dans la mesure, du moins, où c'est un Européen qui est en cause.⁸ (Malamoud, s. 13)

Yerlilere göre düşünülecek olursa gazeteci haklı idi, ancak o omuzlarının üzerinde bir Avrupalı kafası⁹ taşıyordu.¹⁰ (Uzel, s. 13) Hakkı vardı, özellikle bir Avrupalı olarak.¹¹ (Ayaz, s. 13)

Beirut hakkında haklıydı tabii, hele bir Avrupalı olduğu düşünülürse.¹² (Ülner, s. 11)

Compared to the translations by Ayaz and Ülner, which effectively convey the message of the source text, Uzel's translation exhibited numerous challenges. Aside from failing to capture the essence of the source text, Uzel's rendition introduces problematic elements. For instance, he chooses to employ the expression "European mind" in an essentialist manner, a move borrowed from the repertoire of Islamist discourse. This choice is fundamentally at odds with Said's intentions, as he aimed to critique such stereotyping and overgeneralization.

Moreover, Uzel's translation is marred by frequent errors in word choices, as well as unnecessary additions and deletions. One particularly glaring example of this can be seen below:

Because Orientalism is a cultural and a political fact, then, it *does not exist in some archival vacuum*; (s. 13)

Pisque l'orientalisme est un fait culturel et politique, il n'existe donc pas dans un espace vide, dénué d'archives (Malamoud, s. 25)

Oryantalizm kültürel ve politik bir *varlık* olduğuna göre *arşiv hazinesinden yoksun boş bir alan değildir*.¹³ (Uzel, s. 32)

O halde, Oryantalizm kültürel ve politik bir vakıa olduğu için varlığı bir arşiv boşluğunda değildir.¹⁴ (Ayaz, s. 28)

Şarkiyatçılık, kültürel ve siyasal bir olgu olduğuna göre, yalıtılmış bir belgeler uzamında sürdürmez varlığını;¹⁵ (Ülner, s. 22)

What Said particularly wants to emphasize here is that Orientalism as a discursive academic field does not exist only in documents, in an archival void disconnected from the world, but is much more than that, Orientalism is a cultural and political "fact" and can be understood within these social and historical contexts. However, the concept of "varlık

⁸ Since Uzel translated from an intermediary language, the French translation is given below as well as the English translation.

⁹ "Bu kafa, **Avrupalı kafası** değil, Avrupalının Türk aydınında görmek istediği, her türlü murakabe ve muhasebe gücünden yoksun taklitçi şebek kafasıdır." (Kısakürek, 2014) (This mind is not the European mind, it is the imitator monkey head that Europeans want to see in Turkish intellectuals, devoid of any control and accounting power.) "Kadın kocasının eline bakmayacak, çalışacak" diyenler, Rablerinin huzurunda rezil olacakları sözleri söylemektedirler. "İşçi kadın" isteyenler, sömürgeci **Avrupalı kafası** taşımaktadırlar." (Yıldız, 2017) (Those who say 'a woman will not take care of her husband, she will work' are saying words that will make them humiliated in the presence of their Lord. Those who want "working women" have colonialist **European minds**) All the back-translations are created using <https://translate.google.com/>.

¹⁰ According to the locals, the journalist was right, but he was carrying a European head on his shoulders.

¹¹ He had the right, especially as a European.

¹² He was right about Beirut, of course, especially considering he was a European.

¹³ Since Orientalism is a cultural and political entity, it is not an empty space devoid of archive treasure.

¹⁴ Since Orientalism is a cultural and political phenomenon, its existence does not exist in an archive void.

¹⁵ Since Orientalism is a cultural and political phenomenon, it does not continue its existence in an isolated space of documents;

(being)” used by Uzel is completely different. The word “fait” is also used in the French translation, which is the exact equivalent of the English “fact.” In the French translation, the words “l’existence” or “la creature,” which are equivalent to the word “existence” in Turkish, are excluded. Uzel also made an addition in the same sentence. Although the word “hazine (treasure)” does not appear in either the English or the French translation (le trésor), Uzel added this word next to “archive,” indicating an “emptiness” or “extension” in the sentence, and an abundance, multiplicity. More serious than these, we encounter the mistranslation of concepts that play a theoretically central role.

The exteriority of the representation is always governed by some version of the truism that if the Orient could **represent** itself, it would; **since** it cannot, the **representation** does the job for the West and *faute de mieux* for the poor Orient. “Sie können sich nicht vertreten, sie müssen vertreten werden,” as Marx wrote in The **Eighteenth** Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (s. 21)

L’extériorité de la représentation est toujours gouvernée par une version ou une autre du truisme: si l’Orient pouvait se représenter lui même, il le ferait; puisqu’il ne le peut pas, la représentation fait le travail, pour l’Occident, et, faute de mieux, pour le pauvre Orient. « *Sie können sich nicht vertreten, sie müssen vertreten werden* », comme l’écrit Marx dans le *Dix-huit Brumaire de Louis Bonaparte*. (Malamoud, s. 34-35)

Takdim’i oluşturan itici güç, daima basit gerçeğin şu veya bu şeklindedir. Eğer Doğu kendi kendisini **takdim** edebilseydi her halde sonuç başka türlü olurdu. **Ama** yapamamaktadır. Bu çalışma Batı’lılar tarafından yürütülür ve böylece “**Takdim**” Batı’lıların hesabına çalışır. Doğu böylece daima zarardadır. Marx: **Dixhuit** Brumaire de Louis Bonaparte: Louis Bonaparte’ onsekiz Brumaire’in de. . . bu şu demektir “Kendilerini **takdim** edemiyorlar, **takdim** edilmek zorundalar. . .”¹⁶ (Uzel, s. 46)

It is evident that Uzel misinterpreted the word “representation” as “presentation,” which should be translated as “temsil,” in Turkish as “takdim.” In the source text, the noun “representation” is used 61 times, and the verb “represent” is used 171 times. The erroneous translation of such a crucial word stems from the disparity between the habitus of the author and that of Uzel. Uzel not only overlooks the significance of the concept of “representation” but also provides a consistent translation of the concept of “discourse,” which is a key term in Said’s work. This concept, mentioned 104 times, is sometimes rendered as “anlatım şekli (a form of expression)” (p. 14), sometimes as “hitabet (oratory)” (p. 17, 44), sometimes as “konuşmalar (conversations)” (p. 21), and at times as “form of address” (p. 31). Moreover, the word “discourse” is completely omitted at certain points. It is challenging to explain Uzel’s translation errors solely based on the fact that he translated from an intermediary language. The French translation remains faithful to the original text word for word. In the First Part, which follows the introduction, the translation begins to fail, which is particularly evident in the titles.

The Scope of Orientalism **Knowing the Oriental**

On June 13, 1910, Arthur James Balfour gave a lecture to the *House of Commons* on “the problems with which we must deal in Egypt.” These, he said, “belong to a wholly different category” than those “affecting the Isle of **Wight** or the West Riding of Yorkshire.” He spoke with the authority of a long-time member of Parliament, former private secretary to Lord **Salisbury**, former chief secretary for Ireland, and former secretary for Scotland. former prime minister, and veteran of numerous overseas crises, achievements, and changes. (s. 31)

Le Domaine de l’Orientalisme **Connaître l’Oriental**

Le 13 juin 1910, Arthur James Balfour fit un discours à la **Chambre des Communes** sur « les problèmes que nous avons à résoudre en Egypte ». « Ils ne sont, dit-il, pas du tout de la même espèce que ceux qui touchent l’île de **Wight** ou l’arrondissement ouest du Yorkshire. » Il parlait avec l’autorité d’un homme depuis longtemps membre du Parlement, ancien secrétaire privé de lord **Salisbury**, ancien secrétaire d’État pour l’Irlande, ancien secrétaire d’État pour l’Ecosse, ancien Premier ministre, vétéran de bien des crises, de bien des réalisations et changements en politique étrangère. (Malamoud, s. 45)

Oryantalizmin Alanı¹⁷ **Doğu’yu Tanımak**¹⁸

13 Haziran 1910 günü Arthur James Balfour, **Millet Meclisinde**¹⁹ “Mısır’da çözmek zorunda bulunduğumuz problemler” adı ile bir konuşma yaptı. “**Wight** adasında yahut Yorkshire’in batı yakasında karşılaştığımız meselelerle bunlar aynı karakter taşıyorlar” diyordu. Uzun zaman Parlamento üyeliği yapmış bir insanın ses tonu ile konuşuyordu. Lord **Salisbury**’nin eski özel sekreteri, eski İrlanda bakanı, eski başbakan, her türlü krizin altından kalkmış, devletin dış politikasında söz sahibi bir insan başka türlü olamazdı. . .” (Uzel, s. 59)

¹⁶ The driving force behind the **Presentation** is always some form or other of simple truth. If the East had been able to **present** itself, the outcome would probably have been different. But he can’t. This work is carried out by Westerners, and thus the “**Presentation**” works at the expense of Westerners. Thus, the East is always at a loss. Marx: *Dixhuit Brumaire de Louis Bonaparte*: Louis Bonaparte in his *Eighteenth Brumaire*. . . This means “They cannot present themselves, they have to be presented. . .”

¹⁷ Orientalism’s Domain.

¹⁸ Getting to Know the East.

¹⁹ In the national assembly

As evidenced by the highlighted words above, Uzel not only makes translation errors but also struggles with accurately spelling words and names. Notably, the translator cannot be solely held responsible for these shortcomings. In the Metis translation published in 1999, Beril Eyüboğlu and Orhan Koçak are credited as the editors of the text. However, there is no mention of such editorial support in the 1982 Uzel translation published by Pınar Publications. Similarly, in Pınar's translation by Selahattin Ayaz, such editorial credit is not indicated in the book's title either. In the same paragraph:

In addition, his remarkable social **eminence**, the breadth of his learning and wit—he could write on such varied subjects as Bergson, Handel, **theism, and golf**—his education at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, and his apparent command over imperial affairs all gave **considerable authority to what he told** the Commons in June 1910. (s. 32)

De plus, sa remarquable **supériorité** sociale, l'étendue de ses connaissances et de son intelligence — il pouvait écrire aussi bien sur Bergson que sur Haendel, sur le théisme que sur le golf—, son éducation à Eton et au Trinity College de Cambridge, et son apparente maîtrise des affaires impériales, tout cela donnait la plus grande autorité à sa déclaration aux Communes (Malamoud, s. 45)

Üstelik James Balfour yüksek sosyal **yetenekleri** bilgisinin genişliği, zekasının inceliği ile aynı anda hem Bergson ve hem Haendel hakkında yazı yazabilecek güçte idi. **Ne felsefede ne de siyasette başaramayacağı konu yoktu.** Eton ve Cambridge'in Trinity College'inde edindiği bilgiler daha sonra imparatorluğun işlerini yürütmeye gösterdiği erişilmez başarı, **otoritesinin en yüksek noktalara kadar ulaşmasında kendisine yardımcı olmuşlardı.**²⁰ (Uzel, s. 59-60)

Toplumdaki büyük saygınlığının yanı sıra bilgisinin, zekasının enginliği (Bergson, Handel, teizm ve golf gibi değişik konularda yazabiliyordu) Eton ile Cambridge'de, Trinity Kolejinde okumuşluğu, imparatorluk işlerindeki gözle görülür ustalığı, Haziran 1910'da Avam Kamarasında söylediklerine hatırı sayılır bir **yetkinlik** katıyordu.²¹ (Ülner, s. 42)

Here, Said discusses the sources of authority attributed to Balfour's words, highlights his intellectual interests, skills, his Eton and Cambridge education, and his positions within the highest bureaucracy of the empire, all of which contributed to establishing his authority. The mistranslation of a crucial word, crucial in addressing the chapter's discussion, undermines the transmission of the argument from the outset. Ülner, who was pursuing her doctorate in philosophy at the time of the translation, recognized the critical role this keyword played. Her adeptness in handling such a task, stemming from her habitus, enabled her to consistently and persistently translate the concept accurately every time.

We **know** the civilization of Egypt better than we **know** the civilization of any other country. We **know** it further back; we know it more intimately; we **know** more about it. (s. 32)

Nous **connaissons** mieux la civilisation égyptienne que celle de tout autre pays, nous la connaissons de manière plus intime; nous en **savons** plus sur elle. (Malamoud, s. 46)

Mısır uygarlığını bütün diğer uygarlıklardan daha iyi **tanıyoruz**. Ona diğerlerinden daha **yakınız**. Onun hakkında çok şey **biliyoruz**. (Uzel, s. 60)

Mısır uygarlığını herhangi bir ülkenin uygarlığını **bildiğimizden** daha iyi **biliyoruz**. Tarihini başka ülkelerinkinden daha eski zamanlara dek **takip edebiliyoruz**, daha yakından **tanıyoruz**, hakkında daha çok şey **biliyoruz**. (Ülner, s. 42)

In Uzel's translation, the word "know" from the source text, corresponding to the verb "connaître" in the French text he translated, was rendered as "to recognize" in the chapter title. This choice is significant as the word "know" holds particular importance, especially within the quote from Balfour, given that Said's primary focus in this chapter revolves around the philosophy of knowledge. The repercussions of Uzel's translation from the intermediary French text are undeniable. Conversely, it is evident that the French translation remains faithful and meticulous. Some shortcomings in Uzel's translation can be attributed to the lack of editorial support. The examples provided above underscore the deep disparity between Uzel's and Said's habituses, which significantly affected the resulting translation. Said, having completed his undergraduate and doctorate degrees at prestigious universities like Princeton and Harvard in the United States, and serving as a professor of comparative literature at Columbia University, possessed a profound understanding of social and literary theorists such as Freud, Vico, Hegel, Foucault, Gramsci, Adorno, Derrida, and Bourdieu, among others. He was proficient in using this highly technical jargon. In contrast, Uzel, primarily a musician²² and Sufi, later transitioning into a translator and a columnist as a secondary occupation, did not possess the scholarly mastery of the theories adeptly utilized by Said. Consequently, he encountered significant difficulties conveying Said's specialized terminology and even resorted to omitting certain parts of the text altogether. Due to the vast disparity in their habituses, Uzel employed overgeneralizations that Said would find objectionable in terms of political correctness. While Said was

²⁰ Moreover, James Balfour, with his high social skills, breadth of knowledge, and subtlety of intelligence, had the power to write about both Bergson and Haendel at the same time. **There was no subject he could not achieve, neither in philosophy nor in politics. The knowledge he acquired at Eton and Cambridge's Trinity College later helped him to reach the highest levels of authority** and the unattainable success he showed in managing the affairs of the empire.

²¹ In addition to his great prestige in society, his breadth of knowledge and intelligence (he could write on such diverse subjects as Bergson, Handel, theism and golf), his education at Eton, Cambridge and Trinity College, and his apparent **mastery** of imperial affairs added considerable competence to what he said in the House of Commons in June 1910.

²² Uzel worked mostly in music after high school, played in music programs on the Turkish Radio and Television TRT, gave concerts abroad and took part in album recordings with Kudsi Erguner, a ney player who lived in France.

against generalizations and marginalizations, the translator resorted to a culturalist and essentialist discourse. Moreover, the publication of the translation with such significant errors and deficiencies can be attributed to Pınar Publications' lack of cultural capital to detect and rectify these issues. Consequently, the publishing house could not ignore the criticisms directed toward the translation and subsequently commissioned a second translation from Selahattin Ayaz.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study examined the historical context surrounding the publication of Edward Said's seminal work, *Orientalism* (1978), in Turkish in 1982, and the subsequent impact it had, with a focus on key figures involved in the translation process. Özkaya, the founder and editor-in-chief of Pınar publications, the Islamist movement that influenced him, *National Struggle Again*, *Pınar magazine*, which laid the groundwork for the publishing house, and Cemil Meriç, who contributed significantly to the early development of the publishing house with his cultural and social influence, were analyzed alongside the first translator, Nezih Uzel. Detailed discussions were conducted to elucidate how these actors shaped the translation process and the dynamics of its transfer. Meriç's²³ (1985, p. 92) influential book in Islamist circles, *Bu ülke (This land)* (1985), rejected various "-isms" with particular disdain toward Zionism, imperialism, and communism. While not entirely aligning with an absolutist and oppositional stance, Said's advocacy for the Palestinian cause, his exploration of the connections between imperialism and the discourse of Orientalism, and his skepticism toward overarching narratives such as communism intersect with Pınar's *conatus*²⁴, characterized by what Tyulenev (2014) termed "the father's project." Uzel's translation of *Orientalism* emerged within this intellectual habitus, Pınar's target audience was predisposed to engage with critiques of the West/Christendom versus East/Islam binary, minorng Uzel's familiarity with the esteem of Islamic civilization within French culture, stemming from his education in a foreign system high school, akin to Said and Meriç.

When examining the 1982 edition of Uzel's translation in light of Bourdieu's concept of the "field," it becomes evident that Pınar Publishing viewed the translation of *Orientalism* as a means to gain traction in the cultural battleground to defend their ideological positions. Despite fierce advocacy from Islamist movements for Ottoman Turkish and its lexicon, Pınar chose the title *Oryantalizm (Doğubilim)*, with a pure Turkish explanation in parentheses. Ironically, the leftist publishing house Metis, which ostensibly rejects the Ottoman heritage, boldly opted for "Şarkiyatçılık," a more direct equivalent in old Turkish.²⁵

²³ Though Meriç was quite critical of the Western culture and the people he still had admiration for figures like Balzac, Saint-Simon, Camoens, Vico and Scott among many others, so at times he did not find it easy to identify with the groups who fundamentally rejects all the western values. Meriç, who is between these two poles, states this hybrid identity with these words: "I mean, with my language, my tastes, my excitements, with me, I belong with the *Büyük Doğu*²⁸ (*Grand East*) (1943–1978) crew, to Yön²⁸ (*Direction*) (1960–1967) with my thoughts and beliefs" (Jurnal, 19.11.1964). Meriç, who is also familiar with the Marxist literature on which the left leans, has a status that can be considered a "devshirme," a recruit for these Islamist journals. There are two main tendencies that render Meriç eminent for these journals: First, he preferred the Ottoman Turkish, heavily loaded with Arabic and Persian vocabulary to the modern Turkish word choices that the republican cadres tried to embed in as a part of the efforts of constructing the new national identity, and he waged a committed struggle in this regard; and second, within the same line with the Islamist narrative of the time, he accused republican "westernist" intellectuals of betraying their identity. In addition, Meriç argues that Muslim societies can survive against imperialism only by clinging to Islam. Recruiting an intellectual like Meriç to their own journals and publishing houses is actually the result of a similar vacuum. In this context, Meriç has the status of a translated text within the Islamist discursive repertoire.

²⁴ Bourdieu defines *conatus* as that combination of dispositions and interests associated with a particular class of social position which inclines social agents to strive to reproduce at a constant or an increasing rate the properties constituting their social identity, without even needing to do this deliberately or consciously. (1988: 176)

²⁵ On this choice Özkaya admits that they, as a new publishing house with little cultural and symbolic capital, did not dare to use "Şarkiyatçılık" as the title, even though they wanted to (2019). Özkaya states that they were concerned that they would not be taken seriously enough by intellectual circles and that the readership would be limited to a very small circle. Özkaya reports that they surprised the leftist intelligentsia with such a publication and while they expected some appreciation from these circles, they were criticized for their bravado. In an article published in *Cumhuriyet* (a daily newspaper) about the publication of the book at that time, Özkaya states that the critics were astounded by the publication of a book with such a serious academic weight by Pınar Publications, and they questioned why the publishing house was daring to publish such scholarly works while it would be more appropriate for them to publish catechisms. Upon left's contemptuous reception, Özkaya expresses pride for having done a job that surprises everyone, and resentment for being underestimated in this way.

Peer Review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: Author declared no conflict of interest.

Financial Disclosure: Dokuz Eylül University Department of Scientific Research Projects; Project Number: 2020.KB.SOS.004

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış bağımsız.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazar çıkar çatışması beyan etmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırmalar Projeleri: Proje Numarası: 2020.KB.SOS.004

ORCID IDs of the authors / Yazarların ORCID ID'leri

Atalay Gündüz 0000-0003-0325-5191

REFERENCES / KAYNAKLAR

- Ahmet Mithat (1897-1900). *Nizâ-ı İlm ü Dîn* 1-4. İstanbul: Tercüman-ı Hakikat Matbaası.
- Aydın, M. (2005). Bir Milli İslamcılık Serüveni: Mücadelecilik. M. Gültekinil ve T. Bora (der.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Cilt 6/ İslamcılık*. İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 452-468.
- Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (1990). *Translation*. London: Printer Publishers.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Peter Collier (Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1972). Outline of a Theory of Practice. *Trans. Richard Nice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bora, T. (2016). *Cereyanlar: Türkiye'de Siyasi İdeolojiler*. İstanbul: İletişim yayınları.
- Erdoğan, Y. (1969). Robert Koleji ve Faaliyetleri. *Pınar Aylık Kültür ve Sanat Dergisi*. Y. 9, N. 13, October. pp. 18-19.
- Even-Zohar, I. (2003). Culture Repertoire and Transfer. Susan Petrilli (Ed.). *Translation Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (1997), pp. 425-431.
- Gündüz, A. (2020). *İslamı Çeviriyle Savunmak: Orientalism'in ilk Türkçe Çevirisi (1982) Bourdieci bir Analiz Çalışması*. İstanbul: Kriter.
- İlhan, A. (2002). *Hangi Batı*. Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Kara, İ. (2001) İslamcı Soylemin Kaynakları ve Gerçeklik Değeri Üzerine Birkaç Not. *İslamiyet* IV, sayı 4, pp. 37-53.
- Koçak, O. (2018). *Ataç, Meriç, Caliban, Bandung: Evrensellik ve Kısmilik Üzerine bir Taslak*. İstanbul: Zoomkitap Not Defterleri.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London ve New York: Routledge.
- Mardin, Ş. (2002). Oryantalizmin Hasıraltı Ettiği. *Oryantalizm. Doğu Batı*, pp. 111-115.
- Meriç, C. (1985). *Bu Ülke*. İstanbul: İletişim. (1974).
- . (1977, Şubat). Aydın Denen Meçhul. *Pınar*. 62, 20-24. <http://katalog.idp.org.tr/pdf/4835/8840>. Access: 04.09.2019.
- Milton, J., Bandia P. (2009). Introduction: Agents of Translation and Translation Studies. John Milton ve Paul Bandia (Ed.). *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, p. 1-18.
- Namık Kemal. (1962). *Renan Müdafaaanamesi: İslamiyet ve Maarif*. Yayınlayan: Ord.Prof. M.Fuad Köprülü. Ankara: Milli Kültür Yayınları Dini Kültür Serisi. (1910).
- Ocak, A. Y. (2013). *Türkler, Türkiye ve İslam: Yaklaşım, Yöntem ve Yorum Denemeleri*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Oğuz, A. (2019). Ömrünü Musikiye ve Mevleviliğe Vermişti Nezh Uzel. Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği, Writers Union of Turkey, <https://www.tyb.org.tr/omrunu-musikiye-ve-mevlevilige-vermist-i-nezh-uzel-40192h.htm>. Access: 06.02.2024
- Okay, M.O. (1992). Büyük Doğu, TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, <https://islamansiklopedisi.or.tr/buyuk-dogu> Access: 02.06.2023
- Ortaylı, İ. (2006). *Son İmparatorluk Osmanlı: Osmanlı'yı Yeniden Keşfetmek 2*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Özkaya, C. (May 6, 2011). Pınar Yayınları Nasıl Başladı. Meryem Uçar (Presenter). Access: 19.08.2019 <https://www.dunyabizim.com/soylesi/pinar-yayinlari-nasil-basladi-h6249.html>
- . (2012a, July). Roger Garaudy'nin Ardından. *Umran*. 215, pp. 80-86.
- . (2012b, July). Geçmişten Geleceğe İslamcılık: Cevat Özkaya, Şemseddin Özdemir, Mustafa Tekin ile söyleşi. *Umran*. 215, 64-79.
- . (August 2, 2018). Cevat Özkaya ile Sözlü Tarih Görüşmesi I-II. *İlmi Etüdler Derneği*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6qsmpVTjQwM&t=2448s>. Access: 21.07.2019
- . (2019, 29 Haziran). Uzun Hikaye - Değişen Okur-Yazar ve Yayıncılık Profili. Faruk Aksoy ve Ali Akçıl (Sun.). TVNET.. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ixkPoLYo6Ng> Access: 21.07.2019
- . (2008). Türkiye'nin Ruhu Cemil Meriç. Belgesel.. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OwhyWkxH4-0>. Access: 01.09.2019
- . (1993). *Representations of an Intellectual: Reith Lectures 1993*. http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/rmhttp/radio4/transcripts/1993_reith1.pdf. Access: 04.09.2019.
- . (1995). *Entelektüel: Sürgün, Marjinal, Yabancı*. Tuncay Birkan (Trans.). Ayrıntı, İstanbul. (1993)
- . (1984). *Haberlerin Ağında İslam*. Alev Alatl (Trans.). İstanbul: Pınar. (1981).

- . (1982). *Oryantalizm:(doğubilim); sömürgeciliğin keşif kolu*. Nezi̇h Uzel. (Trans). Pınar Yayınları.
- Süphandađı, İ. (2017). *Batı ve İslam Arasında Oryantlizm*. Ankara: Maarif Mektepleri.
- Şehbenderzade Filibeli Ahmed Hilmi. (1986). Müslümanlara Siyaset Rehberi. Ed. İsmail Kara. *Türkiye’de İslamcılık Düşüncesini 1: Metinler Kişiler*. İstanbul: Dergah. (1912), pp. 78-91.
- Tevfik Fikret. (1911). “Promete”. Behramođlu, A. (Ed.). (1987). *Son Yüzyıl Büyük Türk Şiiri Antolojisi* (Vol. 1). İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınlar.
- Toury, G. (2002). Translation as a Means of Planning and the Planning of Translation: A Theoretical Framework and an Exemplary Case. Saliha Paker (Ed.). *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi U P, pp. 148-165.
- . (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tymoczko, M. (2007). *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester/Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Tyulenev, S. (2014). *Translation and Society: An Introduction*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ungay, R. (2002). Kudüm, TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/kudum>. Access: 06.02.2024
- Uzel, N. (1982). “Sunuş.” Said, E. W. *Oryantalizm:(doğubilim); sömürgeciliğin keşif kolu*. Nezi̇h Uzel. (Trans). Pınar Yayınları. p. 9-12.
- . (1993a). *Her Dem Yeniden*. İstanbul: İrfan.
- . (1993b). *Dersaadet’ten İstanbul’a*. İstanbul: İrfan.
- . (2006). *Radyoda Bir Gün*. İstanbul: Pan.
- Yalçın, A. K. (2019). *Fikriyat ve Eylemlilik Arasında Yeniden Milli Mücadele Hareketi ve Türk Siyasal Hayatına Etkileri*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation.) İstanbul University/Social Sciences Institute: İstanbul.
- Yeniden Milli Mücadele*. (1977). “Robert Kolejli Ecevit ABD Gönüllüsü Mü?” 12 Nisan 1977. 8. Cilt, 375. Sayı, p.4.
- Yenilmez, H. (2015). *II: Meşrutiyet dönemi İslam tarihi yazıcılığında Oryantalizm etkisi (Dozy reddiyeleri örneđi)*. (Unpublished master of art dissertation). Marmara University/Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul.

How to cite this article / Atıf biçimi

Gündüz, A. (2024). Political dynamics of transfer: Said’s Islamist orientalism (1982). İstanbul Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Dergisi - Istanbul University Journal of Translation Studies, 20, 82-92. <https://doi.org/10.26650/iujts.2024.1360531>