Baumanian Perspective on Translation Sociology:
A Non-Essentialist Reading of Orhan Pamuk's *A Strangeness in My Mind* as the Representation of the Other
Çeviri Sosyolojisine Bauman Perspektifinden Bakmak: Orhan Pamuk'un *A Strangeness in My Mind* Çeviri Romanının Öteki'nin Temsili Açısından Özcülük Dışı Bir Okuması

Dudu Özbek 🔲 0000-0003-1113-9000
Sinop University

ABSTRACT

Translation sociology has been constructed and evolved with the contribution of interdisciplinary studies. While drawing on the works of various sociologists, little attention has been paid to the sociology of Zygmunt Bauman to conduct interdisciplinary research in the field of translation studies. This article considers the possibility of adopting Bauman's sociological perspective to understand translational phenomena, particularly through his methodological conceptualization of 'defamiliarization'. Applicability of his theory in translation research was tested in this study through the analysis of the novel *A Strangeness in My Mind* by the Nobel prize winner Turkish writer, Orhan Pamuk. As part of the research in translation sociology, the analyses involved both the agents of the translation process and the textual analysis of the cultural content of the book. The cultural elements in the original novel were detected according to Aixela's (1996) definition of the culture specific items and their translations in *A Strangeness in My Mind* were examined in terms of defamiliarization. Additionally, the translator's and the publisher's approaches to defamiliarization were analyzed using Bourdieu's concept of the 'habitus'. The aim of these analyses was to examine the reflections of defamiliarization in the approaches of the translator and the publishing house as well as in the translated work itself considering that Bauman finds defamiliarization necessary in order to comprehend the ambivalence and the difference of the Other. Results of the study reveal that although the habitus of the publisher aligns with Bauman's approach to defamiliarization, both the translator's habitus and her translation approach indicate dispositions to create a familiarizing effect on the target readers more than defamiliarization.

Introduction

In the humanities, interdisciplinary studies are valuable in the sense that it is very difficult to explain social phenomenon through the tools of one particular discipline since the complex nature of the social contexts require a versatile approach to understand their multifaceted dynamics. After the foundation of translation studies as an autonomous discipline and the 'cultural turn' in the field (see Bassnett and Lefevere 1990), interdisciplinary research has gained more prominence to explore the cultural and social functions of translations. Translation research mainly cooperates with fields

such as literary studies, cultural studies, linguistics, ethnography, philosophy, computer engineering, and sociology. By collaborating with related scientific disciplines, translation studies aim to gain deeper insights into various aspects of the act and theory of translation.

As part of these developments, sociology of translation has been a field of research since the 1990s (Sapiro, 2014). Through such studies in the field of translation sociology, it was possible to investigate various aspects and agents of the translation processes. Interdisciplinary research in the field, particularly helped "to challenge those approaches claiming to hold a monopoly on text comprehension and those sustaining a sociological reduction to external factors" (Wolf, 2010, p.341). In other words, it is not sufficient to focus only on textual or the sociological external factors in order to reveal multidimensional nature of translation. In Wolf's (2010) words, "a sharpened attention to the processuality of translation and its constituencies (sociology of agents, sociology of the translation process, sociology of the cultural product) has opened up an array of research fields which highlight the urgent need to foster interdisciplinary work" (p. 342).

Integrating insights from sociology and translation studies, this interdisciplinary research uses Bauman's sociological perspective to analyze the English translation of Orhan Pamuk's novel, *Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık*. In particular, this article aims to present an interdisciplinary methodological contribution to the ongoing methodological discussions in translation sociology. In this context, Bauman's methodological framework is mainly used to expand the boundaries of translation sociology particularly through his concept of 'defamiliarization' in comprehending the Other.

It should be primarily emphasized that the influence of Bourdieu as a sociologist is undoubtedly observed during the process of constructing a sociology of translation. In the pioneering book, *Constructing a Sociology of Translation* (2007), there is a whole chapter allocated to the influence of Bourdieu in translation studies. In the introduction part of the book, Wolf (2007) emphasizes the crucial role Bourdieu's work has played in the methodological conceptualization of translation sociology. She also mentions that many studies in the field were conducted based on Bourdieu's key concepts like *illusio*, *cultural capital*, and *habitus*. The other scholars that are mentioned as influential in translation sociology, though not as much as Bourdieu, are Latour and Luhmann. Wolf (2007) indicates that Latour's and Luhmann's sociological theories were also tested by the researchers in terms of their applicability to translation studies (pp. 18-22).

Although Zygmunt Bauman is one of the most well-known and influential sociologists in Europe and forms connections between sociology and textual productions to advocate interdisciplinary studies, he has not received much attention from scholars in translation studies. Acknowledging such a prospect of relevance, this study is an attempt to form a bridge between his theoretical discussions and the research areas in translation sociology.

Bauman's work is, indeed, cross-disciplinary and amenable to conduct research in various fields including translation studies. In relation to the ambivalent and hybrid nature of Bauman's theoretical approach, Jacobsen and Poder (2008) state that "by mixing sociology with literary sources and poetic formulations such as metaphors, Bauman dissolves clear-cut divisions between the different realms of human knowledge and exposes a more lenient attitude towards how to conduct and report sociological knowledge" (p.8). To clarify Bauman's hybrid methodological perspective, Jacobsen and Marshman (2008) cite one of his interviews with Maaretta Jaukkuri, during which he explains his interdisciplinary attitude towards sociology and literature/art. In that interview, Bauman states that "there is a striking similarity between the sociological and the artistic vocations. They operate on the same ground, they feed from the same table; hence one would expect them to be engaged in some sort of 'sibling rivalry', but also to complement, correct and inspire each other and learn from each other" (p.19). Thus, as Vecchi (2004) puts it, "Zygmunt Bauman has often been defined as an eclectic sociologist, and he would certainly take no offence at such a definition"

(p.2).

In order to reveal Bauman's sociological thought in that respect and adopt it to explore the sociological aspects of the translation practices, his theoretical formulations will be used in this research to analyze the English translation of Orhan Pamuk's novel, *Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık* which was published with the title *A Strangeness in My Mind* in English. In the following parts of the article, first, some information is provided about the representation of the Other in the novel and then, its translation into English is analyzed in terms of Bauman's theoretical conceptualization of "defamiliarization."

Identification of the Other in *A Strangeness in My Mind* from a Non-Essentialist Perspective

When the novel *A Strangeness in My Mind* (2015) is considered overall, it is clearly noticed that the story is deeply connected to the story of Istanbul, which has undergone strong changes and transformations since the 1960s. While describing these transformations of the city in the background, it tells the events in the life of boza and yoghurt seller character, Mevlut Karataş. Just as it is stated in the epigraph of the book, the novel is about "the adventures, and dreams of Mevlut Karataş, a seller of boza, and of his friends, and also a portrait of life in Istanbul between 1969 and 2012 from many different points of view" (Pamuk, 2015).

As mentioned in the epigraph, the novel presents different time periods of Istanbul from various political and sociological perspectives. The underlying orientation of the novel as the subtext is the sociological evolution and social problems of Istanbul in the last 50 years until the 2010s and these problems are mostly based on the documentary research and observation of the author, himself. As Pamuk mentions in various interviews, it took him six years to write this novel since he collected data about the distant parts of the city, about the outsiders, and the life of the poor by conducting interviews with the meat-ball sellers, mussel sellers, etc. to learn about their lives and experiences. In this sense, Pamuk indicates that the book has a realistic and sociological character like a documentary (Milliyet Sanat, 2014; Özdemir, 2015).[1] This documentary character of the book is emphasized by Karal (2017) as "the novel is one of the literary sources for the sociology of literature and urban sociology in terms of its themes about the increase in urban slums and urban struggles as it is based on realistic sociological data" (p. 159).

From this point of view, *A Strangeness in My Mind* has a different character compared to Pamuk's earlier books. It is observed that since the publication of his first book, Orhan Pamuk has mainly told stories taking place in the central parts of Istanbul where usually wealthy people live. In his first book, *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları/Cevdet Bey and His Sons*, he depicted a three generational picture of a wealthy family living in Nişantaşı, which is a central district inhabited by wealthy Istanbulites. In that book, Pamuk reflected on the lifestyles and the transformations of these people during the early modernization periods of the Turkish Republic. Similarly, *Kara Kitap/ The Black Book* is concerned with Istanbul as the main setting and the districts in which the events take place are prosperous neighborhoods like Nişantaşı, Beyoğlu and Teşvikiye. Pamuk's other well-known book, *The Museum of Innocence*, is set in Istanbul during the end of the 1970s and again the characters are members of the secular, westernized social classes living in the upscale, central parts of the city. As a consequence, it is evident that growing up and living in Nişantaşı and Cihangir, has had a personal influence on Pamuk's choice of themes and settings for his novels. That is a significant issue in relation to how the Nobel-prize winner author presents Istanbul to the readers in different parts of

---

[1] See the following videos for the interviews with Orhan Pamuk about his book, *Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık/ A Strangeness in My Mind*: Milliyet Sanat. (2014) *Orhan Pamuk Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık'ı anlatıyor.* Retrieved from https:// www. youtube.com/watch?v=nOYTwl-lULM and Özdemir, C. (2015) *5N1K Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık.* Kanal D Arşiv. Retrieved from https:// www. youtube. com/watch?v=h1c-23BQe-8.

the world, particularly the West.

Contrary to such settings and the characters in his earlier novels, while writing *A Strangeness in My Mind*, Pamuk turned his face to the outer parts of the city and looked from the perspectives of the poor and the working classes. The events in the novel mainly take place in two fictional neighborhoods, Kültepe and Duttepe, which represent the slums of Istanbul. In Karal's (2017) words, "*A Strangeness in My Mind* is a novel which involves the people of the slums, the Alevis, the Kurds, the women, the street vendors; that is, the 'others' of Istanbul" (p. 159). In a similar vein, Güngör (2015) mentions that, in this book, Pamuk describes Turkey's social formation by shifting his focus to impoverished neighborhoods or districts (p. 125). Consequently, the novel can be read not only as a search for a compromise between different parts of Istanbul so that they can exist together but also as a reconciliation of Orhan Pamuk's career as a Turkish writer with the remote parts of Istanbul and with their residents.

In fact, in one of his interviews, Pamuk, himself, mentions this issue frankly by stating that he is not familiar with this face of Istanbul and the experiences of the people living in the outer suburbs of the city. He admits that he had to collect information and make observations in order to understand life in such places and to adopt these people's points of view while writing *A Strangeness in My Mind* (Özdemir, 2015).[2] Accordingly, it would not be wrong to state that this novel is the novel of 'a reconciliation with the Other' in a variety of aspects.

In relation to these representations of the Other, it is clearly observed that the novel draws a picture of the differences and main causes of the social clashes in Turkey (Budak, 2015; Genç, 2020; Karal, 2017; Kula, 2016). It bears many forms of the conflicts between self and the other or clashes between different groups and identities in the society occurring as *us* vs. *them*. These oppositions and differences can be summarized as the *secular/Islamıst*, *East/West*, *modern/traditional*, *urban/suburb*, *Alevis/Sunnis*, *leftists/nationalists*, etc. A list of these binary oppositions which reflect how the book is based on the issue of the Other and difference is demonstrated in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Binary oppositions and distinctions indicated in *A Strangeness in My Mind* (2015)

Binary oppositions and distinctions mentioned in the book		Page numbers for reference to the binary opposition
East	West	453, 490
Turkey	Europe	256
Village	Town	45-62 , 94
Westernized Seculars	Islamist Conservatives	341
Sunni	Alevi	124, 158, 466, 491
Maliki Sunnis	Hanafi Sunnis	124
Ottoman	Republican	31
Kültepe	Duttepe	139, 141
Rayiha (The girl Mevlut married)	Samiha (The girl Mevlut actually fell in love and to whom he wrote love letters at the beginning)	12, 488, 494, 508, 520-523, 669-673

---

[2] See the video for the interview: Özdemir, C. (2015) *5N1K Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık.* Kanal D Arşiv. Retrieved from https:// www. youtube. com/watch?v=h1c-23BQe-8.

Aktaş (Whitestone) family	Karataş (Blackstone) family	52
Houses of devout families who perform daily prayers and leave their shoes outside	Houses of rich and westernized families where you can go in with your shoes on	25
European men	Turkish men	387
European girls	Turkish girls	109
Women wearing headscarves	Women not wearing headscarves like the ones in the European movies	78
Children of decent families who always sit in the front rows of the class	Poorer boys sitting in the back rows of the class	90
Lifestyle of the people from the western cities like İzmir or from the cities in Central Anatolia like Konya	Lifestyle of the people from the eastern parts of Turkey like Bingöl	156
Children of the civil servants, doctors and lawyers who live in modern and European style apartments	Children of the families who immigrated from the Anatolian cities and who live in the slums of the new quarters of Istanbul	92
Nationalists	Leftists-socialists	142
Pro-Moscow socialists	Maoists	149
Motherland coffeehouse in Duttepe which is attended mostly by the nationalists	Homeland coffeehouse in Kültepe which is visited mostly by the leftists	142
Public view a person declares	Private thoughts	169, 427, 469, 519, 585
Civil marriage	Religious marriage	253, 255
Pro-Soviet factions in left-wing clubs	Pro-China factions in left-wing clubs	292
'Family room' in some restaurants which is reserved for women and the families only	Floors of the restaurants which are open to all customers	308
Haremlik (Private parts of the Ottoman palaces & the houses for women and the children)	Selamlik (Rooms in the Ottoman houses reserved for men or used for hosting the guests)	309
Book of nationalistic names from Central Asia	Handbook of Modern Baby Names	309
Bathroom families use in their houses which the servants are not allowed to use	Small servants' bathroom that the cleaning lady shares with the cat or dog of the house	364

Public appearances	Private motivations	382
Turkish style music (*alaturka*)	European style music (*alafranga*)	22, 385
Conservative, old neighborhoods across the Golden Horn like Çarşamba in Fatih	Stylish and more modern neighborhoods of Istanbul like Nişantaşı in Şişli	436, 437
Ottoman calligraphy	New Latin alphabet	452
Adopting the western values	Keeping the national values	490
Realm of the real world	The other realm of the spiritual	492
Public intentions	Private intentions	609
What our heart intends	What our words intend	611
Supporters of the secular Republican People's Party in the migrants' association	Conservative members of the migrants' association	646
Intentions	Actions	651
New neighborhoods beyond the old city walls/ Outside the city	Old neighborhoods in the city center / Inner city areas	653
Gangs from Mardin trying to hold control of the markets in Beyoğlu	Gangs from Diyarbakır active in the territory of Tarlabaşı in Beyoğlu	662
Court literature	Folk literature	717

As can be seen in Table 1, it is obvious that there are 'others' mentioned in the novel which include their own 'others'. For instance, outer neighborhoods which are represented with Kültepe and Duttepe are distinct from the central and upscale districts of the city like Nişantaşı. These are the two poles that constitute what we call the Other in many respects such as prevalent lifestyles, social practices and beliefs of the residents. However, there are distinctions between Kültepe and Duttepe as well. They are different from each other in terms of the political orientations, religious practices and the hometown of the people living in these two places (Pamuk, 2015, p.142). Thus, it is clear that the two parties constituting the Other reciprocally are not homogeneous in themselves and Pamuk illustrates this interwoven and fluid character of the Other well in the novel. In this respect, all the examples that are listed in Table 1, indicate that Pamuk takes on a postmodern, non-essentialist approach while revealing the dynamics of the culture and the society he writes about.

At this point, it would be useful to mention postmodern, non-essentialist approaches in intercultural studies as a background to analyze how the novel handles the issue of representing the Other with reference to the sociology of Bauman as well.

For modernist and essentialist approaches in cultural studies, "there is a universal essence, homogeneity and unity in a particular culture" (Holliday *et al*., 2004, p. 2). In line with the modernist perspective, cultural groups were regarded as grounded in the nation and the nation-states. Not surprisingly, this holistic approach produces cultural stereotypes while describing other cultures like one simple society with fixed cultural and social patterns. Non-essentialist approaches, on the other hand, emphasize "the complexity of culture as a fluid, creative social force which binds different groupings and aspects of behavior in different ways, both constructing and constructed by

people in a piecemeal fashion to produce myriad combinations and configurations" (Holliday *et al.*, 2004, p.3). What is significantly distinct in this approach is "the multifacetedness of Other people and societies" (Holliday *et al.*, 2004, p. 7).

Such a non-essentialist approach to the phenomenon of the Other and the organization of the societies is very well reflected in the works of Bauman. In *Thinking Sociologically*, Bauman and May (1990/2019) identify the fluid, non-essentialist nature of the social groups by stating that "although often characterized by similar language and customs, they are also divided in their beliefs and practices" (p. 30). In other words, there are many variables for the individuals in different communities to relate with or to reject as the Other. As a result, in today's world, it is difficult to imagine societies as single, homogeneous entities. Undoubtedly, every society is complex and culturally varied. Schalk (2011) mentions this variety within the societies as following:

> When one enters a room s/he doesn't just notice races, but also gender, age, ability and a variety of other identifiers which affect our perception of others. And furthermore, when one enters a room of people with whom one is acquainted, one is able to recognize and assess multiple visible and non-visible identities of those individuals as well. It is not that every black person most identifies with every other black person, but that when in contact and communication with others, people are making constant calculations of their relatedness with others, or lack thereof. (p. 200)

With regard to this discussion in terms of the nature of the social identifications, it is possible to conclude that the representation of the Other in the book, *A Strangeness in My Mind*, is compatible with the non-essentialist, postmodern views of culture beyond stereotypical nation-state definitions since it displays social dynamics of Istanbul with all its varieties, conflicts and various social identities it bears. The novel reflects this view through the plot, underlying themes, settings, and various identities of the characters, which are exemplified in Table 1 above. Considering the novel's culturally loaded context, an analysis of the translator's decisions reveals how effectively this multidimensional perspective is reflected in the target text. Such an analysis illustrates if the translation approach aligns with the perspective in the novel in terms of the representation of the Other. The analysis will be conducted by using one of Bauman's theoretical conceptualizations, namely, "*defamiliarization*."

Defamiliarization as a Strategy to Comprehend the Other

Zygmunt Bauman's personal life experiences during the political, economic and social turmoil in Europe situate him in an ambivalent social position "as a thinker who at various times and in various places has been cast as a stranger *ante portas*, in, but not of, the West" (Palmer, 2023, p. 3). These experiences of him, especially as an exile for many years, enabled him to critically question the fixed categories of modernity and its uniform social systems. From an 'outsider' perspective, Bauman criticized the modern societies of the West in terms of classifying people as the Other and he searched for the possibility of managing the '*art of living together*' which was actually a part of European cultural heritage (Palmer, 2023, p. 177).

It is obvious in his works that the issue of the Other constitutes a large part of Bauman's sociology. According to Bauman and May (1990/2019), "we come to know ourselves through others via symbolic communication. Language is the medium through which we speak, but also how we hear ourselves and evaluate our actions and utterances according to the responses of others" (p.20). In consequence, communication with others helps us to understand ourselves and form our social identities. It largely determines how we form our relation with the world and give meaning to it. Particularly, it is noticeable that "our ability to make distinctions and divisions within the world includes those between "us" and "them" (Bauman & May, 1990/2019, p. 29).

The divisions between "us" and "them" take different forms in the societies. Social groups are formed based on similar social identities and this results in an exclusion of the others who do not share these. Actually, there is a dialectical relationship between self and the Other, and between "us" and "them." In Bauman's words (1990/2019), "these opposites are inseparable, for there cannot be one without the other. They sediment our map of the world on two poles of what can be an antagonistic relationship. Such fixities in assumptions render the groups "real" to their respective members and provides for the inner unity and coherence they are taken to possess" (Bauman & May, 1990/2019, p. 29).

This positioning of the self and the groups as "us" and "them" within the specific societies are usually based on certain differences like political views, religion, class, etc. In other cases, the divisions can be based on larger groups such as countries, cultures or nationalities. In-groups and out-groups within a particular society are usually visible by looking at the social spaces these people use in their everyday lives. Modern cities are full of examples for such differences between the social spaces. As Bauman (1997) indicates, "in the postmodern city, the strangers mean one thing to those for whom 'no-go area' (the 'mean streets', the 'rough districts') means 'I won't go in', and those to whom 'no go' means 'I can't go out'" (p. 28).

Similarly, in the book *Other Colours*, Orhan Pamuk (2007) discusses this situation in modern cities. In the chapter entitled "No Entry", he centers on a sign saying 'No Entry' on the street, and opens up a discussion related to the 'no-go areas' which divide people who have the privilege to pass through the door and who do not. Inevitably, the discussion of the barriers that take people apart as "us" vs. "them" turns into a question of identity. It appears that the people on the other side of the door represent "all those who oppose those virtues which they have assigned themselves. However, they now define themselves, the people outside are their opposite. It could even be said that they are only able to define themselves by saying what they are that the people outside their door are not" (Pamuk, 2007, p. 186).

As a result of this process, the outsiders also start to form their identities in opposition to the others that are inside. Pamuk (2007) states that "now, it has become important for him to know who, and what, he is. He must establish an identity that rejects all that the arrogant insiders stand for" (p.187). Relatedly, Bauman (1998) explains how this feeling of rejection turns into a vicious cycle between the rejected identities and the people who reject as "rejection and exclusion are humiliating and meant to be such; they are meant to result in the rejected/excluded accepting their social imperfection and inferiority" (p. 126).

Considering these points about the various aspects of the Other, what can be the solution for realizing the 'art of living together' despite such differences? For Bauman, 'defamiliarization' is an answer to that question. According to him, for opening the ways to gain insight of what the other is, such a defamiliarization process is necessary to develop. The responsibility of the sociologist, specifically, is therefore "to 'defamiliarize the familiar' because familiarity may hamper and hinder inquisitiveness and the impetus to innovate and transform" (Jacobsen & Poder, 2008, p. 3). In this sense, by defining defamiliarization as one of the responsibilities of the scholars in the field of sociology, Bauman frames a methodological perspective for the researchers to conduct sociological research.

While explaining the concept of defamiliarization as a methodological framework to analyze social phenomena and to foster understanding between different social groups and identities, Bauman (1982) rests on the idea that there is a historical tendency "to absorb and accommodate new experience into the familiar picture of the world; habitual categories are the main tools of this absorption. New experience does not fit the categories easily" (p. 192). Thus, trying to fit new experiences into our familiar categories, in other words, trying to replace what is different in the

existence of the Other with our familiar concepts, prevents us from appreciating the true nature of the world around us. Consequently, it is claimed that "defamiliarization shatters the impenetrable walls of common sense that prevents us from experiencing and understanding the world anew" (Jacobsen & Poder, 2008, p. 4).

Defamiliarization is, therefore, required to get out of the comfort zone of what is familiar in an attempt to reach more comprehension of the Other. For Bauman, that is particularly crucial in today's postmodern cities as "strangers are part of the social order, they will not disappear neither through pragmatic statements nor by wishful thinking" (Månsson, 2008, p. 157). Defamiliarization process is directly linked to "the right of the Other to his strangerhood" (Bauman, 1991, p. 236). Its most obvious benefit is that "it opens up new and previously unsuspected possibilities of living one's life with more self-awareness, understanding of others, and comprehension of our surroundings in terms of greater knowledge" (Bauman &May 1990/2019, p. 9).

Within this framework, it is possible to think about the question of how the methodological conceptualization of defamiliarization can be used to analyze translations as "'inventions' or 'constructions' of the 'Other'" (Wolf, 2007, p. 3). In other words, how can translation be used as a tool to '*defamilarize the familiar*'? In order to answer this question, it is helpful to discuss how translations can be utilized differently either to familiarize the Other which exists in the original text or to defamiliarize it. This is specifically crucial considering that "translations of literary works are often regarded as a relevant source for learning about the culture in which they were originally produced" (Sapiro, 2014, p. 88).

Analysis of *A Strangeness in My Mind* in terms of Defamiliarization through Translation

Historically, discussion of the translations in relation to the representation of the Other or the foreign essence of the original texts has been carried out around the question of how to convey the unfamiliar aspects of the source text to the target readers. Schleiermacher (1813/1992), Nida (1964), Newmark (1988), Venuti (1995), and Toury (1995) are the scholars who put particular emphasis on different strategies to convey the unfamiliar content of the original text to translations. With the help of these discussions, it became possible to reveal the relationship between the prevalent translation strategies used during the translation process and the approach adopted by the translator to represent the foreign essence of the Other which already exists in the original text.

Related to this discussion, scholars such as Venuti (1992, 1995), Appiah (1993/2004), and Spivak (1992/2004) obviously advocated an approach which is widely known as foreignization later in the field. In general terms, these scholars are in favor of keeping the foreign essence of the original text in translation. For instance, Venuti (1992, 1995) is fiercely against domestication as he views that "domesticating" translation serves the Anglo-American cultural hegemony by assimilating the cultural difference of the original text for the sake of fluency. He suggests that "foreignizing translation seeks to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation, it is highly desirable today, a strategic cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs, pitched against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others" (Venuti, 1995, p. 20).

Similarly, Spivak (1992/2004) claims that the translator should 'surrender' to the source text and reveal its original rhetorical aspect since translation is "a simple miming of the responsibility to the trace of the other in the self" (p.397). However, according to Spivak (1992/2004), translators mostly do not adopt this approach in translation as they choose the easier and safer way of the logic and the systematic structure of the languages. Through domesticating strategies, they ignore the rhetoricity of the original and usually for the sake of convenience, they transfer bodies of meaning and produce texts which are safe but at the same time, the same.

As for Appiah (1993/2004), translation creates an opportunity and a challenge for us to face the difference and show a genuine respect for the others. Like Venuti and Spivak, he favors the autonomy of the Other in translation. To achieve this, Appiah (1993/2004) suggests 'thick translation' as a translation methodology which is based on providing annotations and glosses with the aim of locating "the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context" (p. 427).

In line with the proposals of such scholars in translation studies, Bauman puts forward defamiliarization in sociology as a procedure for comprehending the Other. For him, it is only through defamiliarization that the ambivalent and foreign essence of the Other can be noticed in social relations. While describing how difference of the Other is lost in familiarization processes, Bauman (1982) asserts that "in order to be reduced to the familiar and therefore 'understandable', its protruding edges must be trimmed, its uncustomary colours dulled, and everything genuinely novel must be explained away or dismissed as an aberration" (p. 192). With these words, Bauman displays a very similar approach to Venuti, Spivak and Appiah in relation to the risks of domestication in the social representations of the Other. He clearly expresses that "if all these 'domesticating' expedients have been successful, much of the truly unprecedented quality of the new experience may have passed unnoticed for a considerable time" (Bauman, 1982, p. 192).

Bearing such a similarity in these approaches, it is significant to note that Bauman particularly underlines the social dynamics in his conceptualization of the idea of defamiliarization. Thus, there is an emphasis on the sociological aspect of the term in Bauman's understanding. From such a perspective, it is possible to evaluate how far the translations provide the readers with an opportunity to face the Other through defamiliarization in a social sense by conducting research which involve various agents of the translation process as well as the translated text itself. In order to shed light on the possibility of adopting Bauman's concept in studying translational phenomena, an analysis of *A Strangeness in My Mind* is carried out in terms of its capacity for defamiliarization. It is assumed that this analysis yields interesting results as to the representation of the Other for the readers of the book in English.

Methodology

Since interdisciplinary research in translation sociology requires investigations more than solely text-based analyses, the present study evaluates *A Strangeness in My Mind* in terms of its capacity for defamiliarization based on the sociology of the agents in the translation process and the representation of the cultural content in the translated book.

In order to reveal the dynamics that could be influential on the translation approach of the translator in terms of defamiliarization, the analyses firstly involve an investigation of the translator's and the publisher's habitus based on the conceptualization of Bourdieu. The term 'habitus' in Bourdieu's sociology is defined as "a system of *dispositions*, that is of permanent manners of being, seeing, acting and thinking, or a system of *long-lasting* (rather than permanent) schemes or schemata or structures of perception, conception and action" (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 43). To elaborate on this definition, it can be suggested that 'habitus' indicates internalized attitudes and characteristics which shape the perceptions and actions of individuals in a particular field. The skills and capacities that underlie how individuals interact with the world and how they behave in certain manners are predisposed by their habitus, a collective condition resulting from a lengthy process of socialization.

In the field of translation sociology, one application of the term 'habitus' as a methodological concept is to reveal how the habitus of the translator can be influential on the translation process (Gouanvic, 2010; Simeoni, 1998). In such studies, familial or educational backgrounds as well as world views of the translators are studied as their habitus in order to investigate the relationship between the translation process and the habitus as a social variable. Furthermore, the term 'habitus'

is not restricted to the human agents like translators. As Philpotts (2012) mentions, "a literary journal is characterized by what we can identify as its own 'common habitus', the defining ethos which unites the members of its 'nucleus' and which acts as 'a unifying and generative principle' for their cultural practice" (p. 42). Thus, it is possible to conduct research on the editorial habitus of a journal or habitus of a publishing company as a socio-cultural institution which has varying dispositions in the field. Publishers compete with each other and act depending on their aims, values and institutional history which collectively form their action schemes or habitus while deciding which books to choose for translation and how to introduce them to the readers. Consequently, grounded on this theoretical framework, this study conducts analyses of both the translator's and the publisher's habitus in order to reach conclusions related to defamiliarization potential of the translated book *A Strangeness in My Mind* for the target readers.

In addition to these analyses, the present study involves textual analysis of the cultural content of the novel in terms of defamiliarization. This analysis is based on the translation of the culture specific items (CSIs) in the book. These items were detected for examination according to Aixela's (1996) definition. Aixela (1996) defines culture specific item (CSI) as the expression in the source text which "poses a translation problem due to the nonexistence or to the different value (whether determined by ideology, usage, frequency, etc.) of the given item in the target language culture" (Aixela, 1996, p. 57). Based on this definition, after collecting data in relation to the CSIs in the original book, their translations were examined in terms of the strategies proposed by Aixela (1996). The translation strategies that were used for these items in the target text were found to be *repetition*, *linguistic (non-cultural) translation* (using the target language version of the item), *orthographic adaptation* (adapting the item to the alphabet or spelling norms of the target language), *naturalization* (substitution with a similar item in the target culture), *absolute universalization* (substitution with a general/neutral item), *intratextual gloss* (providing in-text explanation) and *deletion*. With the analysis of these translation strategies used for the CSIs in the translated book, it was aimed to reach more insights in relation to the defamiliarization opportunities the target readers are provided with.

In consequence, through the analyses and evaluation of the translator's habitus, the publisher's habitus and the translation of the CSIs in the book, this study aims to find answers to the following research questions:

1. "What kind of a translation approach in terms of defamiliarization is reflected in the English translation of Orhan Pamuk's novel 'Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık' considering the translator's habitus?"
2. "Does the publisher's habitus, in the case of the English translation of "Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık", reveal a tendency to encourage defamiliarization through its publishing strategies?
3. "To what extent do the translation strategies used for the translation of the CSIs provide opportunities for the target readers to defamiliarize and face the Other represented in the original book?"

With the purpose of finding answers to these research questions, in the following parts of the study, first, the translator's and the publisher's habitus will be examined in terms of Bauman's concept of defamiliarization. After these analyses, translation of the CSIs will be analyzed with respect to the defamiliarizing potential of the cultural content for the target readers who encounter the Other through translation.

Translator's Habitus in terms of Defamiliarization

As a start for the analysis, the translator's habitus which is a crucial factor that has an impact on the translator's attitude towards the translation process is discussed in order to evaluate the capacity of the translation in terms of providing the target readers with the possibilities of defamiliarizing and comprehending the Other in the source culture.

Such an analysis on the translator's habitus involves a biography of the translator in terms of his/her familial, educational and intellectual background as well as his/her experience in the field of translation. According to Wolf (2010), research on the biographies of translators and interpreters is one of the fields that are "partly under-researched and/or under-theorized" (p. 337) Similarly, for Sapiro (2014), a significant research question might be related to how the social characteristics of translation agents affect their translation approaches. She believes that these characteristics are incorporated in Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus'. In Sapiro's (2014) words, "these agents' beliefs and practices, as well as their strategies, are informed, first, by their habitus, i.e. their cultural and ethical disposition and the kind of resources they possess (economic, cultural, and social capital) according to their family background, education, and social trajectory" (p. 84). As a consequence, it is claimed that translational actions of the translators are not independent of their habitus; hence, it is a significant social factor that is worth researching for revealing the underlying aspects of the translation processes.

In order to discuss the influence of the habitus of the translator on his/her approach to defamiliarization, personal history of the translator, his/her beliefs, social circle, educational, familial, intellectual background and his/her experience as a translator are investigated in this part of the study. It is believed that the habitus of the translator is significant since creating opportunities for the target readers to defamiliarize what is new, requires having a considerable command of the source culture and its prevalent rhetorical forms.

Following the translation process, *A Strangeness in My Mind* was published in 2015 by Faber& Faber as the English translation of Orhan Pamuk's *Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık* which is originally in Turkish. It was translated into English by Ekin Oklap. According to the biography on the publisher's web site[3], the translator of the book, Ekin Oklap was born in Turkey but she grew up in Italy and she currently lives in London. In an interview with Vanwesenbeeck (2017), Oklap mentions that she was born in Turkey but her family moved to Italy when she was two years old and she went to an international school where she received English medium education. After that, she moved to England for university and she has been living there since then. In another interview which was conducted by Canseven (2016) about the translation process of the book, Oklap states that she knows English better than Turkish. This information is valuable in the sense that such a situation can be influential on her decisions about defamiliarization as reflecting the foreign essence of the book requires to be highly knowledgeable about the source culture and its language use.

Furthermore, in terms of Oklap's experience as a translator, it is noted that this translation is considered Oklap's first full-length book translation. After the translation of *A Strangeness in My Mind*, she translated other books by Orhan Pamuk but she was not experienced as a translator before she translated this book. In her interview with Vanwesenbeeck (2017), Oklap mentions this situation by stating that she started her journey as a translator only a few years ago by translating the catalog Orhan Pamuk wrote for his museum, which was published with the name *The Innocence of Objects* in 2012. Other than this catalogue of Pamuk's museum, Oklap did not have any published translations until the publication of *A Strangeness in My Mind.*

With respect to the translation approach, on the other hand, Ekin Oklap favors producing a fluent text in the target language which can be read easily by the readers. In her interview with Canseven (2016), she states that she prefers translated texts to be read as if they were written in the target language. In this sense, she finds it natural to be invisible as the translator of the book. She reinforces this idea by mentioning that although the role of the translator is crucial, the most important part of the process is the story and the text, itself. She suggests that the readers of the novel usually talk

---

[3] See the biography of the translator on the publisher's web site: Faber. (2021). Ekin Oklap. Retrieved from https://www.faber.co.uk/author/ekin-oklap

about its story. When she reads the reviews about the book, for instance, she takes it as a positive response if they do not mention the translation or the translator (Canseven, 2016).

This attitude of the translator is also observed related to the use of the footnotes, annotations and glosses in the translated text. As in Appiah's (1993/2004) thick translation, such strategies are usually used by the translators to provide the readers with the cultural and linguistic context of the source text in a more detailed way. When the translation of the novel is examined in terms of such strategies, it is observed that the translator did not use any of these strategies throughout the translation. During the interview with Canseven (2016), Oklap explains this approach by stating that she did not prefer using translator's notes in her translation as she believes that some of the unfamiliar expressions can be explained within the text and strategies like using footnotes would not be practical for the translation of the book.

Given these points about the profile and the attitude of the translator, it is concluded that the translator opted for producing a comprehensible and fluent text for the target readers who read the book in English. In her interview with Canseven (2016), Oklap states that at the beginning, Orhan Pamuk was searching for a translator for his book and Oklap recommended herself as the translator. This indicates that it was Orhan Pamuk who chose the translator for his book. In addition, Oklap mentions in the same interview that they had a close cooperation with Pamuk during the translation process. Consequently, it can be concluded that Orhan Pamuk also supported Oklap's translation approach favoring comprehension and fluency in the target language over the visibility of the translator in the text. As the scholars like Venuti, Spivak and Appiah indicate, such an approach usually results in a more familiar text to the readers and this decreases the opportunities for the target readers to defamiliarize and face the difference already existing in the Other.

Publisher's Habitus in terms of Defamiliarization

Just like the other agents of the translation processes such as the translator, the publisher or the editor, publishing companies are characterized by their own ethos, underlying beliefs and principles, all of which constitute their habitus. Being socio-cultural institutions, publishing companies act as active agents in their own right to participate in the cultural field to acquire economic and symbolic capital. Bourdieu (1996) describes the habitus of the gallery directors and publishers as a unique form of habitus, and their roles are termed as 'double personages'. They serve as intermediaries between the aesthetic/intellectual domain and the commercial domain and these domains usually operate in opposing dispositions (p. 216). As a consequence, in the literary field, publishers have both economic dispositions and intellectual dispositions, both of which contribute to their habitus and determine their actions.

When the habitus of the publisher of *A Strangeness in My Mind* is examined, it is firstly noticed that the firm, Faber& Faber, has a long history in the publishing industry. Founded in 1929 in Britain, it has published works of reputable writers including T. S. Eliot, Ted Hughes, Harold Pinter, Sylvia Plath, Samuel Beckett, and Kazuo Ishiguro. It also publishes works of contemporary writers such as Sally Rooney and Max Porter. Publications of the company involve fiction, non-fiction, poetry and drama. It also promotes translated fiction of various authors in world literature including Orhan Pamuk, Natsuko Imamura, Lucas Rijneveld and Leila Slimani.

Based on this information, it is suggested that Faber& Faber has particular intellectual dispositions in addition to its economic inclinations. When the official website of the publisher[4] is examined, it can be seen that its intellectual dispositions are emphasized more than the commercial ones. The publisher specifically underlines its pride in publishing classical literary works of the foremost

---

[4] For more information about the publisher, visit the following web site: Faber (2021) About Us. Retrieved from https://www.faber.co.uk/

figures in the literary field. On the timeline of the history of Faber & Faber, it emphasizes the fact that during the 1930s when James Joyce's *Ulysses* was banned in the country, it published Stuart Gilbert's study on the novel, which contained very long quotations from the original book to introduce it to the readers. Faber &Faber also highlights that it is an independent publishing house and it has Faber Academy to assist novice writers from all over the world through workshops, courses, mentoring, etc.

Another significant fact in terms of the publisher's approach to defamiliarization is that it has a specific plan to enhance diversity in its organization and to create an environment which is free of bias. According to this plan which is described on its official website, members of Faber "believe in championing equality, in challenging discrimination of any form and in supporting one another to advocate for fairness. Our goal is for Faber to be an organization that is free of bias and open to all" (Faber, 2021). This statement is crucial in comprehending the publisher's habitus in terms of its attitude towards defamiliarization. As part of this diversity action plan, the publishing company aims to follow a five-step program to promote empathy, awareness of others and tolerance for the differences.

All this data related to the habitus of the publisher indicate that the company has highly intellectual dispositions in its actions and it adopts an encouraging approach towards promoting defamiliarization in its attempts to represent the Other and show respect for cultural and individual differences.

Cultural Content of Translation in terms of Defamiliarization

In this part of the analysis, translation strategies used for the culture specific items in the book are examined in terms of defamiliarization. To begin with, culture specific item (CSI) is defined as the expression in the source text which creates a difficulty in translation as it does not have an equivalent term or has different implications in the target language (Aixela,1996, p. 57). These items are significant since analysis of their translation may yield results in relation to the representation of the Other and the opportunities given to the readers to comprehend the cultural differences through defamiliarization. Sapiro (2014) points out this relation as "the gap between languages is also a source of enrichment for critical thought, since it can force us to compare not only two linguistic systems but also two cultural systems, and subsequently to relativize our own categories of thinking" (p.90). In other words, translations provide the readers with the opportunity to face different cultural systems and their way of thinking, which eventually facilitate developing a critical perspective towards difference. In this vein, analyses of the representation of the source culture in *A Strangeness in My Mind* is crucial in this study in order to determine the extent the translated book facilitates defamiliarization for the target readers.

As a start for the analysis, when the novel *Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık* was examined as the original book, a total number of 435 CSIs of the source culture was detected depending on every different type, which means that the recurrent items with the same translation strategy were not counted. This total list of the CSIs also excludes the proper nouns for ordinary people and places like Mevlut or Nişantaşı. Thus, the items included in this part of the analysis are mainly the common nouns and the well-known brands which are specific to the source culture.

After compiling the list of the CSIs in the original book, all the strategies that were used for the translation of these CSIs in the translated book were listed next to the items. On the whole, the strategies that were documented involved 'repetition', 'using the target language version', 'adapting the item to the alphabet or spelling norms of the target language', 'substitution with a similar item in the target culture', 'substitution with a more general/neutral item', 'in-text explanation' and 'deletion'. These are what Aixela (1996) calls 'repetition', 'linguistic (non-cultural) translation', 'orthographic adaptation', 'naturalization', 'absolute universalization', 'intratextual gloss' and

'deletion', respectively. It was noted that strategies of 'extratextual gloss', 'synonymy', 'limited universalization' and 'autonomous creation', which take place in Aixela's (1996) original categorization, were not used for the translation of the CSIs by the translator of the book.

In addition, to test the reliability of the research, both the list of the CSIs and the categorization of their translations into the translation strategies were subjected to inter-coder agreement. According to Geisler & Swarts (2019), inter-coder agreement is "a measure of the extent to which coders assign the same codes to the same set of data" (p. 160). By determining the agreement rate for listing and categorizing the data into the strategies, it was aimed to reach an 'inter-coder reliability percentage' at the end of the process. This number gives the percentage of the agreements and is found by dividing the total number of coding decisions by the number of agreements (Geisler & Swarts, 2019, p. 160). For a high reliability rate, the result is expected to be above 90% (Neuendorf, 2002). Accordingly, in this study, two experts in the fields of literature and translation studies took part in the process of coding the CSIs in the list and the categorization of the items in terms of the translation strategies. As a result of the process, the agreement rate was found to be 97% for the list of the CSIs and 98% for the categorization of the items into the translation strategies.

As to the translation of 435 CSIs detected in the book, it is firstly noticeable that a large number of these items were translated through familiarization strategies for the readers in order to ease their comprehension. Other than very few items that were translated as they are such as "rakı", "ayran", "boza", "yogurt", "bulgur", "baklava", "sunni", "alevi", "yenge", "hafız", "imam" and "muezzin", most of the CSIs were translated either by using similar words in target culture instead of them or by providing explanations in the text to familiarize the readers with these items. Oklap explains this situation in her interview with Canseven (2016) as an answer to the question about why she retained some cultural items in Turkish in italics. She mentioned clearly that actually she did not want to use them as they are in Turkish. She wanted to use English equivalents for the cultural items whenever possible. The idea behind leaving these words as they are, was their familiarity to the readers. As an example, she translated the word "rakı" as it is in Turkish since she believed that the readers would already know what it is. However, she stated that she translated the dessert "tavukgöğsü" with its description like *shredded-chicken blancmange* without using the original word. She explained that if she left the word in italics in Turkish, the readers would not understand it at all and it would be difficult for the target readers even to read it. Thus, it can be concluded that the translator of the book aimed to achieve familiarity, comprehension and fluency in the translation of the CSIs more than achieving defamiliarization. Table 2 below illustrates how the translator applied her translation approach in practice by demonstrating the distribution of the CSIs (excluding the proper nouns for ordinary people and places) in the novel in terms of the translation strategies proposed by Aixela (1996).

Table 2. Translation Strategies Used for the CSIs in *A Strangeness in My Mind* (2015) Based on Aixela's (1996) Categorization Model

TRANSLATION STRATEGY	NUMBER OF THE TRANSLATION STRATEGIES USED FOR THE CSIs*
Repetition (Retaining the item as it is)	33
Linguistic (non-cultural) translation (Using the target language version of the item)	76
Orthographic adaptation (adapting the item to the alphabet or spelling norms of the target language)	8
Naturalization	217

(Substitution with a similar item in the target culture)	
Limited universalization (Using a less specific item which is closer to the target readers' cultural background)	-
Absolute universalization (Substitution with a general/neutral item)	22
Synonymy (using a synonym or a parallel reference in the target text for stylistic reasons)	-
Intratextual gloss (providing in-text explanation)	62
Extratextual gloss (providing explanation of the item in the form of footnotes, endnotes, etc.)	-
Deletion	17
Autonomous creation (adding an item or extra information to the target text which is non-existent in the source text)	-
TOTAL	435

*The numbers do not involve the strategies used for the proper nouns for ordinary people and places

In the detailed analysis of the results, Table 2 shows that 33 CSIs were retained in their original forms. and these are mostly the items that the target readers are presumably familiar with. Among 435 items in the book, 12 of them are potentially familiar to the target readers, such as "rakı" and "boza.". In addition, 21 well-known brands of the source culture were also translated by using this strategy of repetition. These brands included *Çamlıca chewing gum*, *Tamek tomato ketchup*, *Yeni Harman cigarettes*, *Arçelik three-wheelers*, *Lux soap*, *Tipitip chewing gum*, *Golden chocolate bars*, *Flinta ice-cream*, *Filiz tea*, *Samsun cigarette*, *Maltepe cigarette*, *Murat cars*, *a pack of Bafras*, etc.

On the other hand, a large number of the other culturally loaded items were predominantly translated with strategies which would not hinder readers' comprehension and the text's fluency. It was found out that 217 items were translated by the substitution of the CSI with a similar item belonging to the target culture. In Aixela's (1996) model, this strategy is called naturalization. By way of illustration, translation of the different entertainment places is discussed through examples from the source text (ST) and the target text (TT) below:

Table 3. Examples about the use of naturalization for the translation of the CSIs related to entertainment places

	ST	TT
Example 1	"On beş yıl önce, 1970'lerin sonunda Beyoğlu'nun arka sokaklarında müzikli salaş **gazinolar, pavyonlar** ve yarı gizli randevuevleri hala açıkken oralarda gece yarısına kadar satış yapabiliyordu Mevlut" (Pamuk, 2014, p. 29)	"Fifteen years ago, toward the end of the 1970s, when the area's ramshackle **cabaret bars** and **nightclubs** and half-hidden brothels were still in business, Mevlut was able to make sales in the backstreets until as late as midnight" (Pamuk, 2015, p. 22, translated by Oklap)
Example 2	"Satıcı giremez" diye **meyhanelerden, gazinolardan** pek çok kereler uzaklaştırıldık" (Pamuk, 2014, p. 90)	"Many times we were turned away from **bars** and **nightclubs** with the old 'No vendors allowed'" (Pamuk, 2015, p. 120, translated by Oklap)

It is noticeable in the excerpts that the translator preferred to use *cabaret bar* for "gazino", and *nightclub* for "pavyon" in example 1 and she used *nightclub* for "gazino" and *bar* for "meyhane" in example 2. It seems that she did not differentiate between these places while translating the items as she used *nightclub* as a familiar item in the target culture both for "gazino" and "pavyon" in the source culture. Throughout the book, it was observed that the translator used *nightclub* or *club* for "pavyon" and *bar* for "meyhane" although these do not represent the same entertainment places in the two cultures. Since the original book reflects the major events, places and lifestyles of the people in Istanbul during a particular time period, it is actually significant to display their understanding of entertainment in the translation as well. Accordingly, in the following examples in Table 4, it is seen that the translator replaced the items related to food and drink with more familiar items in the target culture:

Table 4. Examples about the use of naturalization for the translation of the CSIs related to food and drink

	ST	TT
Example 1	"Ona hediye olarak **elma şekeri** al" (Pamuk, 2014, p.149)	"You should send her a **lollipop"** (Pamuk, 2015, p. 219, translated by Oklap)
Example 2	"... sonra annesinin çantaya özenle yerleştirdiği **gözlemesini** yerdi" (Pamuk, 2014, p. 51)	"... while eating the **wrap** his mother had dutifully packed for him" (Pamuk, 2015, p. 55, translated by Oklap)

In the examples in Table 4 above, it is seen that the translator used similar items in the target language to translate "elma şekeri" and "gözleme" in the source text. Although *lollipop* and *wrap* are similar to these, they do not convey the real meaning of the items in the source culture. Thus, it is seen that the translator prefers to use familiar items to increase comprehension of the text. In many other cases, too, she adopts this strategy of replacing the words with more familiar items. For instance, she translated "tarhana" as *homemade soup powder*; "dolmuş" as *taxi*; "aşiret" as *clan*; "kahya" as *assistant*; "muhallebi" as *pudding*; "cacık" as *yogurt*; "çörek" as *biscuits*; "mesnevi" as *ode*; "değnekçi" as *valet*; "mezeci" as *restaurant*, "tombalacı" as *lottery-ticket seller*, etc.

In addition to naturalization, the translator employed absolute universalization-a strategy involving the use of general and neutral terms-for the translation of 22 CSIs. She replaced these CSIs with more general and neutral items which would be more comprehensible and familiar to the target readers. An example of this strategy can be seen below:

Table 5. Example about the use of absolute universalization for the translation of the CSIs

	ST	TT
Example	"... babası onu Kasımpaşa'da ahşap bir evdeki bir **şeyhe** götürüp okuyup üfletti" (Pamuk, 2014, p. 56)	"his father took him to a **holy man** in a wooden house in Kasımpaşa who said a few prayers and breathed a blessing over Mevlut" (Pamuk, 2015, p.65, translated by Oklap)

Example in Table 5 above illustrates that the translator used the general item *holy man* to translate the word "şeyh". In other words, instead of using the specific word "şeyh", she used a general item *holy man* to describe the term. She used this strategy in the translation of "Aygaz" as *butane*; "Spor Toto" as *sports betting*; "Arap sabunu" as *soap*; "çoban salata" as *tomato salad*; "kaşar peyniri" as *cheese*; "Fatiha" as *a few prayers*, etc.

Furthermore, it was detected that 62 CSIs were translated with an in-text explanation for the target

readers. In Aixela's (1996) terms, this strategy is called 'intratextual gloss'. An example for the use of this strategy in the translated book is indicated below:

Table 6. Example about the use of intratextual gloss for the translation of the CSIs

	ST	TT
Example	"… Karaköy'deki, yalnızca **güllaç** ve **aşure** satacak bir dükkan tanıtılıyordu" (Pamuk, 2014, p.317)	"…a place in Karaköy selling **rosewater and milk-soaked Ramadan pastry** and *aşure*, **the traditional pudding of fruits and nuts**" (Pamuk, 2015, p. 490, translated by Oklap)

As seen in the example in Table 6 above, the items "güllaç" and "aşure" pose a translation problem for the translator and she chooses to translate them by explaining what they are. In the case of "güllaç", she only describes the dessert and while translating "aşure", she adds the original name of the dessert as well as its description. In both cases, she aims to increase the comprehension and familiarity of the items to the target readers. The translator used this strategy mostly for the names of the food and drink and the specific places selling these. As another example, she translated the word "kuruyemişçi" with its description in the text as *the shop that sold nuts and sunflower seeds*.

Other than these, 76 CSIs out of the total number of 435, were translated with their versions in the target language and this strategy is called linguistic (non-cultural) translation. For instance, the translation of the game "okey" as *rummikub*, "Ramazan" as *Ramadan*, "yeniçeri" as *janissary* and the translation of the name of the political group "ülkücüler" with their well-known names in the west as *Grey Wolves* are examples of this strategy. Furthermore, 8 CSIs that were detected in the original book were found to be translated by using orthographic adaptation in the target text. Examples of this strategy include the translation of "hacı" as *hadji* and "şiş kebap" as *shish kebab*. As these examples suggest, this strategy refers to the adaptation of the item to the morphological or phonological system of the target language.

Additionally, it was found out that 17 CSIs were totally deleted in the translation process and were not reflected in the translated text at all. It was observed that most of these items were specific ways of addressing people in the source culture like "abi" and the names of certain leftist political organizations or workers' unions like the leftist police union "Pol-Der."

As a final remark, it is significant to note that the translator did not use any footnotes or glossaries for the explanation of the CSIs, a strategy which would typically be classified as extratextual gloss. There were no instances of synonymy, limited universalization and autonomous creation as well. In addition to these, translation of the word "gecekondu" was interesting on its own. Throughout the translation, it was translated in 15 different ways including *a house in one of those slums, a gecekondu, a slum house, gecekondu homes, unregistered houses, homes built overnight, illegal home, poor neighborhoods, gecekondu building, impoverished neighborhoods, ramshackle, gecekondu houses*, etc. Due to such diversity in its translation, this word was not included in the total number of the CSIs and was examined separately.

Based on this analysis, it is revealed that the CSIs which were detected in the original novel as common nouns and well-known brands that are considered to be unfamiliar to the target readers, were predominantly translated through familiarizing strategies in the translated text.

On the other hand, as to the proper nouns for ordinary people such as Mevlut, Vediha, Rayiha and for the public places like Şişli, Beyoğlu, Tarlabaşı, Harbiye, Fatih, Erzincan, Beyşehir, Konya, etc., it was found out that they were all translated with their original names except a few cases. In these few cases, it was observed that the translator added the literal meaning of the items next to them

like translating "Buzludere" as "Buzludere, Icy Creek" or translating "Kültepe" as "Kültepe, Ash Hill". Additionally, for a few items, she added an explanation next to the proper noun such as translating the name "Bozkurt" as "Bozkurt (named after the legendary Grey Wolf that saved the Turks)". Other than these, all of the proper names for ordinary people and places that were found out in the original book were translated by repeating their original names in Turkish.

As a consequence of these findings, it is possible to claim that in line with the translator's approach, unfamiliar items to the target readers were largely translated through familiarizing strategies which decrease the readers' opportunities to defamiliarize and to face the Other through translation. Defamiliarizing effect of the translation was mainly observed in the translation of the names of the characters and the places belonging to the source culture.

Conclusion

The above analysis of Orhan Pamuk's *A Strangeness in My Mind* reveals how the sociological perspective of Bauman is applicable in translation research. Through Bauman's concept of defamiliarization, it is possible to evaluate translations as a means of representing the difference of the Other to the target readers. In this sense, this study is the first to use Bauman's sociology in analyzing translational phenomena. As interdisciplinary research, the study involved both textual analyses and sociological evaluation of the translation agents' habitus, particularly in relation to 'defamiliarization'.

When Bauman's sociology is considered, it is evident that he puts great emphasis on understanding the complex and multidimensional nature of the modern societies. For Bauman, the Other is ambivalent and we should accept its difference without excluding or familiarizing it. Through the present analysis, it is evidenced that such a non-essentialist view of representing the Other is well reflected by Pamuk particularly with the plot, settings and backgrounds of the characters in his novel, *A Strangeness in My Mind*. The novel presents the Turkish culture with a dynamic view of representing its social groups and its ongoing social construction as well as the conflicts among different identifications in it.

A similar approach is observed when the habitus of the publisher of the book, *A Strangeness in My Mind* is investigated. The analysis of the publisher's habitus proved that the publishing company had an ethos to promote cultural diversity in its actions in the literary field. Interestingly though, it is found out that this view is not reflected in the translation process of the novel. Regarding the analysis of the translation approach adopted and the cultural elements in the translated text, it is clear that the translator opted for a familiarizing effect on the readers more than defamiliarization. Indeed, since translation is a kind of Other for the target readers, they are expected to find ambivalence in it and accept its difference as Bauman suggests. That is especially true for the culture specific words and the rhetoric of the book. However, the analysis of the translators' habitus, her translation approach and the translation strategies that were used for the culture specific items revealed that the translator tried to produce a comprehensible, fluent text for the target readers more than providing opportunities for them to defamiliarize themselves to comprehend the Other. Through the analysis of the translator's habitus and her translation approach which was indicated by herself in the interviews, it was identified that she was more concerned with conveying the story of the novel in a fluent manner than creating a defamiliarizing effect on the target readers.

In consequence, this study shows that translations have various sociological functions that can only be comprehensively analyzed through interdisciplinary research. It has been significant more than ever in today's multicultural societies to face the ambivalent and unfamiliar nature of the Other. This increases the need for the societies to facilitate the 'art of living together' in Bauman's terms. Undoubtedly, translations have such a potential to promote cultural awareness and respect for the differences beyond merely conveying stories to different parts of the world. Through studies on the

different aspects of the translation processes such as various sociological functions of the translation agents and the cultural content of the translated texts, it can be possible to reveal the position of translations in fostering cultural reconciliation. Further studies utilizing Bauman's various sociological concepts in analyzing such functions of translations will certainly expand the horizons of translation sociology as a field of translation studies.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

References

Aixelá, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Álvarez and M. C. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion* (pp. 52-78). Multilingual.

Appiah, K. A. (2004). Thick translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 417-429). Routledge. (Original work published 1993)

Bauman, Z. (1982). *Memories of class.* Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bauman, Z., & May, T. (2019). *Thinking sociologically*. Wiley Blackwell. (Original work published 1990)

Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and ambivalence*. Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (1997). *Postmodernity and its discontents*. New York University Press.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. Polity Press.

Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (1990). Introduction: Proust's grandmother and the thousand and one nights: the 'cultural turn' in translation studies. In S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Translation, History and Culture* (pp. 1-13). Pinter.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art: genesis and structure of the literary field* (S. Emanuel, Trans.). Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). Habitus. In J. Hillier and E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A Sense of Place* (pp. 43-49). Routledge.

Budak, A. (2015). Orhan Pamuk'un 'Kafamda bir tuhaflık' romanı'nda yerellik ve geleneksellik. *Yeni Fikir Dergisi*, *7*(15), 69-90.

Canseven, C. (2016, May 12). *Orhan Pamuk çevirmen arıyordu, kendimi önerdim*. K24. Retrieved 29 March, 2024, from https://t24.com.tr/k24/yazi/ekin-oklap,705

Faber. (2021). *Diversity action plan*. Retrieved 10 February, 2025, from https://www.faber.co.uk/about-faber/social-responsibility/diversity-inclusion

Geisler, C., & Swarts, J. (2019). *Coding streams of language*. The WAC Clearinghouse/ University Press of Colorado.

Genç, H. N. (2020). Orhan Pamuk'un 'Kafamda bir tuhaflık' adlı romanını çatışma ve göç kültürü modeli bağlamında okumak. *Folklor/Edebiyat*, *26*(101), 1-21.

Gouanvic, J. (2010). Outline of a sociology of translation informed by the ideas of Pierre Bourdieu. *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, 2, 119-129.

Güngör, B. (2015). Öteki İstanbul'un anlatısı: 'Kafamda bir tuhaflık' adlı romanın yapısalcı metodoloji ışığında çözümlenmesi. *Journal of Turkology*, *25*(1), 119-141.

Holliday, A., Hyde, M., & Kullman, J. (2004). *Intercultural communication*. Routledge.

Jacobsen, M., & Poder, P. (2008). Introduction: the sociology of Zygmunt Bauman – challenges and

critique. In M. Jacobsen and P. Poder (Eds.), *The Sociology of Zygmunt Bauman* (pp. 1-15). Ashgate Publishing.

Jacobsen, M., & Marshman, S. (2008). Bauman on metaphors – a harbinger of humanistic hybrid sociology. In M. Jacobsen and P. Poder (Eds.), *The Sociology of Zygmunt Bauman* (pp. 19-39). Ashgate Publishing.

Karal, S. (2017). Orhan Pamuk'un Kafamda Bir Tuhaflık adlı romanında gecekondulaşma ve toplumsal mücadeleler. *Sosyologca. 7*(13-14), 156-170.

Kula, O. (2016). 'Kafamda bir tuhaflık' romanında sosyal-siyasal ayrımlaşmanın anlatılaştırımı. *Folklor/Edebiyat*, *22*(88), 9-22.

Månsson, N. (2008). Bauman on strangers– unwanted peculiarities. In M. Jacobsen and P. Poder (Eds.), *The Sociology of Zygmunt Bauman* (pp. 155-171). Ashgate Publishing.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Sage Publication.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. E.J. Brill.

Palmer, J. (2023). *Zygmunt Bauman and the west: a sociology of intellectual exile*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Pamuk, O. (2007). *Other colours*. Faber and Faber.

Pamuk, O. (2014): *Kafamda bir tuhaflık*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Pamuk, O. (2015): *A strangeness in my mind* (E. Oklap, Trans.). Faber and Faber. (Original work published 2014)

Philpotts, M. (2012). The role of the periodical editor. *The Modern Language Review*, *107* (1), 39-64.

Sapiro, G. (2014). The sociology of translation. In S. Bermann and C. Porter (Eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 82-94). Wiley Blackwell.

Schalk, S. (2011). Self, other and other-self: going beyond the self/other binary in contemporary consciousness. *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology. 2*(1), 197-210.

Schleiermacher, F. (1992): On the different methods of translating (W. Bartscht, Trans.). In R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (Eds.), *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 36-54). The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1813).

Simeoni, D. (1998). The pivotal status of the translator's habitus. *Target. 10* (1), 1–39.

Spivak, G. (2004). The politics of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 397-416). Routledge. (Original work published 1992).

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.

Vanwesenbeeck, I. (2017). *Translating into familiarity: a conversation with Ekin Oklap*. World Literature Today. Retrieved 29 March, 2024, from https://www.worldliteraturetoday.org/blog /translation/ translating-familiarity-conversation-ekin-oklap-iclal-vanwesenbeeck

Vecchi, B. (2004). Introduction. In Z. Bauman and B. Vecchi (Eds.), *Identity: conversations with Benedetto Vecchi* (pp.1-8). Polity Press.

Venuti, L. (1992). *Rethinking translation: discourse, subjectivity, ideology*. Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: a history of translation*. Routledge.

Wolf, M. (2007). Introduction: the emergence of a sociology of translation. In M. Wolf and A. Fukari (Eds.), *Constructing a sociology of translation* (pp.1-36). John Benjamins Publishing.

Wolf, M. (2010). Sociology of translation. In Y. Gambier and L. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (pp. 337-343). John Benjamins Publishing Company.