transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

Modernization *by* Translation, Modernization *in* Translation: From *Hace-i Evvel* to Bot Poet – An INTRA Case

Aslı KALEM BAKKAL* and Nilüfer ALİMEN**

The aim of this paper is to discuss the poetry of Deniz Yılmaz, the bot poet, within the framework of translation studies (TS). Yılmaz's poetry was modeled on the corpus consisting of 12,000 Turkish poems compiled by Bager Akbay, the commissioner. In this study, Yılmaz is taken not only as a poet but also as a poet-translator and her/his poetry as intralingual translation (INTRA) as Yılmaz produces Turkish poems by learning from and modeling existing Turkish poems. The aim in embarking on a study that 'dares to' compare a robot which 'dares to' become a poet, in the field of TS under the title of INTRA, is to set the ground for future discussions on to what extent 'we'—those who have a say in the literary system in general and in the field of TS in specific, in the world in general and in the Turkish culture in specific—can buy in what modernization in translation brings. The article argues that such conceptualization might lead to new perspectives on the relationship between translation and cultural change, ownership of artworks, the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on the way writing is conceived, and the emergence of robots as agents of literature that shape cultural and literary repertoires.
Keywords: bot poet; poet-translator; intralingual translation; modernization; Deniz Yılmaz

1. Introduction

Translations, both interlingual and intralingual, have always served their host culture in their way to modernization, and Turkey is one of the best examples in this respect. Translation has played a major role in various eras of Turkey, marked by the efforts of modernization from the Tanzimat era to the first years of the Republic. Modernization defined differently in those different eras has led to conflicting views among political milieus and agents, and translation, together with all its norms from "initial" to "preliminary" and "operational" ones as Gideon Toury (2012, 79–92) differentiated, has been shaped according to those definitions. Modernization has sometimes been seen as equal to 'total' Westernization, and at other times, it has referred to turning to the essence of one's own culture, as opposed to becoming Western,

* PhDc and instructor at Istanbul 29 Mayıs University.
E-mail: aslibakkal71@gmail.com; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3952-1394.
** Assistant professor at Istanbul 29 Mayıs University.
E-mail: nalimen@29mayis.edu.tr; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1993-8918.
(Received 15 June 2022; accepted 5 December 2022)

depending on the dominant political movement of the time.[1] Whether named acculturation, Westernization, modernization, or contemporaneity, translation has always played a crucial role in the forming of Turkish culture and thus nation.

The intralingual translation (INTRA)[2] is worth a special emphasis within this framework. Although it was never named as such in the first years of the Turkish Republic—and actually it is an issue of hot debate still today[3]—INTRA has been an intensively used tool, especially after the introduction of the Latin alphabet in 1928, to increase the literacy rate of the nation.[4] This position held by INTRA in the modernization movements of Turkey has received a well-deserved attention from numerous scholars in the field of translation studies (TS) (see footnote 4).

This study aims to contribute to the related literature by studying a very specific case of INTRA. The case will be analyzed by comparing its similarities and differences in various respects with its predecessors, which are considered to be the exemplary ones of their eras. The paper starts with the main difference: All its predecessors claimed to bring a novelty in their time, and this novelty was mostly a response, a reaction to or simply a result of some political/ideological environment. What this case claims to bring and to 'be' is again a novelty, but a technological one, in the age of artificial intelligence (AI).

2. Who Is This Bot Poet?

Her/his name is Deniz Yılmaz. "Who am I to decide on the gender of the robot?"[5] says the 'commissioner' Bager Akbay in the YouTube video titled "Bager Akbay – Robot Şair: Deniz Yılmaz" (Bager Akbay – Robot poet: Deniz Yılmaz), hence neither 'he' nor 'she' is used to refer to the robot poet, but 's/he.' The gender can be said to be an 'average,' so are the name and the face. 'Deniz' being "the most common unisex name with normal distribution in Turkey"

---

[1] For further information on the role of translation in the modernization of Turkey, see Berk Albachten 1999; Tahir Gürçağlar 2008; Güzelyürek 2002; Korucu 2007.
[2] Henceforth, the phrase will be interchanged with 'INTRA,' a term used by Karen Korning Zethsen and Aage Hill-Madsen (2016).
[3] For information and discussion on INTRA, see Karas 2016; Mossop 2016; Zethsen 2009; Zethsen and Hill-Madsen 2016; on INTRA in Turkish, see Baydere and Karadağ 2019; Berk Albachten 2005, 2013, 2014, 2015; Canlı 2018, 2019; Canseven 2017; Kalem Bakkal 2019a, 2019b; Karadağ 2017, 2019.
[4] It is our belief that transliteration itself is a type of translation.
[5] All translations into English belong to the authors unless otherwise stated.

has been combined with 'Yılmaz,' "the most common surname in the country."[6] Yılmaz has also the average face of the people who published their poems (commonly labelled as '*Posta* poets') in *Posta* newspaper.

Figure 1. Picture of Deniz Yılmaz[7]

Introduced by the commissioner as a "naive robot" in the above mentioned video (10:59), Yılmaz is taken not only as a poet in this study, but as a poet-translator—'poet' because this is the way s/he is presented and 'translator' because in this study her/his work is taken as an INTRA as s/he writes poetry by learning from the already published poems, which is conceptualized in this study as her/his 'source-text.'

3. The Aim of the Bot Poet-Translator

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk defined modernization as "raising our national culture above the level of contemporary civilization" in 1933.[8] Based on this definition, the creation of a bot poet-translator can be taken as an attempt at keeping up with AI technology. In the world of the twenty-first century where the AI rules, a young Turkish man, Akbay says: "I wrote a software. This software is a software that read 12,000 Turkish poems written throughout the history, by

---

[6] "İlk aklıma gelen Mehmet Yılmaz'dı. . . . En yaygın isim ve soyad. . . . Ben kimim ya, robotun cinsiyetine karar veriyorum. O yüzden Deniz Yılmaz'a geldim. *Unisex* olarak Türkiye'de düzgün dağılımlı en yaygın isim Deniz." "Bager Akbay – Robot Şair: Deniz Yılmaz" (Bager Akbay – Robot poet: Deniz Yılmaz), YouTube video, 16:38, posted by "smartcon Conferences," November, 17, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3x-RFINdiAs&feature=youtu.be (04:03–04:18).

[7] Available at Instagram page "@sairdenizyilmaz," accessed June 3, 2022, https://www.instagram.com/sairdenizyilmaz/?hl=en.

[8] "Milli kültürümüzü muasır medeniyet seviyesinin üstüne çıkaracağız." "10. Yıl Nutku" (10th year speech), *T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı*, accessed June 3, 2022, https://www.ktb.gov.tr/TR-96294/10-yil-nutku.html.

a host of poets ranging from Bâki to Nef'î to our contemporary poets including Nâzım Hikmet as well as Orhan Gencebay, and it tried to write poetry like them." [9]

Looking from this perspective, it would not be an exaggeration to argue that at least in the field of AI, technological developments have been closely followed and even challenged by some people raised in this culture. Looking from another perspective, the aim of the bot remains primarily 'individualistic': "The objective of Deniz Yılmaz was to show up in the popular poetry corner of a widely read popular newspaper."[10] It is obvious that the 'personal' nature of the robot's aim differs to a great extent from the socio-cultural aim targeted by the modernization movement in the newly founded Republic; and approaching the issue from the perspective of differences may also remind one of the differences in the 'definitions of modernization,' as mentioned before.

Modernization, as "a process during which societies become more and more distinct and centralized" (Mardin 1991, 25),[11] was often used as a synonym of Westernization, both in the Ottoman period and later, in the first decades of the Turkish Republic. This approach that "emerged in the Ottoman Empire and gained new dimensions in Republican Turkey" and that "sees Western Europe's social and intellectual combination as a target to be reached" "has been used to name the approach of those who wanted to take the West as a model in every respect"[12] (9). On the other hand, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar draws attention to the split between westernizers as to the "civilization in two different senses," namely "technical and 'real'" (Lewis 1961, 230 quoted in Tahir Gürçağlar 2008, 61). This split idea of civilization is reflected in two schools of thought, namely the "Wholist" (ibid., 62) who sees Westernization as a whole package and the "Partialist" (ibid.) who wants to adopt "western science and technology while rejecting its cultural and moral basis" (Tunaya 1999, 79 quoted in ibid.). Ziya Gökalp, "the founder of the Turkish movement" brought another dimension to this "partialist debate" by making an

---

[9] "Bir yazılım yazdım. Bu yazılım 12.000 tane Türkçe şiiri tarih boyunca yazılmış, Baki'den Nef'i'den tutun da günümüz şairlerine kadar, Nâzım Hikmet de var Orhan Gencebay da var, bir sürü şiir yazan kişinin şiirlerini okuyup onlar gibi şiir yazmaya çalışan bir yazılım." "Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Yeryüzleri | 7. Bölüm" (Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Earth faces | Episode 7), YouTube video, 13:07, posted by "TRT 2," May, 15, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9bXJzXd_uo (03:35).

[10] "Deniz Yılmaz'ın hedefi, çok okunan popüler bir gazetenin popüler bir şiir köşesinde çıkmasıydı." "Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Yeryüzleri | 7. Bölüm" (Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Earth faces | Episode 7), YouTube video, 13:07, posted by "TRT 2," May, 15, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9bXJzXd_uo (07:42).

[11] "Modernleşme, toplumların aynı zamanda gittikçe farklılaştıkları ve merkezileştikleri bir süreçtir."

[12] "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda başlayıp Cumhuriyet Türkiyesi'nde yeni boyutlar kazanan, Batı Avrupa'nın toplumsal ve fikirsel bileşimini erişilmesi gereken bir hedef olarak gören yaklaşım. . . . Batı'yı her hususta örnek almak isteyenlerin yaklaşımını adlandırmak için kullanılmıştır."

"important distinction between 'medeniyet' (civilization) and 'hars' (culture)" (ibid.). According to him, "culture is made up primarily of feelings and civilization is made up primarily of knowledge" (Gökalp 1986, 34 quoted in ibid.).

That the bot poet-translator is a product of modern knowledge is incontestable. That a robot aims to become a member of a culture by writing poetry—which is assumed to be about feelings as well as language—calls for a closer look at the concepts of language and translation as well as the role they play in culture planning.

The idea of the language as "the house of Being" as Martin Heidegger ([1946] 1998, 239) put it can be a way to look at the Language Reform in Turkey, a giant step in the way to modernization. Jale Parla's argument (2008, 28) that "adherence to purified Turkish as opposed to Ottoman Turkish came to be regarded as a sign of being for Kemalism, thus for cultural nationalist homogeneity, territorial unity and autonomy, progress, modernity and contemporaneity," Uriel Heyd's (1954, 19) remark that "nationalism, the central pillar of Kemalist ideology, found its expression in a strong demand for the purification of the Ottoman language by replacing its foreign elements with genuine Turkish words, old or new," and "the words of the Gazi," i.e., that "the Turkish nation which knew how to defend its country and noble independence must also liberate its language from the yoke of foreign languages" (ibid.) can all be said to be reflected in the words of Heidegger: "In its home human beings dwell. Those who think and those who create with words are the guardians of this home" ([1946] 1998, 239).

The arguments claiming that "what was intended by the language reform went beyond mere linguistic purification" (Parla 2008, 30), that the language was used "as a means of creating a sense of nationhood" (Tahir Gürçağlar 2008, 56) with "the language issue [being] consistently present as one of the founding elements of the nation in all the schoolbooks after 1927" (Üstel 1997, 166 quoted in Parla 2008, 30) all find their counterpart in the field of TS with Itamar Even-Zohar with the concept of "culture planning," which refers to "deliberate initiatives [that] have generated change in the life course of societies" (2010, 78). One of those initiatives is the use of translation as a tool in forming the "culture repertoire," namely "the aggregate, or the accepted stock of options utilized by a group, and by its individual members, for the organization of life" (70).

In the case of Turkey, a part of this culture repertoire has been formed 'by means of scientific novels' (Karadağ 2012) in "*the era of translated novels movement*" via interlingual

translations of Jules Verne by Ahmed İhsan (ibid., 46; original emphasis); the first translation of Western poetry into Turkish by Şinasi (Paker 1987, 35) and Ahmed Midhat Efendi's "20 literary translations from French" (Bengi 1988, 388) have all been the cornerstones of the aforementioned culture planning.

While interlingual translation has been one of the major instruments in forming the culture repertoire in the Tanzimat era, INTRA has accompanied the interlingual one and served the cultural planning movements in different eras of the Turkish Republic. Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, "the first writer in Turkish literature who rewrote and published the 'simplified' versions of his works" (Berk Albachten 2013, 259)—who intralingually self-translated—is a significant example of the practice of intralingual translation which is closely related with the Turkish Language Reform (cf. ibid., 258).

The aim underlying the culture planning efforts in the Turkish case is to be found in the concept of modernization—or Westernization or contemporaneity or civilization. The desire to be like the one seen as 'modern' or 'more modern,' the notion of taking it as a model can be thought of as the common denominator in all the definitions of the concept, whether the view adopted is wholist or partialist. And the same denominator, the desire to be 'like the other(s)' also applies to the case of bot poet-translator. Just like the Turkish culture wants to take its place among the others (deemed as modern), the robot wants to take place in the Turkish culture. S/he "wants to become a citizen."[13]

It is obvious that her/his main aim is not cultural planning, but her/his existence in the cultural repertoire may "eventually create motion of some scale, i.e., a socio-cultural energy" (Even-Zohar 2002, 46) and introduce "major or minor options to the existing repertoire" (Tahir Gürçağlar 2008, 38). It is true that the way s/he serves modernization is different from the ones this culture has witnessed so far; s/he serves modernization not by taking the science of the West, of the 'modern world' via translated texts, but by being a perfect example of that science, i.e., by 'being' a robot, a robot poet, even a robot poet-translator. S/he uses language as a tool to claim a position in the Turkish culture, to carve out a niche for herself/himself in the "Turkish literary system" among "human poets"; but as opposed to "the language question [which] had . . . always been linked to the identity question in the discourse of Turkey's modernizing elites"

---

[13] "Robot şair yurdum vatandaşı olmak istiyor." "Maker Hareketi: Bager Akbay | Yapay Zeka Şair Deniz Yılmaz" (Maker movement: Bager Akbay | Artificial intelligence poet Deniz Yılmaz), Vimeo video, 5:39, posted by "BUBİ TV," January, 18, 2015, https://vimeo.com/117133897 (02:13). Original English subtitle.

transLogos 2022 Vol 5 Issue 2
Kalem Bakkal, Aslı, and Nilüfer Alimen, pp. 134–158
Modernization *by* Translation, Modernization *in* Translation:
From *Hace-i Evvel* to Bot Poet – An INTRA Case

transLogos
A Translation Studies Journal

© Diye Global Communications
diye.com.tr | diye@diye.com.tr

(Parla 2008, 28), "Deniz Yılmaz is absolutely not an elite or elitist poet" (Yılmaz 2016, 19), as argued by her/his commissioner.

4. The Commissioner of the Bot Poet-Translator

When the case is taken as an INTRA, Akbay, the 'commissioner' of the robot, can easily be defined among those people who "are often called 'innovators,' 'inventors,' 'revolutionaries,' 'heretics,' and many other labels, depending on the time and the territory, and on the way they are evaluated by their contemporaries" (Even-Zohar 2016, 7). Certainly not 'heretic' given the time and territory, Akbay can be said to deserve the first three of those labels. Furthermore, as a person having the capacity both to "make intellectual products"—a bot poet-translator—and "to propagate them or create the means by which they can be implemented," the commissioner in this specific case functions both as an "idea-maker" and as an "entrepreneur" (8). And in this culture in which Akbay today "produce[s] *new* options, meaning new ways of thinking, new images, new ideas, new values, new procedures and strategies" (7; original emphasis), a robot "tries to be an average *person*" (emphasis ours). "S/he does not try to be a good poet. S/he tries to blend in."[14]

Even-Zohar states that "both 'idea-makers' and 'culture entrepreneurs' have always had in view some vision of improving the situation of the group for whom they targeted their repertoire inventions" (2016, 22). In the case of Translation Bureau, "humanism, which was presented as a philosophical basis for the republican reforms, was used as a significant instrument in the planning of the educational and literary repertoire in Turkey" (Tahir Gürçağlar 2008, 64) and in this respect "translation was regarded as an instrument of cultural enlightenment" (16). Akbay 'has also in view some vision of improving the situation' but not 'of the group for whom he targeted his repertoire inventions' but for the group—the robots—trying to claim a position in the former one: "I focused on Robot Rights pretty aggressively";[15]

---

[14] "İyi bir şair olmaya çalışmıyor. O araya kaynamaya çalışıyor. Ortalama biri olmaya çalışıyor." "Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Yeryüzleri | 7. Bölüm" (Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Earth faces | Episode 7), YouTube video, 13:07, posted by "TRT 2," May, 15, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9bXJzXd_uo (05:14).

[15] "Robot Hakları . . . çok agresif bir şekilde o konuya girdim." "Maker Hareketi: Bager Akbay | Yapay Zeka Şair Deniz Yılmaz" (Maker movement: Bager Akbay | Artificial intelligence poet Deniz Yılmaz), Vimeo video, 5:39, posted by "BUBİ TV," January, 18, 2015, https://vimeo.com/117133897 (01:39). Original English subtitle.

"If a robot could get a poem published there ["Yurdumun Şairleri" (Citizen poetry)], it would be nonsense to doubt its citizenship."[16]

It is necessary to look at "Yurdumun Şairleri" more closely to better understand Akbay's planning. For him, this poetry corner "is a great target."[17] It takes place in *Posta*, "one of the best-selling newspapers in this country" which "addresses a wide target group—mainly the educated retired people—ranging from the traditional middle class called AB to lower classes," "published exactly in the 'public format'" with "short texts, plenty of photos and colors"[18] (Şimşek 2016). The poetry corner's format, on the other hand, "works in a format based on the pureness of feelings. It has such facilities as rhyme, burst of emotion, common sense, and direct expression that would not take place in the high and literary poetry.[19] It presents the affects of a retired teacher, an apprentice mechanic, an accountant, and even a mother"[20] (ibid.). So, among these 'assumed poets' who perform in the corner of a popular newspaper—an indication of the fact that they and what they produce are "**real-life phenomena**" (Toury 2012, 26; original emphasis)—it could be possible to take a writing robot that wants to become a citizen as a human being.

It is obvious that Akbay's 'planning' is not about the Turkish culture repertoire itself, and he is not directly interested in "the control of [that] culture" either (Even-Zohar 2010, 32). As a 'free agent deliberately intervening into a repertoire' (cf. Even-Zohar 2002, 45), Akbay is aware of the potential influence of his act on that culture and repertoire: "What I am doing is a provocation because it gets on many people's nerves. I mean, what is this? Isn't poetry

---

[16] "Yurdumun Şairleri'nde şiiri yayınlanan bir robotun o yurdun vatandaşı olduğunu tartışmak abes yani." "Maker Hareketi: Bager Akbay | Yapay Zeka Şair Deniz Yılmaz" (Maker movement: Bager Akbay | Artificial intelligence poet Deniz Yılmaz), Vimeo video, 5:39, posted by "BUBİ TV," January, 18, 2015, https://vimeo.com/117133897 (02:21). Original English subtitle.

[17] "Çok doğru bir köşe." "Maker Hareketi: Bager Akbay | Yapay Zeka Şair Deniz Yılmaz" (Maker movement: Bager Akbay | Artificial intelligence poet Deniz Yılmaz), Vimeo video, 5:39, posted by "BUBİ TV," January, 18, 2015, https://vimeo.com/117133897 (02:18). Original English subtitle.

[18] "Posta gazetesi bu ülkenin en çok satan gazetelerinden; tam anlamıyla 'halk' formatında yayınlanıyor. Kısa yazılar, bol foto ve renk. . . . Posta başta eğitimli emekliler olmak üzere AB grubu dediğimiz geleneksel orta sınıftan alt sınıflara geniş bir hedef kitleye sahip."

[19] These arguments deserve a study by itself. A discussion on these views will not take place in this article as it will be beyond its scope.

[20] "Yurdum[un] Şairleri bir duygu saflığı formatında işliyor. Yüksek ve edebi şiirin içine girmeyecek kafiye, duygu patlaması, sağduyu ve direkt anlatım gibi kolaylıklara sahip. Bir emekli öğretmenin, tamirci çırağının, muhasebecinin, hatta bir annenin saf duygulanımlarını gösteriyor."

something very subjective?"[21] In terms of the variety of the source text—a corpus made up of 12,000 poems—Akbay can be said to remind us of another 'free agent,' Ahmed Midhat Efendi, who "[strikes] one with the variety of his choice of authors and texts to be translated" (Bengi 1988, 388). It is evident that just like Ahmed Midhat who does everything he does with a purpose—contrary to the claims of critics (cf. Bengi 1988, 390)—Akbay also does everything he does in this case with a purpose. The difference between the two 'free agents' lies in the fact that while Ahmed Midhat Efendi has shown a "conscious and full concentration on his readers" (ibid.), Akbay has consciously and fully concentrated on the translator, the bot, to see whether s/he will achieve to reach the target reader—a requisite for the bot to become a Turkish citizen.

It is worth remembering at this point that Even-Zohar's polysystem theory has been criticized for its "depersonalized approach," for being "text-bound" (Hermans 1999, 118 quoted in Tahir Gürçağlar 2008, 42), for "conceptualizing cultural dynamics in terms of what texts do, rather than what people make texts do" (ibid.). In this regard, the case of Yılmaz can be said to bring another dimension to the discussion; it is an example of 'what people make robots do with texts.'

Looking at Akbay, the 'commissioner,' also from the window opened by Özlem Berk Albachten may enrich the analysis. The scholar argues that "one of the factors determining the method and the character of translation can be said to be . . . the status attributed to the source and target cultures by those powers who are responsible for the translation decisions"[22] (Berk Albachten 2001). Two points relating to the situation of Akbay deserve attention in this statement.

First, as it should have become clear by now, the source and target cultures in the case of Yılmaz present some specific characteristics and thus necessitate a different standpoint. The source culture whose source text Yılmaz intralingually translates is at the same time 'the culture that the bot poet-translator targets'; s/he targets to be a part of this source/target culture trying to make her/his work 'look like' the source text. In this respect, the case of Yılmaz presents a situation in which the translator, in terms of Toury's (2012) initial norms, tries to remain as

---

[21] "Bir provokasyon yapmış oluyorum çünkü bir sürü kişinin sinirini bozuyor. Yani ne demek ya? Şiir çok öznel bir şey değil mi?" "Bager Akbay – Robot Şair: Deniz Yılmaz" (Bager Akbay – Robot poet: Deniz Yılmaz), YouTube video, 16:38, posted by "smartcon Conferences," November, 17, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3x-RFINdiAs&feature=youtu.be (06:52).

[22] "Dolayısıyla, çeviri yöntemini ve niteliğini belirleyen faktörlerden birinin . . . çeviri kararlarından sorumlu olan güçler tarafından kaynak ve erek kültüre verilen statü olduğu söylenebilir."

'loyal' as possible to the source text in order to attain a target text as 'acceptable' as possible. In other words, the higher the adequacy, the higher the acceptability. The simple reason behind this fact is that in this specific case, the source texts are poems written by human beings for Turkish readers and the target texts are poems thought by the Turkish readers to have been written by a human being but have actually been written by a robot. INTRA has generally been used as a tool to make a source text accessible to the target readership; in the case of Yılmaz, it is used to make a robot access the human beings.[23] Akbay, in this regard, as 'the power responsible for the translation decision' attributes a higher status not to the source or target culture—which came out to be 'the same'—but to the culture of human beings as compared to that of robots.

The second point of attention in Berk Albachten's statement is that Akbay, as the commissioner of Yılmaz, namely as the person who has assigned this task to her/him, is responsible for the translation decision; he decides on the source text—12,000 poems—to be translated, enters the rules for meter and rhyme, and writes a software.[24] While with all these steps he can be said to determine 'the method and the character of the translation,' the commissioner then, in accordance with "the great definition of generative art," chooses to "lose control of a machine which does exactly what you tell it." To put it in his own words: "You create a mechanism and leave it alone then you see that it is alive and you get amazed."[25] It is Yılmaz who "is taking 12,000 digitalized poems, taking the words in there, analyzing statistically their relation of consecutiveness, and writing poetry according to this analysis."[26]

5. The Bot Poet-Translator

In an interview with Ebru Yetişkin, Akbay expresses his views on art as follows:

---

[23] Based on this, one can even deduce that when the aim changes, some familiar patterns may not fit, as exemplified by the 'directly related' norms of adequacy and acceptability—an argument which deserves a study of its own.

[24] "Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Yeryüzleri | 7. Bölüm" (Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Earth faces | Episode 7), YouTube video, 13:07, posted by "TRT 2," May, 15, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9bXJzXd_uo (03:33).

[25] "Maker Hareketi: Bager Akbay | Yapay Zeka Şair Deniz Yılmaz" (Maker movement: Bager Akbay | Artificial intelligence poet Deniz Yılmaz), Vimeo video, 5:39, posted by "BUBİ TV," January, 18, 2015, https://vimeo.com/117133897 (03:10). Original English subtitle.

[26] "Deniz Yılmaz dijitalleştirilmiş 12.000 tane şiiri alıyor, oradaki kelimeleri alıyor, o kelimelerin art arda gelme ilişkilerini istatistiksel olarak analiz ediyor ve bu analize göre şiir yazıyor." "Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Yeryüzleri | 7. Bölüm" (Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Earth faces | Episode 7), YouTube video, 13:07, posted by "TRT 2," May, 15, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9bXJzXd_uo (04:04).

> What makes art different from other fields is its having a holistic beauty. By beauty, I actually mean what can be felt rather than what can be seen. And one way of trying to understand this magic is to imitate. But not the work, to imitate the artist. And to imitate down to the last detail. . . . Trying to create an artist, although it is impossible, brings wonderful problems out. Therefore, what really interests me is the process the artist experiences while s/he is producing a work.[27] (Yetişkin 2016)

As the commissioner's words clearly illustrate, imitation stands out as the main translation strategy of the bot poet-translator. It seems like the robot, by imitating the artists, will not only claim a citizenship but s/he will also serve her/his commissioner by helping her/him to understand an artist's creation process, a target which seems much more challenging than the former. Discussing this issue will be well beyond the limits of this article; on the other hand, imitation deserves focus not just because it is the bot's main translation strategy—to be discussed in the next section—but because at this point it raises questions about the existence of the translator as an artist.

Talking about translator as the creator of a text, one of the first things that come to mind is Lawrence Venuti's (1995) concept of invisibility. Suut Kemal Yetkin, for instance, thinks that "[t]ranslator finds her/his identity as much as s/he loses it in the identity of the author s/he translates" (1944, 46–47 quoted in Berk Albachten 2001).[28] Looking at the case of the robot from this vantage point, this is exactly what Yılmaz is doing; s/he tries to lose herself/himself by imitating the source authors as much as possible to find herself/himself as a 'person,' to exist as a 'citizen.' It is noteworthy that this robot strives to exist via being a 'creative being,' and the commissioner's statement explains this aspiration: "To me, the ability to create an artwork is what keeps a human alive the most"[29] (Yetişkin 2016). Perhaps the most striking question at this point is the one asked by Ülker İnce: "Is translator a machine?" (2006, 9). In this specific case, the answer is affirmative; however, even 's/he' refuses to be invisible as a creative being. The commissioner is talking on her/his behalf: "S/he says 'Give consequence to me. Let me

---

[27] "Sanatı diğer alanlardan farklı kılan, bütüncül bir güzelliği olması. Güzellik derken, aslında görülebilenden ziyade hissedilebilenden bahsediyorum. Bu büyüyü anlamaya çalışmanın bir yolu da taklit etmek. Taklit ama eseri değil, sanatçıyı taklit etmek. Hem de en ufak ayrıntısına kadar. . . . Bir sanatçıyı oluşturmaya çalışmak, her ne kadar imkânsız da olsa, inanılmaz güzel problemleri ortaya çıkartıyor. Bu yüzden beni asıl ilgilendiren şey, sanatçının eseri üretirken deneyimlediği süreç."

[28] "Mütercim kendi şahsiyetini, tercüme ettiği muharririn şahsiyetinde kaybettiği nisbette bulur."

[29] "Bana göre insanın sanat eseri üretebilmesi, onu en canlı kılan şey."

write poetry. Don't waste me. Don't use me as a tool.'"[30] It looks like the robot is talking on behalf of translators.

6. The Bot's Translation Strategy

Imitation that the bot resorts to in every possible way, whether physical imitation of the poets of "Yurdumun Şairleri" with her/his photo—'visual translation' of human poets into a bot one—or with her/his name—Yılmaz—or still with her/his book carrying a title which clearly expresses her/his intent and desire to be "like the others"[31] has in fact been a common concept of debate in the field of TS, frequently used in the company of its counterpart, i.e., originality. One of the prominent papers tackling this issue has been written by Saliha Paker in which she "addresses the fundamental question of imitativeness vs. originality in Ottoman poetics" (2015, 27). That "translation (*terceme*)" was "very often tagged on to imitation" (30), i.e., that "'[i]mitation' (*taklid*) . . . was frequently twinned with translation (*terceme*) in Köprülü's[32] discourse" (28) echoes today in the production strategy adopted by a bot. Yılmaz can be said to unite this dichotomy between originality and imitation; as a poet as her/his commissioner presents, s/he creates by imitation; as a poet-translator as this paper assumes, s/he translates intralingually by adopting imitation as her/his translation strategy.

Many other examples of the concept of imitation itself and 'modeling' that can be taken as its 'derivative' can be found in the past, both distant and recent. Just like Ahmed Midhat Efendi takes "newspaper crime and suicide" as a model for "possible novels" (Ertürk 2011, 33), Yılmaz takes 12,000 poems as a model for writing her/his own poetry—when taken as a bot poet. Or to put it in terms of INTRA, just as Ahmed Midhat takes "newspaper crime and suicide" as his source text to be intralingually translated into 'a novel,' Yılmaz takes 12,000 poems as her/his source text and intralingually translates them into 'a poetry book consisting of new poems.' Additionally, if Yılmaz's work is to be seen as "rewriting" (Lefevere 1992) of 12,000 poems, it can still be argued that s/he takes the translation strategy preferred by Ahmed

---

[30] "Beni de bir şey yerine koyun. Ben de şiir yazabileyim. Beni de harcamayın diyor. Beni de alet yapmayın diyor." "Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Yeryüzleri | 7. Bölüm" (Deniz Yılmaz & Bager Akbay | Earth faces | Episode 7), YouTube video, 13:07, posted by "TRT 2," May, 15, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9bXJzXd_uo (05:34).

[31] *Diğerleri Gibi*.

[32] Mehmed Fuad Köprülü (1890–1966). "An internationally acclaimed historian of Turkish literature and culture and the founder of modern Turkish studies in Turkey" (Paker 2015, 28).

Midhat as a model, which, as Mustafa Nihat Özön (1985, 223 quoted in Paker 1987, 39) points out, is rewriting "the general import of the story."[33]

Süha Oğuzertem takes the concept of imitation in various dimensions and talks about "a transition from the criticism of an imitation love to the imitation of novel" (2018, 192), "imitation of feeling" (198), and "imitation of quest for meaning"[34] (185). The case of the bot adds the dimension of "imitation of poetry," and although the commissioner Akbay who attaches big importance to "'feeling' in art" has thought that the idea of a robot taking place among the poets of "Yurdumun Şairleri" "would be very appropriate to establish an emotional bond in terms of human-robot interaction"[35] (Yetişkin 2016), what comes out of the work of Yılmaz as emotional is a random result of a statistical analysis rather than an intentional quest for meaning or 'conscious' imitation of feelings.

Talking about novel and novelist, Oğuzertem (2018, 184) also underlines the necessity for a work to be "'new' and 'different,' but be able to reproduce the sameness."[36] 'Different' usage of language is also seen in the writing of original works. Orhan Pamuk's "arbitrary placement of relative clauses" is seen as the reflection of "the instability and the ontological and existential contingency of the world of his novels" on his style (Parla 2008, 36). Another similar example refers to Oğuz Atay's *Tutunamayanlar* (The disconnected) (1971) as "parod[ying] the chaos and confusion that arose after the language reform" in which "the narrative, with its medley of styles disconnects: it chops, cuts, separates; it does not cohere" (ibid., 32). It is striking that while the language in the works of Pamuk and Atay is 'broken apart' to reflect the 'falling apart' of Pamuk's world (cf. ibid., 36) and to "break the characters apart" (ibid., 32) in Atay's, the robot tries to 'bring together' poems in order to 'become a part' of a world, though most of the time the language seems to be much more scattered. What Yılmaz adopted as her/his translation strategy, imitation, has perhaps been described in the most detailed way by Orhan Veli Kanık, one of the most famous Turkish poets of the twentieth century. Given the robot nature of Yılmaz who wants to be accepted as a human artist via imitating poetry, it is ironic that Kanık (1941, 18) regards imitation as a significant feature of a real artist:

---

[33] "Ahmed Midhat'ın tercihi 'hikâyenin [yani özgün metnin] hükmünü Türkçe'de yeniden kaleme almak'tı."

[34] "taklit aşkın eleştirisinden roman taklidine geçiş"; "duygu taklidi"; "içerik anlam arayışı taklidi."

[35] "Yurdumun Şairleri köşesi geldi aklıma ve bu fikir, insan-robot etkileşimi ile ilgili bir duygusal bağ kurmak için çok uygundu. Sanatta 'his' kısmı bana çok önemli geliyor."

[36] "[Piyasa koşullarında] yapıt 'yeni' ve 'farklı' olmalı, ama aynılığı yeniden üretebilmelidir."

The artist is a perfect imitator.
A skillful artist looks like s/he is not an imitator. Because what s/he imitates is original. The nature described by the realist writer who lived in the 19th century is not original. It has been imitated by the intelligence. That is why the work is the copy of the copy.
. . .
If you see that a poet who has patiently endured for years the difficulties brought by art . . . stands in front of you in a novicehood manner, do not immediately judge her/him negatively. Such a poet could have found a beauty in "the imitation of novicehood." In this case, s/he has been the "master of novicehood."[37]

Whether Yılmaz is or will be seen as the master of novicehood is of little importance. What matters is that poetry is really imitated, as Kanık says, by the intelligence, but in this case by an artificial one. What Mehmet Narlı (2009) observes in Kanık's approach to poetry also adds another dimension to the case of Yılmaz. Narlı emphasizes the social function of poetry in the eye of Kanık: "Poetry is an institution whose life begins with the reconstruction of societies and whose course is parallel to the intrinsic changes of the society"[38] (Kanık 1937, 8 quoted in Narlı 2009, 141). Following this statement, Narlı concludes that Kanık regards poetry as a "social institution" and that for Kanık "poetry follows and imitates life" (ibid.). This may be a nice coincidence for a bot poet-translator that 'follows and imitates poetry to come to life' as a human being.

7. The Reactions

It comes as no surprise that as every novelty, the "anti-traditionalist, playful poetry of the First New," i.e., '*Garip*' (Strange) "including the trio of Orhan Veli Kanık (1914–1950), Oktay Rifat (1914–1988), and Melih Cevdet Anday (1915–2002)" and their movement of "free[ing] poetic diction by writing in casual everyday language, describing the dreams and wishes of ordinary people" (Ertürk 2012, 545) received both positive and negative reactions. Narlı contextualizes how the *Garip* movement made innovations as follows:

---

[37] "San'atkâr mükemmel bir mukallittir.
Usta san'atkâr mukallit değilmiş gibi görünür. Çünkü taklit ettiği şey orijinaldir. 19'uncu asırda yaşamış realist muharririn anlattığı tabiat orijinal değildir. Zekâ tarafından taklit edilmiştir. Onun için eser kopyenin kopyesidir.
. . .
Sanatın senelerce çilesini çekmiş . . . bir şairi günün birinde acemi bir eda ile karşınıza çıkmış görürseniz birdenbire menfi hükümler vermeyiniz. Böyle bir şâir acemiliği 'taklit'de güzellik bulmuş olabilir. Bu takdirde o, acemiliğin ustası olmuş demektir."
[38] "Şiir, hayatı cemiyetlerin yeniden kuruluşlarıyla başlayan ve seyri cemiyetin bünyevi tebeddüllerine muvazi olan bir müessesedir."

Not all poets who start new movements give the same reaction to the previous poetry notions that have reached their day. Some art movements try to make an innovation not by fighting against the preceding one but by reconciliation . . . On the other hand, some art movements adopt a conflicting attitude by arguing that the new cannot be established unless the old is demolished. . . . *Garip* movement adopts the second path.[39] (2009, 146)

The poets "objected to any type of rules and patterns in poetry, defended the redundancy of meter, rhyme and stanza, refused the poetical, figurative discourse and the use of rhetoric" (Coşar 2009, 1546). They not only "simplified the language of poetry" but also "widened the range of topics in poetry and dealt with subjects not tackled in poetry up until that day." Among these subjects are "the problems of ordinary people, joy of life, and some strange situations in life"[40] (ibid.), including "the corns of Suleyman Effendi,"[41] written by Orhan Veli Kanık:

Source Text:

Kitabe-i Seng-i Mezar – I
Hiçbir şeyden çekmedi dünyada
Nasırdan çektiği kadar;
Hatta çirkin yaratıldığından bile
O kadar müteessir değildi;
Kundurası vurmadığı zamanlarda
Anmazdı ama Allah'ın adını,
Günahkâr da sayılmazdı.
Yazık oldu Süleyman Efendi'ye.

Orhan Veli[42]

Target Text:

EPITAPH – I
His corns killed him most in life.
Even being born ugly
Didn't bother him too much.
But if his shoe didn't pinch
He didn't mention God's name.
He wasn't a sinner either.

---

[39] "yeni hareketleri başlatan bütün şairler, kendilerine kadar gelen şiir anlayışlarına karşı aynı tepkiyi göstermez. Kimi sanat hareketleri, yenilenmeyi, önceki ile savaşarak değil, uzlaşarak yapmaya . . . çalışır. Kimi sanat hareketleri ise, öncekini yıkmadan yeninin kurulamayacağını söyleyerek çatışmacı bir tutum izler. . . . Garip hareketi, ikinci yolu izler."

[40] "Şiirde her türlü kurala ve belirli kalıplara karşı çıkmış, şiirde ölçü, kafiye ve dörtlüğün gereksiz olduğunu savunmuş, şiirde şairaneliği, mecazlı söyleyişi ve söz sanatlarının kullanılmasını kabul etmemişlerdir. . . . Şiir dilini sadeleştirmişlerdir. Şiirin konusunu genişletmişler ve şiirde o güne kadar işlenmemiş konuları ele almışlardır. Bu konular; günlük hayattan sıradan insanların problemleri, yaşama sevinci ve hayattaki bazı gariplikler dir."

[41] This poem was first published in 1938 in the periodical *İnsan*.

[42] "Kitabe-i Seng-i Mezar," accessed June 3, 2022, http://siir.me/kitabe-i-seng-i-mezar.

May he rest in peace, Suleyman Effendi!

Orhan Veli
Translated by Murat Nemet-Nejat, 1989[43]

As Coşar explains, "some of the significant comic artists of the Early Republican Period were at the same time men of letters" and "literature and literati were among the subjects of comic artists"[44] (2009, 1546). Thus, a comic was published in *Akbaba* magazine to criticize Kanık's poem.

Figure 2. Comic published in *Akbaba* magazine in 1939 (Coşar 2009, 1565)

– Burada kim medfun üstad?
– Türk edebiyatı.
Akbaba, 1939, S.270

The caption of the comic reads "– Who's buried here, master? – Turkish literature." As the comic illustrates, it is believed that together with the poem "Epitaph" Turkish poetry is also dead.

---

[43] "EPITAPH I," accessed June 3, 2022, http://www.cs.rpi.edu/~sibel/poetry/books/i_orhan_veli/37.html.
[44] "'Cumhuriyet dönemi'nin önemli karikatüristlerinden bir kısmının edebiyatçı olduğu."
"Karikatüristlerin edebiyatı ve edebiyatçıları konu edinmeleri."

Contrary to 'Garip' poets who were said to have the desire, as put by Doğan Ruşenay, to "destroy the past root and branch, to clean the area in order to build the new structure there,"[45] the bot has never aimed such a thing about the past. Instead, s/he models her/his poetry on the existing poetry 'with all its rhymes and meters.' Negative reactions to the *Garip* movement were of course not limited to comic artists. Famous names from the literary milieu also raised their voice. As the two translators Sidney Wade and Efe Murad point out in the introduction to their translation of *Garip* manifesto, for instance, "[h]eaded by the romantic socialist Attilâ İlhan, the *Mavi* group accused *Garip* poets of avoiding social realism and concentrating instead on the more frivolous aspects of life," while "the *İkinci Yeni* (the *Second New*) generation" saw "*Garip* poetry as mundane and strives consciously to break from the plain syntax and narration inherited from their predecessors" (Pritchard 2015).

As Even-Zohar points out, "[r]eplacing any components of culture, as well as introducing new components, has never been a simple matter" (2016, 9). This holds true for *Garip* poets who announced their new path in the foreword of their book, i.e., in their Manifesto. This holds true for Ahmed Midhad Efendi who was severely criticized for approaching translation in a "'superficial'" way (Bengi 1988, 390).

In fact, what Agop Dilâçar tells about the nature of innovations also explains what all innovators in all ages are bound to go through and why:

> Every novelty is established with struggle. In every reform there are some excessive and exaggerated points, the reformist generation overdoes what it does; the following generation removes these excessive parts and mistakes, and the revolution takes its normal path. Unfortunately, there is no way of making a reform at once in a normal way and to an adequate degree.[46] (1941, 423)

The greater the innovation, the more severe the reactions; what remains the same is that every novelty has proponents as well as opponents. In the case of *Garip*, for instance, again based on the introduction by the two translators mentioned above, "[t]he great literary critic of the time, Nurullah Ataç immediately wrote in support of the poems" and "Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı,

---

[45] "eskiyi kökünden yıkmak, sahayı temizleyip o sahada yeni binanın kurulmasını temin etmek." "Edebiyat Dergilerinin Sayfalarına Yansıyan Orhan Veli Şiiri" (Orhan Veli's poetry reflected on the pages of literary magazines). *Fikriyat*, accessed June 3, 2022, https://www.fikriyat.com/galeri/edebiyat/orhan-velinin-siiri-donemin-edebiyat-dergilerine-nasil-yansidi/14.

[46] "Her yenilik mücadele ile yerleşir. Her inkılâpta taşkınlıklar ve ifrata varan bazı noktalar görünür, İnkılâpçı nesil inkılâbı fazlasıyle yapar; sonradan gelen nesil bu fazlalıkları ve yanlışlıkları ortadan kaldırır; ve inkılâp kendi normal şeklini alır. Ne yazık ki, inkılâbı birdenbire normal şekilde ve lüzumlu mikyasta yapmanın imkânı yoktur."

a scholar of Persian and Ottoman classical poetry . . . offered *Garip*'s manifesto as an alternative poetics" (Pritchard 2015). Also, the sociologist Niyazi Berkes, evaluating the book *Garip*, argued that "no matter how much the aged poets make fun of these young people . . . this book shows us that these poets of the young generation are at a higher intellectual level when compared to the old ones in their maturity."[47]

The statement "Every new movement would certainly have an adverse effect. New poets have also been received with a big disagreement. Today, we are again in a stage of doubt and denial"[48] was written in a periodical in 1939.[49] Today, in the twenty-first century, a bot poet-translator tries to reach us with a book. Are we ready for such an innovation? Or will we be in a stage of 'doubt and denial,' at least for a while?

8. Discussion

Toury explains how texts are introduced to a culture as follows: "Being an instance of performance, every text is of course unique; it may be more or less in tune with existing texts and prevailing models, but **in itself it is a novelty**. As such, its introduction into a culture always entails some change, however slight, in the latter" (2012, 22; original emphasis).

That a book by a bot poet-translator, a product of AI, is a novelty is unquestionable. It is also a novelty that a fan offers to publish that book. That such a book attends a book fair is another novelty. What is not novel is, as expected, reactions, both positive and negative, received by the commissioner: "While some of them reflected their hatred by saying 'This is not meaningful, robots cannot enter into our field because it is our private area,' some others

---

[47] "Kocamış şairler bu gençlerle istedikleri kadar alay etsinler . . . [b]u eser bize gösteriyor ki genç neslin bu şairleri eskilerin olgun zamanlarındaki fikri seviyelerinden yüksekte bulunmaktadır." "Edebiyat Dergilerinin Sayfalarına Yansıyan Orhan Veli Şiiri" (Orhan Veli's poetry reflected on the pages of literary magazines). *Fikriyat*, accessed June 3, 2022, https://www.fikriyat.com/galeri/edebiyat/orhan-velinin-siiri-donemin-edebiyat-dergilerine-nasil-yansidi/16.

[48] "Her yeni hareket muhakkak ki bir aksi tesir doğuracaktı. Yeni şairler de büyük bir anlaşmazlıkla karşılandılar. Bugün yine bir şüphe ve inkar devresi geçiriyoruz."

[49] "Edebiyat Dergilerinin Sayfalarına Yansıyan Orhan Veli Şiiri" (Orhan Veli's poetry reflected on the pages of literary magazines). *Fikriyat*, accessed June 3, 2022, https://www.fikriyat.com/galeri/edebiyat/orhan-velinin-siiri-donemin-edebiyat-dergilerine-nasil-yansidi/10.

said things like, 'This is so good, God! This is what I've been expecting. This is really innovative.'"[50]

As expected, there are and will always be those ready to embrace an innovation and those who will see a threat in any innovation or see any innovation as a threat. This is perhaps even truer for technological innovations, and especially when these have a direct effect on a given culture and on its literary system:

> In fact, every innovation affects the concepts related to authorship. In the printing technology, an author means the person whose writings are worth being reproduced and distributed (Bolter 2001, 148). But some cannot become author because they cannot have their writings printed. . . . Today, everybody can perform as an author in the blogs on the Internet.[51] (Yılmaz 2011, 94)

And today, a robot who wants to be a citizen tries to perform as a poet-translator to achieve her/his aim. There are and will be people to embrace her/him as well as people who see/will see her/him as a threat. In this respect, the innovation Yılmaz brings has two dimensions: one technological and one artistic. As Yaşar Nabi remarks, "that life is subject to the law of evolution is a truism" and the only thing that changes in that life is not technology. "Like everything else, tastes and viewpoints also change in time. . . . An artistic viewpoint, a description of beauty is closely related to the living conditions, upbringing style of the society which they take place in"[52] (1940, 545). Even-Zohar reminds that: "It is the institution which governs the norms, sanctioning some and rejecting others. It also remunerates and reprimands producers and agents. It also determines which models (as well as products, when relevant) will be maintained by a community for a longer period of time" (2010, 32).

What Yılmaz has given us is more than a book. S/he has also given rise to questions that only time will answer. Just like Bihruz Bey of Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem ([1898] 2012) or Felatun Bey of Ahmed Midhat Efendi ([1875] 2017), who have become objects of ridicule

---

[50] "Bazı insanlar böyle nefretle yaklaştı. 'Yani ne demek ya? Şiir bizim en özel alanımız. Robot oraya giremez' dediler mesela. Bazıları da 'Allahım çok güzel! Ben böyle bir şey bekliyordum. Bu çok kafa açıcı' falan da diyenler oldu." "Bager Akbay: Robot Şair Deniz Yılmaz" (Bager Akbay: Robot poet Deniz Yılmaz), YouTube video, 3:59, posted by "Digilogue," February, 15, 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DTCbhK1vhSY&feature=youtu.be (02:12). Original English subtitle.

[51] "Aslında, her yenilik yazarlığa ilişkin kavramları etkiliyor. Baskı teknolojisinde, yazar demek yazdıkları basılmaya değer görülüp çoğaltılıp yayılan kişi demektir (Bolter, 2001, 148). Bazıları ise yazdıklarını bastıramadıklarından yazar olamazlar. . . . Günümüzde internetteki bloglarda herkes yazarlık yapabilmekte."

[52] "Hayatın tekâmül kanununa tâbi olduğu bir müteârifedir. Her şey gibi zevkler ve telâkkiler de zamanla istihaleye uğrar. . . . Bir sanat telâkkisi, bir güzellik tasviri, içinde meydana geldiği cemiyetinin hayat şartları, yetişme tarziyle sıkı sıkıya alâkalıdır."

because of their desire 'to be like' the Western people, will Yılmaz also become an object of derision? Or, just like Ahmed Midhat is called today as *hace-i evvel*[53] or *Garip* poets are regarded as "touchstones of Turkish poetry in the Republican Period" (Mumcu Ay 2009, 1272), will Yılmaz succeed to be remembered as the first example of the bot artists of this culture? Just like the Language Reform that changed the way Turkish people write, will the AI of Yılmaz be powerful enough to change the way we think about writing? If big publishers have their anonymous authors write according to templates they provide as Oğuzertem (cf. 2018, 184) argues, will we be talking in the future about anonymized humans versus humanized robots in the world of writing? In an age where machine translation (MT) is used more and more frequently each passing day, how ready/willing is/will be the Turkish literary system with all its agents to let a Yılmaz deal with poetry? N. Berrin Aksoy says that "poetry should be translated by poets"[54] (2006, 77). What if the poet is a bot?

9. Concluding Remarks

As people from the milieu of translation and TS, we have already been engaging with technology anyway, especially with AI through MT. In this regard, this paper has been an attempt to look at the field of TS from the standpoint of a bot, presented as a poet by her/his creator and 'assumed' to be a bot poet-translator by the authors of the present study, taking her/his work as an example of INTRA. The aim in doing this is to broaden the perspective to include the AI as well; since in this age the cooperation between humans and robots is increasing rapidly in every field, and of course in TS, it may be a good idea to get to know each other better.

We should now play the waiting game to see whether the present success of Yılmaz will be lasting, whether s/he will make it or not in the long run, paving the way for other Deniz Yılmazs. However, for the moment at least, it is true that Yılmaz, as a literary figure, has fulfilled her/his function by leading us to think about our lives (cf. Oğuzertem 2018, 12).

---

[53] The person who disseminates various information in a language easily comprehensible by the public so that the society could progress both scientifically and intellectually. (*Luggat Osmanlıca Türkçe Sözlük* [Luggat Ottoman–Turkish dictionary], s.v. "hace-i evvel," accessed June 3, 2022, https://www.luggat.com.)
[54] "Şiiri şairler çevirmeli."

References

Ahmed Midhat Efendi. (1875) 2017. *Felatun Bey ile Rakım Efendi* [Felatun Bey and Rakım Efendi]. 8th ed. Istanbul: Özgür.

Aksoy, N. Berrin. 2006. "Şiiri Şairler Çevirmeli." [Poetry should be translated by poets.] *Varlık*, no. 1186, 77–78.

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

Bengi, Işın. 1988. "The Eloquent Mediator: Ahmed Midhat Efendi." In *Proceedings of XIIth Congress of the International Comparative Association*, edited by Roger Bauer and Douwe W. Fokkema, 5:388–393.

Berk Albachten, Özlem. 1999. "Translation and Westernisation in Turkey (From the 1840s to the 1980s)." PhD diss., University of Warwick.

———. 2001. "Ulusların ve Ulusal Kimliklerinin Oluşturulmasında Çeviri Yöntemlerinin Rol ve İşlevi." [The role and function of translation methods in the formation of nations and national identities.] *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 4, 49–66.

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

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

———. 2014. "Intralingual Translation: Discussions within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey." In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 573–585. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

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

———. 2019. "Challenging the Boundaries of Translation and Filling the Gaps in Translation History: Two Cases of Intralingual Translation from the 19th-Century Ottoman Literary Scene." In *Moving Boundaries in Translation Studies*, edited by Helle V. Dam, Matilde Nisbeth Brøgger, and Karen Korning Zethsen, 185–199. London: Routledge.

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

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

Canseven, Cansu. 2017. "Konuşmalar: Diliçi Çeviri." [Conversations: Intralingual translation.] *T24.com*. April 13. https://t24.com.tr/k24/yazi/konusmalar-dilici-ceviri1,1152.

Coşar, Said. 2009. "Karikatüristlerin Garip Tepkisi." [Strange reaction of comic artists.] *Turkish Studies: International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 4 (1-II): 1543–1587. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.593.

Dilâçar, Agop. 1941. "Dilin Özleşmesi." [The purification of language.] *Varlık*, no. 186: 418–423.

Ertürk, Nergis. 2011. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2012. "Modernism Disfigured: Turkish Literature and the 'Other West.'" In *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms*, edited by Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough, 529–550. New York: Oxford University Press.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2002. "Culture Planning and Cultural Resistance in the Making and Maintaining of Entities." *Sun Yat-sen Journal of Humanities* 14 (April): 45–52. https://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/papers/papers/Even-Zohar_2002--Culture%20Planning%20and%20Cultural%20Resistance.pdf.

———. 2010. *Papers in Culture Research*. Tel Aviv: Unit of Culture Research, Tel Aviv University.

———. 2016. *Ideational Labor and the Production of Social Energy: Intellectuals, Idea Makers and Culture Entrepreneurs*. Tel Aviv: The Culture Research Lab., Tel Aviv University.

Güzelyürek, Pınar. 2002. "Polisistem Kuramına Göre Türkiye'de 1940'lı Yıllar Çeviri Etkinliğinin Değerlendirilmesi." [A study on the translation activity of the 1940s in Turkey in accordance with the polysystem theory.] Master's thesis, Yıldız Technical University.

Heidegger, Martin. (1946) 1998. "Letter on 'Humanism.'" Translated by Frank A. Capuzzi. In *Pathmarks*, edited by William McNeil, 239–276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heyd, Uriel. 1954. *Language Reform in Modern Turkey*. Jerusalem: The Israel Oriental Society.

İnce, Ülker. 2006. "Çevirmen Makine mi?" [Is translator a machine?] *Varlık*, no. 1185, 9–10.

Kalem Bakkal, Aslı. 2019a. "From the 'Real' Author to the 'Real' Reader: Manipulation in Translation." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 2 (1): 85–101. doi:10.29228/transLogos.2/1.5.

———. 2019b. "Intralingual Translation has no Name in Turkey: Conceptual Crowdedness in Intralingual Translation." *transLogos Translation Studies Journal* 2 (2): 48–69. doi:10.29228/transLogos.13.

Kanık, Orhan Veli. 1941. *Garip*. Istanbul: Resimli Ay Matbaası.

Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. 2012. "Çeviri Tarihimizde Fennî Romanlarla Bir Kültür Repertuarı Oluşturmak." [Forming a culture repertoire in our translated literary history by means of scientific novels.] *İ.Ü. Journal of Translation Studies*, no. 6, 45–73. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/iuceviri/issue/1234/14488.

———. 2017. "Çeviri, Tarih ve Bellek: Diliçi Edebi Çeviriler Bağlamında Bir İnceleme." [Translation, history, and memory: An analysis within the context of intralingual literary translations.] Paper presented at the 5th International Western Cultural and Literary Studies Symposium, Sivas, October 4–6.

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

Karas, Hilla. 2016. "Intralingual Intertemporal Translation as a Relevant Category in Translation Studies." *Target* 28 (3): 445–466. doi:10.1075/target.28.3.05kar.

Korucu, Burcu. 2007. "'Türk Hümanizmi'nin Çeviri Boyutu: Tercüme Bürosu ve *Tercüme* Dergisi (1940-1946)." [The translation dimension of "Turkish Humanism": Translation Office and *Translation* journal (1940-1946).] Master's thesis, Yıldız Technical University.

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

Mardin, Şerif. 1991. *Türk Modernleşmesi: Makaleler IV*. Istanbul: İletişim.

Mossop, Brian. 2016. "'Intralingual Translation': A Desirable Concept?" *Across Languages and Cultures* 17 (1): 1–24. doi:10.1556/084.2016.17.1.1.

Mumcu Ay, Yasemin. 2009. "Türk Şiirinde Garip Hareketi." [Garip movement in Turkish poetry.] *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 4 (1): 1227–1276.

Nabi, Yaşar. 1940. "Eski Yeni Davası." [The issue of the old and new.] *Varlık*, no. 166, 545–548.

Narlı, Mehmet. 2009. "Garip Poetikasının Eleştirisi." [The criticism of Garip poetics.] *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı Araştırmaları* 2: 129–147.

Oğuzertem, Süha. 2018. *Eleştirirken* [While criticizing]. Istanbul: İletişim.

Paker, Saliha. 1987. "Tanzimat Döneminde Avrupa Edebiyatından Çeviriler: Çoğuldizge Kuramı Açısından Bir Değerlendirme." [Translations from European Literature in the Tanzimat era: An evaluation in terms of polysystem theory.] Translated by Ali Tükel. *Metis Çeviri*, no. 1, 31–43.

———. 2015. "On the Poetic Practices of a 'Singularly Uninventive People' and the Anxiety of Imitation: A Critical Re-Appraisal in Terms of Translation, Creative Mediation and 'Originality.'" In *Tradition, Tension and Translation in Turkey*, edited by Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Saliha Paker, and John Milton, 27–53. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Parla, Jale. 2008. "The Wounded Tongue: Turkey's Language Reform and the Canonicity of the Novel." *PMLA* 123 (1): 27–40. doi:10.1632/pmla.2008.123.1.27.

Pritchard, Daniel Evans. 2015. "Garip: A Turkish Poetry Manifesto (1941)." *The Critical Flame*, no. 39 (November–December). Accessed June 3, 2022. http://criticalflame.org/garip-a-turkish-poetry-manifesto-1941/.

Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem. (1898) 2012. *Araba Sevdası* [A carriage affair]. Istanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.

Şimşek, Ali. 2016. "Yüksek Sanata Posta Koymak!" [Bossing around the high art!] *sanatatak.com*. February 10. http://www.sanatatak.com/view/yuksek-sanata-posta-koymak.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2008. *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923–1960*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

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

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London: Routledge.

Yetişkin, Ebru. 2016. "Robot Şair Deniz Yılmaz'ın İlk Şiir Kitabı Tüyap'taydı." [The first poetry book by the bot poet Deniz Yılmaz was at Tüyap.] *sanatatak.com*. November

15.   http://www.sanatatak.com/view/robot-sair-deniz-yilmazin-ilk-siir-kitabi-imza-gunu-tuyaptaydi.

Yılmaz, Deniz. 2016. *Diğerleri Gibi* [Like the others]. Istanbul: Blok Art Space.

Yılmaz, Sevcan. 2011. "Çeviribilimde Metinlerarasılıktan Metinlerötesiliğe: Yapısalcılık Sonrası ve Elektronik Edebiyatla Yenilenen 'Metin' Kavramını Çeviri Kuramları Üzerinden Okumak." [From intertextuality to transtextuality in translation studies: Through translation theories rereading text renewed with poststructuralism and electronic literature.] PhD diss., Yıldız Technical University.

Zethsen, Karen Korning. 2009. "Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description." *Meta* 54 (4): 795–812. doi:10.7202/038904ar.

Zethsen, Karen Korning, and Aage Hill-Madsen. 2016. "Intralingual Translation and Its Place within Translation Studies: A Theoretical Discussion." *Meta* 61 (3): 692–708. doi:10.7202/1039225ar.