Who is to blame for the Withdrawal of *Roger Ackroyd Cinayeti* from Circulation? The Critic or the Translator?[1]

Roger Ackroyd Cinayeti'nin Piyasadan Toplatılmasının Sorumlusu Kim? Eleştirmen mi Çevirmen mi?

Research/Araştırma

Seyhan BOZKURT JOBANPUTRA

Assist. Prof. Dr.**,** Istanbul Şehir University, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Translation and Interpretation, seyhanbozkurt@sehir.edu.tr, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6897-5830.

ABSTRACT

Translation criticism has been a controversial area in the field of Translation Studies in Turkey, as it has been throughout the rest of the world. Many, if not most, translation criticisms that have appeared so far have been little more than a list of errors, the result of a strict comparison between the source text(s) and target text(s). These comparisons often fail to take into consideration the external factors that translators pay attention to in their translation processes, such as the composition, knowledge, expectations and requirements, etc. of the target culture and the target audience. In this paper, I will analyze, within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, the discourse of two criticisms of Gönül Suveren's translation of Agatha Christie's novel *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*. One is by the translator and editor Celal Üster, and the other – a response to Üster's – is by Çağlar Tanyeri, a translator and scholar of Translation Studies. This particular incident may actually be considered a singular case as Celal Üster's criticism ultimately led to the withdrawal of Gönül Suveren's translation from circulation by the publishers, Altın Kitaplar. This paper attempts to show how their discourses differ in various aspects and also draws attention to how the power some agents may possess in and over discourse may have catastrophic results, such as the one in this case.

---

[1] This article is a revised version of a paper entitled "Translation Criticism and Critical Discourse Analysis" presented at the 1st Translata Conference (1st International Conference on Translation and Interpreting Studies): "Translation & Interpreting Research: Yesterday–Today–Tomorrow" at the University of Innsbruck. Innsbruck, May 12-14, 2011.

Keywords: Translation criticism, critical discourse analysis, literary translation, translator, editor

ÖZET

Çeviri eleştirisi, yalnızca Türkiye'de değil, dünyada da Çeviribilim'in tartışmalı bir alanıdır. Yazılmış çeviri eleştirilerinin çoğu, kaynak ve erek metin karşılaştırması sonucu oluşan yanlışlar listesi ve çevirmenlerin çeviri sürecinde verdikleri kararları etkileyen erek kültür ve erek okuyucunun ihtiyaçları, beklentileri ve yapısı gibi faktörleri göz ardı eden birer inceleme olmaktan kurtulamamıştır. Bu yazının amacı, Gönül Suveren'in Agatha Christie'nin The Murder of *Roger Ackroyd* romanının çevirisi üzerine biri Celal Üster, diğeri ona cevap niteliğinde Çağlar Tanyeri tarafından yazılmış olan iki çeviri eleştirisini Eleştirel Söylem Çözümlemesi çerçevesinde incelemektir. Bu iki eleştiri yazısı, daha önce yayınlanmış diğer çeviri eleştirilerinden ayrılmaktadır çünkü Celal Üster'in eleştirisi Gönül Suveren'in çevirisinin Altın Kitaplar tarafından piyasadan toplatılmasına neden olmuştur. Bu yazı yalnızca iki çeviri eleştirisinin söylemleri arasındaki farklılıkları değil, aynı zamanda bazı öznelerin söylem içinde ve söylem üzerinde oluşturdukları güç sayesinde böylesi bir sonuca sebebiyet verebileceğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Çeviri eleştirisi, eleştirel söylem çözümlemesi, edebiyat çevirisi, çevirmen, editör

1. Introduction

In her article (Paker, 1988) 'Çeviri Eleştirisinin Kuramla İlişkisi Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler' [Some Thoughts on the Relationship Between Translation Criticism and Translation Theory], Saliha Paker draws attention to translation criticisms that have appeared in multi-cultural countries and in countries that exist in close proximity with and to other cultures (such as Belgium, Holland and Israel). These criticisms were significant because they introduced a target-oriented approach to translation criticism, challenging the notion that an original text had an unquestionable superiority to its translation. As Paker explains, this idea, which had been dominant in Europe since the Renaissance, was strengthened by the supposed 'superiority' attached in the 19th century to the writers of original texts. However, the new target-oriented method of analysis developed in the light of Polysystem Theory and Descriptive Translation Studies questioned the legitimacy of this approach (1988, p. 119).

In his article 'Çeviri Eleştirisi: Sorunlar, İlkeler, Uygulamalar' [Translation Criticism: Problems, Principles, Applications] (2003), Suat Karantay explores some of the current practices in translation criticism by analyzing a number of criticisms published in Turkey that led to disputes between translator and critic. His common observation is the lack of an objective approach to the translation by the critic, with most of the criticisms becoming little more than error analyses.

In the article, Karantay argues that in order to carry out an objective translation criticism, a critic also needs to be well versed in theory, otherwise his/her criticism runs the risk of morphing into merely subjective observations. He also argues that a critic who does not have any translation experience cannot succeed in criticism (2003, p. 172). He points out that translators in Turkey and in the West, for various reasons, do not pay

attention to translation theories; however, he also makes it clear that critics, who establish a bridge between translation studies and practices, do not have the luxury of being able to disregard translation theories (2003, p. 173).

Karantay cites an article by Saliha Paker entitled 'Çeviride 'Yanlış/Doğru Sorunu ve Şiir Çevirisinin Değerlendirilmesi' [The Problem of 'Correctness' and the Analysis of Poetry Translation] (2003) as a first step towards an objective translation criticism that moves away from simple error analysis (Karantay, 2003, p. 170-171). In her analysis, which Karantay lauds as exemplary, Saliha Paker says: "finding 'faults' by comparing the source text with the translation may well be the most striking aspect of translation criticism," (Paker 2003, p. 154, my translation) and goes on to suggest:

> […] rather than deeming the disparities between a translation and the source text 'wrong,' it is more realistic and bound to produce more useful results if we treat the activity of translation as a process and if we describe and define the disparities in question that arise during this process, within the parameters of the act of translation. (2003, p. 153, my translation)

Adopting Popovic's concept of "shift of expression" in her analysis, Paker carries out a descriptive analyses of three different translations of T.S Eliot's poem "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" into Turkish. However, Dizdar's analysis of 23 translation criticisms published in *Metis Çeviri*, an influential translation journal published between 1987-1992, shows that this was not a general tendency in Turkey. Published in the last issue of the journal, Dizdar's article stated that the journal had a source-oriented approach to translation and sought a complete overlap between the source text and the target text, and this, as Dizdar went on to point out, invariably resulted in a source-oriented and "judgmental" approach to translation criticism (1992, p. 130).

When we look at more recent academic journals, we come across some examples of descriptive analyses of translations taking into account the facts of target language and culture. Firstly, there is the comparative analysis of three translations of Melville's *Bartleby, The Scrivener* by Berrin Aksoy (2001), and Şule Demirkol Ertürk's (2019) analysis of two translations of *The Devil's Dictionary* by Ambrose Bierce highlighting the transfer of humoristic elements. Both draw attention to the translators' choices focusing not only on the characteristics of the source texts but the realities of the target context. However, it is still possible to see criticisms published in newspaper supplements such as the one I shall analyze below that still rely upon the age-old source-oriented approach, which compares the source and target texts in order to seek 'faults'.

The aim of this paper is to analyze, using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), two texts: a work of translation criticism entitled "Agatha Christie Cinayeti" (*The Murder of Agatha Christie*),[2] written by Celal Üster and published in *Radikal Kitap* (Radikal

---

[2] We understand that Celal Üster regards his article as a work of translation criticism when he writes "Böylesi çeviri kıyımlarını dergi sayfalarında eleştirerek, umarım, okuyucuyu uyarıp uyandırıyoruz" [*Hopefully by critiquing in the pages of a magazine botched translations such as this we can both warn and edify readers*] (22/8/2003). In a subsequent article, he went on to write: "Yıllardır yapmaya çalıştığım çeviri eleştirileri ilk kez

newspaper's literary supplement) on 22 August 2003, and an article by Dr. Çağlar Tanyeri on this translation criticism, entitled 'Celal Üster ve Gönül Suveren ya da Çeviri ve Çeviri Eleştirisi' (Celal Üster and Gönül Suveren, or Translation and Translation Criticism), published in *Cumhuriyet Kitap* (Cumhuriyet newspaper's literary supplement). Both Celal Üster and Çağlar Tanyeri are translators but Çağlar Tanyeri is also an academic teaching in the field of Translation Studies. This paper will endeavor to demonstrate the differences between the discourse created in these two articles and to see whether Çağlar Tanyeri's knowledge of translation theories affects her approach to translation.

2. Methodology

Teun A. van Dijk defines Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as "a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (2001, p. 352). CDA regards "discourse" as "a *practical*, *social* and *cultural*, phenomenon" (van Dijk 1997, p. 2). Language users who take part in discourse "accomplish social acts and participate in social interaction" and "such interaction is in turn embedded in various social and cultural contexts" (1997, p. 2). Teun A. van Dijk also points out that "In the study of discourse as action and interaction, contexts are crucial" (1997, p.11). "Discourse is being produced, understood and analysed relative to such context features" which can be designated as "participants, their roles and purposes, as well as properties of a setting, such as time and place" (ibid). However, as van Dijk puts forward, not all of these features may be relevant to the analysis of discourse. So discourse can be defined "as the structure of those properties of the social situation that are systematically (that is, not incidentally) relevant for discourse" (1997, p. 11). In this analysis, those features of context which are deemed relevant to the production of the above-mentioned articles will be applied.

2.1 Contextual Analysis

One of the significant features of context relevant to this study is the "participants", especially their professions. I have already pointed out that the professional background of the critics may be one of the reasons behind the differences not only in their approach to Gönül Suveren's translation of *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* but that these backgrounds may also be the reason behind the various differences in their discourse, which I shall try to highlight in this paper. I shall now give a brief overview of the primary actors.

Celal Üster is a prolific translator who has, since 1970, translated renowned authors such as George Thomson, Yaroslav Hašek, D. H. Lawrence, Han Suyin, Iris

---

somut bir karşılık bulduğu..." [*I believe I am happy as for the first time one of my translation criticisms, a field in which I have been active for years, has borne concrete results…*] (29/8/2003). Henceforth, I shall refer to his article 'Agatha Christie Cinayeti' as a translation criticism.

Murdoch, Liam O'Flaherty, Maria Antonietta Macciocchi, Jorge Luis Borges, John Berger, Mario Vargas Llosa and Ismail Kadare into Turkish. He also worked as editor-in-chief at te Can Yayınları publishing house between 2003 and 2008 and at *P Dünya Sanat Dergisi* [P World Art Magazine] for an extended period of time. He also served as an editor-in chief for *Cumhuriyet Kitap* between 1986 and 1993.

Çağlar Tanyeri is also a prolific translator. She was Assistant Professor in the German Translation and Interpreting Department of Istanbul University and also taught in the department of German Translation and Interpreting at Istanbul Okan University. Her important translations include *Ben ve Biz: Postmodern İnsanın Psikanalizi* by Rainer Funk, *Direnmenin Estetiği* by Peter Weiss and *Yürekteki Hayvan* by Herta Müller.

Other contextual features relevant to this study are the media organs and publications in which the criticisms appeared and the milieu in which they were published. Teun A. van Dijk points out that "[much] power in society, however, is not coercive, but rather mental… In other words, one of the crucial means used to influence others people's minds so that they will act as we want is text and talk" (1997, p. 17). It can be safely argued that *Radikal* was one of the most popular and influential newspapers in Turkey, and *Radikal Kitap* was read by a significant number of Turkish bibliophiles. As I have already pointed out, what makes the translation criticism by Celal Üster published in *Radikal Kitap* so significant is that it caused the translation of *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* by Gönül Suveren to be withdrawn from sales, which is indicative of the influence *Radikal* and *Radikal Kitap* had on public opinion and in the publishing world. It should also be noted that Celal Üster held a position of some importance and power in the publishing world; writing articles for *Radikal Kitap* undoubtedly constituted a part of this power.

At this point, it should also be noted that what Celal Üster failed to take into consideration in his criticism, as I shall explore below, is that the translation was first published by *Altın Kitaplar* in 1971 and republished in 2002.

2.2. Discourse Description

As per the tenets of CDA, power relations are discursive. Fairclough and Wodak write that, "It is fruitful to look at both 'power in discourse' and 'power over discourse'…: both the exercise of power in the 'here and now' of specific discursive events, and the longer-term shaping of discursive practices and orders of discourse, are generally negotiated and contested process" (1997, p. 273). In Üster's criticism, we see both "power in discourse" and "power over discourse", a distinction I will try to explore below. The notion of translation presented by Üster and the way he executes translation criticism may not only exercise power in the 'here and now' but also lead to the shaping of similar discursive practices in terms of translation criticism.

I shall now try to analyze the discourse of Üster's and Tanyeri's criticisms in the light of CDA. In my analysis, I will adopt the level of discourse description in 'Discourse as Interaction in Society', which consists of six steps: 1) Topic selection 2) Schematic organization 3) Local meanings 4) Lexicalization 5) Style 6) Rhetorical devices (van Dijk

1997, p. 33). However, it should be noted here that I may not always stick to this particular order of the 6 steps.

3. Power in Discourse

3.1. Celal Üster and *Radikal Kitap*

I should point out at the beginning that since Üster regards his article "Agatha Christie Cinayeti" as "translation criticism" and himself as a "translation critic", in terms of "topic selection" (van Dijk 1997, p. 33) I will describe the article as "translation criticism" and I will try to put forward the features of his translation criticism, although I shall also take into account the fact that this criticism was published in the *Yeryüzü Kitaplığı* [The World's Library] section of the *Radikal Kitap* newspaper supplement. I would like to begin my discussion with the "lexicalization" and the style of the article since as I have already pointed out this was a translation criticism published in Celal Üster's weekly column.

To begin with, I would like to briefly outline Celal Üster's argument. As Celal Üster explains, his encounter with Gönül Suveren's translation of Agatha Christie's novel *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* was purely coincidental. While they were preparing the fall issue of *P Dünya Sanat Dergisi*, the title of which was to be 'Oyun ve Sanat' [The Theatre and Art], they decided to allocate a space in the magazine to a game unfamiliar in Turkey, namely Mah Jong. In the first few paragraphs, Üster explains the origin of the game (China), and relays its popularity in the 1920s not only in China and Japan but also in the US and some European countries, especially in the Great Britain. He then mentions Takaşi Ebaşi, who wrote an article for the issue, and again notes that Agatha Christie dedicated a part of her novel *The Murder of Roger Acyroyd* to the game Mah Jong. Üster then goes on to explain how he found both the original novel and its Turkish translation in order to include the aforementioned relevant part (about Mah Jong) next to the item on Mah Jong in the Fall Issue. What he realizes when he compares the original and the translation is that the game Mah Jong [macong] becomes *domino* in Turkish, whilst other parts related to the game do not exist in the translation. As Üster's comparison of the two texts continues, he notices further omissions.

Firstly, in terms of style it can be said that Üster adopts a conversational tone throughout his article 'Agatha Christie Cinayeti' ('*The Murder of Agatha Christie*'). However, upon examination of his other articles, it can be seen that this conversational tone is his usual style, a tone in which he seems to be 'chatting' with his readers. This conversational tone is supported by some "rhetorical devices" (van Dijk 1997, p. 33). For instance, he often resorts to rhetorical questions. "Şimdi, haklı olarak, "Durup dururken neden macong denen bu garip oyunu anlatıyorsun bize?" diyebilirsiniz. Efendim,..." ['*Now, you may justly ask why I am suddenly and out of the blue talking about this odd*

game called 'macong'? Well....[3]]. Here, the question seemingly comes from the reader and he, as the knowledgeable party of the conversation, begins to talk about the game. Usages like "Efendim…" [Well,] help him establish his position as a guide and the knowledgeable party to the conversation.

Sarcasm and irony, which are used as rhetorical devices in the article and which also enhance the conversational tone, begin when what he defines as translation criticism starts. From this point on, we can talk about a "schematic organization" (van Dijk 1997, p. 33). We understand from his discussion that Üster constructs the whole article around his definition of translation, which allows no place for additions or omissions by the translator. As shall become clearer in the following discussion, Üster has a source-oriented approach to translation and his criticism in the main is organized via a comparison of the translation with the source text in terms of "equivalence". (However, although Üster compares the target and source texts himself, he does not offer the reader the original but, as I will expand upon below, his own translation instead). He writes:

> Şimdi, en önemli noktaya geleyim. Agatha Christie, ilk önemli başarısı olan Roger Ackroyd Cinayeti'ni, tam da macong oyununun Britanya'da çılgın bir modaya dönüştüğü, köylere kadar yayıldığı yıllarda yazmış. Demek, romanında bu oyuna yer vermesi boşuna değil. Macong, yazarın hem güncelliğe uygun düşen, hem de sahici bir ortam yaratmasına katkıda bulunan bir öğe burada!. (2003a)

> [*Now on to the most critical point: Agatha Christie's novel* The Murder of Roger Ackroyd, *her first big success, was written just when the game of Mahjong had become all the rage in Great Britain, its popularity even penetrating the nooks and crannies of the countryside. It was thus no mere coincidence that the game Mahjong appeared in the book. It is an element which, being typical of its time, allowed the author to render the events in the story in a more realistic fashion!*]

As can be understood, Üster evaluates the importance of the game Mah Jong only from the perspective of the source language and culture, never taking into account the dynamics of the target culture and target readers. We can actually say that Üster's approach to translation and translation criticism reflects the common tendency expounded by Saliha Paker as one of "finding 'faults' through the comparison of source and target texts (Paker, 2003, p. 153). Throughout the article, Üster follows the same pattern, by comparing the two texts and finding "faults". For instance:

> Ebaşi'nin sözünü ettiği macong bölümüne gelince, gerçekten de 16. bölü-mün başlığı "An Evening at Mah Johg" idi. "Bir Mah Jong" ya da "Macong Masasında Bir Akşam" diye çevrilebilir. Romanın Türkçe çevirisinin 16. Bölümünü açtım; başlığı şöyleydi: "Domino"!.. Güler misin, ağlar mısın… Ölür müsün, öldürür müsün… (Üster, 2003a)

---

[3] Unless otherwise stated, all translations are mine.

[*As for the Mahjong chapter, to which Ebashi makes reference; indeed, the title of the sixteenth chapter is none other than 'An Evening at Mah Jong'. It might have been translated as 'A Mah Jong' or 'A Night at the Mah Jong Table'. When I opened the Turkish translation to this chapter, I found that it had been translated as 'Dominoes'. What to do? Laugh or cry? Do or die?*]

In his comparison of the source and target texts, Üster notices what he sees as a discrepancy and immediately adopts a sarcastic approach, resorting to the phrase "Güler misin, ağlar mısın… Ölür müsün, öldürür müsün…" [does one laugh or cry, die or kill?] which is used in Turkish when one does not know what to do when something implausible has occurred. Üster does not try to look at the translation from the perspective of the target, nor does he attempt to question why the translator might have translated Mah Jong as *dominoes*, especially when taking into consideration the year or the period in which the translation was carried out. Below is another example:

İnsanın nutku tutuluyor. Bir kere, "Bay Carter" değil, "Albay Carter ". Üstelik, "adam ukalanın biri" değil, ama neyse! (Üster, 2003a)

[*It leaves you speechless. The man who was "Mr. Carter" in the original becomes "Col. Carter" in the translation. What's more, in the process of translation he somehow becomes transformed into "a snob" - but let's not get hung up on details!*]

As in the previous instance, we again come across a phrase, namely *nutku tutulmak* [to be left speechless], which has the same impact as *güler misin, ağlar mısın*. These phrases imply that what Gönül Suveren (the translator) did is completely unacceptable. Again, the target culture or the target readers of the period are disregarded. As the above extract shows, such phrases or idioms are not the only rhetoric devices he uses to enhance the sarcastic and ironic tone. Furthermore, the frequent use of exclamation marks after phrases like *ama neyse* [well, whatever…] creates a similar effect.

It is interesting to note that for those parts which, according to Üster, do not provide a perfect equivalence with the source text, he presents his own translations as a superior or, indeed, flawless equivalent.

Örnek vermek gerekirse, kitabın aslında 16. Bölümün ikinci paragrafı şöyle: "o geceki konuklarımız, Bayan Gannett ve kilisenin yakınlarında oturan Albay Carter'dı.

[*Just to give an example, in the original, the second paragraph of chapter 16 actually reads as follows: "Our guests that evening were Mrs. Gannett and Col. Carter, who lives near the church."*]

When one reads *kitabın aslında…şöyle* [in the original it reads as], one assumes the English original will follow. However, what we see is Üster's translation. Üster accepts his own translation as the "exact" equivalent of the original. As I have already

pointed out, Üster himself is a noted translator and by providing his own translations as the 'original' text here, he posits himself as an authority that can judge whether a translation is "proper" or not. After presenting his own version as the exact equivalent, Üster introduces Gönül Suveren's as follows: *Çevirmenimiz, bu paragrafı şöyle geçiştirmiş* [our translator glossed over this paragraph as follows] (2003a); in particular, the use of the verb *geçiştirmek* [gloss over] imparts the impression that Suveren is an incompetent translator. It is also interesting to note that Üster refers to Gönül Suveren as the *çevirmen* ('translator') rather than by her name, which would again suggest that he considers her another 'ordinary' and anonymous translator with no special importance, even though she was one of the most prolific translators of her generation[4]. Here, Üster's 'power in discourse' is on full display, whereby he is able to regard himself as the adept translator better able to perform the tasks at hand than Suveren. It can be argued that the sarcasm and the irony in Üster's prose are amongst the tools that he uses to help establish his power and authority and which allow him to adopt a teasing-cum-mocking attitude towards Suveren.

Including his translations as 'the original' also takes us to Üster's definition of translation, which is formed throughout the text. According to Üster, the target text should have no additions or omissions when compared with the source text. As he points out, while the original of *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* is 235 pages, the translation is 191 pages, which is again unacceptable to him. He comments on this aspect throughout his criticism, one such instance being as follows:

> Ama hem olmamış hem de bitmemiş! Olmamış çünkü çevirmen "macong"u "domino" diye çevirince, bu bölümde geçen macong terimlerinin tümünü çıkarıp atmak ve bölümü atlaya atlaya, dahası özetleye özetleye çevirmek yolunu tutmuş.
>
> Agatha Christie'ye makas atmakla yetinmiyor, "katkı"da da bulunuyor!
>
> [*But it's neither satisfactory nor complete! The reason being that, by translating Mahjong as "dominoes," the translator then had to remove every instance of Mahjong from the text, and translate roughshod the rest of the chapter in summarizing chunks.*
>
> *Not content with putting Agatha Christie under the cleaver, the translator goes so far as to make his own "contributions" to the text!*]

What we understand from *atlaya atlaya* [riding roughshod], *özetleye özetleye çevirmek* [summarizing chunks], *makas atmak* [to put under the cleaver] and *katkıda bulunmak* [to make contributions] is that, from Üster's point of view, a translator should not make any additions or omissions to the source text, otherwise the translation will be "*eksik ve yanlış*" [incomplete and faulty]. As can be seen, the lexicalization of the

---

[4] In a telephone interview with Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Gönül Suveren, who started translating in the 1950s and has been working as a translator for over 40 years, states that the number of her translations has reached the "hundreds", although she did not know the exact number. As Tahir Gürçağlar points out, the number of translation registered to Suveren's name in the National Library was 482 (including second editions and other reprints) (2005, p. 145). This number has now reached 637.

criticism is quite striking, especially in the use of the terms *eksik ve yanlış*, since these words reflect the general source-oriented approach in translation criticism, an approach which was criticized by Paker (1988, 2003), (Karantay, 2003) and (Dizdar, 1992) for exalting the source text and author while disregarding the facts-on-the-ground and the socio-physical reality of the target culture.

In sum, we can state that not only the lexicalization of the criticism but also the approach of Celal Üster to translation reflects the age-old tendency to deny any intervention into the source text by the translator. Furthermore, in his translation criticism, he compares the original and the translation without evaluating the dynamics of the target context. I shall proceed below to a discussion of Çağlar Tanyeri's article, which represents a different approach.

3.3 Çağlar Tanyeri and *Cumhuriyet Kitap*

Çağlar Tanyeri's article 'Celal Üster ve Gönül Suveren ya da Çeviri ve Çeviri Eleştirisi', which was published in *Cumhuriyet Kitap,* emphasizes the aspects highlighted by Saliha Paker in the passage I quoted above: namely, that differences between source and target texts should be evaluated within the dynamics of a particular translation act that have taken into account numerous factors that were considered crucial to the process, rather than as mere 'faults' or 'errors'.

Tanyeri (2003) stresses that while criticizing a translation, one should not forget to evaluate the decisions of translators in terms of the target audience and its needs. We can therefore say that, in terms of schematic organization, Tanyeri wants to inform readers of another way translations can be viewed and to offer another approach to translation criticism instead of just comparing the target and source texts in terms of equivalence. This can be considered a rebuttal of Üster's argument. Tanyeri writes:

> …eşdeğerliliği doğal bir gereklilik sayamayız, çünkü biliriz ki çeviri sürecinde çevirmenin orjinal metinle kurduğu ilişki pek çok faktörle sınırlanmıştır ve karmaşık bir ilişkiler ağının içinde yer almaktadır" (Tanyeri, 2003).

> [*We should not consider equivalence to be a natural requisite [of tion], as we are well aware that within the process of translation, the relationship established between the translator and the text is limited by a number of factors and exists within a complex network.*]

When it comes to topic selection, at the beginning of the article, Tanyeri emphasizes that the article she has written is neither an appraisal nor a criticism. It neither defends nor criticizes either Gönül Suveren's translation or Celal Üster's criticism of that translation. She maintains, "Bu yazı, Celal Üster'in 22 Ağustos 2003 tarihinde Radikal Kitap'ta çıkan 'Agatha Christie Cinayeti' başlıklı eleştirisinin okunmasından sonra zihinde beliren bir soru yumağının dışavurumudur" (Tanyeri, 2003) [*This article is the result of a few questions that arose in my mind after reading the translation criticism by Celal Üster in Radikal Kitap on August 22, 2003 entitled "The Murder of Agatha Christie"*]

. It is quite clear that in this particular article, Tanyeri does not wish to establish herself as an authority in the field; in the latter sections of the article, she answers readers' questions, although not in Üster's casual manner. However, when we scrutinize her sentences, we also notice an attempt to resort to an authority that comes from academic knowledge, as in the following:

> Çevirilerin kalitesi, yeterlilik ya da yaratıcılık düzeyi daima tartışmaya açıktır ve açık olmalıdır. Ama eleştirel görüşlerimizin temelinde de daha geniş tarihsel bir bağlamın, kültürel bir paradigmanın izleri olduğunu ve bu yüzden de tasavvurlarımızın göreceleşebileceğini unutmamak gerek. Tek bir çeviri anlayışı olmadığı gibi tek ve mutlak bir çeviri eleştirisi anlayışından da söz etmek mümkün değil. (Tanyeri, 2003).

> [*In terms of the level of competency and creativity, the quality of tions has always been, and should always be, open to debate. However, our critical perspectives are fundamentally marked by broader historical contexts and cultural paradigms and so we must not forget that our conceptualizations are also underscored by relativism. Just as there is no single approach to translation, so too is it impossible to speak of a singular and absolute approach when it comes to translation criticism.'*]

As can be understood, the verbs *açıktır ve açık olmalıdır* [has always been and should always be open], *unutmamak gerek* [must not be forgotten/must not forget] and *mümkün değil* [it is impossible] imply a certain imperativeness that also impart an unmistakable sense of power and authority.

It should also be noted although Tanyeri's article appeared in a newspaper supplement, there were notable differences with Üster's text, especially in terms of style and lexicalization. Since Çağlar Tanyeri is an academic and a translator, her prose style and her choice of words is more formal. While Üster's article is replete with colloquial usages helping him to create an ironic, sarcastic and more casual tone, Tanyeri prefers words such as *kaynak metin* [source text] and *eşdeğerlilik* [equivalence], reflecting the terminology of Translation Studies, which actually compensates for the hesitation she shows in establishing herself as an academic at the beginning of the article. However, she is also clearly aware that the article is intended for a general readership, so she sometimes provides explanations, as in the following: Eğer bir metnin, daha da özelleştirelim, bir edebiyat metninin çevirisiyle her düzlemde mutlak bir eşdeğerlilik sağlaması gerektiğini, 'tıpkısının aynısı' üretmekle yükümlü olduğunu düşünüyorsak, o zaman çevirmeni bir günahkar saymak çok kolay olacaktır" (Tanyeri, 2003); [*If we believe that a text, specifically a literary text, should be the absolute equivalent of its translation on every level, in other words, should be a carbon copy of its translation, then it will be easier to consider a translator as a sinner*]. Here, 'carbon copy' becomes the explanation of the concept of 'absolute equivalence'.

Çağlar Tanyeri (2003) admits that one can criticize a translation because the translator might have made changes to the text at various levels such as vocabulary or sentence structure, or that the translator may have skipped some portions of the text

or made additions when compared to the source text, but she also asks whether such a suggestion be generalized and brought to signify an absolute norm for translation criticism. She starts seeking the answer to this question with the following sentence: "Öyle sanıyorum ki, bu sorunun yanıtı her birimizin metin ve çeviri olgusuyla ilgili tasavvurlarında, ön kabullerinde, ön yargılarında yatmaktadır" (Tanyeri, 2003); [*It seems to me that the answer to this question lies in the conceptualizations, presuppositions and prejudices of each one of us regarding texts and translation*]. In this sentence, the use of the term "each one of us" is notable. It may be interpreted as an attempt to avoid making her article a direct criticism of Celal Üster's article by generalizing her answer to "each one of us". By stating early on that her article is "the result of a few questions which arose in her mind" (as mentioned above), it might also be said that she is also avoiding at the outset a direct reply to Celal Üster.

However, Tanyeri begins her discussion with a long quote from Celal Üster's article, summarizing the key parts in which Üster criticizes Gönül Suveren's translation. In the rest of the article, she uses the following words (although not in quotation marks), which make her article appear to be a critique of Üster's criticism: "Bu saptamalardan anlaşılacağı üzere eleştiri üç kategori üzerinde temellenmektedir: değişiklikler, eksikler/atlamalar ve (Celal Üster'in yersiz ve yanlış olduğunu düşündüğü) eklemeler/katkılar" (Tanyeri, 2003); [*Based upon these findings, we can say that translation criticism appears to be founded upon three categories: alterations, deletions and/or skipping text, and (as Celal Üster judges to be improper and wrong) textual supplementation*.] Words such as *atlamalar* and *eksikler* are repeated throughout her article.

The most obvious criticism Tanyeri raises against Celal Üster concerns his explanation of the replacement of 'mah jong' with *dominoes*. Üster (2003a) explains this replacement with an assumption that Gönül Suveren referred to the Redhouse English-to-Turkish dictionary and came up with the definition which explained mahjong as a type of dominoes developed in China and immediately decided to translate 'Mahjong' as *dominoes.* Below I will quote Çağlar Tanyeri (2003), who brings a different (indeed, a target-oriented approach) to the replacement of 'mah jong' with *domino* in the translation:

> ...bir çeviride yapılan değişiklikleri, atlamaları, eklemeleri bir özensizlik, saygısızlık, yetersizlik kabul edebileceğimiz gibi, aynı müdahaleleri çevirmenin iletişim amaçlı 'işlemleri' olarak da kabul edebiliriz pekala. Bu anlamda 'macong' yerine 'domino' demek, yani metnin sözcük düzeyinde bir değişiklik yapmak, sonra da bu değişikliğe uygun olarak oyuna ilişkin terimleri metinden çıkarmak oldu bittiye getirmek olarak yorumlanabileceği gibi metne çeviri okurunun ihtiyaçları ve beklentileri doğrultusunda çevirmenin bilinçli ve tutarlı müdahalesi olarak da yorumlanabilir. Eğer Gönül Suveren gerçekten Celal Üster'in tahminde bulunduğu gibi **"Macong desem kimse anlamaz, domino derim, olur biter!"** diye düşündüyse bu düşüncenin içinde Celal Üster'in eleştirisine konu olmasının yanı sıra başka bir şey daha gizlidir, o da çevirmenin

'macong'u çeviri okuru açısından bir iletişim sorunu olarak algılaması ve bunu çözmeye çalışmasıdır. Çevirmenin kendi kültürünün okurunu hiçe sayarak 'macong'u bir sorun olarak algılamaması, 'macong'a domino demekten daha iyi ya da daha erdemli bir davranış mıdır?

[[*J*]*ust as we can accept that alterations, skipping of text and additions may be examples of carelessness, disrespect and incompetence, so too can we just as easily view those same interventions as "procedures" deliberately undertaken by the translator in order to facilitate communication. Thus, just as making alterations at the level of terminology (saying 'dominoes' instead of 'Mahjong') and removing the original term can be interpreted simply as a 'let's get done with it' approach, such a move can also be interpreted as a conscious and viable solution undertaken by the translator to satisfy the needs and expectations that the reader brings to the translation. If Gönül Suveren truly thought, as Celal Üster supposed, "If I translate this simply as **'Mahjong,' nobody will get it. I'll call it dominoes, and be done with it!'"** then there is another, hidden aspect to this thought, something beyond that which makes it the object of Üster's criticism— namely, the fact that the translator realized that the term 'Mahjong' would be problematic for the reader and thus sought a solution to this problem. Would it have been better and more prudent if, rather than calling Majong dominoes, the translator had completed disregarded the target reader and her/his cultural context and thus failed to perceive of "Mahjong" as a problem?*]

Şehnaz Tahir (2000, p.109) explains that the descriptive approach sets off from the translated text taking 'the process' of translation into consideration, bypassing any attempt to impose rules; it demarcates the characteristics of the translated text and allows us to deduce and to generalize based upon these characteristics. In other words, it is not mere description but also an attempt to scrutinize and resolve. As we see in her criticism, unlike Üster, Tanyeri is trying to understand the reason why Suveren might have opted for *dominoes* instead of *mah jong*.

The above quote, besides representing the target-oriented approach to translation (and translation criticism), is also filled with references to Üster's approach. First of all, Tanyeri defines *atlamalar* [omissions] and *eklemeler* [additions] in the translation of Suveren as "iletişim amaçlı 'işlemler'" [procedures] deliberately undertaken by the translator in order to facilitate communication], not as *özensizlik*, [carelessness] *saygısızlık* [disrespect] or *yetersizlik* [incompetence] as implied by Üster in his criticism. As quoted above, Üster interprets the change of *mah jong* to *dominoes* in the translation as *oldu bittiye getirmek* [to be done with it]. But Tanyeri points out that these changes can also be considered as "metne çeviri okurunun ihtiyaçları ve beklentileri doğrultusunda çevirmenin bilinçli ve tutarlı müdahalesi olarak da yorumlanabilir" [a move that may also be interpreted as a conscious and viable solution undertaken by the translator to satisfy the needs and expectations that the reader brings to the translation]. Actually, here we can say that Tanyeri makes an intra-lingual

translation and subverts Üster's source-oriented approach to the target-oriented approach she offers in the article. Most importantly, she considers the replacement of *mah jong* with *dominoes* as "erdemli bir davranış" [a prudent move].

At this juncture, it is necessary to discuss the period in which Gönül Suveren was an active agent of the system of translated literature. As we learn from 'Ömrünü Çeviriye Ayıran İki Kadın: Gönül ve Gülten Suveren Kardeşler' [Two Women who Devoted Their Lives to Translation: Gönül and Gülten Suveren Sisters], an article by Alev K. Bulut and Sabri Gürses, Gönül Suveren started translating in the 1950s and earned her living as a journalist, book translator, encyclopedia writer and as a translator for journals. Up until the end of the 1990s, she continued translating books for Altın Kitaplar, a publishing house established in 1956 and still active in Turkey and which, since its foundation, has focused primarily on the translations of bestsellers and popular books. In her book *Kapılar: Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar* [Doors: Approaches to Translation History], Tahir Gürçağlar offers a map of the network of which Altın Kitaplar was a part in the 1960s. In order to understand the translation norms of the publishing house, she analyzes three randomly chosen bestsellers published by Altın Kitaplar. One of these works is a translation by Gönül Suveren of Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities* [İki Şehrin Hikayesi]. In her analysis of the translation's matricial norms, Tahir Gürçağlar notices certain ommissions and simplifications. When she contacted Gönül Suveren by telephone, Suveren stated that the publishing house was encouraging its translators to shorten some of the books due to page restrictions (2005, p. 148). Gülten Suveren also revealed much in an interview with Sevgi Serper and Sabri Gürses (as quoted in Bulut and Gürses) about the period in which she and her sister Gönül Suveren were actively translating. For instance, she admitted that when the length of a novel by Agatha Christie, for instance, exceeded the publishing house's budget, they were asked to shorten the novel. When such requests were made, she (Gülten Suveren) would read the novel and translate an entire page in just four sentences. She went on to say that it was the high price of paper and the black market in pirated books that forced the publishing house to make these requests (2019, p. 253). It can therefore be safely inferred that while shortening this specific Agatha Christie novel, Gönül Suveren might have opted for the term *domino* rather than *macong* as it would have been difficult when dealing with space and time restrictions to explain such an alien game to the unfamiliar reader. So as Çağlar Tanyeri points out, Suveren's choice can rightfully be interpreted as "a prudent move".

We can conclude that Üster's and Tanyeri's approaches to translation and translation criticism differ significantly and this can be clearly observed in their discourse in the aspects I explored above. This stems mostly from the fact that although both Üster and Tanyeri are translators, Tanyeri's academic background leads her to adopt a more realistic approach as to why Gönül Suveren replaced *mah jong* with *dominoes* (as well as the other changes she made in the translation).

4. Power over Discourse

After establishing himself as a professional translator with license to criticize a translation, Üster proceeds to further escalate his criticism. He calls upon readers and

the relevant institutions to take action. For instance, he writes: "Böylesi çeviri kıyımlarını dergi sayfalarında eleştirerek, umarım, okuyucuyu uyarıp uyandırıyoruzdur" (2003a) [*Hopefully by critiquing in the pages of a magazine botched translations such as this we can both warn and edify readers*]. We understand that the aim of his criticism is not only to criticize the translation but to also alert and warn readers.

But it is not only the readers he wants to warn; associated institutions, such as copyright agencies and publishing houses are also implicated. He states that although such criticisms have no legal enforcement, the copyright agency can check the translation and act accordingly. He states:

> Dahası, denetmeli. Aracı ajans, iki tarafın, daha çok da o kitabın asıl yayın hakkını elinde tutan kuruluşun, dolayısıyla da kitabın yazarının haklarını korumakla yükümlü değil mi?

> Yayın hakları satın alınarak eksik ve yanlış bir çeviriyle yayımlanan bir kitabı, bir başkasının doğru ve eksiksiz bir çeviriyle yeniden yayımlama olanağı bulunmadığına göre, belirli bir denetim düzeneğini işler kılmak gerekmez mi? (2003a)

> [*Moreover, there should be monitoring. Doesn't the intermediary agency have a responsibility to protect the rights of the body that has the publishing rights, and therefore, ultimately, the rights of the author?*

> *Seeing as there is no possibility of publishing a new, correct and complete translation of a work whose publishing rights were purchased and that was published in an incorrect and deficient translation, surely there is a need to implement an editing apparatus?*]

What is striking in the above quote is that Üster is sure that his criticism is so just and right that he even goes to great lengths to invite the related institutions to withdraw the translation from circulation. So what he judges to be *eksik ve yanlış bir çeviri* [an incomplete and incorrect translation] will be replaced by *doğru ve eksiksiz bir çeviri* [a correct and complete translation].

In the next issue of *Radikal Kitap Eki*, Üster (2003b) evaluates the withdrawal from circulation as a "soylu bir davranış" [a gallant response] and writes, "Yıllardır yapa-maya çalıştığım çeviri eleştirileri ilk kez somut bir karşılık bulduğu için sanırım kendimi mutlu sayabilirim. Hem Agatha Christie'ciler adına hem de kendi adıma, Altın Kitaplar'a teşekkür borçluyum" [*I believe I am happy as for the first time one of my translation criticisms, a field in which I have been active for years, has borne concrete results. I would like to extend my thanks for Altın Kitaplar, both on my behalf and on Agatha Christie's behalf*].

5. Discussion

In my analysis of the contextual properties, the participants to the discourse and their roles and purposes were the most significant factors. The setting, especially the newspaper supplements where the articles were published, were also significant as they

made the topic under discussion accessible to a public audience that was not limited to but also included the translator, Gönül Suveren, other translators involved in literary and/or other types of translation, scholars working in the field of Translation Studies, students of Translation Studies and publishing houses as commissioners of translated works.

What makes this case or the translation criticism of Celal Üster so unique is that it led to the withdrawal of a translation from sales and later to the commissioning of another translation of *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* by Altın Kitap Publishing[5]. My description of Celal Üster's discourse in his translation criticism demonstrates that he first of all establishes himself as the knowledgeable party of the conversation he has engaged in with his readers. His ironic tone, sarcasm and use of local exclamations and idioms enhance the superior status he attaches to himself as the translator and the critic.

An analysis of his schematic organization suggests that his definition of translation reflects the old paradigm in Translation Studies, which puts the source text in a higher position than the target text. His approach to translation criticism is a perfect example of a tendency that is being replaced/phased out not only in Turkey but also in the West, namely that of error analysis (see van den Broeck, 1985; Paker, 2003 & Tahir, 2000).

A discourse description of Çağlar Tanyeri's article highlights a more formal tone in her appeal to readers. However, this does not mean that she establishes herself as a more knowledgeable party but rather as a questioning and investigative reader who is attempting to understand the context of the period when the translation was first published. Although she discusses translation using the more formal and technical terms of Translation Studies, she paraphrases the terms so that they become more accessible to her readers.

Suat Karantay's argument (quoted above) related to the qualifications of the translation critic becomes more significant at this point. While Tanyeri, being well versed in translation theory and being aware of the discussions taking place in the field of Translation Studies, develops an objective analysis of the reasons why Gönül Suveren might have made some changes to the original, Celal Üster severely and quite bitterly criticizes the translator without even attempting to see the overall picture, causing the translation to be labelled as a "bad" one.

6. Conclusion

According to Üster, the withdrawal of the book is due to his "translation criticism". But in the light of this paper, it – the withdrawal – may be seen not so much as the result of Üster's criticism but more of *Radikal Kitap* and *Radikal*'s position of privilege and its influence over public opinion. In this paper, my aim was to show that different

---

[5] In 2005, Altın Kitaplar published another translation of the novel by Gülden Şen; in 2018 another translation by Çiğdem Öztekin of the same novel appeared, also published by Altın Kitaplar.

approaches exist to translation and translation criticism in Turkey by analyzing the course that emerged in the supplements of two important newspapers in Turkey (*Radikal* and *Cumhuriyet*) around Gönül Suveren's translation of *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*. I also wanted to show how a highly questionable translation criticism, one that clings to outmoded paradigms of translation and translation criticism, can cause the withdrawal of a translation from circulation and perpetuate similar discourses via its author's influence over public opinion.

From a descriptive perspective, translations of literary work do more than introduce new works of literature or authors into the target literary system; they also function as works of literature and there are numerous factors that affect translators' decisions during the translation process etc., such as the expectations of the target audience or the publishing houses. Thus, apart from their literary value, they are also perfect material for later analyses by translation researchers and literary scholars into the period in which they were published. This alone may be a reason for bringing to attention the so-called 'success' of Celal Üster in causing the withdrawal of a translation from bookshelves.

References

Aksoy, B. (2001). Çeviride çevirmen seçimleri ışığında çeviri eleştirisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *18*(2), 1-16.

Bulut, A. K. & Gürses, S. (2019). Ömrünü çeviriye adayan iki kadın: Gönül ve Gülten Suveren Kardeşler. In Ş. Tahir Gürçağlar (Ed.), *Kelimelerin Kıyısında: Türkiye'de Kadın Çevirmenler* (pp. 246-276). İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.

Demirkol Ertürk, Ş. (2019). Ambrose Bierce'ın *Şeytanın Sözlüğü* yapıtının Türkçe çevirilerinde mizah öğelerinin aktarımı. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Blimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *21*(1), 11-33.

Dizdar, D. (1992). *Metis Çeviri*'de çeviri eleştirisi. *Metis Çeviri*, 20-21, 124-134.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: Multidisciplanary Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

Karantay, S. (2003). Çeviri eleştirisi: Sorunlar, ilkeler, uygulamalar. In M. Rifat (Ed.), *Çeviri Seçkisi I: Çeviriyi Düşünenler* (pp.165-175). İstanbul, Dünya Yayıncılık.

Paker, S. (2003). Çeviride 'yanlış/doğru' sorunu ve şiir çevirisinin değerlendirilmesi. In M. Rifat (Ed.) *Çeviri Seçkisi I: Çeviriyi Düşünenler* (pp.153-164). İstanbul, Dünya Yayıncılık.

Paker, S. (1988). Çeviri eleştirisinin kuramla ilişkisi üzerine bazı düşünceler. *Metis Çeviri*, 4, 116-121.

Tanyeri, Ç. (2003, October 30). Celal Üster ve Gönül Suveren ya da çeviri ve çeviri eleştirisi. *Cumhuriyet Kitap*. p. A8.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2005). *Kapılar: Çeviri tarihine yaklaşımlar*. İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık.

Tahir, Ş. (2000). Çeviri eleştirisi eğitiminde iki kavram: Yanlış ve varsayımsal kurgu. In T. Kurultay (Ed.) *Forum: Türkiye'de Çeviri Eğitimi*, (pp.107-113) İstanbul, Sel Yayıncılık.

Üster, C. (2003a). Agatha Christie Cinayet. *Radikal Kitap*. Retrieved 15.5.2019 from http://www.radikal.com.tr/Default.aspx?aType=EklerDetay&ArticleID=855199&Date=01.06.2008&CategoryID=40

Üster, C. (2003b). Soylu bir davranış. *Radikal Kitap*. Retrieved 15.5.2019 from http://www.radikal.com.tr/Default.aspx?aType=EklerDetay&ArticleID=855220&Date=01.06.2008&CategoryID=40

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. D. Schiffrin et al. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 352-371). Massachusetts, Blackwell Publishing.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplanary Introduction Volume 2* (pp.1-38). London: Sage Publications.