EDITING AS REWRITING

Esra BİRKAN BAYDAN[*]

Abstract

The products of earlier Turkish literature became less and less comprehensible to younger generations, after the Language Reform which began around 1930s. This led to re-editions of earlier literary works. This paper views editing, in terms of re-editions of earlier works, as a translating practice and accounts for it within the realm of translation studies. Editorial practices with regard to earlier literary works is often accompanied by two main concerns, which in turn lead to two main approaches and/or forms of editing. The first concern is to make the literary work intelligible to younger generations, leading to the *purification* approach. The second concern is related to preserving the style of the author and approximating the original work, which results in *critical editions.* The focal point of the first approach is the reader whereas the latter is concerned with the author. The two approaches will be evaluated through examples.

Key words: Editing, rewriting, purification, intralingual translation, skopos.

Özet

Türk edebiyatının eski eserleri 1930'larda başlayan Dil Devrimi'nden sonra genç nesillerce anlaşılamaz hale gelmiş; bu da eski eserlerin yeniden basılmasına yol açmıştır. Bu makale, eski eserlerin yeniden basılması bağlamında yapılan redaksiyon (metin düzenleme) işini bir çeviri etkinliği olarak ele almakta ve çeviribilim çerçevesinde değerlendirmektedir. Eski eserlerin redaksiyonuna genellikle iki temel kaygı eşlik eder; bu da iki temel yaklaşıma veya redaksiyon türüne yol açar. Birinci kaygı eski eseri yeni nesillerin okuyabileceği veya anlayabileceği bir hale getirmekle ilgilidir; sadeleştirmeye yol açar. İkinci kaygı yazarın biçemini ve orijinal eseri koruyabilmekle ilgilidir; eleştirel basımların hazırlanmasına neden olur. Birinci yaklaşımın odak noktası okur iken, ikincininki yazardır. Bu yazıda her iki yaklaşım da örneklerle değerlendirilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Redaksiyon, yeniden yazım, sadeleştirme, diliçi çeviri, skopos

Introduction

Turkish language is distinguished from many other languages because it has gone through linguistic engineering; a deliberate attempt to change the language and its alphabet. Therefore editing, especially in the context of literary works written before the Language Reform, may involve *intralingual translation,* in Roman Jakobson's terms. Jakobson defines *intralingual translation* as follows:

> "Intralingual translation or *rewording* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language. [...] The intralingual translation of a word uses either another, more or less synonymous, word or resorts to a circumlocution. Yet synonymy, as a rule, is not complete equivalence" (Jakobson 2000: 114).

However, viewing editorial practices of this sort as intralingual translation is only helpful if we can manage to escape from the vicious circle of equivalence and faithfulness discussions. For Hans J. Vermeer, *Skopos Theory* was "a loophole in the vicious circle" (Vermeer 1998: 49).

---

[*] Okutman, Marmara Üniversitesi / Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Bölümü Doktora Öğrencisi.

"First of all, we need a clear point of departure in order to break free of the *vicious circle* of endless variations on the same theme, like the interminable discussions about "faithful" and "free" translations. My own starting point is the strictly functional "skopos" theory. Others may start somewhere else. The main thing is to get to new results. Skopos Theory seems to provide an answer to the question of why (or for what purpose) the translator translates. [...] There is no sense in translating a source text whichever way it is done if the translation does not serve its purpose." (Vermeer 1998: 62, *emphasis mine*)

Another loophole in the vicious circle was André Lefevere's concept of *rewriting*. Lefevere considers translation as a type of rewriting, which shares certain characteristics with other forms of rewriting, such as "historiography, anthologies, criticism and editing" (Lefevere 1992: 4). They are all texts written about other existing texts to create an image of the period, the author and his/her work in a different time or culture. They are all *metatexts*[1] necessarily manipulated to fit in with the "ideological and poetological currents of their time and culture" (Lefevere 1992: 8). Consequently, the concept of *rewriting* provides a broader category[2] for translation researchers to study not only translational but also editorial practices under the realm of translation studies.

The concept of *rewriting* enables the researcher to evaluate editorial practices within a socio-cultural setting in time; whereas *skopos theory*[3] diverts the attention to the purpose of re-editions.

Language Reform and The Purification Debate

The Language Reform, whose aim was to purge Turkish of Persian and Arabic borrowings, made communication with earlier generations and their texts difficult. For Geoffrey Lewis, the Language Reform was a *catastrophic success* because it deprived the language of its natural development.

"The loss affects every Turk who now, in speaking or writing, gropes for the precise word to express the required meaning and does not find it, because it is as dead as Etruscan and has not been replaced. Moreover many of the neologisms were constructed arbitrarily, with little or no regard for the rules and conventions of Turkish, with the result that any Turk with a feeling for language finds at least some of them excruciating and cannot bear to use or to hear them." (Lewis 1999: 4)

According to Tahsin Yücel however, the Language Reform was inevitable and imperative mainly for two reasons:

---

[1] *Metatexts* are texts written about other texts; i.e. they all start from a source text.

[2] See Tymoczko 2007. Tymoczko views *rewriting* as a broad category and she introduces three more categories of *representation, transmission (or transfer)* and *transculturation* to enable translation researchers to gain a deeper understanding of the boundaries and attributes of translation as a whole. In my opinion broader categories also enable translation researchers to engage in interdisciplinary work.

[3] See Vermeer 2000. Translation is conceived as an action which is based on a source text, which has an aim/a purpose and which leads to a result.

1) there was a gap between the written language of the elite and the spoken language of the ordinary people (Yücel 2007: 176-177);

2) the Ottoman Turkish was unable to cater for the concepts of modern sciences and modern thinking (Yücel 2007: 183). We should bear in mind that civilization and modernization have been connected with Westernization, ever since the *Tanzimat* Period (See Karadağ 2008). In other words, Turkish language had to be engineered to be made compatible with Western thinking.

The opponents of the Turkish Language Reform, like Elif Şafak, claim that purification of the Turkish language cut the link between older and younger generations and that Turkish has practically shrunk as a result.

> "I find that very dangerous because I think that linguistic cleansing is something comparable to ethnic cleansing. Imagination shrank, culture and information couldn't flow from one generation to another. We have generations of people who don't know the things their grandparents know, who cannot read the writing of their grandparents, who cannot read the names or who don't know the meanings of the street names." (Şafak, 2005)

Editing in this sense gains further importance. Re-editions of earlier products of Turkish literature are often accompanied by the purification debate. Turkish intellectuals, writers, poets and literary critics discuss the issue from time to time in the press. The following is an example from *Milliyet Pazar*.

> "Mesela bu sadeleştirmeyi kim ya da kimler yapacak? Yöntemi ne olacak? Öztürkçeleştirelim derken, mesela Ahmet Hamdi'nin eserlerinde "tansık", "erinç" gibi sözcüklere rastlayacak mıyız? Ya da Halid Ziya'nın "Aşk-ı Memnu"na "Yasak Aşk" derken içimiz ezilecek mi? Ve tabii, iyi niyetli bile olsa bu müdahaleler yazarların üslubuna zarar verecek, Türkçeyi yoksullaştıracak mı? " (Kaya, 2002)

> (Who is going to be involved in this purification process? What will be the method? Are we going to come across words like "*tansık*", "*erinç*" (new Turkish words which mean "miracle" and "tranquility") in Ahmet Hamdi's works as we transform the language into pure Turkish? Aren't we going to feel bitter when we call Halid Ziya's "*Aşk-ı Memnu*", "*Yasak Aşk*" (old and new equivalents for "Forbidden Love"). And certainly, wouldn't even the well-meant interferences harm the author's style and impoverish Turkish?) (*My translation*)[4]

Ülkü Tamer regards purification efforts as translation, and even as bad translation. He argues that if an old word in a poem is exchanged with a new one, that poem becomes something else and is transformed into another poem. He offers to exchange "*sema*" (an old Turkish equivalent of sky) with "*gök*" (the new Turkish equivalent) in Ahmet Haşim's poem just to see the difference. Tamer makes a distinction between translation and re-creation *(rewriting?)*.

> "Bir dilden bir başka dile çevirmekle aynı dilde yeniden yaratma arasında dünya kadar fark var. " (Tamer, 2002)

> (There is a whole lot of difference between translating from one language into another and reproducing within the same language.)

---

[4] All translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

However Tamer does not clarify what the difference is. Attila İlhan claims that Ottoman Turkish incorporates a lot of nuances which cannot be catered for in the engineered Turkish. İlhan provides the example of "*üzüntü*", which means "sadness" to support his argument. Although there is only one word in modern Turkish for sadness, which is "*üzüntü*", there is "*melal*", "*hüzün*", "*elem*", "*keder*" etc. in Ottoman Turkish. The nuances among these words can be resembled to the nuances among "grief", "sorrow", "unhappiness", "despair", "misery" etc. in English.

Those who are not against purification express certain reservations about the method. Doğan Hızlan is one of them.

> "Birine verip de sadece kelimeleri değiştirerek olmaz bu iş. Çünkü her metnin bir söz dizimi vardır. Bir cümle yapısı, üslubu vardır. Kelimeleri bugünkü dilde kullanıldığı biçimiyle yazarsak ne yazarın üslubu, ne metnin özgünlüğü kalır. Bambaşka bir eser olur. Bunun da edebi bir işlevi yoktur. " (Hızlan, 2002)

> (You can not do this by having someone change the words. Because, each text has its unique syntax, its own sentence structure and style. If we change the words according to their current usage the writer's style and the uniqueness of the work will be lost.)

Others like Lale Müldür, Selim İleri and Ayşe Kulin suggest that the words which are not intelligible to today's generations could be written in paranthesis. However, Ülkü Tamer contends that this method of writing old words in paranthesis makes reading extremely difficult, especially in works like Namık Kemal's *İntibah*. Therefore he suggests printing the original work and its translated form on opposite pages facing one another.

In conclusion, the purification debate deals with the question of whether earlier products of Turkish literature should be translated into today's Turkish on one hand, and on the other hand there is the question of methodology. However, none of the Turkish intellectuals, quoted above, wholeheartedly agree with the purification process. That is why they are so much worried about the method of doing it.

Supporting or resenting the Language Reform depends on one's ideology. However as purification involves intralingual translation it cannot escape from convictions surrounding every translation practice in society. Even the supporters of the Language Reform show resistance to purification due to an aura of originality around literary works. Lawrence Venuti relates originality to a Romantic conception of authorship:

> "The 'original' is a form of self-expression appropriate to the author, a copy true to his personality or intention, an image endowed with resemblance, whereas the translation can be no more than a copy of a copy, derivative, simulacral, false, an image without resemblance. " (Venuti 1992: 3)

With the influence of post-structuralist and deconstructive thinking however, translation studies gained new perspectives and abandoned notions of 'fidelity' and 'equivalence'. Text is no longer regarded as a completed product, written by its author once and for all; but as a process open to new interpretations by its readers. These notions place author and translator, source text and target text on equal footing. Nevertheless, we observe that the same old dilemma marks its stamp on editorial concerns under study here: whether (and how) to be 'faithful' to the author and his work. *Translate or not to translate! That is the question.* Hence the two approaches: purification and critical editions.

Purified Editions: Intralingual Translation

Purification in Turkish is *sadeleştirme,* which also means simplification. Simplification is misleading because the original work is literally translated into current modern Turkish, not simplified. The focal point of such editions is the reader rather than the author. The aim is to make the literary work comprehensible to younger generations. It is more important that the reader understands the work without much ado; that is, without stumbling over old words.

Although we come across many 'purified versions' in the bookshops I could only find two examples which are actually called 'intralingual translation'. One of them is published in *Metis Çeviri (3)* under the heading of "An Example of Intralingual Translation". It is a story, entitled *Kediler,* by Sâmipaşazâde Sezâyi written in 1308 (1891) and translated by Güler Güven. Although there is no commentary or a foreword written by Güven, there is an essay written by Vecihe Hatiboğlu titled "*Türk Dili Üzerine Bir Görüş*" (An Insight on the Turkish Language). This essay defends the language reform against those who accuse it of "purism and racism" (Hatiboğlu 1988: 167). Hatiboğlu contends that the aim of the reform is to enrich and empower Turkish (Hatiboğlu 1988: 166) and makes the following remark.

"Türkçe yoksa, Türkler de yoktur. " (Hatiboğlu 1988: 167)
(There are no Turks if there is no Turkish.)

The other example is a translation of Fatma Aliye Hanım's *Enin* written in 1328 (1910) and translated by Tülay Gençtürk Demircioğlu. In this very comprehensive edition, Demircioğlu provides the source text written in Arabic letters, its transcription and its intralingual translation. She also refers to the draft of the novel and the author's documentation which can be found in the Atatürk Library and the archives of Suna Selen Soner, Fatma Aliye Hanım's granddaughter. In the foreword, Demircioğlu explains her purpose as follows:

"Çalışmamız iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Çevriyazı ile Arap harfli metin okuma sorununu ortadan kaldırmak; diliçi çeviri ile de günümüz okuruna seslenebilmek amaçlanmıştır." (Demircioğlu 2005: viii)

(The study is comprised of two parts: The aim of transcription is to overcome the problem of Arabic letters; and the aim of intralingual translation is to address today's reader.)

More importantly, she maintains that the study serves the enrichment of Turkish cultural and literary history, and it provides important data for the research of women studies in Turkey (Demircioğlu 2005: viii). Demircioğlu explicitly states the reason why she uses the term 'intralingual translation'. She mentions that what is hitherto called 'simplification' or 'purification' is actually an act of intralingual translation. According to her, "the term purification conceals the fact that the study carried out within the culture is actually an act of translation" (Demircioğlu 2005: xx). She also refers to Roman Jakobson's definition of 'intralingual translation' and explains her strategy in the translation process by maintaining that she assumed the norm of intelligibility to overcome the problems of grammar and syntax posed by Ottoman Turkish (ibid).

In conclusion, although Demircioğlu's intralingual translation of *Enin* is similar to 'purified versions' of other literary works in its purpose – i.e. making it intelligible to modern reader – it differs from them in its scholarly focus, mainly for two reasons. First because it has

the nature of a critical edition and secondly because it has the intention of providing data for the research of women studies in Turkey.

Critical Editions

Another approach in editing the products of earlier Turkish literature is compiling critical editions – a practice of textual criticism. Critical editions only interfere with the text at the level of spelling and punctuation in order to update them according to current standard usage. In addition, they compare and contrast the serialized form of the literary work with its publication in book format and provide information about the changes the author her/himself made to the serialized work prior to its publication as a book. Although the changes made to the original work are at minimum level in such editions, there is a lot of editorial work involved.

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Ahmet Haşim's works are published by *Yapı Kredi Yayınları* (YKY) as critical editions. As we are going to deal with Ahmet Haşim's critical edition in detail in the next part, I will concentrate on Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's YKY edition of *Huzur* in this section to provide an example to critical editions.

The editor of this book is Ayfer Tunç, an author herself. Yücel Demirel is referred to as "*yayına hazırlayan*" (copy editor). I assume that he is the copy editor because he is the one who made research, made necessary changes and established the differences between the two versions. The purpose of this critical edition is explained as follows:

> "Bu yayının amacı *Huzur*'un ilk baskısındaki bazı hataları ve eksikleri tefrikadan yararlanarak düzeltmektir. Bunun yanı sıra, tefrika metin ile kitap metni arasındaki bazı önemli farklara ve değiştirmelere değinerek, Tanpınar'ın *Huzur'u* ikinci kez yayıma hazırlarken izlediği yolu okura göstermektir. Ancak hepsinden de önemlisi, Tanpınar'ın tefrika metinden kitaba aktarmadığı bazı önemli pasajları okura sunmaktır." (Demirel 2004: 383)

> (The purpose of this publication is to correct some errors and omissions in the first edition of the book with reference to the serialized edition. This edition attracts attention to some important differences between the serialized and book editions, and the changes Tanpınar made in preparation of the book for publication. However, most importantly, we aim to present the reader some important passages that Tanpınar left out in the book.)

There is a note on the inside cover of the book explaining that the 1949 edition of the novel published by Remzi Kitabevi was treated as the source text. This text was then compared to its 1948 serialized form published in the *Cumhuriyet* newsletter, to be able to account for printing mistakes. The text was also updated in terms of current ortographical conventions. There is a list in the book contrasting the differences between the 1949 edition in book format and its 1948 serialized edition. These differences are then analysed by Handan İnci at the end of the book. A summary of flow of events in the serialized edition is also provided in this critical edition.

In the "Notes" (*Açıklamalar*) section where the summary of the serialized edition also takes place, a distinction is made between intentional and unintentional changes and examples are provided. Intentional changes made by the author have been left intact in this critical edition whereas, not all, but some of the unintentional changes have been corrected. Some of the unintentional changes take the form of omissions which affect the coherence and consistency of the text. However it is asserted that,

"Tefrikada yer alıp kitaba geçirilmeyen bazı bölümlerin yanlışlıkla çıktığı düşünülebilirse de, bunlar metne müdahale etmemek amacıyla olduğu gibi bırakılmıştır." (İnci 2004: 383)

(We think that some parts which take place in the serialized edition are accidentally left out in the book. However, we left them as they were in order not to interfere with the text.)

In conclusion, critical editions like this one, hold the author in the greatest respect and a lot of work is put in to present the author and his work in the most comprehensive way to his/her readers. In this edition for instance, the reader has the chance to follow the writer's creating and recreating process. Such attempts are more likely to address professional readers[5] (or fans) of the author and they have a scholarly focus.

In what follows, I intend to analyze four different editions of Ahmet Haşim's *Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* (Frankfurt Travel). One critical edition and three purified versions will be evaluated in comparison with the first edition of 1933; in order to exemplify the manner in which the *skopos* is reflected on the editorial practice.

A Comparison Of Purified And Critical Editions

Ahmet Haşim lived between 1887 and 1933. His poetry is collected in Göl Saatleri (1921); and in Piyale (1926). His works of prose are collected in three books: Bize Göre ve Bir Seyahatin Notları (1928), Gurebâhâne-i Laklakan (1928) and Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi (1933).

Haşim suffered from heart and kidney problems. He travelled to Frankfurt for treatment in 1932. After he returned to İstanbul he published his travel impressions in Milliyet newspaper and Mülkiye magazine in serial form and right before his death he collected them in a book called Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi. This is the first and last book which he wrote in new (Latin) alphabet. There is a total of twenty essays in this book.

I found eight editions of Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi:

1933 (Semih Lütfi-Sühûlet Kütüphanesi, İstanbul),

1943 ([reprint] Semih Lütfi Kitabevi, İstanbul),

1969 (ed. Mehmet Kaplan, Millî Eğitim Basımevi, İstanbul [this edition also includes Bize Göre and Gurabahane-i Laklakan]),

1981 ([reprint] ed. Mehmet Kaplan, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, İstanbul),

1991 (Ahmet Haşim-Bütün Eserleri: Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi-Mektuplar-Mülâkatlar, ed. İnci Enginün-Zeynep Kerman, Dergâh Yayınları, İstanbul),

1992 (ed. Mahir Ünlü, İnkılâp Kitabevi, İstanbul [this edition also includes Bize Göre and Gurabahane-i Laklakan]),

2000 (ed. Mustafa Kemal Enzel, [sadeleştiren: Sevgi – Yılmaz Şen], Eğitim Yayınları, İstanbul [this edition also includes Bize Göre and Gurabahane-i Laklakan],

2004 (ed. Sabri Koz, [hazırlayanlar: Nuri Sağlam – M. Fatih Andı], YKY, İstanbul.

Two of these editions are reprints. The 1943 edition is a reprint of 1933 and the 1981 edition is a reprint of 1969 by another publisher. Four editions (1969, 1981, 1992 and 2000) also include his other books of prose, Bize Göre and Gurabahane-i Laklakan. The 1991 edition includes his letters and interviews. The versions I will study in this paper are 1933, 1969, 1992, 2000 and 2004. 1933 edition, being the first one, serves as the source text and the

---

[5] In Lefevere's terminology.

other four versions are referred to as re-editions. 1969, 1992 and 2000 versions are 'purified' editions, whereas 2004 is a critical edition.

We find three job titles in relation to the editing of this book. These are "kitap editörü" (book editor), "hazırlayan" (copy editor) and "sadeleştiren" (purification by). What I understand from "hazırlayan" is copy editor because, as in the case of Huzur, "hazırlayan" is the person who sorts through all the variants, makes research and finally edits and revises the text accordingly whereas "kitap editörü" (book editor) is more likely to be the person who commissions this task to relevant people and who oversees the project. "Sadeleştiren" is the person who performs the act of intralingual translation. This person may or may not be supervised by an editor or a copy editor as in the case of 1992 version where Mahir Ünlü is both the copy editor and the intraligual translator.

Skopos of Re-editions: Peritexts[6]

All re-editions that are under study in this paper contain remarks about Ahmet Haşim and the purpose of (re)publishing his works. The 1969 edition is published by *Milli Eğitim Basımevi*. There are standard prefaces written by Süleyman Demirel (Prime Minister of the time) and İlhami Ertem (Minister of Education of the time). These are followed by the preface written by Mehmet Kaplan, the copy editor. It is an introductory piece about Ahmet Haşim's poetry and prose. In the last paragraph, Kaplan explains the nature and the reason of 'purification' carried out in this edition.

> "Hâşim'in dili umumiyetle sade ve açıktır. Okuyucunun bu yazıları rahat bir şekilde anlayabilmesi için, bugün kullanılmayan bazı kelimeler metni bozmayacak şekilde değiştirilmiş ve kitabın sonuna açıklayıcı bazı notlar eklenmiştir." (Kaplan, 1969: v)

> (Haşim has a clear and plain style in general. Some of the words which are not used today have been replaced with the new ones in a manner which would cause no interference to the text and explanatory notes were added at the end of the book.)

The examples of the way Haşim's language is 'purified' are provided in the following section of this paper. Explanatory notes – which do not take place in the source text but are added to this edition – mostly contain information about people who are referred to in the text. These names are various as Hâfız-ı Şirâzi (a poet of the 14th century Iran), Cervantes, Apollinaire and Charles Darwin. Fictive characters such as *Carmen*, mythological gods such as *Marsiyas* are also explained. The curious thing about these notes is that, although Haşim did not find it necessary to explain all these names, a need was felt to explain even the universally known names. These notes and the purification efforts reveal that the widest possible readership is targeted in this edition.

The 1992 edition is published by *İnkılâp Kitabevi*. Mahir Ünlü's (the copy editor of this version) analysis on Haşim and his prose takes place at the end of the book. There is also a bibliography where the 1933 and 1969 editions as well as reference books on Ahmet Haşim written by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Yaşar Nabi Nayır, Asım Bezirci and Mahir Ünlü, and Ömer Özcan's *20. Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı* (20th Century Turkish Literature) are listed. We understand that Mahir Ünlü carried out an extensive research for this edition. There are footnotes to explain who is who as in 1969 edition. Quoting from Haşim, Ünlü makes a distinction between Haşim's poetry and prose:

---

[6] Gérard Genette's terminology for paratextual elements inside the book.

"Haşim, "Şairin dili, 'düzyazı' gibi anlaşılmak için değil, fakat duyulmak üzere oluşmuş, musiki ile söz arasında, sözden çok musikiye yakın, ara bir dildir" derken düzyazının anlaşılır olmasını vurgulamış; onu şiirden en çok bu niteliği ile ayırt etmek istemiştir." (Ünlü, 1992: 171)

(Haşim emphasized that prose should be intelligible and distinguished prose from poetry in this respect. He remarks that "The poet's language is not a composition to be understood, as in 'prose', but a composition to be heard. It is between music and word, closer to music than word, it is an in-between language.")

Ünlü considers Haşim's remarks and his plain style in prose as evidence to the importance he gave to comprehensibility. This gives Ünlü the reason to translate it into today's Turkish. He also makes a few remarks about the method applied in his study:

"Bu çalışma yapılırken, onun kendine özgü tümcelerinin, anlatım özelliklerinin korunmasına özen gösterildi; daha çok eski-yeni, Yabancı-Türkçe sözcük değişimine önem verildi; dile olabildiğince yalınlık, anlaşılırlık kazandırma erek edinildi. Bu arada, anlatımı bozmama kaygısı ile, Haşim'in çok kullandığı "ve, fakat, zira (çünkü)" gibi gün geçtikçe gereksizleşen bağlaçlar, ne yazık ki yerlerini korudular. " (Ünlü, 1992: 171-172)

(Specific nature of his sentences and narration technique were preserved. However old and foreign words were replaced with new Turkish words. The aim was to make the language plainer and more intelligible. Meanwhile, connectors such as "and, but, because" which are amply and unnecessarily used by the author remained in order not to cause any harm to his narration.)

Consequently, the aim was to make Haşim's prose comprehensible to younger generations. Old and foreign words were replaced by new and Turkish words to this end, because Ünlü's targeted readership was mainly pupils. He assumes that Haşim's prose may well be used in literature and writing classses.

The 2000 edition was published by *Eğitim Yayınları*. The editor or copy editor is Mustafa Kemal Enzel and 'purification' was performed by Sevgi Şen and Yılmaz Şen. Although there is a preface in this edition about Ahmet Haşim, there is no explanation as to the purpose of purification. For this reason, this version gives the impression of a sloppy editorial practice.

The 2004 edition has the most academic outlook among other versions. It gives the impression that a serious editorial work is involved in this edition mainly for two reasons. It is presented as a critical edition and the preface written by Nuri Sağlam and M. Fatih Andı (copy editors) is in the form of an academic essay with its footnotes and references. Sağlam and Andı, without resorting to sweeping generalizations about Haşim and his works, tell us specifically of how *Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* was written, the criticism he received and the mood the author was in when it was written. Quotations from his poems serve to reflect Haşim's mood depicted by the editors.

Sağlam and Andı also inform us about the newspapers and magazines each essay was first published. These are also listed at the end of the book in chronological order. They treat the 1933 edition as the source text and they mention the differences between newspaper/magazine and the book versions in the "Notes" section at the end of the book. The additions or omissions to the newspaper versions made by the author himself in the book do not contribute to the "beauty of the style", according to the editors. They rather serve to purify the language and make the style more fluent. Sağlam and Andı assume that the author's effort to replace older words by new ones is influenced by the language purification efforts of the

Turkish Society for the Study of Language *(Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti)*. The editors claim that there was no need to replace old words such as "*nazaran, sihirli, gına, müstakil,* etc." with new Turkish words "*göre, büyü, usanç, ayrı*" (according to, magical, tedium, separate) as they can be clearly understood even by today's generations.

Revising practices carried out in this critical edition are also explained at great length. Spelling was updated according to current standard usage. For example, "*vücudile, hayretlerile, kımıldamıyan* etc." were revised as "*vücuduyla, hayretleriyle, kımıldamayan*". In addition, some mistakes which could be considered as printing mistakes were corrected. For instance, "*elimin hareket kavsi*" which should be "*elimin kavis hareketi*" (the arc of my hand movement) was corrected as "*elimin hareket-i kavsi*" according to the ortographical conventions of Ahmet Haşim's time. The editors did not replace old or foreign words by new Turkish ones. Instead they added a glossary at the end of the book.

In conclusion, as the editors themselves also mention, this critical edition is a product of meticulous editorial work and their aim is to introduce Ahmet Haşim to today's readers. However, the editors of this version differ from others in their purpose as they are concerned with introducing the author in his own terms rather than making him intelligible.

Examples from Edited Versions

The examples provided below are from "*Harikulâde Mukaddime*" in *Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi.* They will illustrate the outcome of the editorial work practiced according to varying purposes.

1933 (Source Text)
İnsan, hayatının tatsızlığından ve etrafında görüp bıktığı şeylerin o yorucu alelâdeliğinden bir müddet kurtulabilmek ümidile seyahate çıkar. Bu itibarla seyahat (Harikulâdelikler avı) demektir.

(One travels hoping that one can escape from bluntness of life and the tiring ordinariness of all the things s/he sees around him/her. In this sense travelling is the hunt for the extraordinary.)

1969
İnsan, hayatının tatsızlığından ve etrafında görüp bıktığı şeylerin o yorucu alelâdeliğinden bir müddet kurtulabilmek **ümidiyle** seyahate çıkar. Bu **bakımdan** seyahat "Harikulâdelikler avı" demektir. *(Emphasis mine)*[7]

1992
İnsan, hayatının tatsızlığından ve **çevresinde** görüp bıktığı şeylerin o yorucu **tekdüzeliğinden** bir **süre** kurtulabilmek **umuduyla geziye** çıkar. Bu **bakımdan gezi** "**olağandışı** avı" demektir.

2000
İnsan, hayatının tatsızlığından ve etrafında görüp bıktığı şeylerin o yorucu alel**a**deliğinden bir müddet kurtulabilmek **ümidiyle** seyahate çıkar. Bu **bakımdan** seyahat "Harikul**a**delikler avı" demektir.

---

[7] Emphasis in bold is mine in all of the quotations from the edited versions.

2004

İnsan, hayatının tatsızlığından ve etrafında görüp bıktığı şeylerin o yorucu alelâdeliğinden bir müddet kurtulabilmek **ümidiyle** seyahate çıkar. Bu itibarla seyahat "harikulâdelikler avı" demektir.

In this paragraph we observe that the 1992 version replaced old words with new ones while the others only updated the spelling of "*ümidile*" (hoping that) according to standard current usage. 1969 and 2000 versions have only replaced "*bu itibarla*" (in this sense) with "*bu bakımdan*". However the lexical changes made in 1992 version destroys "*alelâde – harikulâde*" (ordinary – extraordinary) combination, which adds to the musicality of the text. The words "*tekdüze – olağandışı*" which are used in 1992 edition are not derived from the same root and do not have similar sounds. Besides, these words do not contain all of the connotations of "*alelâde – harikulâde*" couple. "*Tekdüze*" means "monotonous" and "*olağandışı*" means "unusual". In fact, "*alelâde – harikulâde*" could well be replaced with "*olağan – olağanüstü*", preserving the musicality and connotations at the same time.

1933 (Source Text)

Keskin akıllılar (Harikulâde)nin zamanımızda artık bir manası kalmadığını söyleyebilirler. Harikulâde hiçbir zaman hakikat sahasında mevcut olmamışdır ki bundan böyle yok olsun. Başka bir münasebetle de söylediğim gibi, sırf kendi dimağımızın bir ameliyesi mahsulü olan ve sinema şekli gibi bir membadan dışarıya vuran (Harikulâde), birkaç alelâdenin birleşmesinden meydana gelir: Öküz alelâdedir, ağaç alelâdedir, vaktaki öküz ağaca çıkar, harikulâde vücut bulur. Eski milletler, dinleri için lâzım olan ilâhları hep bu düstur ile yaptılar. Yunanlılar, insan bedenini beygir vücudile birleştirerek (Centaure) denilen efsanevi mahlûku, Asuriler, insan başını öküz vücudunu ve kartal kanadını hep bir yere getirerek büyük mabutlarını yarattılar.

(The witty might claim that the extraordinary does not make any sense in our time. Extraordinary had never been present in the realm of truth, then why it should be absent now. As I mentioned elsewhere, the extraordinary, which is just a product of the workings of our mind and springs from it like a cinemascopic image, is a combination of a few ordinary things: The ox is ordinary, the tree is ordinary but when the ox climbs the tree, the extraordinary happens. Ancient civilizations produced deities necessary for their religion all in this manner. Greeks combined the man's body with the horse's and created the mythical creature of *Centaur.* Assyrians put the man's head, the ox's body and the eagle's wing all together and created their god.)

1969

Keskin akıllılar **"Harikulâde"**nin zamanımızda artık bir **mânası** kalmadığını söyleyebilirler. Harikulâde hiçbir zaman hakikat sahasında **var olmamıştır** ki bundan böyle ø olsun. Başka bir münasebetle de söylediğim gibi, sırf kendi **zihnimizin** bir **çalışma** mahsulü olan ve sinema ø gibi bir **kaynaktan** dışarıya vuran **"harikulâde"**, birkaç alelâdenin birleşmesinden meydana gelir: Öküz alelâdedir, ağaç alelâdedir, **vakta ki** öküz ağaca çıkar, harikulâde **vücuda gelir**. Eski milletler, dinleri için lâzım olan **tanrıları** hep bu düstur ile yaptılar. Yunanlılar, insan bedenini beygir **vücuduyle** birleştirerek **Centaure** denilen **mitolojik yaratığı**, **Asurlular**, insan başını öküz vücudunu ve kartal kanadını hep bir yere getirerek büyük **mabudlarını** yarattılar.

1992

Keskin akıllılar **"olağandışı"**nın **çağımızda** artık bir **anlamı** kalmadığını söyleyebilirler. **Olağandışı** hiçbir zaman hakikat sahasında mevcut **olmamıştır** ki bundan böyle yok olsun. Başka bir **nedenle** de söylediğim gibi, **yalnız** kendi **usumuzun** bir **işlem ürünü** olan ve **sinemaya benzer** bir **kaynaktan** dışarıya vuran olağandışı, birkaç olağanın birleşmesinden **oluşur**: Öküz **"olağan"**dır, ağaç **"olağan"**dır, **ne zaman ki** öküz ağaca çıkar, **"olağandışı"** oluşur. Eski **uluslar**, dinleri için **gereken tanrıları** hep bu **ilkeyle** yaptılar. Yunanlılar, insan **gövdesini at gövdesiyle** birleştirerek **"Centaure"** denilen **söylencelerdeki yaratığı; Asurlular**, insan başını öküz **gövdesini** ve kartal kanadını hep bir yere getirerek büyük **tanrılarını** yarattılar.

2000

Keskin akıllılar **"Harikulâde"**nin zamanımızda artık bir manası kalmadığını söyleyebilirler. Harikulâde**,** hiçbir zaman hakikat sahasında **var olmamıştır** ki**,** bundan böyle **ø** olsun. Başka bir münasebetle de söylediğim gibi, sırf kendi **zihnimizin** bir **çalışma** mahsulü olan ve sinema **ø** gibi bir **kaynaktan** dışarıya vuran **"harikulade"**, birkaç **aleladenin** birleşmesinden meydana gelir**.** Öküz **aleladedir**, ağaç **aleladedir**, **vakta ki** öküz ağaca çıkar, **harikulade vücuda gelir**. Eski milletler, dinleri için **lazım** olan **tanrıları** hep bu düstur ile yaptılar. Yunanlılar, insan bedenini beygir **vücuduyla** birleştirerek **Centaure** denilen **mitolojik yaratığı, Asurlular**, insan başını öküz vücudunu ve kartal kanadını hep bir yere getirerek büyük **mabudlarını yanıltılar.**

2004

Keskin akıllılar **"harikulâde"nin** zamanımızda artık bir manası kalmadığını söyleyebilirler. Harikulâde hiçbir zaman hakikat sahasında **varolmamıştır** ki bundan böyle yok olsun. Başka bir münasebetle de söylediğim gibi, sırf kendi dimağımızın bir ameliyesi mahsulü olan ve sinema şekli gibi bir membadan dışarıya vuran **"harikulâde"**, birkaç alelâdenin birleşmesinden meydana gelir: Öküz alelâdedir, ağaç alelâdedir, **vakta ki** öküz ağaca çıkar, harikulâde vücut bulur. Eski milletler, dinleri için lâzım olan ilâhları hep bu düstur ile yaptılar. Yunanlılar, insan bedenini beygir **vücuduyla** birleştirerek **"centaure"** denilen efsanevi mahlûku, **Asurîler**, insan **başını,** öküz vücudunu ve kartal kanadını hep bir yere getirerek büyük mabutlarını yarattılar.

The first thing to notice in this paragraph is the shift of meaning created by the omission of one word "*yok*" (absent) in 1969 and 2000 versions. The chain of reasoning is broken by the absence of the word "absent". The sentence reads as follows: "*Harikulâde hiçbir zaman hakikat sahasında mevcut olmamışdır ki bundan böyle yok olsun.*" (Extraordinary had never been present in the realm of truth, then why it should be absent now.). When the word "absent" is removed from this sentence it reads as follows: "Extraordinary had never been present in the realm of truth, then why it should be present now."

There is a typographical error in the 2000 version: "*yanılttılar*" (mislead) instead of "*yarattılar*" (create). Only one word "*tanrı*" (god) in 1992 version is used for two words "*ilâh*" and "*mabut*" in the source text. These two words are very close in meaning with the connotations of god, deity and idol.

"*Alelâde – harikulâde*" (ordinary – extraordinary) motif in the source text is broken in 1992 version by introducing more words such as "*tekdüze*" (monotonous), "*olağan*" (ordinary) and "*olağandışı*" (unusual).

The expression in the source text "*dimağımızın bir ameliyesi mahsulü*" (product of the workings of our mind) is rendered as "*zihnimizin bir çalışma mahsulü*" in 1969 and 2000 versions, which sounds weird. What is even more weird is "*usumuzun bir işlem ürünü*" in the 1992 edition. These expressions sound strange because "*ameliye*" (workings) is replaced with "*çalışma*" and "*işlem*" just for the sake of using newer Turkish words without much consideration for the reasoning of the whole sentence. This phrase could have been rendered by resorting to 'circumlocution' in Roman Jakobson's terms. However, 'word by word' or 'literal' translation applied here leads to an ambigious and an even weird expression.

I think these examples suffice to make my point. Apart from the 2004 version, which is a critical edition, oriented towards the author; 'purified' or translated versions are clumsy compositions which are difficult to read. Especially the 1992 version, which has more new Turkish words than the others, is a blunt text translated literally without any consideration for textual coherence. The problem lies not in the usage of new Turkish words but in the lack of a broad perspective on translation. For this reason, the intralingual translation performed by the editors of the 1969, 1992 and 2000 versions can hardly be said to have achieved their purpose of making Ahmet Haşim's prose comprehensible for younger generations.

Conclusion

The example from the purification debate quoted above illustrates that editorial concerns about 'faithfulness to the original' create a deadlock. Translation Studies shows a way out to editorial practices, especially within the framework of editing and updating earlier literary works. The broader category of 'rewriting', which also covers editing, presents a perspective which can help overcome the 'fidelity' issue: texts are written and rewritten in line with the politics and poetics of the time and culture and create an image of the author and his/her work. Rewriting is inevitable and necessary for the survival of authors and their works in different times and cultures.

Consequently, *the question is not whether to translate or not to translate*. Even the critical editions which do not involve direct intralingual translation are rewritten texts. The text is updated according to orthographical conventions in critical editions. Sometimes a glossary is added to ensure intelligibility of old words. More importantly, the image of the work and its author is re-created through prefaces and other peritexts. For instance, the editors of the 2004 version of *Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* introduce Ahmet Haşim as "the most important representative of symbolist and impressionist movement in Turkish poetry" (Sağlam and Andı 2004: inside cover). We should note that, such labels as "the most important representative of a movement" or "classic" for instance, are often gained (or bestowed) retrospectively.

Therefore, *the question is* to apply necessary strategies (with competence) for the intended purpose of re-editions. Vermeer makes this point clear by the following remark:

> "There is not much sense in translating a source texteme as faithfully – that is, as literally – as possible if such a "strategy" makes the understanding of the translation unnecessarily difficult for the intended target recipients or prevents it altogether." (Vermeer 1998: 43)

The analysis of the purposes of "purified" and critical editions demonstrate that the targeted readership as well as scholarly or commercial interests[8] determine the *skopos* of re-editions.

Critical editions[9] are more concerned with the author and his poetics. They endeavor not to deprive the work of the feel and sense of the time in which it was written. Their targeted readership is more likely to be professional readers rather than the widest range of readership as possible. They have more of a scholarly focus. The *YKY* edition of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Huzur and* the 2004 edition of Ahmet Haşim's *Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* are of this sort. The intralingual translation of *Enin,* stands as an in-between example. It is a 'purified' edition with a scholarly interest, because it has the intention of providing data for research on women studies in Turkey.

Targeted readership of 'purified' editions is practically anyone, including pupils and students. The circulation of the work among as many readers as possible can be associated with a commercial interest. As their purpose is to re-introduce forgotten authors to a new audience of modern times, the editorial process involves intralingual translation. The examples provided from *Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* prove that intralingual translation performed without translation competence leads to products which do not serve their purpose.

Translation competence is a vast area of research. Among many skills and competencies; linguistic, cultural, textual, research, subject area knowledge and skills as well as communicative and problem solving/decision making competencies come to the fore. However, as agreed by most translation scholars and trainers, translation competence is above all the awareness that a text can be translated in many ways and that the determining factor is the purpose of translation. Anthony Pym, for instance, who seeks to arrive at a "minimalist definition", defines translation competence as

> "The ability to generate a series of more than one viable target text for a pertinent source text; and to select only one viable TT from this series, quickly and with justified confidence" (Pym 2003: 489).

This awareness accompanied by a broad vision of translation is the outcome of a translation studies perspective.

In conclusion, translation studies can be of help to editorial practices especially in two ways: 1) by creating the awareness that any textual/communicative practice, whether it be translating or editing, is an act of 'rewriting', with all its implications touched upon throughout this paper;

2) by training future editors to help them develop translation competence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Culler, Jonathan (1982). **On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism**, Ithaca/New York: Cornell University Press.

---

[8] See Venuti 2004. Venuti makes a distinction between scholarly and commercial interests in retranslations, with an example from Thomas Mann's retranslations.

[9] The editorial effort of restoring the 'original' in critical editions is also criticized in terms of intention and authorial presence by certain scholars. See for example McGann 1992 & Patterson 1985.

Gençtürk Demircioğlu, Tülay (2005). *Enin* (ed.), İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
Haşim, Ahmet (1933) **Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi [= Frankfurt Travel]**, İstanbul: Semih Lütfi-Sühûlet Kütüphanesi.

     --- (1969) *Bize Göre, Gurebâhane-i Laklakan, Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* (ed. M. Kaplan)*,* İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

     --- (1992) *Bize Göre, Gurabahane-i Laklakan (Düşkün Leylekler Evi), Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi (Frankfurt Gezi Yazıları)* (ed. M. Ünlü), İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi.

     --- (2000) *Bize Göre, Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* (ed. M.K. Enzel), İstanbul: Eğitim Yayınları.

     --- (2004) *Frankfurt Seyahatnamesi* (eds. N. Sağlam & M.F. Andı), İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Hatiboğlu, Vecihe (1988) 'Türk Dili Üzerine Bir Görüş' [= 'An Insight on the Turkish Language'], **Metis Çeviri, 3**, 166-167.

Hızlan, Doğan, İleri, S., İlhan, A., Kaya, M.K., Kulin A. & Müldür, L. (2002) 'Ne Olacak Bu Türkçe'nin Hali?' [= 'What Happens to Turkish Now?'], **Milliyet Pazar (online)** http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2002/03/03/pazar/paz03.html [9 May 2007].

Jakobson, Roman (2000) 'On Linguistic Aspect of Translation' in Lawrence Venuti (ed.). **The Translation Studies Reader***,* London/New York: Routledge. 113-119.

Karadağ, Ayşe Banu (2008) **Çevirinin Tanıklığında Medeniyetin Dönüşümü [=Transformation of 'Civilization' in the Witness of Translation]**, İstanbul: Diye.

Lefevere, André (1992) **Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame***,* London/New York: Routledge

Lewis, Geoffrey (1999) **The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success***,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mc Gann, Jerome J. (1992) **A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism***,* Charlottesville: University Of Virginia Press.

Patterson, Lee (1985) 'The Logic of Textual Criticism and the Way of Genius: The Kane-Donaldson Piers Plowman in Historical Perspective' in Jerome J. Mc Gann (ed.). **Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation***,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 55-91, 212-219.

Pym, Anthony (2003) 'Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age: In Defence of a Minimalist Approach', **Meta, XLVIII:4**, 481-497.

Şafak, Elif (2005) 'Linguistic Cleansing', **New Perspectives Quarterly (online)** http://www.digital.npq.org/archive/2005_summer/05_shafak.html [20 May 2006]

Tamer, Ülkü (2002) 'Hem Anlamak Hem Duymak İçin' [= 'To Understand and To Hear At The Same Time'], *Sabah* (online) http://www.sabah.com.tr/Yazarlar/tamer/2006/04/24/Hem_anlamak_hem_duymak_icin [1 June 2011]

Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi (2004) **Huzur [= A Mind at Peace]**, (ed. Y. Demirel), İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları (10th edition).

Tymoczko, Maria (2007) **Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators**, Manchester/Kinderhook: St. Jerome Publishing.

Venuti, Lawrence (1992) 'Introduction' in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), **Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology**, London/ New York: Routledge, 1-17.

Venuti, Lawrence (2004) 'Retranslations: The Creation of Value' in Katherine M. Faull (ed.), **Translation and Culture**, Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 25-39.

Vermeer, Hans J. (1998) 'Starting to Unask What Translatology is About', **Target, 10:1**, 41-68.

Vermeer, Hans J. (2000) 'Skopos and Commission in Translational Action' in Lawrence Venuti (ed.). **The Translation Studies Reader**, London/New York: Routledge. 221-233.

Yücel, Tahsin (2007) **Dil Devrimi ve Sonuçları [= The Language Reform and its Outcomes]**, İstanbul: Can Yayınları.