

**CHALLENGING THE OTHER TRANSLATION: FREDERICK
BURNABY'S ON HORSEBACK THROUGH ASIA MINOR'S
ADVENTURE IN TURKISH**

Seda Taş İlmek, Trakya University, sedatas@trakya.edu.tr.

Original scientific paper

DOI: 10.31902/flj.46.2023.12

UDC: 821.111-992.035:811.512.1

Abstract: This article sets out to scrutinize two different Turkish translations of the English writer Frederick Burnaby's travel writing *On Horseback through Asia Minor* (1878/1996). *On Horseback through Asia Minor*'s adventure in Turkish is an interesting case because the first translation was published in 1998 by *Sabah Kitapları* but just one year after this publication, another translation appeared on the Turkish book market, which was published by *İletişim Yayınları*. However, what is more interesting than these translations, which were published almost simultaneously, is the discourses of the publisher regarding the first translation on the cover of the presentation of the second translation. The publisher claims that the text is a "meticulous", "uncensored" and "complete" translation, which points out that the previous translation included "censored" and "incomplete" parts. Therefore, this study questions the publisher's claims by conducting a paratextual and textual analysis of the source text and target texts and also seeks to understand whether the causality created by the publisher led to the second translation or a retranslation. In its theoretical framework, it uses the concept "paratext" put forward by the French scholar Gérard Genette and "operational norms" introduced by the translation scholar Gideon Toury. The findings suggest that the second target text, rather than a "rettranslation", is a simultaneous translation that emerged incidentally almost in the same period, addressed the same target readers, and tried to bring out its difference from the other translation. It is also seen that the claims of the publisher in the second target text on the grounds of "censorship" and "incompleteness" are valid and this causes a rivalry between translations in the translated book market by not only strongly challenging the other translation but also forming market negativity towards it.

Keywords: translation, travel writing, operational norms, paratext, rivalry

1. Introduction

The widespread publication of (re)translations worldwide and in Turkey, in particular, is prone to further intensive research. Being a translational phenomenon, simultaneous and diachronic (re)translation has its social, historical, and economic characteristics, which do not significantly differ from the causalities of the book publishing. In this context, *On Horseback through Asia*

Minor, the travel writing of the British soldier and writer Fred Burnaby is of particular interest since it was translated two times into Turkish almost simultaneously. The adventure of Burnaby in the eastern part of Turkey began in 1876 from Constantinople and had the purpose of assessing whether the Sultan's army could resist an imminent war against Russia or not. In five months, riding a 1,000 mile with his single servant, Burnaby experienced hostile conditions of the tumultuous region in this winter journey, but he had the chance of observing the Turks away from European influences. In this travel writing published in 1878, he shares his observations and cultural insights, including conversations, customs, landscape, and encounters with Turks, Kurds, Circassians, Armenians, and Persians. This courageous equestrian journey was first translated into Turkish by Meral Gaspıralı in 1998 with the title of *Küçük Asya Seyahatnamesi Anadolu'da Bir İngiliz Subayı, 1876*. Just one year later, the same text was translated into Turkish by Fatma Taşkent with the title of *At Sirtında Anadolu*. However, on the back cover of this text, it was claimed that the first translation was an “unelaborate” translation, which included “censorship” and “incompleteness”. Therefore, this study intends to examine the validity of the publisher's claims by conducting a comparative analysis of the source text and target texts. The study aims to answer the following questions:

- Why was the text translated again? Was the second target text a “retranslation” or a “simultaneous translation”?
- Were the claims of the publisher on the basis that the previous translation included “censorship” and “incompleteness” valid? If they are, in what contexts were censorships and incompleteness involved?

To find answers to above-mentioned questions, the first part of this study focuses on Frederick Burnaby's *On Horseback through Asia Minor* and its two different translations in Turkish. Dwelling on the claims of the second publisher, the second part first explores theoretical remarks of the study which cover “paratext” put forward by the French scholar Gérard Genette and “operational norms” introduced by the translation scholar Gideon Toury. Then, this part conducts a descriptive paratextual and textual analysis of the source and target texts. The last part presents conclusions.

2. Asia Minor through the eyes of an Englishman

Frederick Burnaby (1842-1885) was a British army officer, politician, and traveler who joined the Royal Horse Guards, the Blues, in 1859. He spoke German, Italian, and French. He had also knowledge of Russian, Turkish, and Arabic, which he learned to understand foreign affairs better. Having an adventurous character, he ballooned across the English Channel, traveled to Russia and Spain, and witnessed the civil war (1874). He visited Khiva, in Turkestan on horseback and then wrote his experiences in Russian Asia in his

book *A Ride to Khiva* (1876) which brought him instant fame because of his success in narrating the power struggle of the British and Russian Empires in the Russian territory. Burnaby then traveled to Asia Minor (Anatolia) in order to understand whether the powers of the Ottoman Empire could resist a probable war against Russia or not. His other purpose in this dangerous travel was to see whether Christians were treated inhumanly in the Ottoman Empire, as claimed.

Starting from Constantinople, Burnaby headed to the eastern end of Turkey when Russia was threatening to attack the Ottoman Empire. It was just before the beginning of the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878 when Burnaby set out across unknown territory on horseback together with his loyal servant Radford and traveled for five months in harsh conditions of the winter and the region. He faced many obstacles and hazards such as getting stuck in the waist or high mud, snow along the way, passing through narrow rock paths, staying in filthy huts with fleas, having trouble in finding food, losing horses, cheating local guides, experiencing several horse accidents and frequently being hard up due to lack of adequate roads. During this grueling journey in the savage wintertime, both he and his servant got ill due to malnutrition, lack of rest, and climate harshness. However, they succeeded in riding a 1,000 miles in this tumultuous region, and, upon his return to England, he published his account of this adventure in his book *On Horseback through Asia Minor* (1878).

As a traveler, Burnaby observes the diversity of the population in the region to assess with his own eyes the Turks away from European influences and to understand whether there is any truth in the allegations about the Turks mistreating Christians. There were rumors that the Turks committed many murders in the eastern part of the country and even impaled the Christians living in Asia Minor, which caused unease among the British. Thus, the English writer visits many places in Asia Minor to see with his eyes the atrocities described in the media.

He often writes about his encounter with cultural diversity in the region, including Turks, Armenians, Kurds, Circassians, Greeks, Hungarians, and Italians in his book. He provides an account of their way of life and relationship with each other, religions, beliefs, and even conversations. In a way, he presents a vivid portrait of the Muslim and Christian worlds. Moreover, he gives information about the geographical features of the region, its military equipment, or management because he had a mission to determine whether the Turks had the power to resist a probable war against Russia. Apart from depicting vivid landscapes, he draws the map of the places he traveled. In other words, he not only does what his adventurous spirit drives him to do, but he also completes his mission as a covert intelligence officer with this journey and travel writing.

3. Translation adventure of Burnaby's travel writing in Turkish

The source text reporting the fluctuant tension among different subjects of the Ottoman Empire in a tumultuous region met with its Turkish readers for the first time thanks to its Turkish translation made in 1998 by the translator Meral Gaspıralı. The translator Gaspıralı brought the works of many writers into Turkish in years. Some of these writers are Colleen McCullough, Wilbur Smith, Agatha Christie, Stephen King, John Dickson Carr, and Lee Martin. However, it is not possible to get detailed information about this prolific translator other than her published translations. Her translation from Burnaby titled *Küçük Asya Seyahatnamesi Anadolu'da Bir İngiliz Subayı, 1876* (*Travelogue of Asia Minor: A British Officer in Anatolia, 1876*¹) had 69 chapters and 17 appendices as the source text and was published by *Sabah Kitapları*. In 2007, it was republished by *Merkez Kitapları*. The title of the translation was changed into *At Sirtında Anadolu* (*Anatolia on Horseback*) in this republication.

The second target text with the same title of *At Sirtında Anadolu* (1999) was released to the Turkish book market a year later by *İletişim Yayınları*. Fatma Taşkent, who is both a productive translator, and an academic did this translation. Among the writers she translated from there are the works of Tom Robbins, Stanislaw Lem, Adam Phillips, and Robert A. Heinlein. This translation might be described as a simultaneous (re)translation since it was presented to the same target audience in almost the same years. However, as it is understood from the correspondence with the translator via e-mail, although the second translation was made at the same time as the first translation, it was published a year later due to the delay in the printing process. In this context, rather than a retranslation, it is a case of a translation made in the same period by chance². Therefore, it is obvious that the causality created by the publisher on the grounds of "censorship" and "incompleteness" did not lead to a retranslation, but they were just simultaneous translations in the book market.

On the back cover of this simultaneous translation, the publishing house states that it differs from the other translation because it is a "meticulous", "uncensored" and "complete" translation. Therefore, it might be asserted that the publisher's claims spark a discussion on the validity of the first translation. Based on these statements, this study questions whether the publisher's claims that there were "censorship" and "incompleteness" in the previous translation reflect the truth and if they are true, in what context the "censorship" and "incompleteness" occurred. In the comparative analysis of the source text and the target texts, first the paratexts and then textual elements will be taken into consideration to answer these questions.

¹ Translation belongs to the writer of this study.

² The translator gave permission for the information she provided in the correspondence to be used in this article.

4. Analysis

4.1. Theoretical Remarks

This study benefits from the French scholar Gérard Genette's (1997) notion of paratext and translation scholar Gideon Toury's (1995) operational norms in its theoretical framework to provide a descriptive and target-oriented analysis. According to Genette, paratexts are the elements surrounding the main body of the text, such as covers, prefaces, introductions, epigraphs, illustrations, and footnotes. Paratextual elements supplied by the writers, translators, editors, and publishers function as helpful tools in presenting a text to a target audience, but at the same time, they are effective in guiding the reception or interpretation of the texts by translation readers³. Therefore, what the paratexts of the source text and target texts tell to the readers of the text under the discussion of this study will be focused on in the paratextual analysis part.

Within the "Descriptive Translation Studies", Toury's translation norms are often used as a tool of analysis in order to describe and explore translated texts. Toury's norms (1995, 56-61) introduced in the late 1970s involve "initial norms", "preliminary norms" and "operational norms". Operational norms refer to the decisions taken in the process of translation by the translator and are related to the presentation and linguistic aspects of target texts. They are divided into two types as "matricial norms" and "textual-linguistic norms". Matricial norms are related to the integrity and the distribution of the text. These norms are concerned with additions, omissions, changes, or relocations made in the target texts. On the other hand, textual-linguistic norms appertain to the selection of lexical and syntactic material by the translator in the decision-making process. This category implies the choice and the use of words in the target text. Therefore, it seems appropriate to examine the corpus of this study in the light of operational norms.

4.2. Paratextual Analysis

The source text, first published in 1878, was issued by *Oxford University Press* in 1996. The source text used in the corpus of this study is the one reissued by the same publisher in 2002. Being 366 pages, the source text comprises a preface, an introduction, 69 chapters, and 17 appendices. The front cover of the book has a picture of the writer in the middle and a map in the background. The book starts with the preface of Peter Hopkirk, who introduces the journey of Burnaby by focusing on the hardships of traveling eastwards across Turkey in 1876 and his characteristics as a British officer. Being a British writer, historian, and journalist, Hopkirk lived in İstanbul for a while and visited many parts of eastern Turkey several times. In his four pages of preface, after providing the

³ For further studies on paratexts, see. Tahir Gürçağlar and Taş İlmeç.

insights into the adventure of Burnaby, he explains the purpose of Burnaby's journey:

His object was to try to discover precisely what the Russians were up to in this wild and mountainous corner of the Great Game battlefield, and also gauge the capacity of the Turks to resist a vigorous Tsarist thrust towards Constantinople, the warm-water outlet to the West so long coveted by the Russians. (Burnaby vii)

As understood, Hopkirk clarifies that Burnaby's journey's aim is to understand whether the Turks can defend the region in the face of a war opened by Russia. Similar emphasis on the Russian threat was made by the publisher on the back cover of the book.

Apart from such emphasis, another remarkable point is that Hopkirk specifically mentions the tension between the minorities in the Anatolian lands. Hopkirk finishes his introduction with a warning for the other travelers who intend to follow Burnaby's footsteps for first seeking advice from the Foreign Office in London or the embassy in Ankara because "At the time of writing this, in large parts of south-eastern Turkey a bitter struggle is raging between the Turkish Army and Kurdish guerillas, a war in which some 12.000 people have died over the past decade" (Burnaby viii).

When it comes to the paratexts of the first target text (TT-1), it is seen that the translation has the same number of chapters and appendices. It also has the preface of the writer, but not the map the writer had drawn. The front cover of the book resembles the cover of the source text with its choice of color, a map, and a compass on it. On the back cover of the book, the text is presented to Turkish readers with statements indicating that the writer displays the cultural diversity of the Ottoman Empire in that era and particularly highlights the fact that the object of the writer in that journey is to understand whether or not the Muslims behaved inhumanly to Christians or not.

Burnaby, who investigated the relationship between the peoples living in the Ottoman Empire on the eve of the Russo-Ottoman War, and the origin of the rumors that Muslims persecuted Christians, wrote a book about the life, ideas, and relations of Turks, Armenians, Circassians, Kurds, and Yezidis after witnessing these himself [...]. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı)

This description of the book, while emphasizing the writer's impartiality, also highlights a British officer's investigation of whether Christians were maltreated or not in the eastern part of the country. In this context, it can be said that the emphasis on the writer's research for the "possible Ottoman-Russian war" in the source text has shifted to the emphasis on reflecting "tension between Muslim-Christian worlds" in TT-1.

The second target text (TT-2) published one year after the first one has a front cover design that depicts Anatolia with charcoal work. On its back cover, it is stated that the subject of the text is a British writer's research on whether minorities were treated badly in the Ottoman Empire, rather than the research for a threat of war:

A British officer, who wanted to understand the reality of the claims made in European public opinion regarding the situation of minorities in the Ottoman Empire and to see what was going on in Anatolia with his own eyes, traveled throughout Anatolia [...] (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent)

In this presentation of the book, the observations of a Western writer on the "Orient" were also stated, and it was brought to the attention that this translation was delivered to its Turkish reader with no omission, addition or censorship. The publisher's statement is as follows: "Exhibiting the typical themes of European travel literature, the book aims to capture the essence of the 'Orient'. [...] We present a meticulous, uncensored and complete translation of the work". (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent)

In a previous edition of this translation, the last statement of the publisher included an implication of competition by emphasizing that the translation is unlike a similar one that has recently been published by a "publishing house". Pointing to another publisher specifically on the back cover of the translation directly affects the reader's reception of the text and also, it seems to create an active rivalry between different versions of the text. Therefore, it requires questioning the translation action of the other publisher or shortly examining the other translation. In this context, the following section will try to determine the validity of the claims of the publisher by making a comparative textual analysis in the light of operational norms.

4.3. Textual analysis

From the point of view of matricial norms, the source text (ST) has 366 pages in total, a preface written by Hopkirk, the introduction of the writer, a map drawn by the writer, 69 chapters, and 17 appendices. While TT-1 has 339 pages with the same number of chapters and appendices and the introduction, it lacks the preface of Hopkirk and the map. On the other hand, TT-2 which claims to be a complete translation of the source text has a total of 452 pages with a page with Burnaby's picture and signature, the map drawn by Burnaby, the writer's tribute to his servant Radford (10 pages), the writer's preface to the 7th edition (8 pages), the writer's first preface (2 pages), 69 chapters and 17 appendices. When evaluated with these features, both TT-1 and TT-2 reflect the integrity of ST but as TT-2 includes more paratexts that will inform the reader and put the text in context, it might be asserted that the second publisher carried extratextual elements to target culture because it tries to provide a more

elaborate translation. However, an analysis in the context of textual-linguistic norms helps to better understand if this is true. When examined from this perspective, the selection of lexical and syntactic material of the translators or publishers for reproducing target texts was categorized as “censorship”, “omission” and “different interpretation”.

4.3.1. Censorship in translation

While censorship, aimed at restricting the spread of certain ideas, is a restrictive factor for freedom of thought that has been frequently studied in various fields from the past to the present, it is a relatively current issue that has been started to be discussed in the field of translation studies since the 2000s⁴. When censorship is enforced, its practitioners, reasons for resorting to censorship and methods of censorship vary greatly according to the period, nation, or even language. Censorship as a phenomenon occurring often in social, historical, cultural, economic, and political contexts ultimately causes readers to be deprived of certain thoughts. In this study, rather than the possible causes of censorship, it is tried to be explained with the following examples of whether it took place and which thoughts were prevented from reaching the target culture or readers.

Example 1

ST: I had experienced the cold of Kirghiz steppes in December and January, 1876, and was of opinion that the clothes which would keep a man alive in the deserts of Tarary would more than protect him *aganist the climate of Kurdistan*⁵. (Burnaby x)

TT-1: [...] Bir insanı, Tataristan’ın çöllerinde hayatta tutan giysilerin, onu *Doğu Anadolu yaylasının iklimine* karşı koruyacağı kanısındayım. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 6)

TT-2: Tatar çöllerinden sağ salim dönmemi sağlamış olan giysilerin *Kürdistan’ın iklimine karşı* beni rahatlıkla koruyacağını düşünüyordum. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 31).

The above example is from a section where the writer describes the difficulties of his journey in Anatolia. The writer uses the word “Kurdistan” (meaning “the land of Kurds”) which broadly refers to a geo-cultural region of Kurdish settlement that includes eastern Turkey, northern Iraq, western Iran, and smaller parts of northern Syria and Armenia. The writer implies the geographical regions in eastern Turkey where Kurds lived intensely by using this word. However, it was translated into Turkish as “eastern Anatolian

⁴ Several studies point to censorship in translation. See. Billiani; Brownlie; Ben-Ari; Somló; Üstünsöz; Taş; Parlak and Denissova.

⁵ The emphasis throughout the examples belong the writer of this article.

plateau" ("Doğu Anadolu yaylası") in TT-1 while it was rendered as it is in TT-2. Therefore, instead of using the word directly as used by the writer, using another word or translating by explication strategy to express the region in Turkish creates the impression of censorship in TT-1.

Example 2

ST: Indeed it would sometimes be impossible, as the *natives in certain parts of Kurdistan* make use of buffaloes as a means of locomotion. (Burnaby 10)

TT-1: Hatta *doğudaki birçok bölgenin* yerlileri, yolculuk için mandalardan yararlandıklarından at bulmam bazen olanaksız bile olabilirdi. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 15)

TT-2: Hatta *Kürdistan'ın kimi yerlerinde* köylüler binek hayvanı olarak manda kullandığından imkânsız olacaktı. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 45)

Similarly, it can be seen from the second example that the difficulties of the geographical conditions of the region referred to as "Kurdistan" in the ST are described. While the writer mentions the regions inhabited mainly by Kurds with the word "certain parts of Kurdistan", it was expressed as "many regions in the east" ("doğudaki birçok bölge") in TT-1. This choice of translation shows that the word "Kurdistan" was not used specifically in translation and that censorship was used. On the other hand, in TT-2, it is seen that the word was transferred as it is with the translation of "some parts of Kurdistan" ("Kürdistan'ın kimi yerleri").

Example 3

ST: Major-General Macintosh, when *writing about Kurdistan* during the time of Crimean War, [...]. There is another exceedingly strong pass at Bayazid, [...] from the side of Erzeroum, *except through the roads of central Kurdistan*. It may also be looked upon *as a key to Kurdistan* [...] (Burnaby 252)

TT-1: Kırım Savaşı sırasında *Kürtler hakkında bir yazı yazan* Tümgeneral Macintosh, [...] Ama *Kürt bölgesinin ortasında* bir geçiş olabilir. Sözü geçen vadi, *Kürt bölgesinin, [...] yolunun anahtarı* olarak görülebilir. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 227-228)

TT-2: Tümgeneral Macintosh, Kırım Savaşı sırasında *Kürdistan hakkında yazarken* [...]. Beyazıt'ta, İran tarafında, çok küçük bir düzenli kuvvetin, *orta Kürdistan yolları dışında, [...]. Geçit Kürdistan'a, [...] bir kapı* olarak düşünülebilir" (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 315-316)

The quotations above exemplify how the word "Kurdistan", which is frequently used in the ST, is censored in TT-1. "Writing about Kurdistan" was rendered as "writing about the Kurds" ("Kürtler hakkında yazı yazmak") in TT-1 whereas it was translated word for word in TT-2. Instead of denoting a region, this translation decision expresses the Kurds as a community or group. In the continuation of the paragraph, it can also be said that the word "Kurdistan" was

avoided in TT-1 because “the roads of central Kurdistan” written in ST was translated into Turkish as “the road of Kurdish region” (“Kürt bölgesinin yolu”) in TT-1 whereas it was translated word for word in TT-2. Thus, it can be observed that an indirect expression is preferred for this word, which points out the fact that censorship was applied in TT-1.

From a historical perspective, the Kurds have remained as groups, individuals or groups in western Asia rather than being a people. As the Kurds have not enjoyed a political unit, the word “Kurdistan” in ST is only used as a word referring to a geographical region of Kurdish settlement. However, the thought that the word might evoke different political and historical meanings might have caused the word to be censored frequently in translations throughout history. Recently, as in the examples above, news about the censorship of the word “Kurdistan” in various translated texts has been found in the Turkish press and media. For instance, the news that *Yapı Kredi Yayınları* censored the word “Kurdistan” in *The Travelogue of Evliya Çelebi (Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi)*, or that *Can Yayınları* censored this word in the Turkish translation of Paulo Coelho’s book titled *Eleven Minutes (11 Dakika)* and Salman Rushdie’s *The Enchantress of Florence (Floransa Büyücüsü)* have caught the attention of Turkish readers (“Yapı Kredi Yayınları’ndan”, “Can Yayınları”, “Bu Bir Şaka”). Therefore, *Can Yayınları* even apologized to its Turkish readers, collected the books from the market, and reprinted them after correcting this word. In the example shown above, a censorship was observed by translating with explication strategy.

Example 4

ST: *Sivas, the capital of Armenia Minor*, is situated at the head of the valley of the Halys of the ancients. (Burnaby 138)

TT-1: *Sivas*, antik Halis Vadisi’nin başında bulunuyor. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 127)

TT-2: *Küçük Ermenistan’ın başkenti Sivas*, eski zamanların Halys Vadisi’nin başında yer alıyor. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 185)

Another example of censorship appears in the definition of Sivas, one of the eastern cities of Turkey, as seen in the example given above. Sivas was a region where the Armenian population was concentrated in the period Burnaby visited this Ottoman territory. In the eyes of the English writer, it is “the capital of little Armenia” and for this reason, he uses the word “Armenia Minor.” From a historical perspective, “Armenia Minor” known as “Lesser Armenia” refers to the eastern portion of historic Armenia and was used for the Armenian-populated regions. The writer prefers to use this description for Sivas. However, in TT-1, it is observed that such usage was censored in the translation process by omitting, while it was rendered as it is in TT-2. Therefore, depriving the target reader of

the writer's point of view by omitting an expression can also be considered an example of censorship.

In short, the fact that some words related to the regions where minorities live in ST were omitted or they were translated implicitly with indirect expressions reveals that censorship was applied in TT-1. Although it is difficult to determine whether the publisher or the translator implemented the censorship, it appears that censorship took place in the context of social, political, and historical sensitivities. However, such a justification for censorship cannot make it a necessary practice because censorship ultimately limits the target reader's right to obtain information about what Anatolia or its habitants looked like from the eyes of a foreign writer at a particular time. Thus, in the light of the examples provided above, the claim made in TT-2 that "a recent translation of the same text from a publishing house included censorship" has been proven to be true.

4.3.2. Incompleteness of translation

When a comparative textual analysis was made within the framework of the publisher's claims that the previous translation was not fully translated, it was observed that certain sentences or expressions were omitted in TT-1. Examples of omission are presented below:

Example 5

ST: *A Christian*' he continued, 'even if he had the medicine, would have let me die like a dog. (Burnaby 51)

TT1: --- (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 50)

TT2: *Bir Hıristiyan*', diye devam etti, 'ilacı olsa bile köpek gibi ölmeye terk ederdi beni. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 90)

In the above sentence in ST, it is harshly stated that a Christian will not help a Muslim even if he has the chance. While this sentence comparing Christian and Muslim behavior was omitted in TT-1, it was translated in TT-2.

Example 6

ST: The Armenian in whose house I stopped, complained about of his Circassian neighbours. According to him, *they had hazy ideas as to the difference between meum and tuum*. (Burnaby 136)

TT-1:--- (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 126)

TT-2: Evine uğradığım Ermeni, Çerkez komşularından yakındı. Söylediğine göre *Çerkezlerin mülkiyet hakkına ilişkin tuhaf fikirleri vardı*. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 184)

Similar to the previous example, the italic words, which shows that the Turks and Circassians mentioned by the writer in ST have different opinions on property rights, was not translated in TT-1 either. Failure to understand the

expression of “meum and tuum” which implies the distinction of private property, or not wanting to emphasize or underestimating this distinction between the understanding of Circassians and Turks may have caused such an omission in TT-1. However, whatever the reason, it seems that this exclusion ultimately restricts Turkish readers from learning about the different perspectives of Turks and minorities on a particular issue.

Example 7

ST: *‘They are very clever, these Russian diplomats’*, continued the Pacha. (Burnaby 201)

TT-1: --- (Burnaby/ Trans. Gaspıralı 185)

TT-2: *‘Rus diplomatlar çok zekiler’* diye devam etti paşa. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 259)

It has been observed that certain comparisons of Turks with other nations living outside the Ottoman lands were also not translated in TT-1, apart from removing sentences about comparisons such as Turks and minorities or Muslims and Christians. An interesting example of this is the sentence above in ST, which emphasizes that Russian diplomats are very smart compared to the Turkish diplomats. It was not translated in TT-1 while it was fully translated in TT-2.

Example 8

ST: Then begins a series of dances and fascinating gestures *in the style of those performed by the maids at the Lupercalian games*, [...]. (Burnaby 347)

TT-1: Bundan sonra *bir dizi dans* [...] başlamaktadır. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 322)

TT-2: Ardından, *Tanrı Lupercus şenliğine katılan kızlarınkiyle aynı tarzda danslar ve büyüleyici el kol hareketleri yapılır* [...]. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 436)

The appendix titled “Female Brigandage” tells how young Kurdish women attracted and deceived the men they met on the road, using their charm and sexuality. Male victims, fascinated by the dances performed by women’s bodies and responding to them, were criminalized and fined. In ST, these women’s dances are linked to the dances at Lupercalia, which is known as a pastoral festival of Ancient Roma. However, this analogy of dance was translated as “a series of dances” (“bir dizi dans”) in TT-1 because either it was not understood or seen as unnecessary, but as a result, the target reader was deprived of a cultural image that enriches the text.

4.3.3. Different interpretation

A meticulous translation requires taking into account the many meanings of each word in ST during the translation process, as well as having a good grasp of the period in which the text was written, the language uses in that period, the style used by the writer and the subject of the text among many other issues. In

other words, it is a challenging process that requires not only a large vocabulary in a foreign language and mother tongue but also translation skills that can capture contextual clues in the text to be translated and a carefulness coming from the awareness that the translation is a complex process. Such a perspective toward the translation act can only prevent omissions and misinterpretations in translation. Several examples in this context are presented below and discussed.

Example 9

ST: Give the Turks a good government, and *Turkey* would soon take her place amidst civilized nations. (Burnaby 323)

TT-1: Türklere iyi bir hükümet vererseniz, *Türkiye* kısa zamanda uygar uluslararası yerini alırdı. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 290)

TT-2: Türkler iyi bir yönetime sahip olsalar, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu* çok geçmeden uygar ülkeler arasında yerini alır. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 398)

In the above example, there are differences at the word level in the two translations made almost simultaneously. Before evaluating word preferences in these translations, it is useful to examine contextual clues. With the proclamation of the Republic under the leadership of Atatürk in 1923, the Ottoman Empire came to an end and the name of the newly established state became the Republic of Turkey. However, since the people living in the lands under the rule of the Ottoman Empire for centuries were Turks, the word “Turkey”, which means the settlement area of the Turks, was sometimes used by foreigners to refer to the lands and the people under the Ottoman Empire’s rule. For this reason, it is possible that the English writer preferred to use this word. However, although conceptually referred to as Turkey in this period, these regions belonged to the Ottoman. In this context, the expression “Turkey” used in ST was translated literally as “Türkiye” (“Turkey”), while it was translated as “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu” (“Ottoman Empire”) considering the historical context. In other words, one translation choice reflects the writer’s point of view, whereas the other reflects historical reality. Thus, it can be claimed that there is a difference in interpretation or point of view, rather than negligence or carelessness in translation. In addition, in the correspondence with the translator of TT-2, it was revealed that this differentiation occurred as a result of the decision taken by the publishing house in consultation with a historian.

Example 10

ST: His august master [...] wishes to destroy *the Turkish Empire* [...]. England, allied with *Turkey*, and before the latter power is crippled, could easily apply it. (Burnaby 326)

TT-1: [...] yüce efendisi, *Türk İmparatorluğu’nu* yok etmek istiyor. [...] *Türkiye’yle*, bu ülke devre dışı bırakılmadan ittifak kuracak bir İngiltere, bu cezayı verebilir. (Burnaby/Trans. Gaspıralı 293)

TT-2: Haşmetbeab efendisi, [...] *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nu* yok etmeyi istemektedir. [...] İngiltere, *Osmanlı Devleti* kötürüm olmadan önce bu devlet ile ittifak kurarak falaka yöntemini rahatlıkla uygulamaya koyabilir. (Burnaby/Trans. Taşkent 401)

Words such as “Turkey”, “Turkish Empire” or “Turkish Parliament” in ST were directly translated in TT-1 while they were rendered as the “Ottoman State”, the “Ottoman Empire”, or “Ottoman Parliament or Assembly” in TT-2, as seen in example 10. It is clear that such translation choices throughout TT-2 are related to the historical context, as explained in the previous example above. For this reason, it would be appropriate not to consider them as a deficiency or negligence in translation but a different interpretation for contextualizing the text.

In short, considering the paratextual elements, it can be said that TT-2 offers more enlightening information to Turkish readers for contextualizing ST as it contains more paratextual elements. However, both translations create a different representation of ST by emphasizing the tension between Muslims and Christians in their paratexts while the ST concentrates more on the writer’s research for the possibility of a war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire. When considered in terms of operational norms, it can be argued that both TT-1 and TT-2 have the textual integrity of the ST. On the other hand, in the context of textual-linguistic norms, the range of differences between two translated texts is quite wide due to the issues of “censorship”, “incompleteness” and “different interpretation”. In this sense, as claimed by the second publisher, it was observed that censorship was occasionally resorted to in TT-1 by omitting the words or expressing them implicitly. Also, it can be said that some sentences or phrases related to various historical references and comparisons of minorities or other nations and Turks were omitted from the text causing incompleteness in TT-1. In addition to these, although a very few examples of negligence or loose translation are encountered in some parts of TT-1, it is usually diverging perspectives and interpretations of word choices that make the differentiation. In conclusion, the decisions on the micro-structure of the text demonstrate the validity of the second publisher’s claims, which results in a rivalry between the publishers or translations.

5. Conclusions

This study aimed to examine two different Turkish translations of the English writer Fred Burnaby’s travel writing, *On Horseback through Asia Minor* by using the concept “paratext” and “operational norms” in its theoretical framework. As TT-2 tries to challenge the other translation, this study questioned the validity of the claims of the second publisher based on “censorship” and “incompleteness”. It was found that TT-2 was not a

retranslation, but a simultaneous translation presented to the same target culture by chance. As a result of descriptive paratextual and textual analysis of the source text and target texts, it was found that the paratexts of both target texts direct the reader's reception towards the writer's purpose as to "the research of the tension between Muslim and Christian worlds" while ST puts high emphasis on the writer's research of "threat of a possible Ottoman-Russian war". Although both target texts have textual integrity in terms of matricial norms, TT-2 steps forth with the addition of abundant paratextual elements, which help readers to contextualize the text better.

For the validity of the claims of the second publisher, "censorship" and "incompleteness" were observed in TT-1 when textual-linguistic norms were examined because some words related to regions minorities lived were censored by omitting or translating implicitly. Also, omissions led to incompleteness in some parts of TT-1 where comparisons between some minorities and Turks or Muslims and Christians were made by the writer. Moreover, different interpretations occurred between the two translations due to translating as it is or considering the historical context. This reveals that TT-2 tries to provide a more meticulous translation for its target readers. Consequently, it was revealed that TT-2 challenged the other translation, which resulted in producing market negativity towards it through the aforementioned claims and created an active rivalry in the translated book market.

Further studies could conduct such translation analysis by utilizing the benefits of technology to gain further insights as suggested by Bozan (2021) with a text mining approach.

Works cited:

- Ben-Ari, Nitsa. "When Literary Censorship is not Strictly Enforced, Self-Censorship Rushes In." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction* 23.2 (2010): 133-166.
- Billiani, Francesca. "Assessing Boundaries: Censorship and Translation. An Introduction." *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*. Ed. Francesca Billiani. St. Jerome, 2007. 1-25. Print.
- . "Censorship". *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha. Routledge, 2008. 28-31. Print.
- Bozan, Nalan. "A Text Mining Approach to 'Operational Norms'." *TransLogos* 4.1 (2021): 57-80.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. "Examining Self-Censorship: Zola's Nana in English Translation". *Modes of Censorship in Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*. Ed. Francesca Billiani. St. Jerome, 2007. 205-234. Print.
- Burnaby, Frederick. *A Ride to Khiva: Travels and Adventures in Central Asia*. Cassell, Petter and Galpin, 1877. Print.
- . *On Horseback through Asia Minor*. Oxford University, 2002. Print.
- . *Küçük Asya Seyahatnamesi Anadolu'da Bir İngiliz Subayı, 1876*. Trans. Meral Gaspıralı. Sabah Kitapları, 1998. Print.

- . *At Sirtında Anadolu. Anadolu'da Bir İngiliz Subayı, 1876*. Trans. Meral Gaspıralı. Merkez Kitapçılık, 2007. Print.
- . *At Sirtında Anadolu*. Trans. Fatma Taşkent. İletişim Yayınları, 2015. Print.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts. Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin, Cambridge University, 1997. Print.
- Parlak, Betül and Denissova, Nilüfer. "Türkçe ve Rusça Civitas Solis Çevirilerinde Sansür ve Cinsiyetçi Dil Kullanımı." *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9 (2021): 437-459.
- Somló, Ágnes. "From Silence to Reading between the Lines: On Self-Censorship in Literary Translation." *B.A.S. British and American Studies* 20 (2014): 189-201.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. "What Texts don't Tell: The Uses of Paratexts in Translation Research." *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*. Ed. Theo Hermans. St. Jerome, 2002. 44-60. Print.
- . "Paratexts." *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. John Benjamins, 2011. 113-116.
- Taş, Seda. "Sansürün Çeviride İşleyişi ve Patronaj." *Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 60 (2018a): 213-233.
- . "Çeviride Sansür Bağlamında Kavramsal Bir Tartışma: "Çeviri Yokluğu", "Yok-Çeviri" ve "Kurumsal Sansür." *Çeviribilimde Güncel Tartışmalardan Kavramsal Sorgulamalara*. Ed. Seda Taş, Hiperlink, 2018b. 147-191. Print.
- Taş İlmeç, Seda. "Examining Readers' Perceptions of Translations: The Case of Stephen King's Works in Turkish". *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 16.4 (2020): 1722-1734.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins, 1995. Print.
- Üstünsöz, İrem. "Censorship of 'Obscene' Literary Translations: An Analysis of Two Specific Cases." *Tradition, Tension and Translation in Turkey*. Ed. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Saliha Paker and John Milton, John Benjamins, 2015. 219-232. Print.
- "Yapı Kredi Yayınları'ndan 'Kürdistan' sansürü"
<https://www.indyturk.com/node/53036/haber/yap%C4%B1-kredi-yay%C4%B1nlar%C4%B1ndan-k%C3%BCrdistan-sans%C3%BCr%C3%BC>. Accessed 20 March 2022.
- "Can Yayınları, Coelho'nun Kitabını Bugün Toplatıyor". <https://t24.com.tr/haber/can-yayinlari-coelho-nun-kitabini-bugun-toplatiyor,830650>. Accessed 20 March 2022.
- "Bu Bir Şaka, Hemen Toplayıp Düzeltiyoruz". <https://newsfounded.com/turkey/bu-bir-saka-hemen-toplayip-duzeltiyoruz/> Accessed 20 March 2022.

DEFI A L'AUTRE TRADUCTION : L'AVEVENTURE DE LA TRADUCTION EN TURC DE L'ANATOLIE A CHEVAL DE FREDERICK BURNABY

Cet article se propose d'examiner deux traductions turques différentes du récit de voyage de *l'Anatolie à Cheval* (1878/1996) de l'écrivain anglais Frederick Burnaby. L'aventure de *l'Anatolie à Cheval* en turc est un cas intéressant car la première traduction a été publiée en 1998 par *Livres de Sabah*, mais juste un an après cette publication, une autre traduction est apparue sur le marché du livre turc, publiée par *Publications de l'İletişim*. Cependant, ce qui est plus intéressant que ces traductions,

publiées presque simultanément, c'est le discours de l'éditeur concernant la première traduction sur la couverture de la présentation de la deuxième traduction. L'éditeur affirme que le texte est une traduction "méticuleuse", "non censurée" et "complète", ce qui souligne que la traduction précédente comprenait des parties "censurées" et "incomplètes". Par conséquent, cette étude remet en question les affirmations de l'éditeur en procédant à une analyse paratextuelle et textuelle du texte source et des textes cibles et cherche également à comprendre si la causalité créée par l'éditeur a conduit à la deuxième traduction ou à une retraduction. Dans son cadre théorique, il utilise le concept de "paratexte" mis en avant par le chercheur français Gérard Genette et les "normes opérationnelles" introduites par le spécialiste de la traduction Gideon Toury. Les résultats suggèrent que le second texte cible, plutôt qu'une "retraduction", est une traduction simultanée apparue incidemment presque à la même période, s'est adressée aux mêmes lecteurs cibles et a essayé de faire ressortir sa différence par rapport à l'autre traduction. On constate également que les revendications de l'éditeur du second texte cible pour cause de "censure" et d'"incomplétude" sont valables, ce qui provoque une rivalité entre les traductions sur le marché du livre traduit, non seulement en remettant fortement en question l'autre traduction, mais aussi en suscitant la négativité du marché à son égard.

Mots-clés : traduction, récits de voyage, normes opérationnelles, paratexte, rivalité