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Abstract

This study examines the translation field in Turkey by examining social, cultural, economic and political factors that impact on translators and translation. It is an attempt to contribute to the literature on the sociology of translation by adopting a Bourdieusian perspective whilst looking at how the translation field, along with various forms of translator capital and (dis)positions can be studied, in a contemporary and Turkish context. At the same time, the study elaborates on Lefevere’s concept of patronage and analyses the forces and control mechanisms which influence the field of translation and literary (fiction and other genres) translators in Turkey.

The prosecution of a considerable number of translators in Turkey after they were held responsible for the content of their translations, particularly when these included “insulting Turkishness”, and the lack of research in the field of prosecution of translators in the Turkish context as well as the desire to know Turkish translational culture better by looking at this particular issue led to the carrying out of this study. Yet, neither the scope nor the expected contribution is limited to this.

The contribution of the project to Translation Studies will result from its multi-layered, multi-dimensional and multi-disciplinary approach to investigating the translator as one of the main agents of the act of translating, before positioning him/her within a wider system of translation, and to uncovering the perceived influence of control factors on the field of translation and translational behaviour in Turkey. While the historical dimension will help us in identifying the developments in translation studies in Turkey, the sociological, cultural, economic, and political perspectives will solidify our understanding of the translator as an individual, with the legal perspective foregrounding the link of this individual, not only with the society in which s/he lives, but also with the political apparatus.

The research used a qualitative and exploratory approach for the 16 in-depth interviews conducted. Since the motivation for this study was to understand, in the sociological sense, rather than explain, it mainly attempted to document the world from the point of view of the people studied. The dynamics of the field of translation and the power structures within the field in the context of Turkey were uncovered through a thematic analysis method, where various aspects of the translation world in Turkey were explored under different themes, and political/ ideological, economic and social control factors were found to impact significantly on the field of translation and translational behaviour in Turkey.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Rationale and Research Gap

The inspiration for conducting research on Turkish literary (fiction and other genres) translators and their working environment emerged in 2006 when Aslı Biçen, translator of Elif Şafak’s *The Bastard of Istanbul*, and Ender Abadoğlu, translator of *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* by Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman, were prosecuted and brought to court in Turkey, together with the books’ editors, on a charge of insulting Turkishness (“Türklüğü aşağılamak”) under Article 301 of the Turkish Criminal Code. They are not the first ones to be so accused. Translators such as Lütfi Taylan Tosun, Aysel Yıldırım, Seçkin Selvi, Zafer Korkmaz, Atilla Tuygan, Sertaç Canpolat are among those who have experienced similar treatment and prosecution.

Entering the Criminal Code in 1936, Article 301 has since been revised eight times, with the most recent adjustment taking place in 2008. To summarise the content of the article, Article 301 foresees a jail sentence of six months to three years for people who “openly insult Turkishness, the Republic or the Parliament”. However, a recent report on media freedom for the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) in Strasbourg has emphasised that Turkey is in violation of Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights and as such, the European Court of Human Rights may impose sanctions on Turkey for this notorious article restricting freedom of opinion and expression. It was also argued in the report that the changes made to Article 301 did not substantially reduce the number of court cases in which writers or journalists were prosecuted for their published opinions (Bozkurt 2010). According to the “April-May-June 11999 Media Monitoring Report” by the independent monitoring organisation Bianet, 125 people were on trial within the context of freedom of expression between April and June 2009 (Bianet 2009).

Additionally, further engagement with similar issues reveals that the above-mentioned trend towards control of free expression in Turkey is even more extensive, and can be seen to refer to a control mechanism that far exceeds academic or artistic scope, and is not specific to translation. This control mechanism not only encompasses all dimensions of
social, cultural, economic and political life, but is also the reflection of a desire to transform people’s minds in order to guarantee the reproduction of a particular set of social and political norms on an individual basis. This perspective refers to a social engineering that transcends what is implied by the concepts of reform or modification, as the ultimate level of any state’s desire is to impose order upon aspects of society perceived as strategic by those who control the state (see Introduction in, Scott 1998: 1-8). The historical dimension will help the reader identify developments in translation studies in Turkey as well as clarify who, in the case of Turkey, is behind the state. In other words, one principal aim of this study is to indicate continuities, and highlight memories of cultural control and the way it plays out in present conceptualisations of translation.

These kinds of recurring incidents have been barometers of freedom of expression in Turkey, but they have also drawn attention to the importance of translators and the translation process. Each historical period comes with its own claims and power relations, which change over time. What remains are records or thumbprints of impressions they leave on people. This is what this study attempts to do by combining narratives embedded in the historiographic approach with a more contemporary context. Moreover, the role of the translator in the translation process and the hotly-contested debate on the (in)visibility of the translator have resurfaced once again in a country like Turkey, where the mainstream literature on Translation Studies still concentrates to a great extent on translation theories and practice, while omitting the essential role of the translator as an agent in the translation process (see Chapter 2).

In light of the above-mentioned developments, the present research adopts a contextual perspective, and looks into the role of the translator and the surrounding environment in the translation process with a view to delineating the boundaries of autonomy and heteronomy in the field of translation.

1.2 Research Perspective

Within the general context outlined above, this study aims to present the current state of affairs by complementing existing historical accounts of translation activity in Turkey. In other words, it attempts to: a) outline the characteristics of the field of translation in Turkey through an investigative analysis of the socio-economic and politico-cultural factors that
impact on literary translators and translation as a process; b) elaborate on how their (dis)positions can be studied in a contemporary context; and, following on from that, c) indirectly extrapolate the perceived influence of control factors.

The practical reflection of this attempt is to shed light on the following:

- the extent to which social, cultural and economic environments are perceived as impacting on translational behaviour;
- the extent to which the different types of capital a translator holds are perceived as impacting on translational behaviour;
- the extent to which the dominant ideology in power and the political environment it creates, particularly during periods marked by dramatic political change (i.e. the foundation of the Turkish Republic, military interventions, transition to multi-party regime and so forth) are perceived as impacting on translational behaviour, translational dispositions, translators’ habitus and the selection of titles by publishers and translators.

In line with this attempt, specific research questions appear as:

- Where does the translation activity start and end for the translator?
- How and why do socio-economic and cultural conditions impact on translational behaviour?
- How and why does translational behaviour depend on the configuration of different types of capital held by a translator?
- In countries like Turkey, where regulations are intentionally vague, is self-censorship by translators a necessity?
- What is the role of critics in translation activity?
- How and why do possible shifts or breaks in translational culture during periods marked by dramatic socio-political change, i.e. the foundation of the Republic, military interventions, transition to multi-party regime, end of the Cold War and so forth, impact on translational behaviour?
- What variables influence the selection of titles by publishers and translators?

In order to explore the above-mentioned research questions, the concept of field, as developed by Bourdieu, will be used as a guiding, heuristic concept, so that perspectives of translational behaviour, translational dispositions, translators’ habitus and different types
of capital held by a translator can be identified. In addition, the concept of patronage, as set forth by Lefevere, will be used as a complementary local model for study of the translation field—the existence of which may be a contested topic. Patronage will help tease out perspectives on how the social, cultural, economic and ideological / political environments affect translation as a professional practice. The historical perspective and the topographic context delineated in the study will help to contextualise Bourdieu’s concept of field and Lefevere’s concept of patronage specifically for the Turkish translation scene. Finally, for the collection and discussion of data, this thesis uses a qualitative and exploratory approach, the latter entailing 16 in-depth interviews conducted during 2010. Since the motivation for this study was understanding, in the sociological sense, rather than explaining, it mainly attempts to document the world from the point of view of the people studied through a thematic analysis method, whereby various aspects of the translation world in Turkey are explored under different themes.

This PhD thesis includes four chapters. Following the introductory chapter, the second chapter provides the theoretical framework, and approaches how the translator is presented in different theories of translation: Lefevere’s patronage is examined in the context of human agency within wider structures, and Bourdieu’s sociological approach against the depersonalisation of translation production is explored. Informed by Bourdieu’s emphasis on the historical trajectory of social space being decisive over its specific shape, the third chapter first provides a genealogy of translation during the Ottoman period, with an emphasis on the social, cultural, economic, political and translation-related discourses, various translation institutions and individuals, and then presents the political establishment’s view of translation practice from a historical perspective. In order to clarify the basis on which the interviewees comment in the following chapter, this third chapter concludes with a topography of translation in today’s Turkey. Finally, the fourth chapter sets out the field study’s methodology, the research questions and design, and presents a thematic data analysis, conclusion and discussion.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework and Approach

Introduction

This chapter aims to draw the theoretical and conceptual framework within which the current study will evolve in the ensuing chapters. It will begin with an effort to understand how and where the translator is positioned and treated in different theories of translation throughout the historical development of Translation Studies as a discipline; and why this is the way it is.

It will then move forward to review the current state of art in the literature, with a special emphasis on the Turkish translation scene. In the sub-section on the literature of Translation Studies in Turkey, the main argument will be that analyses of historically-important translation institutions and individuals shed light on the historical trajectory / evolution of the respective translation field, at the expense of studies that predominantly focus on contemporariness.

Thereafter, Lefevere’s approach to the study of translation will be introduced, along with his key concept of patronage, which serves to unearth the individuality of the translator as an active agent in the translation process. This is also key in positioning the translator within a wider network of social, political, economic, and power relations.

Before the chapter concludes, Lefevere’s *patronage* will be linked to the key concepts and parameters of Bourdieu’s *field* approach, in order for the latter more nuanced perspective to be used as the main conceptual framework of the PhD research.

2.1 The Translator in Different Theories of Translation

Depending on the particular approach to translation, varying degrees of emphasis are placed on the position of the translator as an active agent in the translation process. Although every translation is done by a human agent, it is possible to say that in many theories of translation, and especially earlier ones, this agency did not get the attention it deserved and was
sometimes completely muted. The manner in which the translator is treated by various theories is directly related to the conceptual tools used in these theories. These include the very definition of translation, its dynamic nature, objectivity or subjectivity of meaning, the external circumstances relevant for translation and the prescriptive or descriptive approach to the tasks involved.

All these variables have their own impact on how the position of the translator is viewed. Translator autonomy decreases as emphasis on stability or objectivity of meaning increases. In contrast, the position of the translator is seen in increasingly complex ways as the definition of translation is extended to include a multitude of variables. In what follows, these various perspectives will be evaluated in order to analyse how they position the translator.

It is only relatively recently that Translation Studies has extended its scope from the micro, i.e. textual context, to the macro, i.e. socio-cultural context. This has led to an increasing number of scholars exploring the role of broader contextual factors in conditioning the production of translations. This interest in the extra-textual has not only signalled a broadened perspective, but also paved the way to incorporating other methods of analysis in order to distinguish social agents and/or institutions affecting translation activity (see Bassnett & Lefevere 1990, Hatim 2001, Bassnett 2002, Gentzler 2002). It has also generated an interest in critically evaluating power relations and the deployment of differing strategies among those actors (see Tahir-Gürcağlar 2003).

However, in order to fully develop a comprehensive understanding of Translation Studies, it is essential to trace its historical evolution. This will prove to be instrumental in evaluating the increasing importance attributed to the role of agency in translation. Thus, the next section will look into selected aspects of progression of the discipline.

2.1.1 The Historical Evolution of Translation Theories

It is generally recognised that until a certain point in history, ideas on translation were source-oriented and based on the assumption that there is a stable core (words or sense) to be conveyed in the source-text. However, if the evolution of translation is traced as far
back as 18 BCE, it will be noted that Horace, in his Art of Poetry (2000/18 BC), informs us of the necessity for a target-oriented perspective in order to produce a satisfactory translation. Horace warns the translator against the poor result of literal translation or imitation of the original text. According to Horace, the translator should feel free to extricate himself in his translation. Thus, we see Horace emphasising the individuality of the translator.

In the 16th century, Etienne Dolet was accused of mistranslation when, by adding three words, he slightly intensified the meaning of one of Plato’s works. Dolet added rien de tout (anything at all) at the end of a phrase\(^1\), and it was concluded that he was implying atheism in the translation (Robinson 1997: 95) An intervention such as Dolet’s, which in a century under the domination of the Catholic Church in Europe was considered atheistic, resulted in the execution of the translator. In contrast to his strategy of translating, his comments on how one should translate show that Dolet favoured preservation of meaning in translation (Robinson 1997: 95-96). This arose from his idea that there was a fixed meaning inherent in a text which must be grasped and reproduced in the target language by the translator.

Moving forward to the beginning of the 20th century, to a time when it is possible to talk of more established studies of translation, the main trends in translation theories were, according to Venuti, based on philosophy, hermeneutics and phenomenology (Venuti 2000: 11). Although developments in this period with regard to translation are said by Venuti (2000: 12) to be the autonomy of translation and its status as a text in its own right, the status of the translator does not seem to have changed, with the translator still not viewed as the producer of a unique text.

In his essay “The Task of the Translator” in 1923, Benjamin brings a distinct and philosophical approach to translation which is source-oriented. However, this source-orientedness is rather different from what we understand by source-orientedness today. For

\(^1\)The text in concern is Plato’s Axiochus (also called Axiochos or Antiochus). Froeliger notes that, “[a]ccording to Jean Delisle, “He had Socrates say ‘La mort ne peut rien sur toi, car tu n'es pas ci prêt à décéder, et quand tu seras décédé, elle n'y pourra rien aussi, attendu que tu ne seras plus rien du tout.’” [Death can do nothing unto you for you are not now ready to die. And after you die, it can do nothing either, since you will no longer be anything at all (my translation)]. This last phrase is supposed to render the Greek su gar ouk esei. The censors judged that the “anything at all” was not present in the original, was contrary to the author’s intention, cast a doubt on immortality of the soul, and could only stem from heretical thinking.” [Delisle and Lafond 2004; quoted in Froeliger (date N/A): 5]
Benjamin, what should be conveyed in a translation is not the linguistic inventory or the sense of the original work; it is rather reflections of the “pure language” that should be preserved in a translation (Benjamin 2000/1923: 22).

It is difficult to comprehend the implications of this task, as the idea of “pure language” is quite abstract. Benjamin states that the only way to demonstrate the kinship of languages in translation is to convey the form and meaning of the original as accurately as possible (Benjamin 2000/1923: 17). However, he adds that meaning is never found independently in words or sentences, but is in a constant state of flux until it emerges as pure language (Benjamin 2000/1923: 18).

Therefore, Benjamin underestimates the position of translation when he argues “[…] no translation, however good it may be, can have any significance as regards the original” (Benjamin 2000/1923: 16). His idea of translation does not serve the original; rather it owes its existence to it (Benjamin 2000/1923: 22). Accordingly, the competency of a translator lies in his/her ability to offer a simulacrum / mirror-image of the original as effectively as possible by keeping its foreignness.

In this approach, we see a prototype of the translator, abstract and homogeneous, rather than an individual translator making his/her own decisions. The task of the translator seems idealistic and elusive, as it includes transmitting the meaning in such a way that “[…] it is able to emerge as pure language from the harmony of all the various modes of intention” (Benjamin 2000/1923: 17). Although this task is quite an abstract and philosophical one, the way Benjamin sets out the methodology for achieving this task is very concrete and somewhat prescriptive. In his words: “If the kinship of languages is to be demonstrated by translations, how else can this be done but by conveying the form and meaning of the original as accurately as possible? (Benjamin 2000/1923: 17)”

In addition to form and meaning, the transfer of intention is also included in the task of the translator. As a result, we may say that the translator appears as an ideal model, not as an actual individual, in Benjamin’s remarks related to translation.

Moving forward in the same century, in the 1960s and ‘70s the dominating concept becomes equivalence (Venuti 2000: 121). Venuti comments on this as follows:
“Translating is generally seen as a process of communicating the foreign text by establishing a relationship of identity or analogy with it” (Venuti 2000: 121). It may be observed that binary oppositions dominate the line of thought in translation theory in this period, on a parallel with the general line of thought in science of this period.

Nida contributed to the field with his concept of dynamic equivalence. There is a binary opposition in Nida’s approach, the two poles of which are formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. This opposition is closely linked with another binary opposition Nida borrows from Saussure, namely that between content and form. Nida views content as a stable unit inherent in the source-text. In this respect, in his article entitled “Principles of Correspondence”, Nida observes that “[d]ifferences in translations can generally be accounted for by three basic factors in translating: (1) the nature of the message, (2) the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator, and (3) the type of audience” (Nida 2000: 127).

From this remark, it is understood that Nida, who often writes from the perspective of Bible translation, sees the translator as a representative of the author and presupposes that the purpose of the translator is inferior to that of the author, which must be served. Also, Nida affirms that although the purposes of the translator are assumed to be similar to those of the author, there are circumstances when this is not so, and in such a condition the purposes of the translator are relevant for the study of translation (Nida 2000: 128). For Nida, since there are no identical equivalents, the translator should try to find the closest possible equivalent (Nida 2000: 129). This perspective decreases the role of the translator, since it favours a view of the translator as an ineffective reproducer of the fixed meaning in a text. The task of the translator is to apply the prescriptions for practising translation in order that s/he can reproduce this meaning.

Reiss, on the other hand, views the translator as a secondary sender, who necessarily and naturally changes the message (Reiss 2000/1971: 160). The main concept treated by Reiss is the function of translation, which is the extension of the text type. For her, the text type is the most important element in the translator’s translational decisions. This perspective entails the translator initially identifying the text-type of the translation as X, Y or Z and translating the text accordingly. The function of the source-text is important in so far as the translator aims to create a functionally equivalent target-text (Reiss 2000/1971: 162).
other words, the translator seems to have relative freedom in Reiss’ approach, as apparently it is the translator who decides on the function that the target-text will realise in the target culture. Nevertheless, Reiss clarifies that the freedom of the translator is again restricted by the text-type and the function of the target-text.

It is also worth noting that even in “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies” (Holmes 2000/1972: 172-185), a seminal article by Holmes in which he tried to determine the scope and structure of Translation Studies by systemising the different approaches to translation available at that time, the only reference to the translator takes place in the section on process-oriented translation studies. Holmes states that process-oriented translation studies deal with the “little black box” of the translator’s mind (Holmes 2000/1972: 177). In this respect, the lack of human agent in the systematisation of Holmes is another example of the detached, objective and dehumanised perspective that dominated Translation Studies at the time.

The lack of human agency is also evident in the approach of Even-Zohar, who views translation as part of a polysystem, and tries to place literary translation within this broad polysystem (Even-Zohar 2000: 192-197). The controlling element in Even-Zohar’s translational approach is the idea of system and therefore cultural spaces, structures rather than individuals. However, in this system the position of the translator is not very clear: there is place for collectivity but not individuality.

In Toury’s norm-governed translation theory, the translator is seen as a person acting within a cultural system too. In his words:

However highly one may think of Linguistics, Text-Linguistics, Contrastive Textology or Pragmatics and of their explanatory power with respect to translational phenomena, being a translator cannot be reduced to the mere generation of utterances which would be considered “translations” within any of these disciplines. Translation activities should rather be regarded as having cultural significance. Consequently, “translatorship” amounts first and foremost to being able to play a social role, i.e., to fulfill a function allotted by a community – in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference. (Toury 2000: 198)
With these words, Toury—a student of Even-Zohar—underlines the social aspect of being a translator. The underlying idea is that the restrictions affecting the translator’s decisions are not linguistic or textual in nature. Instead, constraints are imposed on translators by the society and culture in which they operate. For Toury, the meaning in a text is constructed according to, and under the restriction of, some cultural norms, which also apply during the production of translations. Thus, the translator makes his/her decisions by considering these norms. S/he either acts in line with these norms or chooses to behave contrarily and bear the consequences of violating them.

However, it is debatable how far this approach extends the freedom of the translator, since the alternatives are predetermined. For instance, the translator initially must decide whether s/he is going to produce an “adequate” or an “acceptable” translation (the initial norm) (Toury 2000: 200-201). In other words, a decision must be made on subjection to the source-text and the norms realised by it, or to the target-text and target system norms (Toury 2000: 201). From this perspective, there is no other alternative, such as the interpretation of the translator.

Toury favours objectivity in translation studies and thus tries to explain translation phenomena by the norms constructed by the corpus of translations, without any reference to the individual decisions and interpretation of the translator. As a result, it may be said that while Toury’s adding of a social identity to the translator differentiates his approach from those of scholars who try to explain the decisions of translators by only referring to textual phenomena, he still does not allow space for any translator autonomy.

From the 1980s onwards, important conceptual and methodological changes took place in Translation Studies (Venuti 2000a: 215). With the impact of functionalism, post-structuralism and post-colonialism, an interdisciplinary perspective to translational phenomena became influential in the field. In line with these changes, there began a more comprehensive evaluation of the position of the translator as a determining element in the translational process.

Vermeer, one of the leading figures in functionalist translation studies, allocated unusual emphasis to the translator. For Vermeer, the translator is the expert in translational action (Vermeer 2000: 222). In his words:
An expert must be able to say – and this implies both knowledge and duty to use it – what is what. His voice must therefore be respected, he must be “given a say”. The translator is such an expert. It is thus up to him to decide, for instance, what role a source text plays in his translational action. The decisive factor here is the purpose, the skopos, of the communication in a given situation. (Vermeer 2000: 222)

The most important constraint of the translator in Vermeer’s view is the skopos, i.e. the purpose of the commissioned translation. If we consider that the skopos is realised by the translator, we may say that the translator is the one who chooses the framework of his/her decisions. The point is that s/he is expected to explain why s/he decided to move one way instead of another (Vermeer 2000: 223).

This change in attitude towards the translator may be related to the change in status of the source-text in Skopos Theory. For Vermeer, the source-text is of importance in so far as it is included in the skopos. The meaning is not seen as a stable unit inherent in the source-text and to be conveyed in the translation. Instead, the meaning is seen as a dynamic concept, subject to spatial and temporal variations. There is also a place for the translator’s interpretation in Vermeer’s model. He states that translation is the realisation of one possible interpretation (Vermeer 2000: 227). The underlying idea here is the subjectivity of meaning, as meaning is not something that can be grasped and reproduced as is by another individual. Meaning is constructed by every individual through his or her interpretation. As the translator is an individual who is reading a text, s/he inevitably interprets the text in order to construct the meaning of the text.

Another scholar who widened the perspective of Translation Studies is Lefevere. In his model, Lefevere produced a different approach in terms of the position of the translator by placing emphasis on asymmetrical power relations. Lefevere has a systemic approach to literature and literary translation, providing us with a more comprehensive understanding of translation, since he views translation as a unit in a wide net of relations. For him, translators are individuals who act within this net of relations and take many factors into consideration while making decisions. Lefevere uses the concept of patronage (Lefevere 2000: 236) to argue that translators are commissioned, performing their profession under
many social constraints more influential than textual or linguistic ones (Lefevere 2000: 237). This attitude indicates that he views translators as individuals affecting and being affected by society.

Compared to earlier theories which focused only on the linguistic aspects of a text where translation is concerned, this perspective offers a more comprehensive approach. For Lefevere, meaning is something that is created in the target language by the systems of that culture. It takes its form depending on the actual conditions of the culture and is open to interpretation and manipulation by the powerful bodies of the system in question. In other words, translation cannot be considered isolated from other domains of social life such as the economy or politics.

A source-oriented approach to translation in this period comes from Berman. The underlying idea in Berman’s remarks is that target-oriented approaches distort the original work in order to adapt it to (or assimilate it into) the target culture. He suggests that some “deformation techniques” are systematically used in order to distort the message of the source text: for him these so-called deformations are used at the expense of the original (Berman 2000: 291). He argues that deforming strategies naturalise, neutralise and homogenise the original work (Berman 2000: 286-297).

It can be inferred from Berman’s ideas that he privileges the intention of the author and undervalues that of the translator. He believes the properly ethical aim of translation to be transference of the foreign as foreign. Thus, he presupposes the single aim of translation to be emphasizing the foreignness of a work, and sees this as binding for all translators. In this way, he puts the translator aside in the translational process. Berman’s starting point is also binary oppositions, such as accentuation versus assimilation of a text, and translation versus original. Therefore, Berman’s approach displays some similarities with linguistically-oriented approaches in terms of the translator’s passivity during the translational process, the bases of which are such binary oppositions.

Similarly to Berman, Venuti—who was greatly influenced by him—problematises the socio-cultural system while attempting to determine the place of translation in the system. Venuti has a political approach to translation. He thinks that, today, translation is not a simple communicative act (Venuti 2000b: 468). In his words, translation never
communicates in an untroubled fashion because the translator negotiates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by reducing them and supplying another set of differences, basically domestic, drawn from the receiving language and culture to enable the foreign to be received there (Venuti 2000b: 468).

The underlying idea in Venuti’s remarks about translation being far removed from a simple communicative act is the asymmetrical power relations inherent in the act of translation. He assumes that “asymmetries, inequities, relations of domination and dependence exist in every act of translating, of putting the translated in the service of the translating culture” (Venuti 1998: 4). According to Venuti, any language is a site of power relationships (Venuti 1998: 10) and this is the main reason for his dealing with domestication strategies applied during translation, especially in the context of the translation of literary works into English. According to Venuti, domestication is the assimilation of the source-text into the target culture. He argues that translation is not a communication between equals because of its ethnocentricity (Venuti 1998: 11), and that the translator always cooperates with the domestic (Venuti 1998: 22).

Venuti deals with the domestication and foreignising strategies used by translators and, like Berman, favours the foreignizing strategy. For him, theorists have moved towards an ethical reflection “wherein remedies are formulated to restore or preserve the foreignness of the foreign text” (Venuti 2000b: 469). He objects to the idea that translation establishes the invariant because “the source message is always interpreted and reinvented, especially in cultural forms open to interpretation” (Venuti 2000b: 470).

In this respect, in order to elaborate on the position of the translator who, in Venuti’s approach, is the interpreter and reinventor of this message, it is necessary to distinguish between the social status of the translator and his/her autonomy in terms of text production. In the introduction to The Scandals of Translation (1998), Venuti states that one of his aims is to “win for translators greater cultural authority and a more favorable legal status” (Venuti 1998: 3-4). This is unique to the extent that among the scholars discussed in this section, Venuti is the first one to make such a conscious attempt to elevate the translator’s status.
Accordingly, the position of the translator cannot be thought of independently of his/her status within the cultural context. In this respect, Venuti refers to the distinct kind of authorship of translators and the laws concerning copyright (Venuti 1998: 47-67). The fact that Venuti draws attention to the social and legal position of translators is noteworthy in that it is a much neglected issue in Translation Studies. However, when we juxtapose this with the autonomy of the translator in terms of text production, the picture becomes quite different.

According to Venuti, the translator has no alternative but to follow a foreignising strategy, since the aim of translation should be to emphasise the foreignness of the source text. The translator will be “complicit in the institutional exploitation of foreign texts and cultures” (Venuti 1998: 4). Thus, the translator is not autonomous in determining and applying his strategy. At this point, Venuti’s approach seems to restrict and reduce the autonomy of the translator. Although Venuti’s starting points are very different, this results in a backward move towards the linguistics-oriented theories in terms of translator autonomy. The idea that the meaning of a text is a static unit has been abandoned and even objected to by Venuti.

However, it is the fact that Venuti views meaning as something that has the potential to be manipulated in a way that it will serve a certain ideology and prescribes the translator to translate accordingly that results in this similarity. On the other hand, it should never be forgotten that there is a significant difference between these two approaches regarding the power of the translator. Whereas translation was presupposed as an impersonal act and the autonomy of the translator was never thought of or discussed in the linguistically- or textually-oriented theories, Venuti is aware of the fact that the translator may be visible or invisible, which means that he is aware of the potential power of the translator in the translational action. However, he still insists on prescribing the translator with foreignising, without considering the underlying reasons why a translator may resort to either strategy.

In his book *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*, Robinson helps us to see translators as actual individuals living and translating in actual settings under some constraints, and notes:
Translation has traditionally been thought of in highly mechanical ways: as an impersonal process of transferring a meaning from a source text to a target text without changing it significantly. The primary people behind this process, translators, have been studied largely in negative ways, in terms of the distortive or disruptive impact of their ‘opinions’, ‘biases’, or ‘misunderstandings’ on the successful completion of the process. Theoretical attention to translators has been largely directed at stripping the ideal translator of such disruptions. (Robinson 1997: 8)

With these remarks, Robinson rightly implies that we should abandon the type of thinking which places the translator in such a disadvantaged position. Robinson helps us to see the translators as actual individuals living and translating in actual settings under some constraints of their individuality. And this time, in contrast to culturally-oriented translation scholars, he includes the asymmetrical power relations between and within cultures in the theory.

Robinson illustrates this point with an example from history. He tells the story of a female interpreter who is the native mistress of an invader and who has been declared a traitor by her nation because she interpreted an overheard secret (Robinson 1997: 11). After giving an account of this incident, Robinson questions “What power do translators and interpreters have in the political realm? And how is that power complicated by factors like membership in a despised gender, race or class? (Robinson 1997: 11)”

With an emphasis on the fact that the translator belongs to a certain group, in terms of his/her gender, race, class, etc., Robinson helps us to view the translator from a novel perspective. While commenting on the decision-making process of the translator, it should not be forgotten that translators perform their profession under many internal and external constraints. They stand on the line between two cultures, which generally have a relationship based on inequalities of many sorts. Besides, there are certain cultural restrictions imposed on translators by the various systems of their country. Lastly, the translator is an individual with his/her own evaluations and judgments. As a result, the translator acts by considering at least three different value systems: that of the source system, that of the target system, and of himself/herself.
Having traced the development of the translation theories; it can be observed that the conceptualisation and theorisation of translation had been focused on texts rather than the role of human agency in translation. The next section will investigate the contemporary literature on Translation Studies.

2.1.2 Contemporary Literature on Translation Studies

It is widely accepted that the genealogy of Translation Studies is marked by two consecutive perspectives which correspond to different scientific paradigms that have replaced each other, albeit not quite entirely. These are, respectively, prescriptivism and descriptivism. Descriptivism flourished “as a reaction to what was labelled as the ‘prescriptivism’ of so-called traditional work, which aimed to tell translators what they should do rather than simply analyse and describe what they do”, and “over the past two or three decades, descriptivism has become a major slogan in translation studies as a whole” (Chesterman 2007: 172). However, research interests were still concentrated around the question of what; and it is only with a shift in focus from what to why that scholars have realised the necessity of going beyond descriptive studies, as conventional methods that served descriptive studies were not adequate to tackle the new question of why.

This process of paradigmatic shift from prescription to description also corresponded to a shift from the textual to the extra-textual, which is framed from a culture perspective, while going beyond description encapsulates the more systematic inclusion of the social. Although some scholars such as Pym (2006: 14) and Wolf (2007: 4) criticise the taken-for-grantedness of cultural and social as being dichotomous, it is now widely accepted that sociological approaches to translation may complement research that focuses on the intersection of these two contested levels and may even serve to create what Chesterman calls “bridge concepts” that will help maintain the coherence of an academic field becoming ever more fragmented, given its existentially interdisciplinary nature (Chesterman 2007: 171).

It is against this background that the present study will now go on to scrutinise the umbrella term of “translation sociology”, as several issues that require different operationalisation of sociological perspectives are usually categorised together, before embarking on an identification of a Bourdieusian contribution. In this regard, it would be
useful to consider Chesterman’s advice and divide “the sociology of translation” into three sub-areas, namely, “the sociology of translations as products”, “the sociology of translators”, “the sociology of translating, i.e. the translation process” (Chesterman 2006: 12). It should be noted that although Bourdieu is a sociologist and never directly contributed to Translation Studies, his sociological framework has been adapted and applied to Translation Studies extensively by various scholars in the field.

There is no doubt that even the so-called traditional approaches to translation were not free of the traces of a certain understanding of socially driven issues. For instance, as previously mentioned, Toury framed translation as a norm-governed activity and attributed a major position to the social role of norms (Toury 1995, 1999). Holmes even called for a sociology of translation as early as the late 1980s (Holmes 1988: 95). However, what these approaches all missed were the theoretical problematisation of the issues raised, and insights for systematic research.

Additionally, as argued above, it was Even-Zohar’s theory of polysystem that framed the phenomenon of translation within a broader socio-cultural context, by presenting literature as a dynamic, functional, and stratified system, and by investigating how translated literature operated within broader literary and historical systems of the target culture (Even-Zohar 1990). However, it should not be forgotten that the polysystem approach was originally developed as a theory of culture and cultural transfer, and is thus more cultural than sociological. As its applications aspire to deal with the cultural position and status of translations as well as with institutional spaces, such as ‘markets’ where products circulate in the literary polysystem of the target culture, it could certainly be seen as contributing to the sociology of translation.

Taking into account the historical development of Translation Studies, what one might call ‘the sociology of translation agents’ developed in an attempt to highlight the variety of actors taking part, directly or indirectly, in the production of translations. The research interest for these is justified through the framing of translation as “the result of cultural, political and other habits of the social agents who participate in translation and of the various forms of capital involved” (Wolf 2002: 41), although they tend to focus on the immediate agents operating on the site of textual production.
In this context, some studies engage in functionalist perspectives in order to, for example, investigate the role of translators in the formation of national literatures (Delisle and Woodsworth, 1995) or even a unified Europe (Barret-Ducrocq 1992). Similarly, Grbić and Wolf (2002) reveal the possibility of a gender-specific approach by examining the position of female translators and their struggle for recognition from the perspective of social networks.

Additionally, Lefevere’s concept of patronage reminds us that agents such as the Minister of Education, the Minister of Culture, or a publisher may not have a direct connection to translation, but may have a great deal of impact on the selection, production, dissemination, and reception of translation products. Be they “agents of change” (Toury 2002: 151) who implicitly or explicitly attempt to engage in “culture planning”, or only economic patrons, the extent of their influence will closely depend on the position they occupy in the field, as a result of the amount of capital they hold, to use key concepts introduced by Bourdieu (for further details, see Section 3 in this chapter).

To conclude, it may be said that although the way the position of the translator as the producer of translations is perceived and dealt with differs from one theory to another, certain theories with similar orientations hold some common views on this issue. The approaches which have a narrow definition of translation and announce the transfer of the linguistic or textual invariants as the ultimate aim of translation may downplay the translator as a result of their viewing translation as a mechanical activity. The autonomy or individuality of the translator has no place in these approaches, since what matters is the inherent nature of the source-text and what should be done is to convey this nature as faithfully as possible. The translator is the neutral mediator of this process.

As a result of this perspective, translation appears as an act without an agent. In time there was a cultural turn in Translation Studies. With this turn, the way translators are treated in translation models also changed. Within the framework of systemic approaches, the translator came to be seen as an individual acting in the cultural realm under many constraints imposed by related systems. As a result of this paradigm shift, evaluation of the position of the translator began to occur in a cultural context.
However, there was not much space for a comprehensive analysis of translation in these approaches because the main emphasis was still on objectivity. In functional approaches, the meaning was seen as something produced in the target system by the translator dominated by the conditions of this system. With the introduction of subjectivity of meaning, the emphasis shifted to translator autonomy. Postcolonial approaches to translation contribute to the change in how the translator is perceived; however, they also impose their own restrictions in terms of the strategy to be applied in translational action.

Although there has been much progress in the evaluation of the translator as an individual and his/her active participation in the production of a translation, much more time should be spent in shedding light on more translational phenomena in order to widen the limits of Translation Studies as an academic discipline.

Having outlined the historical development and assessed the major theoretical frameworks of the discipline, the following section will embark upon a review and a critical analysis of the literature on translation in Turkey.

2.1.3 Literature on the Turkish Translation Scene

It is possible to argue that, as elsewhere, the development of Translation Studies in Turkey is relatively recent. It is reviewed in great detail in Chapter 3; therefore, let it suffice here to state that translation departments in Turkey were established in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Until then, a great deal of work on translation concentrated mainly on translation criticism published in periodicals, and historical translation institutions in both the Ottoman Empire (i.e. Terceme Odası) and the Turkish Republic (i.e. Tercüme Bürosu). Yet, until the institutionalisation of departments on Translation Studies, the latter of these two was mainly under the hegemony of historians and/or scholars of history. (See Gencer 1994, Günyol 1983, Akbayar 1985, Akünal 1985, and Ülken 1997 as examples.)

With the opening of academic departments on translation, not only the number, but also the variety of the subject matters of these studies increased. The diversity of these studies is quite in parallel with their contemporaries elsewhere in the world, ranging from theories to poetry translation practices. As a consequence of the proximity with Linguistics, one could

Afterwards, during a period when efforts to institutionalise Translation Studies departments (see Chapter 3 for an analysis of the transformation from Translation departments to Translation Studies departments) were made, works that concentrate on Translation Studies as a subject are noteworthy. These works generally have çeviribilim (translatology – translation science) as part of their titles. Bengi-Öner 1999 and 2004, Dizdar 2004, Eruz 2003, Yazıcı 2005, Rifat 2004 could be cited as leading samples.

Another outcome of efforts on the path towards the establishment of Translation Studies was a huge increase in works related to historical translation institutions and prominent individuals.

2.1.4 Retrospective Analyses: Missing the Present (Historical rather than Sociological Analyses)

The importance of outlining the historical background for an elaborated understanding of a current field is to be discussed in the forthcoming sections, especially in that on the Bourdieusian perspective. In this respect, studies on the historical translation institutions of the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic helped to create great awareness in terms of both historical relevance, and the instrumental significance of translation as a tool in the establishment of a culture (i.e. Western) desired by the political elites.

Studies such as Kayaoğlu 1998, Berk 1999 and 2006, Demircioğlu 2005, Balcı 2006, Karantay 1991 and 2004, Tahir-Gürçağlar 2003, 2004 and 2008 were some of the most important in successfully portraying these institutions within wider networks of culture. Owing to these, students and scholars of translation in today’s Turkey have an in-depth understanding of the importance of cultural planning and social engineering that was
conducted during the transition period from Empire to Republic through the operationalisation of translation.

However, none of these studies prioritised translators as active agents of the translation process. They concentrated rather more on the institutional aspects of the respective periods and lacked a focus on translators as individuals bounded by social, political, and economic realities. This is also one of the main reasons why the present study undertook a sociological perspective, since without which it would not be possible to bring forward the translator as an agent, or in Bourdieu’s term, as an actor in the translation process.

One of the foremost approaches that constitutes fruitful ground for such an undertaking was developed by Lefevere. Before proceeding further to Bourdieusian sociology, the next section will look at Lefevere’s differentiated attitude on the translator as a social individual.

2.2 Scrutinizing Human Agency within Wider Structures: Lefevere’s Patronage

Before the ‘cultural turn’ movement, the rise of structuralism played a great role in translation studies. The definitions of translation as influenced by the thoughts of structuralism led translation studies to be analysed in a linguistic paradigm, in which the study of translation is on linguistic level, and translation is seen only as the “transform of languages” (Long 2012: 40).

From the 1980s onwards, translation studies have seen the transformation from the linguistic paradigm to the cultural paradigm. The “cultural turn” for translation as a discipline was first proposed by Bassnett and Lefevere in 1990 and it emerged as a reaction to the linguistic paradigm (Long 2012: 40). Lefevere proposed translation as rewriting (Lefevere 1992a). Susan Bassnett, together with Lefevere, redefined the object of translation studies as “a verbal text within the network of literary and extra-literary signs in both the source and target cultures” (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: xi). It is included in the title of their introduction (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990: 1), and is described as the abandoning of the ‘scientistic’ linguistic approach and moving from “text” to “culture”, a “cultural turn” which they say all contributions to the volume have taken.
The following sections will shed light on this shift in paradigms and the discovery of André Lefevere’s functional concepts.

2.2.1 Lefevere and the Cultural Turn in Translation

Translation studies brings together work in a wide variety of fields, including linguistics, literary study, history, anthropology, psychology and economics. Long (2012: 35) states that since the 1950s, with the development of disciplines such as linguistics, literature, anthropology, sociology, psychology and the rise of deconstructionism, feminism, post-colonialism, ever more theories are applied to translation studies. The introduction of theories from various disciplines and thoughts not only offers new perspectives for translation studies, but also brings to it new turns. The cultural turn of the 1980s is one important phase in understanding translation as a discipline that is part of a society’s power relations. One of the most important representative figures of that new movement in translation studies was André Lefevere (1945-1996).

As a translation theorist, historian and translator, Lefevere was one of the first theorists to contribute a vision of how the study of translations illuminates our understanding of cultures. Lefevere was a leading theorist in the field of literary translation. Apart from his prominent books Translation, History, Culture: A Sourcebook (1992b), Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame (1992a), and Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context (1992c), he also authored and co-authored several books, numerous articles, and translated poetry from French, Dutch, Latin, German, English, into Dutch and English (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2006: 435). Just as in Nida’s case, Lefevere’s findings came from his own translation practice. Yet, unlike Nida, Lefevere was able to paint a more accurate picture of cultural semiotics since he looked at canonical and non-canonical traditions alike.

By 1990, Bassnett and Lefevere had begun to write about the concept of ‘cultural turn’ in translation studies. Cultural turn stimulates theorists’ interests in its concern with cultural aspects. Since the 1990s, with the rise of post-colonial studies and the growing impact of power theories such as Bourdieu’s culture and power theory, the relationship between
power and translation has attracted the attention of a great number of scholars (Long 2012: 40). In addition to culture, power relations between the so-called powerful cultures and weak cultures, along with their impacts on translation, have become the focus of translation studies.

Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere stated that translation as an activity is always doubly contextualised, since the text has a place in two cultures. Together, Bassnett and Lefevere integrated the cultural perspective that was beginning to recognise the importance of understanding the processes involved in textual production, particularly the power relations and symbolic meanings that lie behind the production of texts. Thus, they were primary figures in conceiving and promoting the interdisciplinary movement they called “translation studies”. In their work they developed many important connections beyond the traditional field of translation.

With the ‘cultural turn’ movement and the paradigm shift from linguistic to cultural comes a broadening in both the scope and definition of translation studies. The definitions of translation in the cultural paradigm overcome the shortcomings of the linguistics definition, considered as the only definition of translation for many decades (Long 2012: 31). The definition of translation in the linguistic paradigm differs from that in the cultural paradigm in many respects.

First of all, they have different concerns. In the linguistic paradigm, definition focuses on the language itself, whereas in the cultural paradigm, the focus shifts to the cultural, such as ideology, poetics, politics, society, and economy, and care is taken in exploring how these cultural factors influence translation. Secondly, they differ in their attitudes to the translator. The linguistic paradigm ignores the subjectivity of the translator, whereas the cultural paradigm emphasises it. Framing translation as rewriting implies initiative and role for the translator. Thirdly, their approach to translation studies is quite different. The definition in the linguistic paradigm is prescriptive, focusing on what translation should be, while that in the cultural paradigm is descriptive, mainly concerned with what translation is (Long 2012: 37).

Lefevere developed the notion of rewriting “to characterise the process of successful translation as a refocusing and redirecting of a source text into a target culture” (Weissbort
and Eysteinsson 2006: 435). According to Lefevere (1992a), translation is a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics, and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society. Rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another.

But as Lefevere highlighted, rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world / culture in which we live (Lefevere 1992b). Lefevere explained that:

> When we speak of “a culture” or “the receiving culture,” we would do well to remember that cultures are not monolithic entities, but that there is always a tension inside a culture between different groups, or individuals, who want to influence the evolution of that culture in the way they think best. Translations have been made with the intention of influencing the development of a culture. (Lefevere 1992b: 8)

With the “cultural turn” in translation studies, an increasing number of scholars have dealt with translation from a cultural angle. They have gone beyond the limitation of language and have focused on the interaction between translation and culture. As Zhang put it, “[t]ranslation is no longer considered as a mechanical activity, but a creative one within constraints of certain social and cultural factors.” (2012: 301). As Zhang further highlights, Lefevere’s theory places translation “within a larger social, political and cultural context and stresses the translator’s role and the various control factors in translation and allows us to observe the way in which translation interact with the target environment.” (2012: 297).

### 2.2.2 Translation within the Literary System
Lefevere (1985: 214) argued that literature is one of the systems that constitutes “the super-system” known as society, which also encompasses other systems, such as physics, law, and many more. He thought of society as a super-system and literature as one of the subsystems, or “system of systems”. As Zhang notes, “André Lefevere attempted to study translation from a sociological perspective and aimed to explain how translational activities operate and function in the target society” (2012: 297). For Lefevere, the translation process does not happen in a vacuum, but serves the needs of the ideology and power relations of a given society. In this respect, a society and a culture are the main environments of a literary system. The literary system and the system of society are open to each other and they influence each other.

According to Lefevere (1992a), translation is probably the proto-typical instance of rewriting. All different forms of rewriting tend to work together in a literary system. In Lefevere’s understanding, no translation published as a book is likely to give us just the translation. It is nearly always accompanied by an introduction or preface, which is a form of criticism. Sometimes the society’s experience or culture cannot be translated 'exactly' into another language because the universe of discourses may be very different. Universe of discourse features are those features particular to a given culture, and they are, almost by definition, untranslatable or at least very hard to translate. They can be things like ‘bistro’ in French, or concepts, like ‘volkisch’ in German. They belong to a certain time and go with their time as far as their language of origin is concerned (Lefevere 1985).

Translation is “as important as original writings in the establishment of the poetics of a literary system” (Lefevere 1992a: 28). Lefevere (1985) mentions that if the study of translation is to be made productive for the study of literary theory and, especially, literary history, it is quite clear that translation can no longer be analysed in isolation, but must be studied as part of a whole system of texts and the people who produce, support, propagate, oppose and censor them. Translation plays an important part in the evolution of the literary system because “the struggle between rival poetics is often initiated by writers, but fought and won or lost by rewriters” (Lefevere 1992a: 38). Thus, for Lefevere it is of great importance to highlight the subjectivity of the ‘translators’, or the rewriters.

2.2.3 Subjectivity of the Translator
As Lefevere (1992b) states through *Translation, History, Culture: A Sourcebook*, the fields of translation are not abstractions, but a series of concrete events involving real people and interpersonal contacts in historical settings. Lefevere reminds us to keep in mind that translations are made by people who do not need them for people who cannot read the originals. Translation then, is not just a process that happens in the translator’s head. Readers decide to accept or reject translations (Lefevere 1992b: 5).

The impact of a translated work of literature depends not just on the image of it created by critics, but primarily on the image of it created by translators (Lefevere 1995: 8). Lefevere’s stress on subjectivity of translators is very essential for understanding the cultural turn of translation studies. Translations are not made in a vacuum. Translators function in a given culture at a given time. The way they understand themselves and their culture is one of the factors that may influence the way in which they translate (Lefevere 1992b: 14).

The importance of factors / concepts such as patronage and the ‘universe of discourse’ have to be revealed in order to analyse elaborately the subjectivity of the translator. The idea of the power of patronage is a cornerstone of Lefevere’s approach to translation. Translators tend to have relatively little freedom in their dealing with patrons, at least if they want to have their translations published. Patrons can encourage the publication of translations they consider acceptable and they can also quite effectively prevent the publication of translations they do not consider so (Lefevere 1992b: 19).

Although there is the power of patronage, the agents of translation, in other words translators, have their own subjective contributions. For instance, they may be going against the system by attempting to introduce works which are not accepted by a totalitarian, undifferentiated system (Milton and Bandia 2009: 5). However, translators have to strike a balance between the ‘universe of discourse’ (i.e. the whole complex of concepts, ideologies, persons, and objects belonging to a particular culture) as acceptable to the author of the original, and that other ‘universe of discourse’ which is acceptable and familiar to the translator and his/her audience (Lefevere 1992b: 14).

2.2.4 Translation, Ideology, and Patronage
This section of the chapter sets out to discuss the cultural turn in translation via two main control factors: ideology and patronage, as formulated by André Lefevere.

For Lefevere, the role of ideology in the shaping of a translation is an important factor. By “ideology”, Lefevere understands, “a set of discourses which wrestle over interests which are in some way relevant to the maintenance or interrogation of power structures central to a whole form of social and historical life” (Gentzler 2004: 136). Lefevere’s term is not limited to the political sphere, and according to him, ideology is anything that may be in the form of conventions or beliefs that order our actions (Lefevere 1992a: 16). Ideology is often enforced by patrons, the people or institutions who commission or publish translations.

One can assume at this point that the more a translation is in line with the normative standards of a culture, the easier it will be considered for publication, and / since the more acceptable it will be in the target culture. In this respect, it would not be wrong to conclude that ideology will always be an important determinant of not only the choice, but also the reception of the subject matters of the original texts in translation. Referring to this, Lefevere states that:

The ideology dictates the basic strategy the translator is going to use and therefore, also dictates solutions to problems concerned with both the ‘universe of discourse’ expressed in the original (objects, concepts, customs belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer of the original) and the language the original itself is expressed in. (Lefevere 1992a: 41)

Zhang rightfully underlines that, “ideology in Lefevere’s terms is not limited to the political sphere and can also be understood here as systems of ideas based on value judgments and attitudes, or the propositions and assumptions people hold, that influence people’s thoughts and behaviors” (2012: 298). On the other hand, translation is also related with authority and legitimacy; namely with power (Lefevere 1992b: 2).

As Lefevere stresses, translation is not just a “window opened on another world” (1992b: 2). Translation is not an isolated act, but part of an ongoing process of intercultural transfer. In the newer approaches to translation, the relation between the writer / reader and
The translation is a focus and inevitably involves relations of power. Translation rarely involves an equal relationship between texts, authors, or systems. As Wolf notes:

In particular, the notion of “rewriting” in Lefevere’s approach is one that denotes both the manipulative interventions on the level of the text and the cultural (literary) devices which direct and control the production procedure in the interplay of social forces. The patronage system at work within this interplay embraces individuals, collectives and institutions, which are determined mainly by ideology. (2007: 10).

In Lefevere’s explanation of translation, patronage is presented as a control factor and is said to be operating mostly outside the literary system proper. By patronage, André Lefevere refers to “any kind of force that can be influential in encouraging and propagating, but also in discouraging, censoring and destroying works of literature” (Gentzler 2004: 137). In Lefevere’s words, patronage is understood “to mean something like the powers (persons, institutions) which help or hinder the writing, reading and rewriting of literature” (1985: 227).

Lefevere further argues that “[p]atronage is usually more interested in the ideology of literature than in its poetics, and it could be said that the patron ‘delegates authority’ to the professional where poetics is concerned” (Lefevere 1992a: 15). Patronage consists of various elements, which can be seen to interact in various combinations. There is an ideological component, which acts as a constraint on the choice and development of both the form and the subject-matter. There is also an economic component: the patron sees to it that writers and re-writers are able to make a living, by giving them a pension. Patrons may be persons (influential and powerful individuals), groups of persons (a religious body, a political party, a social class, a royal court, and publishers), and “last but not least, the media, both newspapers and magazines and larger television corporations” (Lefevere 1992a: 15).

The role of the patrons cannot be ignored when the production of a cultural artefact is the case. Patrons will have central roles in regulating the literary system, prizes, censorship, and the educational system. Some examples are “official” writers in Socialist states, and universities and foundations which provide scholarships. According to Lefevere (as cited in Milton and Bandia 2009: 3), undifferentiated patronage will exist when there is a
totalitarian system where a favoured writer is attached to the court, the ruler or the political
leaders in the single-party state. Differentiated patronage will exist when there are free
market conditions. Patronage can certainly be important in deciding which works get
published, but says little about any individual agents dissatisfied with the status quo and
attempting to instigate changes, be they translators, critics, journalists, politicians or
figures with influence in the literary world.

2.3 Bourdieu’s sociological approach to the depersonalisation of translation

production

Lefevere not only ascribes a social dimension to this notion (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998:
48), but also extends it by means of Bourdieu’s concept of “cultural capital”. Lefevere sees
this as the driving force in distribution of translations within a specific culture, as “cultural
capital is transmitted, distributed and regulated by means of translation, among other
factors, not only between cultures, but also within one given culture” (Bassnett and
Lefevere 1998: 41). The rewriting concept also draws on other concepts closely linked to
Bourdiesuan categories—economic capital as an important contribution to the final shape
of a translation, and “status”, which is responsible for positioning the “patrons” in their
respective literary system and is vital for the conceptualization of a sociology of translation
(Wolf 2007: 10). However, as Wolf (2007: 10) argues, the slightly fuzzy use of the notion
“cultural capital” by Lefevere cannot be fully associated with the Bourdiesuan notion.
Thus, it is essential to present Bourdieu’s approach towards linguistics and translation in
more detail by analysing the main notions of his theory.

2.3.1 The Bourdiesuan Perspective

This PhD research examines the role of human agency in translation activity and aims to
re-establish the missing link between human agency and structure, by targeting political,
economic, cultural and social aspects of the structure within which agents operate in a
Turkish context. Therefore, the study builds upon the framework that is proposed by
sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, since his work offers a useful framework to analyse the impact
of socio-economic and cultural environment on the translator and the production of
translation.
The paradigm shift in emphasis from textual to extra-textual brought about a new focus within which cultural and social factors gained further prominence in Translation Studies, most notably including the issue of how power is reproduced—and not just interactions from a cultural semiotics perspective. Naturally, lifting the veil that isolated the translator from the rest of the society inevitably brought about the adaptation of sociological approaches in order to shed light on, until then, neglected areas in Translation Studies. Among these approaches is Bourdieu’s, which is of particular interest in the present PhD research. At a time when major theories such as Even-Zohar's polysystem or Toury’s translation norms were under attack for their omission of agency in the translation process (Hermans 1999), the research perspective Bourdieu aimed to promote was adopted by scholars in order to avoid the depersonalisation of translation production (Buzelin 2005: 203).

In the light of the above, this section will be divided into two sub-sections. In the first section, I will attempt to assess the functionality of the specific intellectual attitude Bourdieu advanced, by 1) looking specifically at what Bourdieu meant by social space or field as he named it, and examining the dialectic relationship between the concepts he developed as components of his methodological tool kit—field, capital, habitus; 2) considering specific “fields” in Bourdieu’s own writings, i.e. the field of power and education; 3) reviewing literature adopting Bourdieu’s methodological tools; and finally 4) elaborating on some criticisms of the concept of field and its operationalisation in research. Then, in the second section, I will move on to identify the place of a Bourdieusian perspective in the sociology of translation, and conclude with offering a perspective on how it has contributed and will possibly continue to contribute to Translation Studies in the future.

### 2.3.2 The Bourdieusian Perspective of Social Space: the Notions of Field, Capital, Habitus

Classically trained for a degree in philosophy at a time when sociology was just beginning to develop as an academic discipline, and later, an assistant to Raymond Aron, one of the leading figures in properly institutionalizing sociology in France, Bourdieu was concerned
with explaining the social, political and cultural practices that surrounded him, claiming that he never theorised for the sake of it (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1989: 50). In his own words, his mission was to “restore to people the meaning of their actions” (Bourdieu 1962: 109 quoted in Grenfell 2008: 15).

In this respect, Bourdieu believed that in order to understand interactions between people, or to explain an event or social phenomenon, it is not sufficient to look at what is said, or what happened; instead it makes epistemic sense to examine the social space in which interactions, transactions and events occur (Bourdieu 2005: 148). For Bourdieu, in this respect, the analysis of social space means not only locating the object of investigation in its specific historical and local, national and international context, but also interrogating the ways in which previous knowledge about the object under study had been generated, by whom, and in whose interests.

Bourdieu demonstrates the application of this specific understanding on several occasions (e.g. Bourdieu 1993, 1994, 2001), which recalls the logic of the understanding of discourse proposed by Foucault, referring to historically specific systems of meaning which form the identities of subjects and objects (Foucault 1972: 49), and which naturally brings about a focus on “the construction of discourses” as “involving the exercise of power and a consequent structuring of the relations between different social agents” (Howarth 2000: 9).

First using the concept of field in an article entitled Champ intellectuel et projet créateur [1971 (1966)] in which he discusses the differences between Roland Barthes and Raymond Picard, Bourdieu’s field theory can simply be considered as the culmination of his efforts to answer the question that lies at the heart of his intellectual exercise: “How can behaviour be regulated without being the product of obedience to rules?” (Bourdieu 1994: 65). To put it in Maton’s words, “Bourdieu asks how social structure and individual agency can be reconciled, and—in Durkheim’s terms—how the “outer” social, and “inner”, self help to shape each other” (Maton 2008: 50). This initial puzzle is also concretely represented in much of Bourdieu’s later writing especially, in which he is concerned with specific investigations and applications of field, i.e. education (1977, 1988, 1996 b) culture (1984, 1990 a, 1990 b) television (1998), housing (2000 b), literature (1996 a), politics (2000 a), science (2004).
Bourdieu develops the notion of social space / field as a step towards the study of human activity and argues for a methodology that would bring together an interdependent but co-constructed trio—field, capital, and habitus—with none of these prioritised over the other. According to Bourdieu, the social field consists of positions occupied by social agents (people and institutions) and what happens in the field is consequently framed. There are thus limits to what can be done, and what can be done is also shaped by the conditions of the field.

For Bourdieu, the nature of interaction in the fields is competitive, with various social agents using competing strategies to at least maintain or improve their own position. At stake in the field is the accumulation of different kinds of capital, which are both stakes in the process of emerging fields and parts of the final product identified as a field. From Bourdieu’s perspective, every individual has a unique configuration assortment of different types of capital, with a variety of types at differing amounts or volumes. In this regard, Bourdieu distinguishes four types of capital: economic capital (money or possessions); cultural capital (varieties and levels of knowledge; taste, aesthetic and culture-specific preferences; language, narrative, and voice); social capital (affiliations and networks; family, religious and cultural heritage); and symbolic capital (virtues which stand for all other forms of capital and can be exchanged in other fields, i.e. “accumulated prestige, celebrity, consecration or honour”) (Bourdieu 1993:7).

In this context, it is worth noting that players who begin the game with particular forms of capital are advantaged at the expense of others, as they are able to use their capital advantage to gain/accumulate more and be relatively more successful. This reminds us of the possibility of making predictions derived from the equilibrium in the field: once a graph is drawn and the players on the field are mapped according to their individual volume and composition of capital, it is then possible to understand the way it will look if any of the players changes position as a result of a modification in their portfolio of capitals, or if new players are introduced.

Fields are shaped differently according to the nature of the game that is played out on them, as they all have their own rules, symbolic or codified regulations, historical trajectories, prominent players, renowned or wicked legends and lore, and can be recognised through their distinctiveness. This is also reflected in Bourdieu’s description of
the economic field as “a cosmos” (2005: 5) and “a separate universe governed by its own laws” (2005: 7).

Fields are human constructions with distinct prevailing beliefs which rationalise and justify the rules of field behaviour, each field having its own distinctive “logic of practice”.

The activities within a field follow mostly regular and ordered patterns and consequently have some predictability. They are, first and foremost, hierarchically structured: not everyone is equal, and there are some who are dominant and who have decision-making power over how the field functions. Social agents who occupy particular positions understand how to behave in the field, and this understanding not only feels “natural” but can be explained using the truths, or “doxai”, that are common parlance within the field: “The doxa misrecognises the logic of practice at work in the field, so that even when confronted with the field’s social (re)productive purpose, social agents are able to explain it away” (Thomson 2008: 70).

A social field is not fixed and it is possible to trace the history of its specific shape, by diachronically analysing operations in the field, movements of the players, interactions and turbulences. To do so, it is important to remember that there are striking similarities between social fields in terms of power play, and remarkable patterns and predictable practices within each field, along with relationships of exchange between fields, making them interdependent.

In Bourdieu’s words, a field is:

[...] a structured social space, a field of forces, a force field. It contains people who dominate and people who are dominated. Constant, permanent relationships of inequality operate inside this space, which at the same time becomes a space in which various actors struggle for the transformation or preservation of the field. All the individuals in this universe bring to the competition all the (relative) power at their disposal. It is this power that defines their position in the field and, as a result, their strategies. (Bourdieu 1998: 40-41)

The interdependency between fields is especially important for making sense of how the field of power—the largest field in society—both shapes and is shaped by different social
fields which are at interplay as a result of collectives of people occupying more than one social field at any given time. Defined strictly in terms of power relations:

The field of power is a field of forces defined by the structure of the existing balance of forces between forms of power, or between different species of capital. It is also simultaneously a field of struggle for power among holders of different forms of power. It is a space of play and competition in which the social agents and institutions [...] confront one another in strategies aimed at preserving or transforming this balance of forces. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 76)

This approach is instrumental in highlighting correspondences or compatibility between a position in the field and the stance of the agent occupying that position. The hierarchical nature of the positions, as outlined above, dictates the underlying logic of position-taking strategies, which make the field the main mediator of how social agents act in specific contexts. In this respect, it is highly important to notice the dialectic relationship between field and habitus, through which context-specific practices legitimise themselves by reproducing the social world that enables them.

Habitus is a concept that orients our ways of constructing objects of study, highlighting issues of significance and providing a means of thinking relationally about those issues. Its principal contribution is thus to shape our habitus, to produce a sociological gaze by helping to transform our ways of seeing the social world. The methodological attitude Bourdieu stresses is a reflection of the basic insights of a sociological tradition advancing the existence of a social reality both inside and outside the individual. Thus, as an attempt to transcend the dualism between the individual and society, the purpose of the key concept of habitus is to suggest that “the socialised body (which one calls the individual or person) does not stand in opposition to society; it is one of its form of existence” (Bourdieu 1980: 29).

In Algeria (1979 [1960]: vii), Bourdieu defines habitus as “a system of durable, transposable dispositions which function as the generative basis of structure, objectively unified practices”, while a later and longer definition of the concept reads as: 
[...] a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks, thanks to analogical transfers of schemes permitting the solution of similarly shaped problems. [Bourdieu 1971 (1966): 183]

According to Bourdieu, habitus is a property of social agents (whether individuals, groups or institutions) that comprises a “structured and structuring structure” (1994: 170). It is “structured” by one’s past and present circumstances (such as family upbringing and educational experiences and socialisation in general); and it is “structuring” in that one’s habitus helps to shape one’s present and future practices. It is a “structure”, in that it is systematically ordered rather than random or unpatterned, which comprises a system of dispositions which generate perceptions, appreciations and practices (1990: 53), expressing “first the result of an organizing action, with a meaning close to that of words such as structure”, and also designating “a way of being, a habitual state (especially of the body) and, in particular, a predisposition, tendency, propensity or inclination” (1977: 214). Durability, in terms of lasting over time, and transposability, in terms of being capable of becoming active within a wide variety of social action theatres are two characteristics of these dispositions (1993a: 87).

In summary, all the above-mentioned may be translated into words as habitus being thus both structured by conditions of existence and generating practices, beliefs, perceptions, feelings and so forth in accordance with its own structure. However, this should not be understood as habitus acting alone with a pre-determined outcome that is the consequence of our upbringings and experiences in society. In this sense, Bourdieu summarises the “obscure and double relation” (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 126) or “unconscious relationship” (Bourdieu 1993: 76) between habitus and field by noting the equation (Bourdieu 1986: 101):

\[
[(\text{habitus})(\text{capital})] + \text{field} = \text{practice}
\]

This formula can be explained as follows: practice is the result of the relations “between one’s dispositions (habitus) and one’s position in a field (capital), within the current state of play of that social arena (field)” (Maton 2008: 51). Simply put, practices are the result of
the relations between one’s habitus and current circumstances. This is a reciprocal relationship, since the field structures the habitus, while the habitus also forms the basis for the capacity of social agents to make sense of their actions within this particular field. It is conditioning as “the field structures the habitus” while at the same time being “knowledge or cognitive construction” based as “habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world” (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 127). Thus, the path to understanding practices goes through understanding not only the evolving fields within which social agents act regarding their positions, but also the evolving habituses which those agents bring to their social fields of practice (Bourdieu 1990: 52-65).

It should be stressed at this stage that Bourdieu notes of the field as “a game devoid of inventor and much more fluid and complex than any game that one might ever design” (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 104). This fluidity and complexity is key to understanding why Bourdieu emphasises that the field approach is not a theory to be adopted as a one-size-fits-all formula to be used in any given situation. Instead, he proposes three main steps to follow in order to develop a case-by-case basis foundation for investigation:

1) Analyse the positions of the field vis-à-vis the field of power.
2) Map out the objective structures of relations between the positions occupied by the social agents or institutions who compete for the legitimate forms of specific authority of which this field is a site.
3) Analyse the habitus of social agents, the different systems of dispositions they have acquired by internalizing a determinate type of social and economic condition, and which find in a definite trajectory within the field... a more or less favourable opportunity to become actualized. (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 104-5)

Much of Bourdieu’s own work concretely demonstrate how the three steps he proposes aim at deconstructing the field structure in order to see how its elements build upon each other and are articulated at different stages during its construction; and, in a sense, how this is an attempt to trace the history of the composition of a picture, rather than taking it as given and unchanging by looking at the final outcome.

In The Rules of Art (1996a), for example, Bourdieu investigates the literary field by mapping the positions of bestselling and well-recognised authors by looking at their date of
birth, stated profession, place of residence, prizes, honours, and their relationship with the publishers (1996a: 155); and through this, he manages to show how the meaning attributed to artists and works of art is a consequence of education, and how hierarchisation is operated through a distinction between those produced in pursuit of commercial interest and those produced for their own sake.

It is also worth mentioning that the educational field was of special interest to Bourdieu, confirmed by the multitude and significance of his investigations in this field. (e.g. 1988; 1996b; Bourdieu & Passeron 1977; Bourdieu & Passeron 1979; Bourdieu et al. 1990a) This was mainly due to Bourdieu’s belief that, as a field, education reproduces itself more than others, meaning that the strength and influence of its practices and discourses are so extensive that almost no social agent who occupies a dominant position is immune from its effects.

Especially in The State Nobility (1996b), Bourdieu underlines the importance of education as one of a series of strategies used by families to advance their position (1996b: 273), since education as symbolic capital works together with other types of capital to help social agents position themselves in multiple fields. This emphasis is in line with his criticism of the French education system as the main engine for elite production and maintenance through the exercise of elite discourses and practices of differentiation rather than being based on meritocratic principles.

The importance and emphasis Bourdieu places on education is a reminder to all scholars who seek to follow in his path and borrow from his methodology that it is not be possible to recognise any one context where the educational field does not interact with the specific field chosen for investigation; and thus, it is a necessity that every investigation of a specific field includes a reference to the educational field within the identified context. However, it should also be remembered that the conclusions Bourdieu drew as a result of the specific way he approaches the educational field are open to criticism in terms of the difficulties one should expect when drawing the limits and identifying where the effects of educational field stop; and these need to be reviewed along with other criticisms directed at his methodology.
One major criticism directed at Bourdieu’s concept of habitus stresses that it bears too much theoretical weight. This is clearly represented in Di Maggio’s description of it as “a kind of theoretical deus ex machina by means of which Bourdieu relates objective structure and individual activity” (1979: 1464). As Bourdieu and Wacquant point out (1992), one part of the problem is caused by the fact that Bourdieu’s theoretical aim has been systematically misread; the very concept he introduced to transcend the antinomy between subjectivity and objectivity was inadvertently injected with dilemmas referring back to the same dichotomy it was trying to avoid, i.e. subjectivity vs. objectivity.

Additionally, it is also important to see that the multitude and significance of the case studies he employs to both test and develop his arguments have led scholars towards academic scepticism regarding the success of such an approach. As mentioned earlier, Bourdieu seeks to clarify that his attitude towards fields is more like an exploration of their unique character rather than a theory to be adopted as a one-size-fits-all formula.

Another criticism to Bourdieu’s work, as reported by Thomson (2008: 79), appears to concern its deterministic nature, or at least its emphasis on the reproductive aspects of fields rather than their changeability. Yet, this criticism is far from doing justice to Bourdieu, as many of his investigations (see Bourdieu 1979; 1984; 1988; 1996b; 2001) focus on periods of change. Moreover, he not only discusses how change can be experienced at moments of disjunction between the habitus and the current conditions of the field, but also talks about how dominant players in the fields and/or a shift in the power equilibrium can initiate change. And above all, at an abstract level, his description of the field as a site for struggle during an unending game strongly implies the possibility of change at any moment.

Another important line of criticism concentrates on what I have tried to outline above regarding the educational field, i.e. the problem of limits, or how to identify where the field effects wane. In modern societies, education has long been a matter of importance, seen as a motor of innovation and progress. The understanding of privileging education is also reflected in today’s world, as evident in life-long learning, open universities, public education programmes, certificate courses, and even staff development programmes organised by companies of all sizes.
Questioning the limits of the educational field appears as a very legitimate line of inquiry in such a complex framework. However, we should not forget that, if a particular study is not focused on the educational field, it will only supplement our investigation of the specific field we are dealing with, and it is the role of the researcher to identify where to draw the line as long as consistency is achieved. On the other hand, not all fields will prove to be as complicated as the educational field in terms of border identification.

To summarise, it should be emphasised that the field approach Bourdieu developed and practised resembles more an epistemological stance than a theoretical formula. By mutually constructing the trio of field, capital and habitus, Bourdieu tries to overcome philosophical dualities such as structure vs. agency, and objectivity vs. subjectivity; and the subjectivity of the available data attached to individuals or institutions.

In this respect, habitus is to Bourdieu’s approach what power-knowledge to Foucault’s. Once internalised and made practical, Bourdieu’s aim of producing a sociological eye translates into reality as a whole new vision of the social world, along which all acquired material needs to be reformulated. It is this will of mental transformation that opens up new possibilities of research, with an equal emphasis on both the social and individual; and an emerging sociology of translation has already confirmed that it has done so with regards to Translation Studies.

### 2.3.3 A Bourdieusian Perspective and the Sociology of Translation

In this sociological perspective, the identification of a Bourdieusian influence is relatively easy, as some studies address translation agents by theoretically modelling them upon Bourdieu’s main concepts. For instance, in his seminal study, “The Pivotal Status of the Translator’s Habitus”, Simeoni distinguishes “translational norms” from “a habitus governed account” which emphasises “the extent to which translators themselves play a role in the maintenance and perhaps the creation of norms” (Simeoni 1998: 26). He then concludes that the roots of servility and subservience to the author exemplified by contemporary translators are hidden in the practice of translators from the Enlightenment period.
Another pioneering scholar on the use of Bourdieu in translation and interpreting studies is Moira Inghilleri. Inghilleri (2003, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c) scrutinises the use of Bourdieusian research tools in Translation Studies from a theoretical and introductory perspective.

On the other hand, Buzelin (2005) embarks on a theoretical exploration of how Bourdieusian analyses in Translation Studies could be complemented by Latour’s actor-network’s theory. From a different angle, Wolf (2002) investigates the power relations that influence the translation process within what she calls the “Harry Potter field”, which was created by influx of capital investments. From the same angle, Hanna (2005) investigates the origins of the field of drama translation in Egypt, with special emphasis on Shakespeare’s tragedies. Similarly, Gouanvic scrutinises in various studies the importation of American science fiction literature into France between 1945 and 1960 (Gouanvic 1997, 1999), and explores the power struggles in the American and French fields of science-fiction literature, which were conditioned by the differing interests of the various social agents, also reflected on the textual form of the translations. In the same way, Sapiro (2010) analyses the book markets in France and the US, with a focus on literary translations.

Nevertheless, in order to complement the perspective of the sociology of translation agents, it is necessary to attribute equal importance to the sociology of the translation product, which serves a cultural function by contributing to the construction of not only national and/or social, but also ideological and/or religious identity. This is mainly because neither the selected titles nor the discourses formed around them are ideology free, and may become objects of cultural structuring.

The lack of research with this specific focus could be partially explained by the practical difficulties in assessing the impact of a literary product on the general public. However, one should also recognise the limits of a descriptive approach. A Bourdieusian perspective in this context may prove extremely fruitful, once the question of “What is the impact of product x, on group y, at time z?” changes into “Why is the product x selected for group y at time z?” It is then possible to re-construct the research framework around the chosen translation product as a symbol of the power struggle, and trace its historical and cultural
significance through an evaluation of the positions occupied by the different agents of the field.

Additionally, when dealing with the translation process, a Bourdieusian perspective is productive in terms of complementing and expanding the scope of network approaches. In these approaches, translating would be taken as an “institutionalised” social practice which consists of “the performance of translation tasks (observable as translation events)”, that are “carried out by translators, as people with their own subjectivity, interests and values”, and “completed under constraints (norms, policies, other networks...)”, and translators as agents that aim to “create and use networks” which consist of “human and non-human actors”, where each of them “fulfils a role or function” which has “a status (public perception)” (Chesterman 2006: 23). In this context, research problems may be listed as follows:

- Whom do translators work with? Which other agents cooperate?
- What kinds of relations prevail between the various agents?
- What is the status of the agents? How is this status manifested?
- What are the policy decisions on procedures for producing multilingual documents, in different institutions? (Chesterman 2006: 20)

By framing the networks within the relevant field, and identifying the power balance, the researcher can move beyond the descriptive dimension to understanding so as to make sense of:

- Why do certain translators work and cooperate with some agents, but not others?
- What is the nature of relations that prevail between the various agents?
- Why is agent status low/high?
- Why do different institutions deploy different strategies?

At this point, it should be noted that the perspective Bourdieu advanced and the methodological tools he developed have been adopted and tested in various circumstances. However, for a discipline such as Translation Studies, which has developed at the intersection of established borders, constant metamorphosis is a necessity, in order for the
field not to fall behind recent developments in the original disciplines that may bring about future research prospects.

Thus, Translation Studies now has a duty to maintain close contact with sociology. Not only Bourdieusian, but all sociological perspectives need to be tested and re-tested in different translation contexts, and complemented by those that will modify the research spectrum as well. Such an approach will guarantee relevance of the research agenda to the needs of translation professionals and society alike.

In this respect, as Lefevere stated, “power” is one key topic that has provided the impetus for the new directions that translation studies has taken since the cultural turn; and subjectivity of the translator in these power relations is worthy of analysis in more detail because these 'relations' are the main driving forces for a social view of the translation process; in other words for the “sociology of translation”.

Pierre Bourdieu offered one of the most influential frameworks for study of the factors which condition the power relations inherent in both the practice and theory of translation. As Wolf (2007: 22) highlighted in Constructing a Sociology of Translation, edited with Fukari (2007), Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology seems particularly fertile ground for deepening the understanding of the social relevance and responsibility of the translation process. His theory of practice enables us to analyse the impact that translation can and does have on social change, or the relation of social factors of dominance in the selection and ultimate shaping of translations (Wolf 2007: 12).

Thus, it is essential to focus on Bourdieu in order to grasp the basis of a theoretical framework for a sociology of translation (Wolf 2007: 18). This section of the thesis aims to examine the legacy of Pierre Bourdieu from the perspective of translation studies. Outlining Bourdieu’s theory of practice and his main concepts, a brief analysis of translation studies through Bourdieu’s lens is presented.

Jean Marc Gouanvic is one of the first scholars who attempted to highlight Bourdieu’s importance for the study of translation, and who draws on Bourdieusian concepts in order to shed light on agents’ activities in the translation field (Wolf 2007: 18). He points out that Bourdieu’s concepts may be widely applied to translation studies, as it is a “sociology
of the text as a production in the process of being carried out, of the product itself and of its consumption in the social fields, the whole seen in a relational manner” (Gouanvic 2005: 148).

Bourdieu was particularly influenced by the political philosophy of Karl Marx and the sociology of Max Weber. Bourdieu relies on Marx in elaborating on a general framework to comprehend social reproduction processes. He also extends Weber’s sociology and philosophy through the construction of a more general sociology of interests by considering all practices, stating that agents’ internalised dispositions and interests are as effective as the social and material conditions of existence (Malsch, Gendron and Grazzini 2011: 197). Bourdieu wrote widely about language and linguistics, but his main engagement with linguistics is his use of linguistic reasoning to elaborate on broader sociological concepts including habitus, field, and symbolic capital (Hanks 2005: 6).

To revisit shortly Bourdieu’s concepts; the concept of field can be conceptualised as a configuration of relationships not between the concrete occupants themselves, but rather between the social positions the occupants happen to hold within the given configuration of social space. These positions and the forces binding them together constitute the structure or temporary state of power relations within which struggles or maneuvers take place over resources, stakes and dominion over the field (Malsch et al. 2011: 198). In Bourdieu’s view, capital encompasses a wide variety of different types of resources (economic, cultural, social or symbolic—tangible or intangible) which are convertible, in principle, into one another at different rates of exchange (Malsch et al. 2011: 198). The third concept in Bourdieu’s triad, habitus, offers a means of linking micro and macro levels of analysis. Habitus is formed and produced through long processes of inculcation during a lifetime, including socialisation and formal education that predispose agents to act and react in certain ways in particular situations according to the amount of capital they possess. Habitus is a structuring structure and organises practices and perception of practices; at the same time it is a structured structure and organises perception of the social world (Bourdieu 1984, as cited in Malsch et al. 2011: 198).

It is important to stress that Bourdieu’s three key concepts, or thinking tools, should not be seen as independent entities. Rather, they are all interconnected, making up the structure and conditions of the social contexts Bourdieu studied (Grenfell 2008: 2). Analysis of
translation from Bourdieu`s perspective and concepts presents certain dynamics and diversity of translation`s functions. The Bourdieusian framework of field, capital and habitus integrates a theory of social structure (translation as a field), a theory of power relations (capital and translation), and a theory of the individual (habitus of the translator). The following three sub-sections look more closely into the potential of Bourdieu`s framework for a more comprehensive understanding of translation.

2.3.3.1 Translation as a Field

Field is a significant aspect of Bourdieu`s work, and much of his later writing was concerned with specific investigations of field, such as education, culture, literature, television, science and bureaucracy. (Grenfell 2008: 68). As defined by Bourdieu, a field is a form of social organization with two main aspects: (a) a configuration of social roles, agent positions, and the structures they fit into and (b) the historical process in which those positions are actually taken up or occupied by actors (Hanks 2005: 72).

In order to describe a social phenomenon as a "field" it is essential to focus on certain of its features, such as the space of positions, the historical processes of their occupancy, the values at stake, the career trajectories of agents, and the habitus shaped by engagement (Hanks 2005: 72). One of the central notions of the field of translation is related to the construction of chains of translation because claims and ideas are progressively transformed into facts through the enrolment of people who come to interpret claims and ideas in ways that cater to their own interests and translation implies ideas being transferred in time and space through human agency (Malsch et al. 2011: 195).

To understand translation as a social field, it is necessary to bypass purely textual approaches and essential to reintegrate all the agents – individuals and institutions – that participate in the practice (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 104). The field of translation has to be conceptualised as an international field in which there is a hierarchised space with unequal exchanges that effect the circulation of texts. As Heilbron and Sapiro (2007: 104) underline, Bourdieu`s sociological theory allows us to take these relations into account in given social, political, and historical conditions.
2.3.3.2 Power, Capital, and Translation

As Malsch and colleagues (2011: 215) mentioned, translation does not constitute a neutral mechanism. The field of translation can be inscribed into Bourdieu’s thoughts on analysis of the social conditions of the international circulation of social, economic, and cultural capital. Analysing translation via Bourdieu’s power / capital concepts leads to an interpretative and more broad analysis of transnational 'translation' exchanges (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 93). Heilbron and Sapiro (ibid) mention that translation as a field presupposes a space of international relations, this field being constituted by the existence of nation-states and linguistic groups linked to each other by relations of competition and rivalry. Thus, in order to understand the act of translating, it is necessary to think of translation as embedded within the power relations among national states and their languages.

Power relations within the translation act can be classified into three types – political, economic and cultural (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 93). In these, the means for political, economic and cultural struggles are unequally distributed. Cultural exchanges are therefore unequal exchanges that express relations of domination. Certain transfers of literature or translation may be principally governed by the logic of the market. In cases of extreme liberalisation of the book market, as in the United States, cultural goods may appear primarily as commercial products that must obey the law of profitability: the best illustration of this is the process of manufacturing standardised worldwide bestsellers. The field of publishing is dominated more by large business enterprises that impose criteria of profitability that harm literary and cultural logic (Bourdieu 1999, as cited in Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 98). Alongside the economic aspect of translation, other dimensions— most notably the political and symbolic—have to be presented, and their specific effectiveness cannot be ignored if one wants to understand the functioning of cultural markets of the act of translation (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 98).

Analysing translation flows in light of power relations among languages allows us to better understand sociological, political, and historical changes. In accordance with these analyses, the flows of translations should then be resituated in a transnational field characterised by power relations among national states, their languages, and their
literatures (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 95). A country’s loss of prestige or power, and the resulting diminution of its language’s status have consequences for the level of translation activity (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 97). For instance after the collapse of socialist regimes, the international position of Russian changed rapidly and the number of translations from Russian decreased very sharply, accompanied by a sharp rise in the number of foreign translations published in Russia (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 97).

Along with the social, political and economic relations embedded in power relations, Heilbron and Sapiro (2007: 99) also focus on Bourdieu’s notion of *symbolic capital* (or symbolic power) and argue that the relative autonomy of cultural fields was lost gradually through influence of the state and the market, both of which continue to govern the production and circulation of symbolic goods. Bourdieu (1991: 164) describes symbolic power as "the invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it, or even that they themselves exercise it." This complicity lies at the heart of practice and is explained not by any conscious concealment but by the structural relations between semiotic systems (including language), the habitus (including the perspectives it embodies), and the field (Hanks 2005: 76).

Bourdieu took Marx’s proposition and argued that “texts circulate without their context”, which means that reception is in part determined by representations of the culture of origin and in part by the status of the language itself. Recipients reinterpret translated texts and translated works may be appropriated in diverse and sometimes contradictory ways (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 103). Heilbron and Sapiro (2007: 99) claim that national cultures are themselves endowed with a symbolic capital that is relatively autonomous with respect to the economic and political power relations among countries or linguistic communities.

From the standpoint of literary exchanges, there is unequal distribution of linguistic and literary capital, which means that the dominant languages are those endowed with literary capital and high international recognition. Due to their specific prestige, their antiquity, and the number of texts that are written in these languages, they are universally regarded as important, and they possess a great deal of literary capital.
2.3.3.3 The Habitus of the Translator

Habitus is central to Bourdieu’s distinctive sociological approach, ‘field’ perspective, and philosophy of practice, and key to his originality and his contribution to social science. It is probably the most widely cited of Bourdieu’s concepts, has been used in studies of an astonishing variety of practices and contexts, and is becoming part of the lexicon of a range of disciplines, including sociology, anthropology, education, cultural studies, philosophy and literary criticism (Grenfell 2008: 49).

Habitus is the link not only between the past, the present and the future, but also between the social and the individual, the objective and subjective, and structure and agency. Habitus links the social and the individual because one’s experiences may be unique in their particular contents, but are shared in terms of their structure with others of the same social class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, occupation, nationality, region and so forth. For example, members of the same social class by definition share structurally similar positions within society that engender structurally similar experiences of social relations, processes and structures (Grenfell 2008: 53).

Habitus conceptualises the relation between objective and subjective or “outer” and “inner” by describing how these social facts become internalised. Habitus is also how the personal comes to play a role in the social and brings together both objective social structure and subjective personal experiences (Grenfell 2008: 53). Thus, practices are not simply the result of one’s habitus, but rather of the relations between one’s habitus and one’s current circumstances (Grenfell 2008: 52). In this respect, translators could well be considered as unique configurations of social forces, since in the words of Bourdieu:

Personal style is never more than a deviation in relation to the style of a period or class so that it relates back to the common style not only by its conformity . . . but also by the difference” (Bourdieu 1977: 86).

According to Hanks (2005: 69), for language, the *habitus* has a bearing on the social definition of the speaker, mentally and physically, on routine ways of speaking, on gesture and embodied communicative actions, and on the perspectives inculcated through ordinary referential practice in a given language. Hence, from Bourdieu’s practice perspective, it
can be argued that translating, speaking or discourse production are ways of taking up positions in social fields, and these agents have trajectories over the course of which they pursue various values (Hanks 2005: 72).

The search for a theory which places more emphasis on the role of the agent of translation, or translator brings us to Pierre Bourdieu (Milton and Bandia 2009: 8). The habitus of the translator, the mode of acquisition of linguistic competence, the type of education and training, the publishing norms, the national tradition with respect to translation norms—all contribute to orienting linguistic and stylistic choices of the translators (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 104).

During the translation process, a literary text reinvents the rules of the literary genre to which it belongs, and subsequently is reinterpreted by the agents involved (Gouanvic 2005: 163). Gouanvic stresses that there is an aesthetic pleasure in playing this game—which Bourdieu calls *illusio*—that can be viewed as the object of the translator’s work. The principle of illusio is primarily actualised through the agents’ habitus; during the translation procedure, the act of translating is incorporated through, and at the same time influenced by, the translator’s habitus, which can be identified by reconstructing the translator’s social trajectory (Wolf 2007: 19).

As Wolf (2007: 20) stresses, a habitus-led consideration of translation practices would encourage more helpful analyses of the “socio-cognitive emergence of translating skills and their outcome”. For example, Daniel Simeoni (1998) takes Bourdieu’s concept of habitus into account from a different perspective. Simeoni claims that over the centuries the translatorial habitus has contributed to the internalisation of a submissive behaviour, and thus generated low social prestige for translators. In other words, historically conditioned and willing acceptance of norms by translators has significantly contributed to the secondariness of the translation activity (Simeoni 1998: 6).

In his studies, Gouanvic analyses the factors and agents responsible for the production of translation in specific institutions (critics, translators, publishing houses, etc.) and comes to the conclusion that the stakes of translation are strongly legitimised practices, endowed with power, on the basis of which the terms of translation operating between the various social spaces are continually renegotiated (Gouanvic 1997, 2002, as cited in Wolf 2007: 196).
According to Gouanvic (2005: 157), translation strategies should not be understood as deliberate choices conforming to or breaking norms, but rather that have to be stated as the translator’s habitus.

Likewise, Toury (1995: 250, as cited in Wolf 2007: 8-9) argues that translators undergo a socialisation process during which feedback procedures, motivated by norms, are assimilated. This helps them to develop strategies for coping with various problems they encounter during actual translation, and in some cases translators might even adopt automatised techniques to resolve specific problems. This internalisation process is part of the translator’s habitus.

As in all other professions, in their training, future translators will learn certain norms from teachers and practitioners which they must follow if they are to become professional translators and/or interpreters. However, Simeoni (1998: 26) distinguishes habitus from norms by stressing the role of the translators themselves. According to him, a habitus-governed account emphasises the extent to which translators themselves play a role in the maintenance and perhaps the creation of norms. In order to be accepted by society, to maintain a job as a professional translator, to be published, to obtain scholarships, to win friends and influence people, and—in certain societies—to stay out of prison, the translator will have to follow certain conventions (Milton and Bandia 2009: 8).

Conclusion

This chapter was an attempt to provide the theoretical and conceptual background upon which the current study is built. It aimed to provide the readers with an overview of historical and thematic developments in the field of Translation Studies.

It started with a review of the position of the translator in different theories of translation, set against the background of the historical development of Translation Studies, before moving forward to present the literature on translation in Turkey. The aim in the latter subsection was to provide the readers with an understanding of the necessity of a sociological approach for the uncovering of the translator as the foremost agent of practice in a translation process.
Following this, Lefevere’s approach to the study of translation was introduced. With a focus on the concept of patronage, this section intended to demonstrate the extent to which extra-textual factors are of importance in an analysis of the translation process. Such a framing of the issue was also instrumental in providing the readers with a picture wherein it is easier to position the translator within a wider network of social, political, economic, and power relations.

The chapter than moved on to a clarification of the Bourdieusian sociological attitude, based on a detailed overview of its conceptual tools, i.e. field, capital, and habitus. These concepts will be used throughout the following chapters in order to provide a detailed picture of the field of translation in Turkey. In the chapter to follow, historical and current translation institutions will be presented and the importance of several individuals will be underlined. This is important in that it will give an idea about the development of the field as such. Based upon this, the fourth chapter will offer an analysis of the field from within, based on data gathered from its actual actors.
Chapter 3: The Topography of Translation in Turkey

Introduction

[C]ulture is the mother, institutions are the children. (Etounga-Manguelle 2000: 75)

Who is a Turk? And what qualities identify a Turk? The one who speaks Turkish, who is a Muslim and who has love for Turkishness is a Turk. [Tanrıöver 2000 (1923): 152]

It has been argued that when considering translation activity, the necessity arises for recognition of the translator as an individual acting within a society as any other individual and with similar social and economic concerns. Toury’s norm-governed translation theory and Lefevere’s concept of patronage are instrumental in terms of providing a framework for understanding how these socio-economic concerns and the issue of sensitivity are closely linked to the political environment in which translation is produced. I believe that this perspective is important in providing clues regarding the research areas I have previously noted:

- The extent to which economic and socio-cultural conditions impact on translational behaviour.
- The extent to which shifts in translational culture during periods marked by dramatic socio-political change, i.e. the foundation of the Republic, military interventions, transition to multi-party regime, the end of the Cold War, and so forth, impact on translational behaviour.
- The extent to which translational behaviour depends on the configuration of different types of capital held by a translator.
- The extent to which translational dispositions are independent from the dominant ideology in power.
- The variables that influence translators in adopting a specific translation strategy.
- The variables that influence the selection of titles by publishers and translators.
However, although all these issues correspond to the self-positioning of translators, which will be addressed in the empirical part of the study in Chapter 3, the theoretical framework for the overall study would be inadequate if it did not incorporate a complementary historical perspective on how translation activity and translators, as the main agents of this activity, are perceived by the political establishment. Presumably, memories of previous social changes have been passed down to current generations and affect the way they view the world. As our interviews show, when prompted, participants elaborated on some aspects of history. (For details, see Chapter 4). In other words, in order to be able to understand the effect of today’s economic, social and political structure on translation behaviour, we need to identify the roots and evolution/development of this structure diachronically, and highlight the relationship between this structure and translation behaviour in the past. In this respect, this chapter will start with an elaboration on how the political elites’ perception of translation as a tool influenced the shape of the field both in the past and today. Subsequently, other actors (i.e. institutions and individuals) of the field will be introduced in order to both fully depict the whole topography of the translation field in today’s Turkey, and constitute the background against which readers should evaluate the data from the in-depth interviews, presented in Chapter 4.

3.1 State-Led Translation Institutions and the Political Establishment’s View of Translation Practice from a Historical Perspective

With respect to the above framework, the aim of this present section is to: a) contextualise translation and the activities and impact of two state-led translation institutions/departments within a socio-political framework; and b) position these institutions/departments within a network of republican cultural institutions. The two institutions/departments are Osmanlı Terceme Odası (the Ottoman Translation Office) and Tercüme Bürosu (the Translation Bureau).

The main argument in this section will be that in the final decades of the Ottoman Empire and the first few decades of the newly-founded Turkish Republic, translation was made part of modernisation/Westernisation efforts, and became the engine for transferring and spreading certain ideas into Turkey. Thus, by focusing on the ideological role attributed to translation by the state, it will be also possible to reveal the reason behind the canonical
status which translated classics assumed in these periods, in addition to the preference for adopting *domestication* as a translation strategy over *foreignisation*. Translation was made a tool for nation-building, contributing to the dissemination of the improvements generated by the re-shaping of language policies. In this respect, the *Tercüme Bürosu* will be explored in two periods marked by a drastic ideological change, which was reflected in the change of the translation strategies adopted, and its political attribution will be illustrated.

3.1.1 Conceptual Discussion

The paradigm shift from modernity to post-modernity and increasing interest in globalization studies has not only generated a multitude of policy proposals ranging from good governance to inter-religious dialogue, but also accompanied the revival of scholarship regarding cultural identities of different nation states. While different strategies for nation formation attribute different importance to language and its functions within the wider context of culture, these differences are also key to understanding the variety of language policies developed and implemented by those who adhere to these strategies.

It should be noted that language policy is mainly about the development of public policies that aim to use the authority of the state to affect various aspects of the status and use of languages by people under the state’s jurisdiction (Schmidt 2004: 5); this is a political issue, to the extent that the strategic decisions regarding this development are taken by political elites and implemented mostly through state agencies, especially when a central part of the “debate” concerns the status of the language concerned.

At this point, it is necessary to clarify the distinction between *status* and *corpus* planning dimensions of language policy. According to this typology introduced by Heinz Kloss in 1968, while *status* planning refers to “the efforts directed toward the allocation of functions of languages/literacies in a given speech community”, *corpus* planning concerns “the efforts related to the adequacy of the form or structure” (Hornberger 2006: 28).

According to Hamers and Blanc, *corpus* planning, which has also been called *internal* planning or *language engineering* by Wurm (1977, quoted in Hamers and Blanc 2000: 311), constitutes “a systematic interference with the internal dynamic processes to which
languages are subject”; the reasons for such interference, that may be restrictive or creative, “are matters of policy decision and implementation”. On the other hand, with respect to \textit{status} planning, for which Wurm prefers the label \textit{external} planning, Hamers and Blanc note that “status is a function of the relative economic, demographic, social, and political power of the linguistic groups that speak those languages, and of their subjective perceptions of the power relations in the wider society” (Hamers and Blanc 2000: 311-12).

One can easily predict that \textit{status} planning processes are likely to generate tension between members of the majority group and the minority group/s. In this context, Fishman refers to \textit{nationalism} as the tendency of a group for which language acts as a powerful symbol for ethnic identification to resist fusion into the larger nationality, which results in a strengthening of their own national consciousness; and to \textit{nationism} as the tendency to select a common language and oppress the above-mentioned resistance for reasons of national efficiency (Fishman 1968 quoted in Hamers and Blanc 2000: 312).

Fishman (1994) also points out that language planning policies and tendencies regarding these policies are often conducted by elites acting in self-interest, and that these policies reproduce social and cultural inequalities (quoted in Hamers and Blanc 2000: 311). All these points make it necessary to tackle the concepts of culture and ideology, before moving further to investigate how institutions that were responsible for translation activity during the final period of the Ottoman Empire and the early years of the Turkish Republic were used in order to promote the ideological interests of the respective political tendencies.

Another equally crucial element is the concept of culture. It was first introduced by Tylor in 1873 (Hamers and Blanc 2000:198). Nowadays, there is an overwhelming convergence of ideas among scholars about the concept of culture being a very complex entity and encompassing the entire gamut of human social—thus learned, not innate—experience and comprising a set of symbolic systems. Almost all definitions of culture agree that language is an important component of culture. Here, culture also encompasses religion, beliefs, ideals, values, and their symbolic expressions; behavioural norms, patterns of behaviour; art and customs. It further includes knowledge and techniques acquired from one’s own society in order to be able to adapt to historical, socio-economic and geo-political habitus.
Generally speaking, with the transition from the age of empires to the age of nation-states, the concept of culture came to assume a foundation of shared values, attitudes and institutions that bind together the members of a nation, as the nation has come to be perceived as the primary identity with which to identify. However, because the process of nation formation is never teleological, it thus includes a hegemonic competition of different groups and different projects, different ideologies and different strategies employed by different actors influencing the shape and the outcome of this competition (see Özkırımlı 2000, 2005 for a detailed theoretical discussion of this competition; Altınay 2004 on this competition in the Turkish case; Özkırımlı and Sofos 2008 for a comparative study of the Greek and Turkish cases).

The contextualisation of this competition is vital for making sense of the two distinct periods of the Tercüme Bürösü, namely 1940-46 and 1946-60. However, let me first start with the Ottoman Terceme Odası, not just for chronological reasons, but also for the sake of displaying the political, social and intellectual milieu of the Ottoman Empire at the time this institution was set up. This will help the reader to understand why it is important to be aware of the continuity between the Ottoman Empire and the early republican years of Turkey, and to make sense of the radicalism inherent in the reforms introduced by the Kemalist elites.

3.1.2 The Tanzimat Period and Translation as Cultural Rapprochement

The period referred to as the Tanzimat (re-organisation) in Ottoman-Turkish history starts with the proclamation of Gülhane Hatt-ı Şerifi (Noble Rescript of Gülhane) in 1839, and continues until the proclamation of the first Ottoman constitution and the establishment of a parliamentary regime in 1876. Although more systematic and extensive in this period, during the whole 19th century, the Ottoman Empire was subjected to wide-ranging administrative, legal and educational reforms that had significant social and cultural consequences.

Throughout the reform attempts during the decline of the Ottoman Empire and then in the early years of republican Turkey, Europe and the Western civilisation were regarded as the modern entities with which to be aligned (Lewis 1968: 75-125; Shaw and Shaw 1977: 61-118; Davison 1990: 114-128). These reforms were considered the means of both preventing
the empire from disintegrating, and also keeping up with “the spirit of the time” (Palmer 1994: 110).

With regard to all the above-mentioned, it is possible to argue that the Tanzimat marks the beginning of a long Europeanisation movement in Ottoman-Turkish history, keeping in mind that “the pressure from the French, British, and Austrian governments to carry through the reform programme” (Palmer 1994: 135) suggests that it was not just a consequence of internal dynamics.

Regarding the literary dimension in this process, Demircioğlu explicitly reports that:

[...] from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, and particularly during and after the Tanzimat period, the spread of western ideas and familiarisation with Western social and political materials were strongly motivated by the rise of a new literature which started to differ both in form and content from the Ottoman traditional literature (2005: 11). [...] not only the emergence of the new literary models and genres adopted in time by Ottoman writers and translators was the result of the first translations from the West, mainly from the French literature, but also the interest in Western thinking discovered by the Ottoman readers. (2005: 11).

Western poetry, philosophy and the novel were the new literary genres introduced to Ottoman society through translation (Paker 1991: 11). Additionally, the fact that “not only in newspapers and magazines, but also in prefaces and introductions of books we encounter numerous statements, evaluations and disputes on translation” (Demircioğlu 2005: 13) should be considered a clear indicator of translation being an important factor in that period in modelling domestic literary repertoires after western standards.

At this point, looking at the view of translation provided by one of the significant cultural and literary figures at the time, Kemal Paşazade Saîd, will help us to understand the mission attributed to translation, before we move on to the Terceme Odası as the institution which in many respects marks the beginning of all the above-noted transformations. In the preface entitled Mütalâaname (Evaluation) to the Müntehabat-i Teracim-i Mesâhir (Collection of Famous Translations) of a translation anthology which included political
and literary translations from French into Ottoman Turkish and vice versa, edited by İbrahim Fehim and İsmail Hakkı, and published in 1889-1890, Said noted that:

It is translation that conveys to us the progress of the West in its various fields… It is translation that makes for improvement in education and serves the progress of our civilization from day to day… When one refers to a foreign language, the French language comes to mind because it has been considered a source which has provided progress and conveyed knowledge from the West to the East. (quoted in Demircioğlu 2005: 29)

The studies concentrating on the Ottoman literary activities from the Tanzimat period onwards, especially the first ones in republican Turkey tackling Ottoman literary and translation history and published in the 1930s and ‘40s, considered the role of translations from the West in the making of a new “Turkish” culture, language and literature, not only by introducing Western material developments, i.e. scientific knowledge, but also by improving Ottoman intellectual and cultural life (Demircioğlu 2005: 36-41).

In this framework, one particular institution requires special attention, as it informs us of the irresistible and irreversible wave of transformation that would take place, crowned by the Tanzimat: the Terceme Odası. Established in the year of 1821 as a result of growing diplomatic relationships between the Ottoman administration and European powers of the time, it survived until the end of the Empire. Its main duties were translating diplomatic correspondence, laws and regulations of special interest to the state, and establishing contact with foreign journalists in order to make a good impression on European public opinion. In addition, Terceme Odası was responsible for translating the first official newspaper of the Empire, Takvim-i Vekayi (Calendar of Incidents), into French. Translators were also individually assigned to duties ranging from dealing with inquiries at customs to conducting censuses, especially in non-Muslim populated areas (Balcı 2006: 116-130).

The importance of the Terceme Odası, which constituted a point of contact with European cultures, can be seen in terms of two interrelated aspects. First, although in the past most statesmen had risen to their position from the ranks of the military administration, from the beginning of the 1830s, it was via the Terceme Odası that they ascended to power
Thus, it could be argued that reformist prime ministers or *Grand Vizirs* of the 19th century such as Reşid, Âli, Fu’ad, and Mithat Paşas were the products of this institution (Findley 1972: 403-408). According to Hanioğlu (2008: 73), it was these prominent statesmen who mainly took charge of the reforms in the *Tanzimat* by adopting Metternich as their role model and his oppressive bureaucracy as their source of inspiration for top-down conservative reform.

However, what is even more significant about *Terceme Odası* is that “it symbolised the orientation of the Ottoman state towards Europe, the adoption of a new mentality, and the ascendancy to power of a new civilian bureaucracy which was substantially different from the old imperial officials” (Karpat 2002: 259-260). This European orientation would later be taken over by republican cadres in their attempts to create a modern, secular, classless society whose members would be proud of identifying themselves as Turks.

Presumably, national identity established then affects what people say today about their identity and what public narratives of identity inform their views. In fact, what the republican elite tried to do consequently was embark on an ambitious mission to create a nation for the newly-founded Turkish state, rather than the other way round (Özkırımlı and Sofos 2008). For this purpose, an extensive reform program was carried out in the first decades of the Republic, with a great emphasis on language policies, and the *Tercüme Bürosu* was an essential part of this initiative.

### 3.1.3 The Republican Period and Translation as Nation-Building Tool

The Ottoman Empire was a highly multi-religious and multi-lingual political entity. To provide the reader with an idea of the multi-lingualism of the empire, Şükrü Hanioğlu notes:

> In the year of 1911, the Union of All Ottoman Elements, a committee for public affairs, published an appeal to form a united front and it did so in nine languages: Ottoman Turkish, Arabic, Armenian, Bulgarian, Greek, Ladino, Serbian, Syriac (in two different scripts, Nestorian and Serta), and French; [...] although [leaving] aside numerous languages in use in the Ottoman lands (such as Albanian, Kurdish,
Rumanian and numerous Caucasian tongues, to name a few of the most significant). (Hanioğlu 2008: 33)

Thus, under these circumstances, it is hardly misleading to note that in the eyes of the “founding fathers”, the success of the subsequent nation-building project depended on the promotion of a monolithic culture and language, as they were trying to shift the basis of identification from religion (Güvenç 1997: 225, 245). To this end, in November 1928, the Arabic script was replaced by a Latin-based alphabet and the new Turkish alphabet was adopted by Parliament. However, this was only one of the many policies conducted under language planning, which can only be properly assessed if it is placed within the general framework of interrelated republican practices, such as the unification of education in 1924, the Turkification of the Friday sermon in 1928 and the Turkification of the call to prayer in 1932.

Following the adoption of the new alphabet, the first book using Latin characters was published on January 1, 1929 and by the mid-1929, all publications were already using the new Turkish alphabet (Dikici 1996: 53). It is necessary to note here that the Turkish language planning efforts fit mainly under the category of corpus planning, in terms of the adoption of the Latin alphabet, purification efforts, and neologisms introduced by the Turkish Language Society. Regarding all these reforms and novelties, what is worth remembering is that all of them were initiated with a top-down approach as state initiatives, and the cultural field was not exempt from these interventions, exemplified by the establishment of the State Theatre, State Opera, and State Fine Arts Museum. These practices actually shed light on the establishment and functioning of the Tercüme Bürosu.

The official Tercüme Bürosu was established in the year of 1940 under the auspices of the National Ministry of Education, following on from a report of the Translation Committee, which was set up on May 2, 1939 during the Birinci Türk Neşriyat Kongresi (the First Turkish Publishing Congress) and according to Berk, it “conducted perhaps the most productive and influential translation activity in the Turkish history, affecting the socio-cultural system, being shaped, at the same time, by political, historical and social developments” (Berk 2006: 6).
The remarks made at the opening speech of congress by Hasan Âli Yücel, then Minister of National Education, is remarkable in terms of summing up the necessity for such an institution. The Minister declared that Republican Turkey “which wants to become a distinguished member of the Western culture and thought” was obliged to translate “the old and new works of thought of the modern world into its own language and strengthen its identity with their sensitivity and thought” (quoted in Berk 2006: 7).

The initial Tercüme Bürosu was composed of seven eminent writer-translators [Nurullah Ataç (Chairman), Saffet Pala (Secretary General), Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Sabahattin Ali, Bedrettin Tuncel, Enver Ziya Karal, and Nusret Hızır (Tahir Gürçağlar 2001: 111)] and “gave its priority to the translation of the ancient Greek and Latin texts, and played an important role in the country’s cultural Westernisation attempts” (Berk 2006: 7). To a great extent, this is in line with the Translation Committee report presented at the Congress, which contained a list of the texts to be translated mainly consisting of the Latin and Greek classics with only seven works from Eastern literatures and asking “to give more importance to the works belonging to humanist culture while translating” (quoted in Berk 2006: 7).

What is noticeable about the period between 1940 and 1946 is that while Greek and Latin works were largely prioritised, Eastern works were to a large extent neglected, as only 23 out of 467 titles translated during this period were Eastern (mainly Arabic and Persian), equating to only five per cent (Tuncor 1989: 26-65). This fact clearly exemplifies a shift from the Ottoman to the Republican period. However, with the transition to a multi-party system and the replacement of Hasan Âli Yücel by Şemsettin Sirer as Minister of Education, another essential shift can be observed in the decisions on the works to be translated by the Büro.

During a meeting convened by Sirer on January 29, 1947, it was decided that the Tercüme Bürosu would concentrate more on translating philosophy, history and science books along with prioritizing works which would convey patriotism to the youth (Tahir Gürçağlar 2001: 144). The total output of the Büro was 973 (excluding the reprints), with 476 of the works being translated between 1946 and 1966, reflecting the fact that while Arabic and the Persian works more than doubled, Russian classics fell from favour as anti-communist sentiments reached a peak, clearly illustrative of the shift of focus in the activities of the Büro.
Gürçağlar argues that “the shift and decline in the activities of the Translation Bureau have to do with the new definition of nationalism in Turkey” and develops her argument by noting that “after 1947, as nationalism was re-interpreted within a partialist paradigm, the culture planning project also changed direction” (2001: 147). It was a period during which Turkey started to embrace its religious past and although the West was still considered the source of science and technology, foreign works were no longer necessary in the making of a new Turkish culture. This is the reason why “imports of foreign classical works via translation began to lose their central position and political function, at least in the discourse of the state” (Tahir Gürçağlar 2001: 147-8).

All in all, as I have tried to demonstrate above, the institutional practice of translation in the Ottoman Empire was not only the result of practical requirements but also a symbol of inclination towards the West. Translation activity both during and after the Tanzimat laid the necessary basis for the development of a domestic cultural repertoire. The top-down style of initiating reforms was later inherited by the republican elites.

During the reform process in the early decades of the newly-founded Turkey, language policies and cultural planning were discovered as necessary agents in order to create a new basis for the construction of a new identity, and translation occupied an important role in these policies. As the ideological shift after the year of 1946 illustrates, the state-led translation activities were, to a great extent, influenced by particular socio-political conditions, which needed to be carefully considered in identifying the change in the translation strategies adopted during these periods.

This chapter will now proceed to the remaining institutions in the actual field of translation in Turkey before in engages with the individuals for a fuller appreciation of the topography.

3.2 Other Translation Institutions

This section will begin with an overview of the translation education institutions (i.e. university departments) before moving on to publishing houses and private translation offices. An elaboration on the education sub-field within the wider field of translation is
important in that Bourdieu placed a great emphasis on it, underlining its reproductive nature particularly. Since the importance of the educational field to Bourdieu has been analysed in detail earlier in Chapter 1, let it suffice to note here that Bourdieu especially focused on the function of education as symbolic capital. His criticism of the French education system as the main engine for elite production and maintenance through the exercise of elite discourses and practices of differentiation rather than being based on meritocratic principles is worthy of consideration, especially keeping in mind that in highly centralised state structures such as France and Turkey, the content of any social structure (in our case, the education system) is not immune from the main strategies of the government. On the other hand, what is equally at stake here in this section, is the numerical relationship between the academic departments, publishing houses and private translation offices, along with the volume and economic limits of the book market, since these have repeatedly surfaced in many of the interview materials in the chapter to follow.

3.2.1 Translation Education Institutions

Departments of Translation Studies in the universities in Turkey were named, until recently, as Mütercim-Tercümanlık (Translation-Interpretation). In the last few years, this name has been replaced to a great extent in many universities with the name Çeviribilim (Translation Science). The name Mütercim-Tercümanlık is in Ottoman/Old Turkish where mütercim refers to written translation and terçümanlık refers to oral translation (i.e. interpretation) whereas çeviri is in modern Turkish and usually can refer to written as well as oral translation unless it is specified as yazılı Çeviri (written translation) or sözlü Çeviri (oral translation).

The main reason for the name change explained above is curricular changes in Translation Studies in universities in Turkey. In comparison to departments of Mütercim-Tercümanlık, which tended to focus on the linguistic perspective and technical translation, the departments of Çeviribilim provide a larger scope of studies, not only linguistically regarding the foreign language to be studied, but also culturally regarding the culture related to the language to be studied. The fact that the new name of these departments includes the word bilim (science) certainly opens the floodgates to debates on the “scientificity” of Translation, and this issue has also been addressed by several
interviewees, as will be seen in Chapter 4. In this study, the mention of departments of “Translation Science” in Turkey by the respondents in Turkish was translated into English as “Translation Studies”.

Currently, academic studies in the field of translation are organised in the universities in Turkey under such titles as “Translation Studies Programme”, “Translation Department”, “Translation Studies Department”, “Inter-Linguistic and Inter-Cultural Translation Programme”, “English Translation Department”, “Inter-Linguistic and Inter-Cultural Translation Studies Department”, “Translation and Translation Technologies Department”, “Multi-Linguistic Interpretation Studies Department”, “Written Translation Department” and so forth.

According to statistical data received from/published by the Higher Education Council (Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu – YÖK), in 2014, there were twenty-eight universities in Turkey offering education in translation studies to students. In addition, there are four universities outside Turkey, three in Northern Cyprus and one in Kyrgyzstan, where education in translation studies is offered and to which students may be accepted according to results obtained in Turkey’s central university entrance exam. Since some universities offering translation studies include more than one translation studies department according to the languages provided, and since these are considered as separate departments, it may be concluded that there are a total of forty-five departments of translation studies in these twenty-eight universities in Turkey.

It should be noted that the statistical data provided above relate merely to undergraduate studies, and there are more universities in Turkey that offer graduate and doctorate degrees in translation studies, for which the statistical data were not included in this study. Departments of translation studies in universities in Turkey for undergraduate studies usually operate under the faculties of “Social Sciences” or “Sciences and Literature”. Graduate and doctorate studies (MA and PhD) usually operate under Social Sciences Institutes, which operate under the auspices of universities, but have a different status according to YÖK regulations.

According to the same statistical data from YÖK, in 2014, departments of translation studies in universities in Turkey have a total quota of 2,178 students. Since numerical data concerning the total number of translation studies students and/or graduates was not
available from the same or other sources, it can be roughly estimated that, in 2014, 2,178 students were accepted by and registered with translation studies departments in universities in Turkey, with a similar number having graduated in 2013. Since undergraduate studies in translation is a four-year programme, it can be estimated that 8,712 students study in these departments.

Regarding distribution by city; Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, which are the largest cities in Turkey in terms of population, trade activity and economic turnover, have the largest shares with Istanbul having 861, Ankara 292 and Izmir 231 students. Quotas of the three universities in Northern Cyprus providing translation studies amount to 102 (For details, see Appendix 1).

Although in the past most universities offering translation studies settled for English as the main foreign language in the departments of translation studies, later on, French and German were added in a few of them. It is also noticeable that in the 2000s, new departments opened up with main languages such as Russian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Arabic and Persian in accordance with the country’s educational policies. It may be assumed that the attention these additional languages have drawn, to the point of their being included in the curriculum of translation departments in Turkey is, at least partly, related to the growing economic power of the countries in which these languages are used and expanding relations between Turkey and these countries.

It is also noticeable that multi-lingual translation studies in universities in Turkey have grown dramatically in the last few years. The number of translation departments in English-French-Turkish, German-English-Turkish, and so forth have increased significantly since the early 2000s, something also mentioned by one of the interviewees in this study (For details, see Chapter 4).

A list of the universities offering translation studies education in Turkey can be found in Appendix 1.

3.2.2 Publishing Houses and Private Translation Offices
During the early years of The Turkish republic, the Tercüme Bürosu was a state-led institution of cultural planning. The publishing houses that existed in the country at the time had rather arbitrary and unsystematic approaches to the field of translation, which may well be the reason for the lack of researcher interest in their activities during that period (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2008: 29). However, micro studies of translations of canonised works as well as non-canonised popular books provide insight into the strategies assumed by the publishing houses and translators of the time.

For instance, in her analysis of the popular, non-canonised novels published by Altın Kitaplar, Tahir-Gürçağlar (2005: 138) comes to the conclusion that the dominant approach of the publishing houses was to find a balance between adequacy and acceptability, while most translators tried to remain loyal to the original texts, making only slight alterations such as dividing long sentences into shorter ones in order to render the translations fluent. Adding footnotes in order to explain the elements of foreign cultures rather than domesticating them into the target culture was another strategy that showed a tendency towards accuracy rather than acceptability (Tahir Gürçağlar 2005: 143).

Among the first private publishing houses of the Republic’s early years were; Vakit Kitabevi, Kanaat Kitabevi, Suhulet Kitabevi, Remzi Kitabevi, Varlık Yayınevi, Altın Kitaplar, Resimli Ay Matbaası and Yeditepe Yayınevi. Remzi Kitabevi stands out due to its initiation of a series called Dünya Muharirlerinden Tercümeler (Translations from Authors of the World), which was published as early as three years before the establishment of the Tercüme Bürosu.

Unfortunately, there is a dearth of sources on the strategies employed in these translations, and those produced by the private publishing houses during this period were mainly ignored. Studying the first translations from the West, İsmail Habib Sevük (1940-1941) claims that translators who worked for these publishing houses were rather incompetent and that the publishing houses also lacked coordination and competence (quoted in Berk 1999: 143).

While it appears that during the early years of the Republic the most eminent and competent authors and translators were used by the state-led institution, the situation is significantly different today. As will be seen from testimonies of the study respondents in
Chapter 4, publishing houses are the main employers of the literary translators in Turkey today.

According to 2013 statistical data provided by the Turkish Publishers Associations *(Türkiye Yayuncular Birliği)*, there were 1,732 publishing houses in Turkey at that time, with 7.1 published books per capita. The total number of titles published (ISBN 2013) in the same year was 47,352 and the total wholesale and retail book market had turnovers of 1,583 billion and 2,314 billion US dollars respectively, inclusive of educational, cultural, academic and imported books *(Türkiye Yayuncular Birliği; http://www.turkyaybir.org.tr/komisyonlar/2013-turkiye-kitap-pazari-raporu/504)*.

Moreover, the total number of titles produced in Turkey in 2013 was 47,352, with titles distributed as follows: 15.35% adult fiction, 26.43% adult non-fiction, 14.13% children and youth, 22.13% educational, 12.05% academic and 9.91% religious books *(Türkiye Yayuncular Birliği; http://www.turkyaybir.org.tr/komisyonlar/2013-turkiye-kitap-pazari-raporu/504)*. Table 1 provides the related 2009-2013 statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of publishing houses</th>
<th>Published books per capita</th>
<th>Wholesale market turnover (billion US$)</th>
<th>Retail market turnover (billion US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>2,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>2,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As is clear from this table, there was a gradual increase in the number of the publishing houses in Turkey from 2009 onwards, with a similar trend in the number of published books per capita, and turnovers of the wholesale and retail book market.
The Turkish Statistical Institute (*Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu – TÜİK*) gives the total number of titles published (ISBN 2013) in 2013 as 42,655 (slightly lower than the number reported by the Turkish Publishers Association) and reports an increase of 11.1% in material published compared to the previous year, 2012, with the highest increase occurring in electronic books. *TÜİK* also reports that, in 2013, 89.6% of material was published by the private sector, 7.6% by the public sector and educational institutions, and 2.8% by non-governmental organisations (*TÜİK*; http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=16120).

Table 2 shows statistical data received from the General Directorate of Libraries and Publications – ISBN Agency of Turkey (*Kütüphaneler ve Yayınlar Genel Müdürlüğü ISBN Türkiye Ajansı*) regarding the total numbers of ISBNs (International Standard Book Number) received in Turkey between 2008 and 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ISBN Number of Publications</th>
<th>Number of Translated Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32,342</td>
<td>5,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31,286</td>
<td>5,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35,767</td>
<td>6,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>43,096</td>
<td>7,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42,626</td>
<td>7,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>47,352</td>
<td>8,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Besides publishing houses, which are the main employers of literary translators in Turkey, private translation offices are also significant organisations in the field of translation, especially for technical translation. Private translation offices range from single-person translator and agency-owner size to large-scale companies employing tens of in-house and/or freelance translators.
The number of companies in Turkey involved in translation and interpretation activities, including sworn/certified translation, and their geographic distribution among cities is provided in Appendix 2. These are private translation offices registered under the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB - Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği) and as can be seen, there are a total of 625 such offices in Turkey. The greatest numbers of these are located in the three largest and most populated cities, where the largest turnover of commercial activities take place; namely, Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, which have 346, 157 and 26 respectively.

In Turkey, it is usually a requirement in translations of official documents—technical or legal, rather than literary translations—that the translator swears an oath attesting that it is the legal equivalent of the source text. Therefore, the translator of the documents is required to be certified, and evidentiary documents or other official documentation are required by the notary from the translator whose translation will be notarised. Often, only translators who can prove their full command of the foreign language with the relevant documents are authorised to swear such oaths. Even if a translator in Turkey specialises in legal translation or is a lawyer, this does not necessarily make him/her a certified translator. The certification procedure is conducted at the notaries.

3.3 Individuals

Finally, in an attempt to fully comprehend the translation field in Turkey, one should consider the major actors on the stage, i.e. individuals. In this section, attention will be first directed to what we may refer to as legendary individuals. In Chapter 1, it was noted that while referring to fields, Bourdieu mentions “legendary players” who, by their mere existence, have/had intentionally or unintentionally shaped their respective fields. In the practical context of the current study, this is no doubt that Hasan Ali Yücel and, to a lesser extent, the translators of the Tercüme Bürosu fulfil this criterion. By elaborating on their essential contribution, it will become easier for the reader to notice the striking contrast between past and present, insofar as the concerns of today’s individuals/actors in the translation field are socio-political developments that practically influence their personal
lives, while their colleagues in the past operated at the idealistic level of the socio-political arena.

3.3.1 Legendary Individuals

Bourdieu’s every field has its legendary players, and for the purpose of this thesis, it is important to remind the reader of the names of those legendary people who had a strong impact on the field of translation in Turkey. One such towering figure is one time Minister of Education, Hasan Ali Yücel. His name has appeared earlier in this thesis and will show up several times in the sections to follow, especially in Chapter 4, since almost all respondents in this study paid homage to him and his visionary work.

To repeat briefly was has been already mentioned in a previous section on the Tercüme Bürosu, Hasan Ali Yücel served as Minister of Education from 1938 to 1946, appointed by virtue of his humanitarianism as well as for his rich educational background. Hasan Ali Yücel was considered a model of intellectual enlightenment and was an idealist in his political and bureaucratic nature. Considered a prime architect of the ideology and Westernisation project of the Republic, he remains the most recognised and discussed individual in the community of education of the Turkish Republic.

When Hasan Ali Yücel is mentioned, the first things that come to mind are the Village Institutes (Köy Enstitüleri), which he founded, and the translation reform conducted in the country during his term of office at the Ministry of Education. Both of these are extremely important with respect to the creation and narration of the cultural background of the new Republic.

---

2 Although Köy Enstitüleri were officially founded in 17 April 1940, experimental studies started in 1937. Additionally, although these remained operational until their closure in 1954, the original phase ended in 1946 upon the withdrawal of Hasan Ali Yücel from the Ministry of Education. These were intended as learn-by-doing schools that trained primary schools teachers, for an ambitious civilisational leap-forward in rural parts of the country. Courses ranged from agriculture to music. Köy Enstitüleri are still one of the major foci of political and ideological debate in Turkey. As Karaomerlioglu reports, while “[m]ost leftist oriented Kemalists saw in the Village Institutes the embodiment of Kemalist populism at its highest point (…), many right-wing politicians and intellectuals condemned the Village Institutes and made them the scapegoats for their political ambitions and anti-communist hysteria. On the other hand, some socialists such as Kemal Tahir, a famous Turkish novelist, criticized the Village Institutes as being fascistic institutions by which the Single Party regime aimed to spread its ideology.” (1998:48)
Emerging victorious from a battle for existence, The Turkish Republic was, on the one hand, inclined towards the civilisations of the West, and on the other, towards a national identity, revealed in the doctrine “Happy is s/he who says I'm a Turk” (“Ne Mutlu Türk'üm Diyene!”) as stated by the Republic’s founder, Kemal Atatürk. Under the influence of historical experiences and wars, the newly-founded Republic endeavoured to establish a different and modern version of nationalism, identified with the founder’s name as “Atatürk nationalism”, and inserted into the Republic’s Constitution. Atatürk's vision for the nation was rationalistic and humanistic, and significant endeavours were made to inculcate national and universal values in the population through education. In this respect, the aim of Hasan Ali Yücel’s cultural policy was to translate and introduce the most popular literary and philosophical creations in the world into Turkish in order to build sound foundations for modernisation of the country. For this purpose, it was necessary to form solid intellectual and cultural infrastructures for the nation, and one tool that could serve this purpose was translation of the world’s classical works into Turkish to be introduced to the Turkish public.

As soon as Hasan Ali Yücel was appointed to the Ministry of Education, he convened “The 1st Publication Congress”, which aimed at consolidating enlightenment reform in the country. During this congress, Hasan Ali Yücel disclosed his project concerning translations from Western literature into Turkish and a work-group was established within the congress for the selection of translation topics. The report that was presented to the congress stated:

It is an obvious fact that translations are very important for the education of the public in our country. Translations will not only introduce the ideas and sensitivities of the civilized nations to our people, but they will also provide guidance for the enrichment of our own language. (quoted in Başaran 2010: 70)

The decisions accepted and adopted at the congress were implemented immediately and in accordance with these, the Tercüme Bürösü, comprising eminent authors such as Nurullah Ataç, Sebahattin Eyüboğlu, Saffet Pala, Bedrettin Tuncel, Enver Ziya Karal and Nusret Hızır was founded.
In 1940, a translation journal named *Tercüme* (Translation) was published for the first time in Turkey. A total of 87 issues were published between 1940 and 1966. These were published with state support, and thus affected directly by political changes of power and staffing trends. In one issue of the journal, Yücel wrote:

> In our opinion, translation is not a mechanical action… An author who translates a text into the local language must adopt the mentality [of the original text]; more precisely, the author must penetrate into the cultural spirit of the society from which the author [of the original text] comes. (quoted in Başaran 2010: 71)

By virtue of Hasan Ali Yücel’s efforts, the *Tercüme Bürosu* began publishing classical works of Western literature every year on Republic Day—October 29th—to which the prime minister and the president of the state contributed forewords. It is important to note that a total of 496 works were translated between 1941 and 1946, during which an intellectual enlightenment, the state’s policy and purpose, was experienced in the country.

The personal approach of Hasan Ali Yücel to the history of translation and his determination concerning occasional criticisms directed towards him personally are worth noting. In one of his statements, Yücel indicated that “the translation movement in Turkey had a long history; the scholars of Islam read the works from the Ancient Greek, the interest grew, and the philosophy of Ancient Greece was applied to Islamic beliefs”. Ultimately, attacks were made against Yücel personally in order to undermine him as a humanist and brand him a communist. He resigned from the Ministry of Education in 1946 and engaged with journalism for the remainder of his life.

There were indeed some legendary translators and authors performing translation work during the period of the Translation Bureau, 1940 until 1967 (Berk 1999: 153). Many respondents of this study mentioned the names of Sabahattin Eyüboğlu and Nurullah Ataç whose translations were regarded as particularly successful and exemplary in the field of translation in Turkey. Among others, Orhan Burian and Suut Kemal Yetkin are also considered as important translators of their time.

As mentioned earlier, when we move towards the present, it may be observed that important literary and translation figures are in the headlines not because of the quality of
their work, but because of prosecution-related news. Especially in the 2000s, many eminent authors and translators in Turkey have been prosecuted according to Article 301 of Turkish Penal Code, Law Number 5237, which was approved on September 26th, 2004 under the heading of “Crimes against the Symbols of Turkish Sovereignty and the Dignity of Turkish Government Institutions”, and under the title of “insulting Turkishness, the Republic, and State Institutions”.

Among those prosecuted according to TCK 301 were Turkish writer Orhan Pamuk (Rainsford 2005) following his interview in a Swiss magazine, in which he commented on Kurdish and Armenian citizens killed during the Ottoman era and Turkish Republican time; journalist Perihan Mağden for her article named “Conscientious Objection” published in 2005, Turkish writer Elif Şafak on publication of her novel “The Bastard of Istanbul”, published in 2006, and Turkish publisher Ragıp Zarakolu for publishing translations of “The Experiences of an Armenian Doctor: Garabet Haçeryan’s İzmir Diary” by Dara Zakayan and “The Truth Will Set Us Free: Armenians and Turks Reconciled” by George Jerjian” (Dilek 2008).

In this respect, the issue of freedom of expression deserves attention in order to make sense of the socio-political environment in which today’s intellectuals operate.

3.3.2 Article 301 and Freedom of Expression

As stated the introductory section of this thesis, the inspiration for conducting research on Turkish literary translators and their working environment emerged in 2006, when Aslı Biçen, translator of The Bastard of Istanbul by Elif Şafak, and Ender Abadoğlu, translator of Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media by Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman, were prosecuted in Turkey, together with the book editors, on a charge of insulting Turkishness (Türklüğü aşağılamak) under article 301 of the Turkish Criminal Code.

They were not the first to be accused, as other translators such as Lütfi Taylan Tosun, Aysel Yıldırım, Seçkin Selvi, Zafer Korkmaz, Atilla Tuygan, Sertaç Canpolat are among the many others who have experienced similar treatment. Orhan Pamuk, prominent
Turkish writer and 2007 Nobel Prize winner, was similarly accused under article 301 of “insulting Turkishness” by telling a Swiss weekly that one million Armenians and 30,000 Kurds were killed in this country but no one dares to talk about it.

The main issue in this section is the juridical implementation of the controversial article in the Turkish Penal Code (TCK), namely article “TCK 301”, which relates to translations and publishing. First, the content and a brief history of TCK 301 will be introduced. Then, a number of controversial cases from recent years in the context of the Turkish cultural arena will be discussed, since these provide an understanding of the practical reality of the translation profession. This is followed by accounts of several situations in which TCK 301 resulted, oppositional opinions from translators and writers, and a thorough discussion on possible solutions and political stances.

Article 301 has been revised eight times since it first entered the Turkish Criminal Code in 1936. In summary, it foresees a jail sentence of six months to three years for people who “openly insult Turkishness, the Republic or the Parliament”. With the most recent adjustment in April 2008, the expression Türklüğü (“Turkishness”) has become Türk Milletini (“Turkish nation”), and Cumhuriyeti (“the Republic”) has become Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devletini (“the Republic of Turkey”).

However, a recent report on media freedom for the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) in Strasbourg has emphasised that Turkey is in violation of Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights and, as such, the European Court of Human Rights may impose sanctions on Turkey for this notorious Article 301 restricting freedom of expression. It was also argued in the report that the changes made in Article 301 have not substantially reduced the number of court cases in which writers or journalists have been prosecuted for their published opinions (Bozkurt 2010). According to the April-May-June 1999 Media Monitoring Report by the independent monitoring organisation Bianet, 125 people were on trial within the context of freedom of expression between April and June 2009 (Bianet 2009).

Additionally, engagement with similar issues reveals the above-mentioned trend to control free expression as even more extensive, referring to a control mechanism that far exceeds academic or artistic scope, and not specific to translation. This control mechanism
encompasses all dimensions of social, cultural, political, and economic life, and reflects a desire to transform people’s minds in order to guarantee the reproduction of a particular set of social and political norms on an individual basis. This perspective refers to a social engineering that transcends what is implied by the concepts of reform or modification, as the ultimate level of a state’s desire to impose order upon aspects of society that are perceived as being strategic by those who are in control of the state (see Introduction in, Scott 1998: 1-8).

These kinds of recurring incidents have served as barometers of freedom of expression in Turkey, and in turn brought attention to the importance of translators and the translation process and reignited the debate on the (in)visibility of the translator. However, mainstream literature on Translation Studies in Turkey and elsewhere appears to remain concentrated on translation theories and translation practice while omitting the essential role of the translator as an agent in the translation process.

TCK 301 is an article of the Turkish Penal Code, Law Number 5237, approved on September 26th, 2004. The first version of the article was in Book 2, Section 4, Chapter 3 under the heading “Crimes against the Symbols of Turkish Sovereignty and against the Dignity of the Turkish Governmental Institutions”, and under the title “insulting Turkishness, the Republic, and the State Institutions”. The article included the following items:\n
1) A person who publicly denigrates Turkishness, the Republic or the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, shall be punishable by imprisonment of between six months and three years.

2) A person who publicly denigrates the Government of the Republic of Turkey, the judicial institutions of the State, the military or security organizations shall be punishable by imprisonment of between six months and two years.

3) In cases where denigration of Turkishness is committed by a Turkish citizen who lives in another country, the punishment shall be increased by one third.

4) Expressions of thought intended to criticise shall not constitute a crime. A person who publicly denigrates Turkishness, the Republic or the Grand National

Assembly of Turkey shall be punishable by imprisonment of six months to three years.

The vagueness of the terms emphasised—*Turkishness, denigration, and criticism*—resulted in many controversial and sensational cases, and was criticised by many in both national and international public and legal circles. Newspapers and press organisations stated that the revised law remained so vague as to allow arbitrary court decisions and this, in turn, threaten the freedom of expression (Euractiv 2005). Until now, many eminent journalists, writers, academics, publishers, lawyers, and translators in Turkey were investigated and brought to trial because of this problematic article, as also discussed earlier in section 3.3.1.

The story of TCK 301 changed track after the prominent Armenian journalist Hrant Dink was prosecuted for insultsing Turkishness, received a six-month suspended sentence in 2006, and was assassinated by radical nationalists the following year. Following national and international protests against charges brought in trials of similar cases and Dink’s assassination, it became necessary to review the article. At the beginning of 2007, Cemil Çiçek, Minister of Justice, said that “Turkish Penal Code (TCK) Article 301 would be changed if necessary, but the issue was not a priority for the government”. Çiçek stressed that “while some people wanted Article 301 to remain, others wanted it abolished or amended”, adding that “people should openly share their views on the issue with the government”.

Among those wanting the article to remain was opposition party, the MHP (*Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi* – Nationalist Movement Party). Devlet Bahçeli, Chairman of the MHP, stated that “if this article were amended, those in some circles waiting for opportunities to insult Turkey's glorious history and the Turkish nation would be rewarded”. On the other hand, those who wanted it to be abolished or changed came from many walks of life. Haluk Şahin, a journalist, wrote that agents of the TCK 301 issue primarily consisted of those directly affected by it, i.e. those such as writers, journalists, artists, academics, publishers and

---

4 “Article 301 could be changed, but it's not a priority justice minister”, 30 January 2007, Info - Prod Research (Middle East), [http://search.proquest.com/docview/457460781?accountid=7181](http://search.proquest.com/docview/457460781?accountid=7181), retrieved on 13/02/2011.

translators, who make their living by producing and expressing their ideas. According to Şahin, these groups should have been given special privileges in the review of TCK 301 (Şahin 2007).

In April 2008, the Turkish Parliament passed an amendment bill to TCK Article 301, under which the term "Turkishness" was replaced by the "Turkish nation", and "Republic" by “State of the Republic of Turkey”6, but the remit of the clause remained unaltered. Although Pelin Gündeş Bakır, MP for Kayseri in the Turkish government, stated that “the mentioned revision decreased the number of cases by 97%” and “nobody is now being prosecuted according to TCK 301”, the mentioned minor changes seem to retain the same potential for controversy and failed to satisfy either the European Council or relevant non-governmental organisations (Durmaz 2013). Translators, whose experiences with TCK 301 are the main subject of this section, were among the dissatisfied. In the following paragraphs, the reasons for their discontent will be discussed.

The vague content of TCK 301 and its implementation by elements of the Turkish legal body gave rise to some peculiar results: for example, long-dead Russian classical writer Dostoyevsky was put on trial for “insulting Turkishness”. This and few more examples will not only demonstrate the bizarre nature and mechanical application of the code, but will also give the opportunity to analyse the corresponding reactions of Turkish translators to the issue.

Dostoyevsky completed his novel *The Brothers Karamozov* in 1880 and died the next year. In this novel, one of his characters tells the story of a Slavic insurrection against the Ottoman Empire, during which, according to the character, Turks and Circassians committed violent acts against the Bulgarian people, especially women and children.7 What is interesting about the book has nothing to do with the story of the character, but the book’s adventure in Turkey: In Dilek Şanlı’s report, she states that of the twelve publishers who published the Turkish translation of *The Brothers Karamozov*, ten censored the


character’s story about the Turks, either by omitting the whole part or replacing the word “Turks” with the word “Circassians” or “these men”.8

Two main points in this case are crucial; firstly, it is legally possible that TCK 301 can bring to court the ideas of a dead foreign writer. Since the writer does not exist, the crime can and, in fact, often is attributed to the translator and the publisher of the book. If the ideas in the published book insult Turkishness, those who distribute it are liable for prosecution.

Similar in nature is the case of Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Harman. Their book Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media (1988), was edited by Ömer F. Kurhan and Taylan Tosun, translated by Ender Abadoğlu and published by Fatih Taş, Aram Publishing [as Rizanın İmalattı: Kitle Medyasının Ekonomi Politiği (2006)], and led to the prosecution of the writers, editors, translator and publisher for “insulting Turkishness”. All were about to be imprisoned for terms of one to six a half to six years, when the court finally decided that “they are not responsible for the ideas of a writer who is abroad9”. The publisher declared in the court that “the prosecution itself became the punishment”10. It was possible for the Turkish individuals to be set free only after Noam Chomsky, the book’s co-author, came to Turkey, was prosecuted and set free11.

The increasing number of trials involving publishers and translators in Turkey motivated the related professional organisations to intervene. “The Translators’ Union”, “PEN Turkey”, “The Writers Syndicate of Turkey”, “The Publishers Union of Turkey” and “The Professional Union of Publishers” made a joint declaration in 2006 entitled “A translator cannot be blamed for his mission”, and declared that “prosecutions under Article TCK 301, although they generally culminated in no charges being brought, aimed at creating a general climate of moral oppression resulting in self-censorship by authors and translators”. They proposed an amendment to the related article so that translators would

8 ibid.
10 ibid.
not be considered as “the owners of the work” and therefore, freed from any condemnations thereof” (Hamsici 2006).

The legal process against freedom of thought and expression in Turkey is not limited to TCK 301. Although writers, journalists, academics, artists, publishers and translators can defend themselves by denying any responsibility for the original work, the fact remains that besides TCK 301, there exist several other articles in the Turkish Penal Code such as Copyright Law, Press Law and so forth which can trigger the prosecution of individuals who express their thoughts, making it understood that once the political authorities aim to disturb intellectual peace, it is difficult to counteract. In this respect, rather than concentrating on individual circumstances, the established logic of government and control needs to be considered as an important patronage mechanism.

**Conclusion**

This chapter was an attempt to put forward the historical development of the field of translation in Turkey in line with the Bourdieusian perspective. In the first sections particularly, which refer to the political establishment’s perception of translation as a social and cultural engineering tool, I have tried to demonstrate that, in the event of ideals and outcomes being severed from the processes and structures that generated them, then, one day, another power holder could utilise the same mechanisms to reach its desired outcomes.

In Turkey’s translation field, the hyper-centralised nature of general government and the establishment of its respective structures has made it possible for the power holder to decide which shape the field should take. It was easy for the Democrat Party government to change the trajectory of the *Tercüme Bürrosu*, since the working practice and institutional structure established by the Kemalist elites allowed to do it so.

This chapter then tried to outline the main institutions and individuals that have made the translation field what it is today. It is upon this familiarity that readers should evaluate insiders’ perspectives in the chapter to follow.
Chapter 4: The Field Study

Introduction

As noted in the introduction, this study has attempted to analyse the field of translation in Turkey through an examination of the socio-economic and politico-cultural factors that impact on translators and translation as a process. This investigation was constructed on the basis of elaborating on how the (dis)positions of both can be studied in a contemporary context and, from this, indirectly extrapolating the perceived influence of control factors, all the while using and adapting a Bourdieusian perspective to uncover multi-layered and multidimensional aspects of translation.

Towards achieving this, in the first chapter, a sociological approach to translation studies was prioritised over traditional, linguistics-oriented approaches, following a critical engagement with the historical evolution of translation theories and contemporary approaches. This was followed in the second chapter by a presentation of the historical development of the field of translation studies. Informed by Bourdieu’s emphasis on the historical trajectory of the social space being decisive over its specific shape\(^{12}\), Chapter 3 served to demonstrate the old Empire’s and newly-founded Republic’s engagement with translation as part of attempts at cultural engineering. In this respect, Chapter 3 could be considered as a bridge between the historical study of translation activity and the current situation referring to translation and translators. It is in this chapter that the topography of the field of translation in Turkey has been set out through perspectives of the institutions, discourses, and individuals in order to clarify the basis on which the interviewees comment in the current chapter.

To put it in other words, the whole study is a Bourdieusian analysis. Bourdieu provides us with a level of analysis and certain analytical concepts and tools (i.e. field, capital, habitus, field of power, doxa, and so forth) to conduct such an analysis. It is neither a theory nor a hypothesis. Simply, it is an analytical suggestion.

\(^{12}\) See Chapter 2.
On the other hand, Lefevere's patronage is a theory (although he never named it as such) with some hypotheses. These hypotheses (one by one or altogether) are to be confirmed or rejected upon analysis in different contexts.

In this respect, Chapter 4 is the ground where, looking through the Bourdieusian lens, Lefevere's patronage is discovered in the context of translation scene in Turkey. In many instances in the current chapter, there are bold references to Bourdieu and sections where the study will show how Bourdieu's and Lefevere's concepts complement each other, or at least are in a harmony.

Once again, this chapter presents the findings of the study based on interviews conducted with the primary respondents in the study and the interpretation of the results, which it is hoped will shed light on the research topics identified in the introductory chapter:

- The extent to which socio-economic and cultural conditions can be seen to impact on translational behaviour.

- Possible shifts or breaks in translational culture during periods marked by dramatic socio-political change, i.e. the foundation of the Republic, military interventions, transition to multi-party regime, the end of the Cold War, and so forth.

- The extent to which translational behaviour depends on the configuration of different types of capital that a translator holds.

- The extent to which translational dispositions are independent from the dominant ideology in power.

- The variables that influence translators in adopting a specific translation strategy.

- The variables that influence the selection of titles by publishers and translators.

As further clarified in the Introduction, the intention was to go beyond descriptions, and with this in mind, a qualitative research strategy was adopted throughout the whole study. The motivation has been understanding (Verstehen) in the sociological sense, rather than explaining (Erklären). In other words, this study has attempted “to document the world from the point of view of the people studied” (Hammersley 1992: 165) and thus, has given priority to meaning over behaviour. Towards this end, the main research method has been
in-depth interviews, as they provide the best environment for participants to project their very own vision of the specifics of the field in which they operate.

One important aspect of in-depth interviews is the sampling strategy for participants, as it is a key factor in determining success of the research\textsuperscript{13}. For many, and especially quantitative researchers, sampling is about representation, as they claim their research to be representative, value-free, objective, and abstract (Silverman 2000: 2). However, in studies like the one proposed here, where the main motivation is understanding, sampling becomes a strategy “about with whom, where and how to do your research” (Palys 2008: 697). As the proposed study has borrowed from the particular field approach developed by Bourdieu, where fields are characterised by struggle and some agents are believed to be more powerful than others due to their particular accumulation of capitals, a mixed purposive sampling method was adopted in order to understand as many as possible of the different aspects of the field of translation in Turkey.

With regards to this specific method of sampling, Robson (2002: 265) notes that “[t]he principle of selection in purposive sampling is the researcher’s judgement as to typicality or interest. A sample is built up which enables the researcher to satisfy her specific needs in a project. (…) The rationale of such an approach is very different from statistical generalization from sample to population.”

Similarly, in the words of Sarantakos (2005: 164), “[i]n this technique the researchers purposely choose subjects who, in their opinion, are relevant to the project. The choice of respondents is guided by the judgement of the investigator. For this reason it is also known as judgemental sampling. (…) In such cases the important criterion of choice is the knowledge and expertise of the respondents, and hence their suitability for the study.”

With regards to the kinds of purposive alternatives, Palys (2008: 697-698) lists the following: stakeholder sampling, extreme or deviant case sampling, typical case sampling, paradigmatic case sampling, maximum variation sampling, criterion sampling, theory-guided sampling, critical case sampling, disconforming or negative case sampling. However, existentially, purposive sampling could not be limited to the above mentioned.

\textsuperscript{13} See Appendix 3: Demographics of the Interviewees and Selection Criteri(a)on.
As Palys himself notes too, since “there are many objectives that qualitative researchers might have, the list of purposive strategies that may be followed is virtually endless, and any given list will reflect only the range of situations the author of that list has considered” (2008: 687).

Since the study has attempted to understand the field dynamics, the selection of more experienced and more knowledgeable participants was essential as they may provide a better understanding of the structure—*stakeholder sampling*\(^{14}\) and *expert sampling*. Additionally, in a context where the study has attempted to re-establish the link between agency and structure, the political and legal levels needed to be carefully examined, as in Turkey translators are often confronted with prosecutions. Hence arose the necessity for the participation in the study of translators who have been prosecuted—*criterion sampling*\(^{15}\). On the other hand, it was also important to try to identify possible protected domains, to see if there are exceptions or variations, such as translators with very high accumulation of symbolic capital—*extreme or deviant case sampling*\(^{16}\).

Confidentiality was essential in order to provide a secure environment for participants to fully reflect themselves. Towards this end, a confidentiality form was presented to participants at the beginning of interviews, and signed by both interviewer and participant prior to starting.

The thematic structure of the in-depth interviews was established as follows:

1) The determination and observation of material, cultural, social and political belongings;
2) Entry to the world of personal, cultural, and professional values through examples concerning the field of translation in Turkey;
3) Grasping the social, cultural and economic bases of attitudes by current events and experiences;

\(^{14}\) Particularly useful in the context of evaluating research and policy analysis, this strategy involves identifying who the major stakeholders are who are involved in designing, giving, receiving, or administering the program or service being evaluated, or who might otherwise be affected by it. (Palys 2008: 697)

\(^{15}\) This involves searching for cases or individuals who meet a certain criterion. (ibid.)

\(^{16}\) Sometimes extreme cases are of interest because they represent the purest or most clear-cut instance of a phenomenon researchers are interested in. (ibid.)
4) Tracking how the habitus of translators reflects not only on professional attitudes and behaviour, but also on daily life, and how it is reproduced in daily life.

Fifteen of the interviews were face-to-face, with one conducted over the telephone.

The interviews aimed for active dialogue and interaction between participant and interviewer, which was successfully accomplished, with no instances of problems or resistance arising from either interviewer or participant. As such, interviews revealed details of personal (private) and professional lives, critical experiences, defining encounters and moments, breaking points, discussions, and opinion-based arguments.

The purpose throughout was to engage the participants as deeply as possible, in order to:

a) Understand the dynamics of the field of translation;

b) Critically assess the translator as an actor in relation to other actors in the field;

c) Determine the extent to which different types of capital are influential in shaping a habitus;

d) Analyse the close-knit two-way relationship between the habitus of translators and the field of translation.

The purpose of engaging the participants as much as possible was supported by the semi-structured nature of the interviews. Rather than asking direct questions that would frame and thus limit the engagement of the participants, the below themes that refer to power structures within the field were mentioned and used to trigger dialogue:

- Where does translation activity start for the translator and where does it end?

- Who decides on deadlines? Does a translator ever have a say in this?

- In countries like Turkey, where regulations are intentionally vague, is self-censorship by translators a necessity?

- Why have you chosen to translate this (specific) book? To what extent does the end product reflect your initial goals, your sensitivities? How was this possible/not possible?
- Why have you chosen to work with this (specific) publishing house?
- Why have you chosen to be a translator?
- Do you consider anything as a mistake in your career? If you had a chance to go back, would you act differently?
- What do you consider the critic’s role to be in translation activity?

In a context—in-depth interviews—where data analysis mainly depended upon discourse analysis, it was important to not misinterpret the verbal material provided by the participants. This is why all the interviews have been recorded, transcribed, and finally, partially translated for discussion purposes.

Thereafter, a thematic analysis was applied to the interview material using an exploratory content-driven approach—as opposed to a confirmatory hypothesis-driven one. This was also in line with the purposive sampling strategy adopted. In this respect, key themes in the data have been identified. Practical codes referring to key concepts by Bourdieu and Lefevere (i.e. field, capital, habitus; ideological patronage, economic patronage, status) have been used to categorise themes, and later on, to determine the correspondences between the identified themes.

Below, first of all, the themes will be presented in no particular order. Thereafter, an interpretative analysis of the themes will be presented.

4.1 Quality of Translation in Turkey and Attributes of Qualified Translators

Most interviewees relate to the theme of quality of translation in Turkey, provide their criticisms on the subject and share their observations and opinions on the attributes that qualified translators need to produce translations of good quality.

Most interviewees who relate to this theme evaluate it as relatively low at the present time, and certainly below the level that it should and could be. Their explanations about possible reasons for this vary and include; lack of efficient quality control mechanisms in
publishing houses, absence of effective translation reviews, lack of demand for quality among readers and low payments to translators.

For instance, interviewee 12 notes that “there are no translation-related control mechanisms in Turkey” and reports that “supervision of the quality of the translation works should be primarily organised by the publishing houses in cooperation with the translation associations”. He observes that the issue of quality is important to some publishers in Turkey, but does not matter at all to some others.

He is convinced that “even works of well-known translators who have proven themselves” should be supervised before their works are printed and published. On the other hand, he notes that “it is questionable whether the publishers’ editors are competent enough” to supervise the works of the translators, and that most often, “their level of knowledge may be inferior to that of the translators”. Nevertheless, he believes that editors and translators should “conduct mutual discussions so that the editing work becomes more effective and cooperative”.

On the topic of “questionability of competence among publishers’ editors” in the quality evaluation process for translation works, interviewee 3 notes that “there are only a few publishing houses where the editors master a foreign language” and therefore, “they make many mistakes regarding choice of the right translators”. She indicates that due to this, “there are many unqualified translation works on the translation market” in Turkey.

Interviewee 1 is also convinced that the quality of the translation works in Turkey is low currently and indicates that her husband, who is also a translator, “does not read books that are translated into Turkish anymore” due to “the low quality of most translations”. She notes that “anyone who speaks a foreign language” is employed as a translator by the translation agencies in Turkey.

Interviewee 4 adds academics and translation reviews to the equation and notes:

For undergraduate studies in university, a modular system should be adopted, a good infrastructure should be provided and a lot of practice done. The academics should step in... Many translation works in the market are so poor... Translation
reviews and self-reflective criticisms are needed [in order] to raise the quality [of translation in Turkey].

In order to ensure high quality for translation works in Turkey, interviewee 9 reminds us of the readers’ role, and she blames their lack of demands for quality. She indicates that “the quality of translations, like all other products and services, is a matter of supply and demand” and further explains:

In Turkey, if an important [football] game is not news in a newspaper the day after [the game], readers leave a black wreath at the door of [that] newspaper… However, I have yet to witness a similar reaction [shown by the readers] towards a publishing house which published a bad translation.

As long as there is no demand by the readers for high quality, the publishing houses will not look for it. Why would they spend fifty cents for a work that can be done at five cents? Certainly, this leads to much leakage and wastage on the way. This is [also one of the reasons] why the translators [in Turkey] cannot be gathered under one roof. The publishing houses do not stipulate that translators who are not members of certain associations cannot perform translation works. [As a result of this] everyone says that s/he can do translation...

I examine from time to time the translations on foreign TV series or in the movies and [I observe that] people who know foreign languages at secondary school level do these translations and they make inconceivable mistakes. Would you laugh or would you cry?... I encounter similar [phenomena] with [translated] books as well.

In a similar way, interviewee 5 also places emphasis on the readers’ role and notes:

Reading rates in Turkey are increasing; however, this does not mean that the quality of the books or of the translations is increasing... Usually, there is much ideology that interferes with the scene: what [kind of books] do [Turkish] readers read? The fact that book sales have increased [in the country] does not necessarily mean that the quality has increased.
In relation to the quality issue, interviewee 15 underlines the significance of the translators’ ethics in this field:

Some [Turkish] translators are arrogant… They underestimate the readers and they perform translations at primary school level or they skip some parts by thinking that the readers will not understand [anyway]… For qualified translators, not only good professional qualities are necessary, but also ethical qualities are essential.

However, for the development of professional ethics, a profession must be organised; if a profession is unorganised, it will be difficult to organise its professional ethics. Therefore, as long as the profession of translation is not organised well in Turkey, we will continue to experience these types of [quality] problems.

Ethical problems are relatively few in the field of conference interpreting because we have a strong professional organisation there; this is a field in which only a limited number of translators are involved and thus, it is easier to ensure the ethics. There are also people who are engaged in conference interpreting and are not members of our professional association. However, as our professional association gains more influence, even those [who are not members of it] are compelled to pay attention to this issue. A similar process has just started for the written translation field, but it is relatively new.

The role of low translation fees is stressed by interviewee 1 with regard to the quality problems. She notes that “even publishing houses having a relatively high level of quality” sometimes publish translations that are “unreadable” and “people who cannot translate do translation”. She is convinced that “because publishers pay such low rates for translation work, the quality of resulting products is very low”.

Interviewee 15 also refers to the same underlying problem and notes:

The publishers give the translators only a small percentage [of sales] in order to make a lot of money themselves… [Due to this,] translators have appropriate strategies too and they prefer to do a lot of “easy” translation work. Otherwise, they
invest much time, but once the [translated] books get published, they get easily forgotten… Thus, the translators do not earn [enough] money… This vicious circle decreases the quality of translators in Turkey [as well as the quality of their translations].

As we see, various issues are mentioned by the interviewees as possible reasons for the quality problems of translation works in Turkey. Nonetheless, there is a remarkable consensus among the interviewees with regard to significance of the translators’ attributes as having a direct effect on quality.

Among the attributes that qualified translators should have, writing and authorship skills are widely mentioned by the interviewees. Interviewee 1 explains:

> Literary translation requires a little authorship. Even if the translator is not an author himself/ herself, s/he should have at least some tendency towards it. If I am trying to translate an author’s book, then I should transfer his/her ideas and his language. What needs to be done [then], in my opinion, is to reflect the author, his/her life and the period that s/he lived in… If you know his/her other books and the way s/he writes, then you can reflect [the author in a better way] in your translation [work].

Interviewee 7 also reports that in literary translations, the translators “who can write with a literary orientation” and “who are experienced in writing” would be more successful. She highlights that translators should “play with the language” and “embrace the author”; moreover, she adds that “translators who have merely a technical orientation would fail to carry out literary translations”. In her opinion, a translator who knows much about the author “would internalise him/her better” and therefore, “would be able to express him/her more easily and correctly” when translating.

In the opinion of interviewee 8, writing skills are indeed among the most important skills for a translator. In her words:

> Translators bear important responsibilities and this profession requires many skills such as decision-making, writing and literacy knowledge, text rendering knowledge
and more… A translator is actually a writer; s/he is not necessarily a novelist, but [certainly] a text writer in the particular field… S/he cannot perform his/her work without having text knowledge [and writing skills].

Interviewee 5 also places emphasis on writing skills and indicates:

It is important that the translator’s language and style address the reader. Recently, I tried to read a [translated] book, but I couldn’t, so I put it aside… When you are reading a well-translated book, you should not be thinking that it is a translation. The book could include foreign elements, but reading it should be easy and smooth…

In a similar way, writing and authorship skills are attributes to which much importance is attached by interviewee 9. She underlines:

All of us speak Turkish fluently. But how many of us become novelists, poets or storytellers? In the same way, you can have full command of a foreign language, but you may not be able to do translation… Unfortunately, I have had instances of this with painful experiences… For this reason, translators must have “the fabric” of an author.

She explains further:

The new generation speaks [the Turkish language] with a very limited vocabulary due to cultural imperialism, forces from the countryside [who have moved to the big cities] and the faith powers… Compared to Latin-based languages, Turkish language has [already a] more limited vocabulary and the new generation [in Turkey] uses even a more limited vocabulary, probably around five-hundred words.

She integrates her points into the big picture:

If you do a technical or scientific translation and your aim is to transfer a scientific issue or if you translate a doctrine, a message or a medicine prospectus, then you can try to simplify [the vocabulary of] the sentences. But when doing a literary
translation, you must [stay loyal to the] author’s style and transfer [sometimes] one sentence of two-and-a-half pages [using a rich vocabulary]. If you divide it, it is disrespectful to the author as well as to the reader. [Such an attempt] would also be disrespectful to the mission of ensuring communication between different languages, which is the main task of the translation profession...

[Therefore,] In the same way a “b” key would be transposed to a “g” key in music, the translator’s task is to turn what is written in a “b” key into a “g” key, still keeping the same timbre.

Obviously, interviewee 9 not only considers authorship skill as a necessary attribute of a qualified translator; but as can be seen from her metaphor, she also conceives creativity as a significant determinant of an eligible translation, which, for her, is a creative craft, like music. She considers translation as a process of achieving similar effects in an act that is greater than the sum of its constituent parts.

Interviewee 15 also considers translation a creative process and “art”. From his perspective, the analogy of “artwork” is closely related to writing and authorship skills. In his words:

In a literary translation, you translate a literary work, which is an “artwork”. This is different from translating a plain text. What makes it an “artwork” is not only the story that is told. You can tell a story in sociology or in other areas too. But there, you tell a story with an artistic content [and style]. You must be able to use both languages at the same artistic and literary levels. This [skill] is not required when you translate a history book, where it is sufficient to translate the grammar correctly and the words, but it is not enough when translating literary works…

[By implication,] a person who does not have creative skills should not perform literary translation. The criteria [used] to evaluate the quality of a literary translation are different [from those used to evaluate technical translations]; a literary translation does not have one single correct translation. Each translation is the product of its performer’s perceptions and interpretations, and is obtained according to his/her ability to use the language [creatively]. The same [literary]
work can be translated by two different translators in equally accurate ways, but their translations would be different from each other.

Some texts are complicated and the author uses the language in [unusual] ways, going out of the classical [linguistic] uses and making innovations. When transferring these to your own language, you must also make innovations in your own language [almost] at the same level. In this sense, capabilities different from [those required] for classical translation are required [for literary translation].

Likewise in poetry [translation]; translators who do not have the ability to use poetic language and to write poetry should not engage in it. A person who is able to perform [the above-mentioned creative activities] in literary translation is a potential author; s/he might not be as good as the author of the book [that s/he translates], but s/he should capture a level that is close to it.

Besides creativity, writing and authorship skills, some interviewees accentuate the importance of an excellent command of the languages the translator uses and knowledge of the cultures and literatures related to these languages. For instance, interviewee 6 states that “a good translator must have an excellent command of the foreign language that/he uses in the translation work”, “s/he must have lived in and experienced the relevant foreign culture so that s/he can fully grasp that culture’s past and present with all of its social and political occurrences”, “s/he must have strong foundations in the sociological, cultural and historical aspects of the language to be translated”. He underlines that “if s/he has deficiencies in these areas, s/he must complete them during the translation process”.

Interviewee 12 defines a qualified translator as a translator “who translates literary works accurately into Turkish” and “who knows both languages well”, especially “in his/her field of expertise”. He explains these points as follows:

The [scope of the] work to be translated and the translator’s field [of expertise] must overlap… Not every translator can translate every topic; for instance, if I receive a translation work in [the field of] chemistry, I cannot do it. Only a translator who has a good command of the [terminology of the particular] field should do the [related] translation. In literary translations, s/he must also have
sufficient knowledge of the literature to which the work belongs… Most importantly, s/he must know how to use the [target] language properly.

Other interviewees place emphasis on the translator’s knowledge of the particular author and period in which s/he lived as an essential positive attribute. For instance, interviewee 3 clearly states that a qualified translator must have good knowledge “of the author that s/he translates” and “about the period in which that author lived”. She also notes that the translator must understand “the reason for which the book is being translated” and “why the translation work was particularly given to him/her”.

Interviewee 3 indicates that a qualified translator “must have literary sensitivity both in written and verbal translations and s/he “must have internalised all the methods”. She notes that “the translators who were considered as qualified some thirty years ago cannot be classified as qualified today”. She explains that “it is impossible to do translation using pen and paper anymore”, especially in the fields of technical expertise. She observes that “competent computerised translations are ever more ranked at the top” and that “colleagues who master translations of media and the internet are considered the most proficient translators nowadays”.

The interviewees report differing views regarding the significance of formal education in translation studies as an attribute of a qualified translator and whether it has an effect on quality of translations in Turkey.

There are a few interviewees who are convinced that formal translation studies education is not a requirement in order to count as a qualified translator and that innate talent is more important. Interviewee 13 clarifies this perspective as follows:

Translation is a matter of talent. Even if you teach theories [of translation] to someone who is not talented [as a translator], it will not help. You cannot “create” a translator from someone who was not “born as a translator” because translation is not something that you can do just by learning theories… [Besides natural talent,] you must [also] establish special connections with the work that you translate, read a lot and have an excellent command of the terminology of the particular field that you translate…
Interviewee 15 also presents a similar approach: he is convinced that a person “does not have to be a graduate of translation studies in order to be a qualified translator” and he adds that “I myself am not a graduate of translation studies neither” because “in my generation, the departments of translation studies had not yet been established in Turkey”.

He states that “qualified translators must master the languages of the source and of the target texts”. Here, he introduces the distinction between passive and active languages, explaining that “the passive language is the language in which a translator cannot express himself/herself at mother tongue level, but s/he can understand it perfectly”. He notes that “a qualified translator must master passive language not only in the academic sense, but also with its living culture and environment”, “s/he must also have a good command of his/her own language” and “particularly for literary works, s/he must know well the history of the period in which the book was written, the language’s structure and the lives of people during that period”. Thus, interviewee 15 considers the translator’s general knowledge as essential.

Interviewee 3 explains that a formal educational background is not a required attribute of a qualified translator; however, she underlines that it is indeed a valuable one. She states:

A formal educational background in translation studies is not a requirement [in order] to be a good translator… The field of translation is not like the field of medicine, where one cannot work if one does not have the relevant educational background and diplomas. Therefore, even if a person did not receive formal translation studies education, s/he can still work in translation.

However, as a faculty member of Translation Studies, I can say that it is indeed very valuable to receive formal education under an institutional framework in verbal and written translations, and in the fields of technical expertise. Even those students who are [innately] qualified in translation improve their qualifications [significantly] during their formal education.

On the other hand, interviewee 1 considers formal education in translation studies strictly necessary in order to be a qualified translator. She relates to the significance of formal
education in the field, stating that “the quality problem in the field and many other problems emanate from the low quality of translation studies education in Turkey”. She explains that “in Western countries, the situation is different” because “translators have to pass many exams in order to receive the title of “translator”.

4.2 Quality of Translation Studies Education in Turkey

Most interviewees relate to the theme of quality of translation studies education in Turkey and share their knowledge, experiences and observations, as well as providing their opinions and criticisms on related issues.

Participants who are academics provide information about translation studies in their own universities as well as sharing their observations of other universities in Turkey.

Interviewee 2 explains that the undergraduate translation studies programme in Turkey is usually four years and that in her university and in several others, there is also an initial language preparatory class for those who cannot pass the language proficiency exam. She notes that in the preparatory class, students are given courses in reading, writing and speaking so that at the end of the preparatory year they can pass the language proficiency exam and she explains that this procedure is in accordance with European Union criteria, which state that students must receive a minimum of a C1 level score in the language proficiency exam and only then can they receive a certificate of success to begin studies in their own field.

Regarding course layout, theories versus practice and the degree to which students are ready to enter the translation market when they graduate, she states that when the Department of Translation Studies was first established in their university, its curriculum was called a “setup programme”. However, the following year they changed this programme and replaced it with a higher number and a larger variety of both theoretical and practical courses. She remarks that while doing this, they thoroughly examined other systems used in universities internationally. She further explains that their students are given verbal, written and applied translation courses equally; moreover, they have courses related to different fields of expertise given by lecturers from different faculties such as
economics, tourism, engineering and others in order to help the students specialise in these areas.

For applied courses, she notes that due to their being a “new department in a state university with a limited budget”, their facilities and possibilities are limited. They have no simultaneous translation laboratory due to the high cost of relevant equipment, but she expresses her optimistic belief that in the near future, they will have better facilities. Currently, they work with recording devices for applied courses, projection devices and more efficient hyper recording instruments. Regarding theoretical courses; they rely on articles and books written by Turkish and foreign professors who publish their works abroad and they try to integrate this material with academic journals and translation reviews.

Regarding sufficiency and relevance of the infrastructure and equipment in the departments of translation studies in Turkey, interviewee 6 also critically notes that he wonders to what degree the libraries and the infrastructure of departments of translation studies are sufficiently rich in Turkey.

In the opinion of interviewee 5, “it is a must for translators to undergo formal translation studies university education”, and she provides her own elaborate description of translation studies education in Turkey in general and in her university in particular:

In recent years, around 65 to 75 new departments of translation studies have opened in various universities all around Turkey. However, there is a general concensus [in Turkey] that translation studies education is not really needed to do translation, which is a remarkable paradox. On one hand, there is a belief that anyone who has a good command of a foreign language can do translation, that s/he can teach the language s/he knows and that translation is not a real profession; on the other hand, every year [more and more] departments of translation studies open and among linguistic departments, they are the most popular with students.

At the same time, she notes that a new trend among universities in Turkey is to open departments where the language of instruction is English; for instance, departments of philosophy where the studies are in English. She thinks that this trend actually undermines
the existence of departments of translation studies because on the one hand, translation studies education is provided in universities; but on the other hand, education of other professions is also provided in English. She underlines:

Turkey is a country of conflicts and contradictions… Many meetings and reunions with the purpose of raising awareness take place in the departments of translation studies of [many] universities, but a lot of mistakes are made during those meetings… Those workshops are not useful… The academy [in Turkey] needs to create a broader perspective on the system of translation studies education and to question the ultimate purpose and the best path that will lead [us] there.

She continues by providing a particular guideline for the future:

Universities such as Bilkent University and Yeditepe University have departments of translation studies where another language—usually French or German—in addition to English language is provided. Therefore, students graduating from these departments become bilingual translators. The Board of Higher Education publishes these departments on its official website too. The quality of these departments which produce bilingual translators is relatively high and probably, this could be the right direction for the Turkish translation education system in the future.

When it comes to the students’ levels and their awareness regarding the field of translation, she clarifies the following points:

For the last few years, we have been receiving 45 new students every academic year and due to this high number of students, it is impossible to take care of them fully anymore or to increase their language levels and their professional knowledge… Usually, their language levels are extremely low when they start their studies in the university. For this reason, we decided to add a language preparatory year… [During their studies,] They learn the essence of being a translator and each student makes progress according to his/her own level of motivation.
However, when graduating from the university after their fourth year, most of them are worried about how they will make money from this profession; they are convinced that they should start to work in an international/multinational company in order to make a career and to sustain themselves… Here again, the importance is attached mainly to the knowledge of a foreign language rather than to the profession of translation and this phenomenon holds true even for those students who choose consciously to study translation studies at the beginning [of their studies].

Also referring to the issue of the students’ levels and their awareness regarding the field of translation, interviewee 2 states that many students applying to study translation studies do not really have an awareness of the field and they do not really care which particular field they study as long as they study English as a foreign language; so, whether the field is English literature, English teaching or translation studies does not matter to them.

However, she has noticed that recently, and especially since 2006, most of their students consciously choose to study translation studies, and if their scores are not high enough to be accepted by famous and large universities such as Bosphorus University or Hacettepe University, then they end up in Trakya University - where she is a lecturer - because these students really choose the field and not the university. Therefore, interviewee 2 reports a noticeable increase in the students’ awareness during recent years regarding the field of translation studies.

Interviewee 3 emphasises that most students gain a higher awareness of and interest in the field only after they start their studies:

The truth is that most students do not have a high level of awareness when they first start to study translation… But I am not looking at the picture in a pessimistic way because even those students who do not have the necessary awareness in the beginning gain it after their second or third year in the university and after they grasp this profession in a better way, they also begin to love and embrace it… After they start work [in the sector] outside and earn money, they become even more enthusiastic…
In this regard, she reminds us of the role of the academics and instructors in Translation Studies:

The first question I ask my students in the first lesson is “*Do you work in translation? Have you ever done a translation in a field of technical expertise?*”… In this way, I check whether students have any real knowledge of the field… Usually, the answers are unsatisfactory… Our duties [as instructors of translation studies] are to teach them to work in the market outside, to do translation in the sector, to execute [translation] projects, to accomplish terminology works, to manage team work, to determine schedules and deadlines, to manage time and the like…

Similarly, interviewee 7 observes that most students do not have a high level of awareness when they start to study translation and blames the “Turkish university entrance system” for the fact that students who are not accepted in their preferred departments are compelled to study in other departments and therefore, many students in the departments of translation studies actually get there randomly and not necessarily because they wanted to study translation.

On the other hand, as can be seen from the above, she also observes that even those students who reach departments of translation studies randomly embrace their field quite quickly. In her words:

I always ask the students in their freshman year whether their coming to the department was a conscious choice. Unfortunately, most of them are not [necessarily] there because they wanted to study translation. But after their first year, they start to do [translations], earn money, see the market and feel more connected to it…

Another who blames the “Turkish university entrance system” is interviewee 14. But she also notes the importance and the role of “qualified” educators of translation studies in transforming the students into “qualified” translators. She provides a detailed explanation:
Students come to departments of Translation Studies through completely false prior acceptances and with incorrect prior knowledge because of the workings of the [Turkish] university entrance exam... Most students have in their minds only simultaneous translation when thinking about studying translation. But even though the students do not come to the departments with the right consciousness, they come with eagerness and love [for the translation profession]...

Among educators [in the field of translation] there are people who have never done translation in their lives, but there are also others who do translation in the sector, know the market and its conditions... The number of the lecturers [in Turkey] who can really help create professional translators is low... [On the other hand,] Translation educators who know the real conditions of the market can be divided into two [categories]: those who are application-oriented and who are not interested in theories and those who are only interested in theories. I think both are erroneous approaches... Translation educators must have knowledge in theories as well as in applications and they must have knowledge, experience and observations. Even if students come to departments [of translation studies] with incorrect prior knowledge, such [qualified] educators are able to change that...

However, even with good educators, it is impossible to transform a student into a qualified translator in four years [of education]. On the other hand, it is certainly better than those who have no [formal] education [in translation] at all, but aspire to be translators just because they are literature enthusiasts or because they know a foreign language... These facts need to be known by the students as well as by the publishers so that necessary guidance is provided [to students]. Here, cooperation between universities and publishing houses becomes essential...”

In a similar way, considering the Turkish university entrance system as ineffective and inefficient in the selection and placement of the right students into the right departments, interviewee 15 suggests a solution that is similar to the one applied in the selection of the students for conference interpreting:

Probably, a special quest for selection of students for departments of translation studies is needed... We have been able to create this specifically for conference
interpreting where we provide education for graduate degree and accept students using a special entrance exam. This way, we are able to select and educate those students who have dispositions [to conference interpreting] from Bosphorus University and Bilkent University. Similar exams should be required for written translation as well; the students’ levels of grammar and their dispositions to written translation, their ability to write properly and to express themselves in their mother tongues together with their levels of “translational intelligence” should be identified... By “translational intelligence”, I mean the ability to communicate, a desire to understand [a text] and to transfer it [into another language] and the passion to do translation.

Interviewee 16 also observes that many students do not have a great awareness when they choose to study translation studies in university and because of this they do not achieve much until their first and second years. However, in her opinion, when they reach their third and fourth years, they become more conscious, start to work in translation projects and get involved in the field. She notes:

I was a lecturer in Turkish-French translation. The students’ level of French was very low and they had real difficulties. They could barely translate casual texts or daily newspaper news… Usually, students [become more competent and] start contacts with publishing houses after their third or fourth years…

Another problematic aspect of translation studies education in Turkey referred to time and again by the interviewees is the disconnection between students’ academic training and the sector, and the lack of a practical link to the field in general.

For instance, interviewee 15 does not consider the process of the establishment of departments of translation studies in Turkey as “serious” because he believes that the lectures should be given by “professional translators” and “a more practical education should be provided” to the students. He notes that, in Turkey, there are more than fifty departments of translation studies in various universities, only a few of which were founded by professional translators:
Probably, [every] translator does not have to be a graduate of translation studies, but translation *can* be taught… However, the people who teach translation [in the universities] should be professional translators and should have practical experience [in the field]…

He continues by underlining that “products created by the academic world of translation in Turkey” are totally disconnected from the real needs of the sector:

Translation students should be provided with an education in line with the sector’s needs. [In Turkey], There are about 53 departments of translation studies in different universities and every year, around 1,500 students graduate from these [departments]. [When we consider the fact that] there are only 6,000 conference interpreters in the world, including Turkey, [we can deduce that] with our 1,500 graduates every year, we produce [potentially] one-third of the world’s conference interpreters [every year]. Of course, this is ridiculous and there is no such [sectoral] need…

In a similar way, interviewee 1 exposes the disconnection between the academic training offered and the sector in many respects, including content-related quality requirements, by mentioning that “when new graduates perform translation works, their translations are incomprehensible” and that “quality of translations in Turkey is progressively declining” because “students receive no practical education in university”. She remarks that, in the past, departments of translation studies provided various courses in expertise and in technical fields, but those are not provided anymore. She comments that “the entire curriculum must be revised” in universities in Turkey.

Interviewee 16 too observes a similar phenomenon and notes:

In Turkey, university departments of translation studies and the real sector outside are totally disconnected from each other. There is an urgent need to bring these two worlds closer to each other, by inviting people from the sector to the universities for lectures and conferences. This is not common practice yet in most of the universities in Turkey…
Interviewee 8 also relates to the quality of translation studies education in Turkey, placing special emphasis on the connection that the academic world of translation studies should keep pace with the translation sector both nationally and internationally. She explains in detail:

For instance, the issue of localisation has been ignored all these years by the universities in Turkey. Localisation projects were mainly run by software engineers and programmers during the eighties. Translation departments in the universities, probably as a result of keeping the tradition of philology and linguistics, did not notice those developments… Departments of translation studies were established very late [in Turkey] and their connections with the sector [remained] weak. As a result, some of the important movements in the industry have been missed by academia…

Nowadays, departments of translation studies are trying to catch up with the dramatic developments and changes that have been taking place in the world of localisation. There is real progress in software and on a parallel with this, there are huge advancements in technology… Personally, I follow these developments and I find them very exciting… This is a non-stop sector, constantly undergoing major changes… While universities do capture something [from these sectoral changes], we should consider what [future changes] we will encounter so that we can make the necessary programmes [already] and significantly contribute to the industry…

As one possible solution to this disconnection problem, interviewee 8 suggests more cooperation between the academic world and other players in the field, and especially with translation corporations:

One of the first important initiatives of “The Association of Translation Corporations”, which has been operating for the last few years in Turkey, was to cooperate with the translation departments of the universities and to help these departments to send their students for internships to translation corporations in the industry.
Every year we [the publishers] receive students for internships and some of them continue to work with us afterwards. This way, they have the opportunity to see the business in its various aspects and to learn the job. They encounter the realities of the business… In the past, students were traveling to other countries to study in exchange programmes. Now they can also travel for internships to [work in translation] companies. Thereby, they have the opportunity to see how international [translation] companies work… I think that it is very important, especially for [applied translation] students to do internships in [translation] companies abroad.

Some interviewees relate to the Turkish name Mütercim-Tercümanlık (Translation and Interpretation) given to departments of translation studies in the country and they criticise it severely. Interviewee 6 shares his view on this issue as follows:

There were translation activities during the period of [the former minister of education of the Turkish Republic] Hasan Ali Yücel, but the first academic organisation for languages and cultures is Istanbul University was established much later [with the departments of] French language and literature, English philology, Italian philology, language and history, Sinology, Hittitology and so forth… The department of translation studies was established [in Istanbul University] after 1982 when YÖK (Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu – the Higher Education Council) was founded… This department was named strangely as Mütercim-Tercümanlık (Translation and Interpretation)… I struggled to change this name to Çeviribilim (Translation Sciences), but I did not succeed…

Interviewee 15 also refers to this name critically and explains:

In Turkey, these departments are named Mütercim-Tercümanlık (Translation and Interpretation)… But this is a ridiculous name because these two words mean the same thing and this is not a correct adaptation of the field’s name [from foreign languages]. More suitable names would probably be “Written Translation” and “Verbal Translation”.

4.3 Translation Theories versus Practice
Interviewees who evaluated the importance of translation theories versus that of practice in the field report differing views regarding the importance of the theories, but a general consensus is salient when it comes to the importance of practice.

Interviewee 8 mentions that translation theories reflect the reality of this field very well and notes:

For instance, the *Skopos* theory of Hans Vermeer focuses on translation skills, research skills, text knowledge and text optimization. If departments of translation studies in universities can help to create these skills, then the result will be successful skilled translators... For instance, a person who did not develop his/her research skills cannot be a good candidate for translator, even if s/he knows the foreign language well.

Interviewee 10 also finds theories of translation necessary in broadening translators’ horizons, expanding their thoughts and perspectives, and helping them to approach their work differently. Notwithstanding this, she notes that she does not know any of the theories by heart and adds:

There are autodidacts [in the translation field] and people who studied it as a profession [in university]. But, [the works of] a person who does translation because s/he knows the language or of a person who had formal education are both open to questionability because what is important is the resulting product.

Interviewee 12 considers translation a science, but he thinks that it is an applied, practical field rather than a theoretical one; therefore, it cannot have too many rules except for a few general ones. But he is aware of the fact that translation is a major activity for every country in the world; thus, he finds that it natural and useful that particular theories regarding this activity are created and ideas developed. On the other hand, in his opinion, applications are more important than theories.

It’s remarkable that even those interviewees who favour translation theories make clear that theories are useful only as long as they are combined and supported with practice in the field. Interviewee 1 expresses her opinion on the topic as follows:
Translation theories are important because they can provide us with a larger perspective, lead our attention to particular points that we might not have thought of before and raise our awareness. All theories [of translation] affect our consciousness and different theories are applied to different texts according to particular purposes; but after all, we create our own theory… On the other hand, internships [for students of translation studies] are more important than the theories. When a translator encounters the working environment, [s/he] sees the reality of the working conditions for translators, the strict delivery times and the economic conditions.

Likewise, interviewee 7 clarifies that theories of translation can help the students’ minds to work in a more pragmatic way. She reports that when the students are told about “texts’ targets and functions” or “about the industry”, these make sense to them... But when they are told about “translating texts’ meanings”, they are confused about the significance of interpretation. In her opinion, as long as the theories are functional, they can help students to get a clearer understanding of the field. In her view, departments of translation studies in most universities in Turkey have largely avoided applications/practice so far and remained mainly theoretical, copying what has been already done without making real progress. She believes that more progress could be made if these departments kept practical pace with the technical and technological environments:

We have deficiencies regarding computerised environments, websites, databases and likewise in the whole country… We do not even have a database in our own department [in the university]… Academics who gather in professional associations start related discussions, but these usually get interrupted and lead nowhere… I feel removed from the technical [aspects]… Academics should start to cooperate with professionals who are good at technical issues and to allocate time to them.

She continues and stresses the significance of practice and of staying connected to the practical aspects of the field:

Activities related to applications, and internships which are organised by universities are effective. Work that is prevalent in most translation agencies is not
applied in departments of translation studies in universities and this lack is a shortcoming for the field… Students complain about the fact that their studies mostly focus on literary translations and less on technical translations of letters, petitions or on fields of expertise [and are therefore disconnected from the sectoral needs].

In a similar way, interviewee 3 explains that their students are strongly advised to do internships from their second or third years onwards in order to obtain the opportunity to meet the real world of translation. In her opinion, internships are important because they can help students clarify what they really like or dislike and she reports that usually, students develop extreme feelings of like or dislike for a technical field of expertise after they get involved and start to work in it.

Interviewee 4 shares her view about the essentiality of combining theoretical knowledge with applications:

I call the field of ‘Translation Studies’ ‘translation applications’ because what a translator does is actually applications of languages whether s/he is autodidact or from the academic world. A well-equipped translator [with knowledge of theories and practice] will certainly have a better standpoint regarding applications and this is why translation experts are usually fed by [other] disciplines [too] such as philosophy, sociology and other [fields of] social sciences… In this regard, I am glad that I come from a background of French language and literature and sociology of literature… Thanks to [my background], I am aware of the cultural baggage that lies behind cultural mobility… When [a translator] is aware of this, it is easier [for him/her] to apply theories and embed them in his/her work… But if [s/he] is only fed by theories of translation and has no idea about the mobility that lies behind them, then [the theories] stay on the shelves like [immobile] trinkets.

A marked minority of the interviewees expressed a view not supporting the significance of theories. According to interviewee 9, a translator “does not have to be a graduate of translation studies or philology”, but “s/he must have the spirit of a writer”. In her words:
I do not know what is taught in departments of translation studies... Translations cannot have theories because we do different translations according to [different] authors and there are no [standard] theories to be drawn with a ruler. There is only one rule: we [must] stay [loyal] to the [particular] style.

Likewise, interviewee 15 also considers the field of translation studies as a field that can be devoid of theories and formulas. He remarks:

Neither translation nor literature is a science; most of the social sciences are not [positive] sciences. We can try to approach these fields using scientific methods; but if we pretend that [translation] is a science and work in this manner, then we will try to obtain theories that are valid in an absolute way for every situation like in [the field of] mathematics and put forward theories rather than approaches, becoming enslaved [to these theories]...

There are academics [in Turkey] who say “This text must be translated according to the following theory...” But it does not work this way in the real [translational] life… Translation is a very complex endeavour where many factors come into play - from the translator’s mood to his/her perception of the text - and it does not have one single correct solution.

Therefore, by definition, accurate and valid theories of translation cannot exist; but certainly, theories can include important approaches from which translators can benefit… We should not try to apply scientific methods at all costs, throwing out some theories and then trying to make them coherent and work in [real translational] life.

From the point of view of interviewee 3, theories of translation are important for verbal and written translations as well as for fields of technical expertise; but, she notes that computer-assisted translation software is most important among all the methods, theories, translation techniques and technical expertise. In her opinion, it is impossible to be a translator in our era with only some technical expertise, but without using relevant software.
4.4 In/visibility of Translators’ Identities on Translations

A fraction of the interviewees relate to the issue of in/visibility of a translator’s identity in his/her translations and to the degree to which s/he should reflect his/her own identity in translation. Nevertheless, those who few who did dwell on it provided detailed information and elaborate arguments; moreover, they shared their personal experiences and observations, and claimed it was a significant challenge faced by most translators in Turkey.

Interviewee 6 elaborates on this theme according to his perception and describes “five levels of a translation process” regarding the trade-off that exists between the preservation of the original text on the one hand and its modification on the other. In his words:

I see the translation processes as including five main levels and [in my opinion,] every text to be translated contains one or more of these levels.

The first level is the ‘pragmatic’ level and it relates to the basic, pragmatic, factual content such as the presentation of a historical fact.

The second level is the ‘planar’ level and it refers to the transfer of the meaning exactly as it is from the original text. For instance, the translator cannot change the date of the Hiroshima bombing and s/he must transfer it exactly as it is… If a text mentions that “the weather is sunny”, then the translator must write in the target language as “the weather is sunny” and s/he cannot modify it.

Once, I had a discussion with a German theorist who told me that, in a translation text from Italian into German, it was written; “In the month of November, he wets his whistle on the balcony” and he [modified the Southern hemisphere’s summer month of “November” into the Northern hemisphere’s summer month of June due to opposite climates and] translated it as “In the month of June...”. [But in fact,] He cannot do this.
The third level is the ‘semantic’ level and it refers to the transfer of the meaning of the original text… What [does the author] really mean? In *Madame Bovary* (Gustave Flaubert, 1856), women who drink at a ball take off their gloves and put them over their drinking glass to indicate that they do not want to drink anymore. How would you translate this into Turkish? In Erzurum [a city in Turkey], people put teaspoons on their tea glasses [with a similar meaning].

Or, for instance, Victor Hugo writes in his texts about regions where only beggars live, so it is not sufficient for the translator to write the name of the region; s/he should also introduce an explanation. However, while introducing the explanation, s/he should remain loyal to the author’s style and introduce it inside the text [and not as a footnote] because footnotes interrupt [the integrity of] the text.

The fourth level is the ‘stylistic’ level and it refers to the transfer of the style [of the original text]. For instance, when translating a poem, a translator should look for the most suitable prosody in the target language [so that the same spirit and style can be preserved]. S/he cannot translate it as a plain text.

We had a professor whose French and Turkish were excellent; however, he translated several works of Marcel Proust with short sentences. Then, it was not [the spirit of] Proust anymore… On the other hand, if we look at the poetry translations that [the famous Turkish poet] Orhan Veli performed; they are so magnificent that most people would think that they were [not translations, but originally] written by him.

The fifth level is the ‘aesthetic’ level and it it refers to the reflection of the effect of the original text into the target text. For instance, there are novelists who write their novels like poems and [if their novels are translated as plain texts then] the readers would be disconnected from the original texts... Thus, [in these cases], the translator needs to be a bit of a poet and s/he needs to understand [the original text] well. Some authors are very difficult to translate and therefore, not every translator should undertake their works.
After presenting his description of this spectrum of levels for a translator’s in/visibility, interviewee 6 continues with more elaborations on the situations in which a translator has no choice but be visible. He explains:

Let’s take, for instance, the *San-Antonio* crime novel series (Frederic Dard, 1968). They include more than 175 novels and I have read [most of] them. He wrote crime novels that include a lot of eroticism and he plays with the French language in [an unusual and] stunning way [full of French slang and new words coined by the author himself]... Therefore, [the translator] has to find the corresponding words and [actually] to re-write them.

[In a similar way,] A translator who translates an Ancient Greek work might think that the readers of Euripides are particular and therefore, s/he might leave the references exactly the same way. But if you are going to play Euripides in a theatre [in Turkey], how many people in the hall would understand [the play]? What should the translator do? Should s/he [stay loyal to the original text or] transform it into an understandable form[at]?

He indicates that “the translations of literary or theatrical works are cultural activities and accordingly, the authors should be respected and their works transferred exactly as they are”. He notes that, in these cases, “the readers’ task is to try to understand [the works] and to ask questions about the meanings. However, he adds that “at times, a political dimension is also included, which can cause the translator to be visible”. In his words:

Normally, a translator should translate a work exactly as it is and s/he should not modify a thing. However, if a novel or play includes political or religious criticisms and ascribing, what should s/he do? Even if s/he translates [the original text] exactly as it is, what will the editor do? What will the publisher do? Many publishers [in Turkey] might be hesitant to publish such translations… These are [challenging] issues [in this country].

In his account, interviewee 15 remarks that “a translator must detach himself/herself from his/her professional, human and national identities completely when performing a translation work”. However, he reveals the problem with this issue:
Our way of thinking, perceiving and understanding of a text are influenced unwittingly by the religious, philosophical and ideological conditionings we have been subject to since our early childhood. Therefore, no translator can be completely neutral and free of ideologies and religious beliefs, or detached from the era in which s/he lives.

But, translators who are aware of these facts can at least question themselves and obtain translation results which are less flawed. They can capture and correct many errors [on the way] if they pay close attention to the interferences and filters that originate from themselves and if they look at the texts with a critical eye. [In a way,] They should make their own [translation] review. They should also pay attention to other people’s reviews [in order to attain more objective results].

If the author of the text is living, the possibility of establishing contact with him/her should be investigated with a view to checking and confirming areas which are not clear to the translator. For instance, when I translated Journey to the End of the Night (Voyage au bout de la Nuit, Louis-Ferdinand Celine, 1932), one of the most complicated texts in French Literature, and whose author left this world forty years ago, I contacted academics who wrote about him and my friends who are French literati… I asked them whether the author meant something else [between the lines] and I tried to understand the text in the most correct way [by corresponding with them and comparing their responses].

As I understood [the text] better, I tried to translate it [into Turkish] in a free way that was in accordance with the logic of the Turkish language, not word-for-word [though], but properly and still staying loyal to [the spirit and the essence of] the text and adopting its style [into Turkish].

4.5 Translation Review / Criticism in Turkey
A common theme to which many interviewees refer is the lack of effectiveness with which translation review is used effectively in Turkey, and how this process can be made more widespread, and performed in a proper and more efficient way.

Translation magazines and reviews are reported as “not widespread” and “matters not dealt with” in Turkey by interviewee 1, and this is confirmed by other interviewees. For instance, in the opinion of interviewee 4; “translation reviews should be done more extensively in Turkey”.

Interviewee 12 also finds that the field of translation review is not developed enough in Turkey, but neither is it in other Western countries. He notes that readers usually attach importance to the literary works themselves and not to their reviews. He also talks about the ineffective and improper ways in which translation review is usually performed in Turkey:

If you made mistakes in your translation, reviewers reveal them [to the public] or sometimes a newly-published book is reviewed and you can read things like “It is a good book, but it should have been translated in a different way...” by exposing [several excerpts from the book] where the translation is not accurate… There are fewer and fewer [reviewers] doing this work correctly… Some of my translations were published once in a review where [the reviewer] showed my “mistakes”; but I gave him a concrete response showing that he had actually misunderstood the whole work… In my comments, I wrote humorously things like “…But our master says that…” and this response was later spoken about considerably [in the field in Turkey]…

Likewise, interviewee 14 also believes that translation reviews are not performed properly in Turkey and notes that in the past, they were even “bloody and controversial” with instances where some reviews mixed up the language of the translator with that of the author and introduced articles that eradicated the translator. In her opinion, this situation is “the misery of translation review in Turkey”.
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Interviewee 15 reveals that the quality of translations could be audited by the translation review institution, but notes that this is actually a deficient and distorted institution in Turkey:

Are the people who do translation reviews competent enough? Some [reviewers] mistakenly think that doing a translation review is “hunting words with tweezers” while some others review translations in a loutish way... In fact, the academic world and translators should work together on the texts [to be reviewed] and study thoroughly the work of their translators. People who engage in the field [of translation review] must have a sound knowledge... For instance, the book Journey to the End of the Night (Voyage au bout de la Nuit, Louis-Ferdinand Celine, 1932) that I translated ten years ago should have been studied [by reviewers] because such [complicated] works can be evaluated from very different perspectives... Translation reviews could be serious quality-control mechanisms [in the field], but they are not conducted sufficiently and correctly in Turkey.

As we see, interviewee 15 is convinced that academics and professional translators in Turkey should cooperate in order to make the translation review process work more properly and efficiently.

Interviewee 4 goes one step further, and advises that translators and academics in the field should not rely on translation review as the only control mechanism of the translation field, but should also adopt a “self-reflexive” critical approach, especially in the field of book translations:

This concept means that each layer in the translation process is inspected and every translator inspects himself/herself too. Academics in this field should also adopt a similar approach and inspect all the layers as academic instructors; but on the other hand, they should also collect data coming from [their] students and evaluate themselves. This self-reflexive approach should be applied intensively in Turkey because then, academics can detect their own deficiencies.

4.6 Translation Awards in Turkey
Interviewees who relate to the issue of translation awards mention them as positive and encouraging factors in the field of translation. Interviewee 1 explains that translation awards can affect a translator’s life by giving him/her greater motivation. She also highlights the economic benefits awards provide. They are usually reported in the press and therefore, “provide publicity” and “create more employment opportunities” for the recipient.

Interviewee 14 also considers translation awards useful and meaningful in various ways. In her words:

In general, awards are encouraging… For those who are at the beginning of their professional life, awards have a special meaning and for those who have produced and created for many years in the profession, they have another meaning… Translation is done alone ultimately and is a sentence to solitude and isolation; but translation awards give translators the sense that even if they work and produce alone, they are not alone… As in every profession, in the field of translation profession there is a need for approval.

4.7 Translation Associations and Organisations in Turkey

Another remarkable theme in the interviews is the topic of professional associations and organisations in the field of translation in Turkey. Among interviewees who relate to this theme, there is consensus about the importance of having strong and powerful translation associations and organisations in the field, and the significance of a lack thereof. However, interviewees differ slightly in the manner in which they describe existing associations and organisations are described by the interviewees slightly differ on their own accounts.

A salient phenomenon in the interviews on this theme is that interviewees differ in terms of their membership statuses in various translation associations and accordingly, their perceptions of the associations differ too.

The interviewees relating to this theme remind us of the various associations. For instance, interviewee 1 mentions that “The Association of Translation Corporations” includes
professional and institutionalised members “having large scopes, such as large translation agencies that employ many translators” while interviewee 3 mentions the “The Association of Book Translators”, “The Association of Verbal Translators” and “The Association of Translation Corporations” adding that “there is also an association where only translation agencies can become members, to discuss their professional problems, but they invite the academics too”.

Interviewee 10 reports that she used to be a member of “The Translation Association”, but later cancelled her membership. She explains that “I was paying my dues in vain” because “I never participated in their meetings”. She sent them a petition cancelling her membership, but has since noted that she no longer receives translation work, which she finds “very coincidental”.

On the other hand, interviewee 11 reports that she is a member of “The Translation Association”, but has never had an active position there. She states that she is not knowledgeable on the activities of professional associations in her field.

Interviewee 3 indicates that associations can be useful in many ways and explains that she is “one of the founding members of ‘The Translation Association’ in Turkey, which brings translators together”. However, she also thinks that this association could and should be working more actively. She notes that “we have reunions at book fairs and exhibitions where exchange of thoughts and ideas among members can take place” and “we also have a Yahoo group where information about publications, journals, conferences and other activities can be exchanged between group members”. She believes that “if the translation associations in Turkey were united, they could become a federation or a professional chamber for translators”. However, in her opinion, “neither member nor association numbers is high enough to enable such an initiative in Turkey”.

Interviewee 5 also refers to “The Translation Association”, and states that this association “has a history and many members”, but “is almost inactive”. She notes that she participated in the past in all reunions and voting in this association, but she has recently decided not to participate anymore because “the members vote and constitute the board of directors, many announcements are made, prizes are awarded, but nothing more is done or achieved on behalf of translators”.
When describing “The Association of Translation Corporations” though, she notes that this association “has been getting a little more active recently” and explains that “The Association of Translation Corporations” has a supervisory board, and works “in a more professional manner”; it gathers trainee translators under its roof and tries to “educate them, paying trainees wages and making them work on real translation projects rather than having them run errands”. She also provides more details about this association, especially regarding their efforts to unite translators in Turkey under one professional union:

‘The Association of Translation Corporations’ mainly covers the translation agencies dealing with technical or literary translations… This association began life with the purpose of becoming the professional translators’ union in Turkey. They have been trying to do this under the auspices of ‘The Turkish Standards Institute’… However, they have recently reached stalemate because of ideologies and politics interfering in the process.

Detailed explanations are provided about “The Translators’ Professional Association” by interviewee 13, who indicates that initially this association was named “The Association of Literary Translators” and explains:

There are translators who are qualified as “authors” according to the Turkish legal system. This is similar in other countries too. Literary translators belong to this category… But, there are also translators who are engaged in technical translations or in subtitles. Recently, we united with [all of] them; in the past, they did not belong to us and we were named ‘The Association of Literary Translators’, but now, we’ve changed our name to ‘The Translators’ Professional Association’. In our association, there are self-taught translators as well as many academics.

Moreover, he remarks that “the translation sector in Turkey should be more organised and unified”, adding that associations are important “for protecting and defending translators’ rights”. He continues:

If translators do not pursue their own rights, nobody will do it for them… The preparations [in our association] started in 2003, but there has been [considerable]
progress since 2006. Through our organised struggle, most translators have realised that there is no way back from certain rights… We have also received a [positive] response from a substantial portion of the publishing houses. They cannot do certain things easily anymore, and they are being forced to adhere to certain policies. [For instance,] they know that if a translator does not receive due payment and applies to ‘The Translators’ Professional Association’, s/he can get results and therefore, they [the publishing houses] act more carefully…

Interviewee 5 also mentions “The Translators’ Professional Association” as an association which she finds relatively efficient in this field and she notes that “useful activities are organised” and “meaningful publications are issued” by this association. She reports that she participates in all of their activities, but confesses that they make no real headway due to their conservative and non-progressive approach to the field of translation.

Interviewee 7 indicates that she is not a member of any of the translation associations in Turkey because “I know some professional associations in other countries” and when compared to them, she thinks that “no serious activities would take place in those in Turkey”. Therefore, she did not register with “The Translation Association” when it was established and feels that to date, no professionally valuable steps have been taken in this organisation.

On the other hand, interviewee 8 is a member of “The Association of Translation Corporations” and of “The Translation Association”. She believes that the overall approach to the professional associations is a problematic field in Turkey from a cultural point of view. She states that there are programmes in some universities in Turkey about “the creation and perpetuation of civil society organisations”. These programmes provide “the necessary information for people engaged in these issues to efficiently proceed and take lead”. In her words:

We establish associations in Turkey without the necessary knowledge and then, we actually step back… We usually think that if we have members and if they pay their fees, then the business is fine. But actually, a different synergy is needed and [this understanding] is missing in our culture… Regarding the formation of associations, it is very important to know how civil society associations can be
maintained, how the work should be carried out and all other [relevant] aspects including financing, creating resources, marketing and public relations… The associations in Turkey need a more professional perspective.

Interviewee 14 is convinced that the associations in this field are important particularly in order to “raise awareness of their rights among translators”. She emphasises that recently, cases of trickery and fraud in this sector have multiplied because people who do not know each other sign agreements. She believes that associations can be helpful in being present in the signing of such agreements.

She notes that “being organised in every profession is useful”, but also expresses her pessimism regarding translation associations in Turkey, stating that “the chances of the translation associations in this country being effective are low” mainly because “power comes from money” and “in a country where usually only a thousand copies of a translated book are printed, neither translators nor associations can gain power”. She underlines that “translators must pay fees to the associations” and “associations must have power of enforcement”.

According to interviewee 6, another challenge that Turkish translation associations deal with is the enactment of translation as a profession into Turkish law, “which does not count it as a profession yet”. He indicates that “because of this loophole, translators can be easily imprisoned in Turkey based on wantonness related to economic, political or religious causes”. In his words:

We attempted to make an application, all associations acting together, in order to create a professional chamber [in Turkey]. We were answered that we could not create such a chamber because we were not recognised by the law as a profession. Instead, they advised us to register with ‘The Chamber of Artisans and Craftsmen’… There are several translation associations wanting to keep their identities, yet also interested in uniting [with other translation associations] under a common roof. There is no such [common roof] yet in Turkey for translators.

With regard to the above-mentioned challenges facing the translation field, interviewee 4 notes:
We still have a long way to go, but most importantly, we should work harder for institutionalisation… The number of the collective projects should increase and ‘The Translation Association’ should work in a more active way… As academics, we should [also] take part in [these efforts]… If these associations could unite and become a professional chamber, then they could achieve so much more…

Interviewee 2 states that “most professional associations are located in Istanbul” and that although “our university is not far from the city”, still “we are considered a provincial university”. Therefore, she explains they are unable to follow and participate in most of the activities that take place even if they are informed about them. However, she notes that “our students are very active and they participate in many events, make appointments with the associations and travel to meet them”.

Interviewee 9, a translator and theatre critic, states that she is one of the founding members of “The Turkish Theatre Critics’ Association”. She is convinced that as long as civil society does not attach importance to its associations and organisations in all areas, neither professional alliances nor the unions will have much of an impact. She also adds the readers to the equation and notes:

Turkish readers do not decide to watch a theatre play according to reviews [of that play]... And they do not say things like “This translation was done by translator x, so I will read it” or “That translation was performed by translator y, so I will not read it”… Thus, quality ceases to be an issue and [in a field where quality is not an issue] associations do not make any sense…

4.8 Lack of Legal Recognition of Translation as a Profession in Turkey

One recurring theme in the interviews is the lack of legal recognition of translation as a profession in Turkey. There seems to be consensus among interviewees relating to this issue regarding its importance, all agreeing on the necessity for it to be recognised as such, while reporting slightly different views regarding the possible reasons for its not being so recognised and solutions to this.
Among the possible reasons for the lack of recognition, interviewee 3 mentions the relatively late establishment of departments of translation studies in universities in Turkey—the 1980s. So, in her opinion, these are “young departments” and “not yet rooted when compared to faculties established fifty years ago”. But, she adds that this field is becoming “ever more popular in Turkey”, necessitating its “institutionalisation”, and therefore recognition as a profession:

Approximately seventy more universities around Turkey are about to open departments of translation studies... New private universities immediately establish these departments... Therefore, it may be concluded that this field is becoming more popular in Turkey. Most fields become institutionalised in Turkey and elsewhere in accordance with market needs... Thus, this field also might also develop with the increase in international relations and trade agreements among countries.

Regarding the “relative youthfulness” of the translation field in Turkey, interviewee 8 explains that the name “Translation Studies” was mentioned for the first time in Turkey no earlier than the 1970s, and continues with the following comments, in line with those of interviewee 3:

[Translation] is a relatively new field in this country. Prior to the 1970s, it was handled under the auspices of philology departments in universities and was considered a subject within the domain of philology, literature and linguistics departments. But, in some European countries, these departments were founded as early as the Second World War because of the necessities created by the war... This way, Europe started to build ‘the tradition of translation’ relatively earlier by establishing faculties and departments with a direct emphasis on translation... The late formation of this field in Turkey as a separate entity can be one of the reasons why it is not yet fully recognised as a profession.

In a similar way, interviewee 5 relates that although translation is an ancient profession in the world, it has been added to and institutionalised in the Turkish universities’ curricula
only in the last 25 years because traditionally “anyone who spoke a foreign language was considered a translator”.

Interviewee 7 also notes that for many years, translation was considered as equivalent to knowing a foreign language and not as a separate profession of its own. She further explains that only due to globalisation of the business world in our era has translation work expanded.

While relating to the “youthfulness” of this profession, interviewee 15 reports the historical process by which translation became a profession in the world and in Turkey:

Translation is an old profession, but before the establishment of the printing press, it was performed by hand-writing and therefore, only very few people read those texts. The people who transferred those texts to other languages were experts in their fields; usually, multi-lingual and qualified people, interested in religion and the academic world performed these works. Translation was not a separate profession… With the arrival of the printing press, translation evolved as an industrial product and slowly, [departments of] translation studies began to appear [in universities]. Here [in Turkey], translation came on the scene very late. The Turkish economy was inward-looking and so was the translation [field in Turkey]… As translation works became more widespread, the need for creating professional translators arose.

Interviewee 1 relates to the lack of legal recognition of translation as a profession in Turkey as an important problem and provides several guidelines as to how it can be solved:

Since translation is not officially recognised as a ‘profession’ in Turkey, it cannot get institutionalised and [therefore, cannot] have a professional chamber… To increase the quality of translations, first of all, this field must be officially recognised as a profession… In other countries, a person must pass many exams in order to become a ‘translator’, but in Turkey this is not the case… How can we prove that translation is a profession? By [determining] certain norms and criteria, by [promoting] relevant education, by [obligating] candidates to pass exams. These all can be achieved with initiative by the big translation agencies.
4.9 Relations and Cooperation between and among Translators and Scholars in Turkey

Markedly, interviewees’ opinions on the nature of relations among translators and scholars in Turkey concur in the sense that the insufficiency and, at times, even lack of cooperation is highlighted, and the need for greater cooperation accentuated.

In interviewees’ reports, a slight difference can be noted between relations among professional translators working in the sector and relations among academics in Turkey; a somewhat higher level of cooperation is reported among professional translators than among academics. Interviewee 3 notes:

> Usually, there is [some] mutual support and help among translators [in Turkey]. When they work together, every translator receives his/her own share. Translators can help each other meet deadlines… Relations in the sector are usually friendly and supportive.

In the opinion of interviewee 7, no sufficient assistance or solidarity exists among translators because “there is materialism in the picture”; however, she also has some experience of cooperation in the field:

> My first experience with teamwork was with another translator who corrected [mainly] my Turkish. I think it is very productive when translators work together because it is very important to be creative in literary translations and when more people are involved together, more creative ideas emerge.

Referring to the issue of whether cooperation is commoner in the translation field, interviewee 11 mentions that there is not strong cooperation or solidarity between translators in Turkey. She observes that most of them work “in their own corners”, consulting with each other “only if necessary” and usually with “those in their immediate environment”. She reports that they usually work alone, except for joint projects.

Interviewee 14 provides a possible reason that might lie behind this insufficiency:
There might be some cooperation among translators, but [as a matter of fact], translation work is something that is handled alone… Up to now, I do not remember a remedy that emerged out of consultation [with another translator].

Regarding the insufficiency of cooperation among translation scholars and academics in universities in Turkey, interviewee 5 articulates that although more support has been given recently for projects in universities and teamwork, many academics still focus on ‘becoming head or chief coordinator’ of the groups rather than focusing on the projects themselves” to the point, she states, that this has even led to the failure of several projects:

Recently, there was a translation project to be carried out [in Turkey in collaboration] with seventeen other countries. But it did not work here because of power wars… I hope that in the near future, academics in Turkey will be more cooperative.

Cooperation in the field of translation is noticeably seen as positive and desired by the interviewees. Interviewee 4 reports:

Academics in Turkey could achieve so much more if they collaborated… Scholars in translation studies should take more responsibilities… If the academics start to plan and share with each other in an effective way for technical or literary translations, then much will be gained in terms of this field… They should look at themselves and each other in a critical and self-reflexive way, without offending each other, but trying to enlighten and help each other. If every scholar uses his/her talents and faculties in a cooperative way and guides each other, then better yield would be obtained.

4.10 Relations between Translators and Publishing Houses / Editors in Turkey

Another prominent theme in the interviews is the nature of relations between translators and publishing houses / editors in Turkey as perceived and described by the interviewees.
Most interviewees who relate to this theme mention that the majority of editors who work for publishing houses in Turkey are not sufficiently knowledgeable or competent.

For instance, interviewee 1 plainly states that “in general, editors in Turkey are not professionally competent, but they are the ones who evaluate the quality of translations and translators” because of their position as “employers”.

In a similar way, interviewee 4 mentions that the publishing houses that she worked with were “well-intentioned”, but “lacked the necessary knowledge and information”. For instance, she notes that on one occasion the editor claimed they had interfered with her text, but failed to find any trace of such interference. In another case, the editor added phrases that did not exist in the original text she was translating. This interviewee believes that translators and editors in Turkey should collaborate in a more effective and efficient way, especially for literary works.

As another example of “publisher incompetency”, she notes that a publishing house once asked her to translate a particular book in three months, but “as an experienced translator”, she knew that “it was an impossible time demand”, with the translation text concerned needing at least six months devoted to it. Finally, she and the publisher compromised on a time somewhere in between.

Interviewee 16 also indicates the incompetence of the publishers and shares her own experience:

When I was a student, I conducted a field study for the ‘Sociology of Translation’ course [that I took]. I prepared several questions to be answered by translation agencies and publishing houses, questions such as “What is the translation process in your publishing house?”, “How do you find your translators?”, “How do you decide which translation to give to which translator?” and “Do you intervene into your translators’ work?” One publisher I interviewed stated that they had a [special] translation department and tried to show me the office, but he did not sound credible… It looked like nobody really worked in that office. He did not have a good command of the relevant issues… He only knew [about the matters of] copyrights, copyright laws, how to prevent to pay penalties, duplication of books, pirate books on
the market and so forth… He said that if a translator submitted his/her work on time, then they were paid in full; otherwise, their payment was reduced. He was a ‘boss’ and he looked only at the material side of the whole thing…

Another criticism of publishing houses is mentioned by interviewee 8, who is convinced that most publishers in Turkey “are not part of all of the new developments and changes in the translation industry”. She observes that most of them seem to have “a particular approach that has remained static all these years”. She thinks that this approach needs to be analysed and questioned fully:

The owners of the publishing houses and their editors [usually] choose the books [to be translated and published] and their proof-readers, including editors and sub-editors perform the redaction of the chosen [and translated] books… I get a bit lost at this point… I think the time has come to deal with editorial matters in detail, to shake them up and to reintroduce them… Should translators accept changes made [during the process of] proofreading, [which is usually] performed according to personal tastes, on [extremely] comprehensive editorial literary texts? On what basis do translators perform their translations? What is the basis on which the proof-readers do their proofreading? Where do these two overlap? These and other [related] issues need to be addressed…

Interviewee 7 reports that her relationships with publishing house editors and owners have been good in general. However, especially at the beginning of her career, when she “noticed mistakes made by the editors who corrected her work”, she reacted with “anger and frustration”. Later, she “learned to soften her reactions” and the editors usually accepted her criticisms. They even told her that, if she wishes, “they will not touch or make changes” to her work. She notes:

No translation [work] is perfect. There will always be someone out there who will find a mistake. Some errors editors find are accepted by me… Every translator who works under time pressure can make errors… But I find errors made by the editors too…
On the other hand, some interviewees, such as interviewee 6, refer to “competent publishers” that exist in the translation field in Turkey. This interviewee reports:

There are [also] some good publishers in Turkey, especially in Istanbul, which usually give projects to translators in their fields of expertise and pay them satisfactorily… Currently, the best-selling books in Turkey are books that nobody will remember in the near future… The valuable and lasting ones are usually supported by publishing houses with strong infrastructures, most of which belong, paradoxically, to banking institutions such as Yapı Kredi Bankası, İş Bankası and Akbank. These non-profit organisations translate and publish a wide range of valuable literary works with no concern about the monetary results.

Interviewee 3 refers to the role and significance of publishers in the translation field, and explains that when a new student of translation studies is interested in doing translation, she advises him/her “to start working for a publishing house, which usually gives him/her trial translation work”. She reports that “the students are motivated by being accepted by a publishing house” in the manner of an internship process. On the other hand, interviewee 4 places emphasis on the fact that a new graduate who is interested in translating “might not have so much power vis-à-vis the publisher” and indicates that “s/he cannot really control whether the editor who edits or inspects him/her is more knowledgeable than himself/herself”.

The process of translation and publishing, together with the issue of the publishers’ competence / incompetence, are described from the publisher’s perspective by interviewee 8. She talks about the publishing house at which she is a partner and explains that their proofreaders “know exactly which adjustments and corrections must be made in the texts” and “for highly technical fields such as advertisement or patent translations, nobody else has the right to say that a sentence should be said in one way or another”. She explains that this is because “there are several rules to follow” and “these sorts of translations have specific purposes as taught in translation theories courses at university”.

According to her, a translation’s proofreading must be done considering “the segment to which it will appeal” and “the reason for which it will be used, namely its skopos”; otherwise, “there are many different forms in which a particular sentence can be said”. She
notes that in some particular cases, “a sentence which can be said in a better way deliberately is not said in that way”. For this reason, she notes that “all principles to be considered by an editor should be clearly determined” and explains further:

The editorial principles for translation of creative or technical texts are very clear. All the balances, the inter-text relationships and the out-of-text attributions should be considered without interfering with the text’s integrity… Translators and editors do not have to work together, to know each other or to sit around a table together. They are totally independent from each other and do not need to know each other’s styles… We use ‘memories’ which are accepted by our company and recognised by our customers… [Our editors] ensure consistency by using these ‘memories’ that are constituted from finalised [translation] texts.

Interviewee 13 also describes the process from the publisher’s perspective:

Our publishing house is an exception… In Turkey, most [of the publishers’] relations with the translators are unhealthy… Usually, translators apply to publishing houses and the publishers, mainly operating within financial parameters, distribute the work among several translators… We have translators with whom we work on a constant basis. We find it appropriate to continue to work with them and we accept very few new applications. Usually, we redirect incoming applications to other publishers… This is because we publish only ‘A-type’ books and these are not easy for beginners to translate.

Moreover, he indicates that, as publishers, they have “their own intellectual and political troubles”. He states that “at a point where these troubles are articulated in Turkey”, they try to choose only “interesting books that will have an effect on the public”. For instance, they usually publish books of “a prominent interdisciplinary nature, books that push readers and expand their world”.

Interviewee 14 provides us with a historical dimension on this topic and explains that “initially, editorship was not a distinct profession in Turkey”. She explains that during the 1960s and 1970s, “the publishers themselves served as editors too”, “the majority of the publishers were also writers” and “editing, writing, translating and publishing were all
intertwined works”. Only later did division of labour evolve, and she notes that “several publishers brought competent people in as their editors and other publishers followed this trend”. But in her opinion, in our era, “somehow these translators as well as editors have evaporated”. She explains that this may be because “the publishers started to take on new graduates as their editors” and “the cooperation between editors, translators and authors became deadlocked”. She notes that nowadays, “there are no famed editors in Turkey anymore”.

She further explains that although the publishers need to have knowledge about translation, “most editors consider theoretical knowledge unnecessary”. Usually, they look at the first translation works of new graduates and see that “no obvious benefits were gained by learning theories at school”; therefore, their confidence in their own approaches is strengthened. She observes that, in the past, the publishers’ views of academia in Turkey were very positive. But today, “many Turkish editors mislead translators” and “demand translations in line with their own understanding”. She specifically highlights the fact that “editors are unaware that they do not have the knowledge to be able to discuss translation strategies with translators”.

Another interviewee who shares her personal experience with publishers is interviewee 3, who notes that she received her first translation work from a publishing house — a book chosen by the publisher — through a friend. It was a one-year project for which they signed an agreement and the book was indeed published a year later. Afterwards, she worked with four other publishers, for one of whom she translated two books, the first chosen by the publisher and the second by herself. She reports:

I worked with a publisher who asked me to translate a book in the field of experimental psychology, but the translation had to be done urgently. They noted the urgency and the deadline issue strictly. I did not experience a problem regarding payment, but the book was published only four years later... It is ridiculous to translate a book that will be published four years later... In the end, it was [actually] published because I put pressure on them; I called them every few months and asked when the book that I translated would be published...
Interviewee 2 reports that she did not have professional relations with the publishing houses, but “she has colleagues who work as translators for publishing houses”. She has a colleague who works as an editor and translator for a publishing house. She explains that “translation work is checked several times by a few translators and then inspected by a superior translator”, “the deadlines are too short and strict” and “the translators work under pressure”. However, she believes that “her colleague is somehow satisfied with her job” and observes that “she works several hours a day for the publishing house and then at home, she continues to do translation work as a freelancer”. She has another friend who also works for a publishing house and she believes that “she is happy with her job” too because “she has been working for the same employer for many years”.

Interviewee 4 describes her relations with publishers, and places emphasis on the fact that “she wants to set some rules when working with the publishers” and “in the future, she will evaluate more fully all the relevant details of translation projects”. She advises translators and students to “practise a lot” and “acquire a good linguistic and theoretical infrastructure” in order to have a status vis-a-vis publishers.

Interviewee 11 also shares her personal experience with publishers in the translation field and states that “after winning a translation contest and entering into the world of translation”, she translated a book for a publishing house. Later, the same publisher asked her to translate another book and after translating her second book, her relationship with the publisher became “strong enough for her to initiate and to propose a third book”. She reports that the publisher agreed and later offered her more books to translate. In the meantime, she also started her academic career. However, she believes that most translators in Turkey need personal acquaintances in order to be introduced to and work with publishers.

Regarding agreements with and payments by publishers, interviewee 3 reports that she worked with a publisher who proposed three books from which she had to choose one. She chose a history book. They then signed an agreement and she did not experience any problems regarding payment or publication of the book.

In a similar way, interviewee 5 explains that she worked as a “community interpreter” (public service interpreter) in France and that she had “a very good income” there. In
Turkey, she worked with “a reputable publishing house which paid well” and “she did not have any problems”. However, she observes that, as a general rule, “most publishers try to work with inexperienced, cheap translators or with new graduates to whom they can pay low rates”. She is convinced that this is the reason why “most translated works in Turkey are of low quality”. In her words:

The editors make corrections on the translated works and denigrate the translators for poor jobs. How can they expect to get translation works of high quality when they pay so poorly? There are several reputable publishers [in Turkey], but most exploit their translators.

4.11 Underpayment of Translation in Turkey

One striking theme in the interviews is underpayment of translators. This is also one of the ‘scandals’ of translation that Venuti so vigorously opposes (1998). While the importance attached to the issue by the interviewees differs in their personal accounts, and thus results in differing solutions being proposed, it is generally considered central to the structural problems in the translation field in Turkey.

For instance, interviewee 1 believes that poor translations are mainly caused by low premiums. She believes that this is a natural outcome in a market where there is a surplus of people claiming “I can do that”. Additionally, in her personal account, this understanding is not limited to the supply side of the balance sheet. She indicates that “…This is what we understand from translating. Everyone who speaks a foreign language is considered able to translate…”

The possible reasons for this problem as mentioned by interviewees are varied, and include publishers, readers, academics, and “pirate” translators who pretend that they can translate equally well at lower rates.

For instance, in the opinion of interviewee 15, publishers are to blame:
Publishers are inclined towards books that will sell fast. These books are not significant in terms of their literary value. While the number of readers increases, the quality of the readership decreases. On the other hand, they do not involve themselves in books that will not sell in large numbers. It is relatively easy to sell a book whose writer is a media star, but it requires much more to bring a book of a higher literary value to the reader; the level of readership needs to be raised. Publishers need to cooperate with readers and universities… Publishers do not want to incur these expenses…

Interviewee 13, a translator, but also partner at a publishing house, admits that the publishers in Turkey pay translators extremely badly, and explains:

The real problem [in this sector] is financial… The fees we [publishers] pay to translators are really ridiculous compared to the average [salary] in Turkey. This is because generally book sales are low, and translated books are also low, with rare exceptions… Only when translated books are published and sold on their second editions does the translator receive the money that s/he should receive. So, the problem here is the necessity to increase book sales and to this end, “The Publishers Union” and all other [relevant] actors must work very seriously.

Likewise, this imposition is underlined by interviewee 1, who indicates that it is difficult for a translator to reject a commission offer. In her words:

Translators are constrained by economic factors... When it comes to bread and butter issues, or if they have a family to look after, their options are very limited.

In her opinion, not only the publishers, but also the readers are to blame for the “ridiculously low” rates paid to translators in Turkey:

In general, we are a non-reactive society, and most readers do not provide feedback… Readers should [be the ones who] determine the quality of translations and complain when a translation is of poor quality so that good translators receive the fees they merit.
Interviewee 9 offers a line of arguments similar to that of interviewee 1, while highlighting the readers’ role:

This is a very basic supply-demand problem… So far, I have not seen any reader bringing a book to the front door of the publishing house to burn it there as a protest. As there is not a request for quality from readers, publishers are not looking for it. Why should they pay fifty cents if there are people out there ready to do it for five?

Interviewee 4 adds academics to this equation:

Unfortunately, the [translation] market finds translators at low rates and mainly works with them… As academics, we do not really know the market… It is important that instructors help their students to work on translation projects in the market, to deal with the [terms and conditions of] agreements with publishers and with translation agencies. We should follow them up and help them wherever necessary.

Interviewee 14 underlines that “no Turkish translator can earn a living only from translation work” and she reports that she had a conversation with one of the best-selling translators in Turkey, who has translated hundreds of books and who still lives in a rented apartment. She explains that she was “astonished to hear that” because in her view, the translator involved “should have made much more money”.

Equally important, interviewee 14 considers low payments in the translation field as an important reason for the fact that translation associations in Turkey have such little influence:

Money means power. If a translated book is in circulation with only one thousand copies, this will not bestow any power on any translator or association… The translator should pay membership dues and the association should have sanctionary powers…
4.12 Ottoman Translation Associations, Turkish Republic’s Public Translation Activities and Actual State-Supported / Subsidised Translation Corporations in Turkey

Significantly, almost all interviewees are well-informed on Ottoman translation associations and organisations, especially those of the Tanzimat (re-organisation) period, the translation activities and remarkable initiatives that took place during the early years of the Turkish Republic after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, and the current state-related translation activities that take place in Turkey.

It is noticeable that all interviewees who relate to the translation activities that took place during the period of Hasan Ali Yücel, the former minister of education of the Turkish Republic, are extremely positive on those activities and initiatives, with some interviewees mentioning them with a sort of “nostalgic envy”.

For instance, interviewee 15 explains that the Tercüme Bürosu (The Translation Bureau) established by Hasan Ali Yücel utilised writers and scientists who were masters not only of of foreign languages, but of their own fields. He continues:

"In the foundation period of the new [Turkish] Republic, the nation’s access to important resources from the East and the West was ensured this way, the country’s alphabet was changed [from Ottoman language to modern Turkish] and a great linguistic revolution was achieved. Certainly, in a cultural revolution formed from scratch, [relevant] sub-texts needed to be provided [in the local language to the public]… Therefore, extremely useful and great work was accomplished…"

Interviewee 1 also indicates that the Tercüme Bürosu was an efficient state-supported office in Turkey and “it determined, in a systematic way, the cultural line of the country, as the leaders of that period aimed at educating the country’s new generation”. She evaluates the translation works performed during that period by the famous Turkish literati as “very successful” and she believes that “it would be useful if a similar structure existed in Turkey today too”.
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Referring to the Ottoman translation associations and to the Turkish Republic’s early public translation activities, interviewee 12 provides us with a detailed picture of the related historical, cultural and ideological aspects:

During the Tanzimat period, interest in Western societies and cultures grew noticeably in The Ottoman Empire and [as a result of this,] many translations from Western literatures were performed… the Tanzimat was a political movement which aimed at a ‘return to the West’… [Many elements of] Western civilisations were adopted in all areas during the [first years of The Turkish] Republic, including translation issues.

The Tercüme Bürosu was founded as a state-owned office in the 1940s and brought together the best translators of that period. Many valuable translations of Western classics were done … However, after the 1950s, the Turkish state withdrew from this work.

The Turkish people’s interest in Western cultures still continues; when a [new] book from Western literature is published in the United Kingdom, France, Germany or the United States, it gets immediately translated into Turkish and published in Turkey too… There are translations from The East as well, but they are in the minority… In Turkey, the public’s interest is more directed to Western cultures, and there is a great interest in their literary works.

Interviewee 6 indicates that the publication series started by Hasan Ali Yücel in the Tercüme Bürosu were gradually stopped and replaced by the “100 Basic Works”, issued by the publishing house of Tercüman Gazetesi (Translator Newspaper – a Turkish daily). These included mainly translations of foreign authors’ works about the East, Turkey and the Ottoman Empire of the 19th century. Regarding this, he notes:

These works were very useful… Turkish poet Süleyman Nazif said in an article that he published in 1933: “... Some sixty years ago, we were six hundred years behind from Iran... But now, we are one hundred years ahead [of them]...” This is thanks to the translations which opened Turkey’s eyes to the world…
Modern civilisations are the accumulations of North, South, East and West. We cannot separate Christian, Muslim, Japanese or Chinese civilisations [from each other]… People expand their view of the world through this cultural exchange… Therefore, the readers [of translations] should [be able to] reach correct information [from every corner of the world].

Interviewee 14 takes up the topic chronologically, and refers to the cultural and ideological changes that have occurred in Turkey from the establishment of the *Tercüme Bürosu* by Hasan Ali Yücel until our current period:

A turbulent period started in 1946, with the change of the minister of education… Establishment of the *Tercüme Bürosu* was in line with Turkey’s political life. This movement was launched by people who sought enlightenment and who wished to participate in the Western world’s culture, to learn its literature, and to add to it examples from our own culture… However, conservative forces [in our country] believe that we do not need to read from Homer, but from [the epic stories of Oghuz Turks] *Dede Korkut*… There are also groups [of people] who pretend that we should read and teach our young people [literary] works like *Varaklı İzmihlaž…* These counter-movements have existed since the early days of the revolution, but they seem to be strengthening in our days…

In spite of the cultural and ideological changes described here by interviewee 14, the translation movements and activities initiated by Hasan Ali Yücel seem to have retained their relevance and importance for the translation field in Turkey today, as reported by interviewee 6. He elucidates:

The publishing house of *İş Bankası* has a classical series that comprises ancient literary works from Greece, China and elsewhere, and includes books that were published via ‘the Translation Committee of the Board of Education’ in the 1940s, during the period of Hasan Ali Yücel…

How were these books determined? In general, a list of the books to be published was issued and the translators who were interested would translate and send a
sample of thirty pages from these books. An upper board decided then which [of the translators] would eventually take on the translation work…

The main principles determined during the period of Hasan Ali Yücel were that the translators’ transfer the artworks and the authors’ messages as they were, keeping the [works’ own] qualities and without censorship. The Ministry of Education published and distributed these books [to the public] cheaply for the sake of education [of the Turkish nation].

In the light of the positive effects that these public activities and initiatives had on the Turkish culture in general, and on the Turkish translation field specifically, related comparisons and comments are provided in the interviews.

For instance, interviewee 4 states that “her dream is to establish a ‘Translation Institute’ similar to the one that existed during The Ottoman Empire”. Inspired by Hasan Ali Yücel’s initiatives in the field, she explains that she dreams of establishing “a structure where scholars of translation studies from all the universities in Turkey come together and share their knowledge and experiences”, “an organisation in close contact with all the relevant translation agencies for all languages”, “a working mechanism that will publish translated works, that will own an extensive terminology database and that will produce conference interpreters on a local and international level”. She believes that “Turkey needs such an institute”, which would rather resemble “a public mechanism” because “the world of translation in Turkey seems too fragmented currently and lacking an organised and holistic structure”.

She views this imagined structure as a “mini-reproduction of the public structure which existed during The Ottoman Empire”, and provides more comments on the subject:

It is amazing to see that, in those times, beautiful cultural capital was created by people who had a great deal of sensitivity towards others. For instance, the texts of translation reviews from that period are so different from those of today… How were they able to criticise so graciously and politely? The reviewers criticised both themselves and translators constructively.
Why can we not find similar behaviour [and fruitfulness] in our time? Probably because human beings’ personality traits have changed… Let’s take Nurullah Ataç, Selahattin Eyüboğlu or Azra Erat who were great [legendary] names then… Were these scholars more self-confident and confident of their cultural accumulation, and also more humble than the scholars of today? When our cultural capital is not well-established, [probably] we try to establish our egos instead, and then we are not able to share with each other... If we cannot share, then we cannot unite and if we cannot unite, we cannot succeed…

Yet, she indicates that “she is optimistic about the future” and she anticipates that “there will be ever more unification among translators and scholars in Turkey”, leading eventually to the establishment of the “Translation Institute” of her dreams.

Even though there exists a noticeable homogeneity among the interviewees on the translation activities and initiatives taken during the early years of the Turkish Republic in the wake of the Ottoman Empire, their views regarding state-related translation activities currently taking place in Turkey differ.

For instance, while interviewee 8 is in no doubt that the process of introducing Western resources to the Turkish readers during Hasan Ali Yücel’s period was a most worthwhile endeavour, she equally believes that in today’s Turkey, translation activities can and should be managed only by the private sector, with the state limiting its involvement to providing incentives such as translation awards. She notes:

The [Turkish] Ministry of Culture has a project named ‘TEDA’ with which they are actually moving backwards… The Ministry [of Culture] created this support programme in order to promote Turkish literature in other countries… If there were a natural demand from other cultures to read particular Turkish writers, then their books could be translated and the effort would be valuable. But as long as the demand is not natural, it is meaningless that the government bears the expense for translation works that will probably never reach the right recipients.
Neither does interviewee 12 favour state-supported structures for the translation field in Turkey today. He believes that “if there were such structures now, they would certainly be influenced by the ideologies of political parties”. He continues:

Power groups and political parties having certain world views rule our country and therefore, only those [books] which do not contradict their world views would be translated… In the [Tanzimat] period, the political situation was different; there were no inter-party conflicts and the vision of being close to Western civilisations was adopted by both rulers and ruled. Today, there are different views in this regard and if the Turkish state supports the Turkish government politically, then it would also support only the books and the works that followed its path…

Unlike the above views and opinions, interviewee 15 believes that the state’s support is still needed and desired. In his words:

In our days, the [Turkish] state’s support is needed for translations of works which would be useful, but are of literary or scientific but not commercial value… Even in a country like France, whose books and authors are abundantly translated into other languages, there is a special organisation which provides support for [French literature’s] translations into other languages. Significant amounts of money are transferred to this organisation.

Turkey has started to make similar efforts in order to translate [national literary works into other languages] because financial support is needed for these non-commercial works… We should remember that consigning the cultural life and the literature of a country to the hands of its commercial life is the best way to kill both, as has been [noticeably] experienced [in our country]…

An ongoing initiative, considerably state-supported / subsided, is referred to by interviewee 5. She reports that there are currently “significant translation activities taking place in The Office of the Prime Minister in Turkey, most of which are related to translation of European Union acquis communautaire documents”. She explains that due to Turkey’s many issues related to The European Union, “there is an increasing need for qualified translators” and “recently, a group of translators affiliated to the Office of the Prime
Minister was formed for this purpose”. She reports that this group organises “important activities in universities and various events such as translation contests” in order to introduce themselves to the public.

4.13 Prosecution of Translators in Turkey, Censorship and Self-Censorship

It is only to be expected that one of the most prominent themes in the interviews is the prosecution of translators in Turkey and, related to this, censorship applied by publishers on translators and self-censorship applied by translators as preventive or corrective measures.

The overwhelming majority of interviewees who relate to this issue in Turkey report that they have either been prosecuted themselves or know translators who have been so treated. Only a fraction reports awareness of the issue, but with no involvement, personal or otherwise.

Moreover, the overwhelming majority of interviewees consider the prosecutions unacceptable, improper and against democracy, freedom of thought and expression, and they discuss the related issues of censorship and self-censorship elaborately.

For instance, interviewee 1 and interviewee 3 report that “they do not know prosecuted translators personally”, but “they are aware of their existence”. Interviewee 1 remarks “I heard about them”, “I do not want to be some Don Quixote” and “this issue is related to the political environment in which we live”. Interviewee 3 explains “if I really like a book and if the text includes politically sensitive issues such as insulting Turkishness, I would still perform the translation without fear of being prosecuted in the future”. If the subject is a matter that she believes in, she is confident that “I would be able to defend myself even if I were prosecuted”.

Interviewee 3 moreover reveals “I am against any censorship, self-applied or otherwise, on translators”. However, she is aware of the fact that “self-censorship increases during times of political pressure” and “censorship is applied almost every time a translation connotes anything that is negative about Turkishness or Turkey”. She provides an example from the
translation of, *The Little Prince* (*Le Petit Prince*, Antoine de Saint-Exupery, 1943) into Turkish and indicates that “in the original text, there is a phrase that states “a Turkish dictator”, which was ignored and left untranslated by some translators”.

Interviewee 7 indicates that “I believe in freedom of thought” and therefore, “the prosecution of translators is improper and unacceptable”. She reports that “there was a prosecuted translator, Yiğit Bener, who translated a glossary on misogyny which received tremendous reactions from the feminists”. She further discusses:

The degree to which a translator can be held responsible for the content of the text that s/he translates is [an issue that is] open to discussion… In the case of Yiğit Bener, those criticisms should have been directed at the author, not the translator. The translator is only an intermediary. Only when a translator changes [the content of the text] or manipulates it can s/he be held responsible [for the content].

Interviewee 4 also reveals that “I finds it unacceptable that a translator would be prosecuted for a translation job that s/he performed” and she is convinced that “usually, the prosecution of a translator happens because of ‘disconnections’ in the system”. She elaborates this point as follows:

A translator belongs to a bigger system that includes more players. S/he is [only] a part of the final translation product, with more players behind [that product]. The law-makers should be aware that there is a whole mechanism behind translation work. When a publishing house signs a contract with a translator, the translator becomes ‘institutionalised’, which means that s/he is no longer alone, and in order to protect him/her, the translated texts should be inspected before publication.

There must be a strong mechanism which will stand behind the translators, supporting them, transforming these situations into more positive ones for the translators. A translator should be knowledgeable about his/her rights, have an attorney and s/he should not accept automatically everything that is imposed on him/her. The scholars [in Turkey] should help to raise awareness among translators because only those who are unaware can get tricked and deceived. Therefore, the
whole issue should be considered in an integrative manner as it includes many factors besides the translator.

She indicates that “I translated a book in a period during which there were sensitivities and pressure regarding the subject matter of the book” and therefore, “I had to translate several words in a more implicit way”. She notes that “the publishing house had a lawyer” and “my translation was returned to me several times due to sensitive issues” and therefore, “I had to find other words in order to solve these issues”.

One who considers censorship, be it self-imposed or otherwise, as necessary or acceptable in particular cases is interviewee 12. In his words:

The publishers [in Turkey] usually do not want [to publish] books that insult the [Turkish] nation… If a book includes negative comments about Turkey or Turks, to the point of insulting them, the [Turkish] nation would be sensitive [about it]… You cannot go against this [sensitivity]… In other countries like France, undoubtedly there must be censorships like these too…

Once, a [Turkish] translator who translated a Dostoyevsky work wrote in his foreword that he skipped several phrases from the original text because he did not want “to insult his nation with his own pen…”… If he did so, he would get into trouble… [On the other hand,] It would be wrong to pulverise a work while translating; in these cases, the translator would rather not translate it at all… When you translate a book written by a communist writer, you cannot make him a moderate leftist; you need to adhere [to his style]…

Interviewee 15 also relates to the issues of censorship, and explains that “sometimes publishers in Turkey censor translated texts because they know that otherwise, they may face problems in the future”. He adds that “at times, translators themselves self-censor because they are afraid of getting into trouble with their work or of getting rejected by the publishers”. He underlines that “the gravest case is when a translator thinks that s/he has the right to censor a text in accordance with his/her religious, philosophical or political views” and provides the examples of The Little Prince (Le Petit Prince, Antoine de Saint-
Exupery, 1943), censored by supporters of Atatürk, and *The Brothers Karamazov* (Dostoyevsky, 1880), censored by Turkish nationalist and religious factions.

He indicates that “political censorship was extensive during the 1970s in Turkey, mainly censoring of translations of leftist and Marxist texts”. He explains that “other areas are subject to censorship in Turkey, such as passages of sexual nature that are taken out completely from the texts, or erotic expressions that are skipped”. He notes that censorship of translations is not only applied in Turkey, but in other countries as well” and “distorted translations of Lenin’s works can be found in countries like China too”. He reports that “because of these censorships, significant differences and distortions can be found in some translations that are commissioned by leaders of different political factions in Turkey and elsewhere”.

Interviewee 6 also refers to translator prosecutions in Turkey and states that “particularly after the coup by the Turkish Armed Forces on 12 September 1980, several Turkish writers, publishers, translators and reviewers such as Selahattin Eyüboğlu and Vedat Günyol were prosecuted for having translated the books of François-Noël Babeuf (1760-1797), a French political journalist considered an anarchist, and because of having spread communist propaganda in Turkey with these translations”. He introduces the difference that exists between verbal and written translations with regard to prosecutors’ approaches and the censorship issue:

Let’s say, in a conference, the speaker is ranting against the regime; what should the conference interpreter do? Could s/he change the speech? If the speaker is an angry politician at the rostrum cursing? Simultaneous translators must be so well-trained that they are able to translate even the slightest ascription. But, in literary translations, they are being condemned [and prosecuted]… Leaders [in Turkey] should become more aware, and stop censoring phrases that go against their opinion.

Interviewee 9 reports: “I am a translator who has been prosecuted many times during my twenty-five years in this profession” and “I was imprisoned for one-and-a-half years because of one particular translation work”. She believes that “the issue of the prosecution of translators in Turkey will disappear automatically when freedom and democracy for all of citizens is finally secured and when freedom of opinion develops sufficiently”. She is
confident that “as long as the judiciary, media and universities in Turkey are tied to the government, translators will be continued to be prosecuted”. In her words:

I was prosecuted in about forty trials over twenty-five years. I was acquitted in most of them. I also experienced interesting things… In these prosecutions, there are expert-witnesses; Sahir Erman and Sulhi Dönmezer were usually the expert-witnesses in [most of my] trials. In one of these [trials], they submitted a report which states: “There are no elements of crime in the book, but as the translator’s world view is known, she should be prosecuted”. After this report, I rejected them as expert-witnesses in the subsequent cases…

She states: “I translated, among others, theoretical books” and “all of my lawsuits actually were due to these theoretical books”. She explains that “even when I translate Lenin or Marx, I try to adhere to their styles. She also underlines that “in spite of my prosecutions, I have not become more cautious” and “I does not apply self-censorship”. She notes:

It is always possible for a translator to be prosecuted, but translators in countries like ours are aware of this fact… [In spite of the fact that I was prosecuted many times,] I did not become more cautious. So why would other translators be? I never applied self-censorship and I do not [personally] know others who do.

Interviewee 12 is another translator among the interviewees who was personally prosecuted. He shares his experience:

This happened to me in the past. Six years after my first translation was published, someone applied to the prosecutor’s office… It was the period of [The Prime Minister] Adnan Menderes, a period of great pressure [in Turkey]. I had translated the book Taraskonlu Tartarin (Tartarin de Tarascon, Alphonse Daudet, 1872) where a nutty man travels to Africa and on his return, he climbs up to the minaret [of a mosque] and screams “Mohammed [the prophet] is an old charlatan…”, a sentence that I translated too… The editor, Mr. Yasar Nabi had not noticed it… The books were confiscated from the market. Probably, that sentence should have been skipped… At that time, there was a terrible chief prosecutor whose name was Hicabi Dinc, who put pressure on the press and authors… He claimed that the book
systematically attacked our religion… Luckily, my case fell to a good prosecutor and I got off.

Interviewee 8 provides her view on the subject matter from a publisher’s perspective, and she states that “the publishing houses describe translators as ‘experts’ and therefore, it is unacceptable that an ‘expert’ will admit to having executed a certain work ‘without knowing’ or ‘unconsciously’”. She explains:

If a translator says: “The publisher gave me [the job] and I just did it, so it is not my fault…”, then s/he does not bear the responsibility of an expert or professional translator. An expert should be able to defend his/her freedom of expression… However, expertise is a situation that manifests itself through behaviours... [As publishers], there are situations in which we think that a particular translation should not be done [for political reasons] and therefore, we do not accept it.

Interviewee 14 attempts to give a possible reason why translators in Turkey are exposed to prosecution and they do not fight against it severely. In her words:

Translation is a profession which is destined to failure… Even if you give a whole year to your translation, your work will still be open to criticism. This stems from the fact that languages and cultures are different [from each other] and you can never re-produce the same text [in your own language]. The original work is always one and unique.

For this reason, a translated work can be seen as flawed and the translators often feel “incomplete”, as if they have produced something which is not ideal, something which is downgraded. This is the psychology of many translators… Generally, this is why many translators harbour the notion, a kind of prejudice [against themselves], that they are wrong, and so do not seek their rights… If left to themselves, their sense of guilt usually outweighs their urge to claim their rights.

Interviewee 10 provides another dimension to the issue of translator prosecution, and describes one way in which some translators try to handle this issue. She explains that “there are cases in which a Turkish translator translates a particular book, but, having
reservations, does not want his/her name to show up” and therefore, “s/he translates the book with another fake, and usually foreign, name”. In this way, the translator’s real name and identity are concealed. She notes that “this phenomenon usually happens with obscene or political publications” and provides the following example:

One of my friends translated the book *Terror in the Bedroom* and the translated books were later recalled from the market here. She was prosecuted in an Istanbul courthouse for ‘obscenity’ and ‘immorality’, but later cleared. In these situations, you must pay a great deal of money to the judicial authorities, and you have nothing left of all the work you did…

She also shares the following:

I attended a seminar in Galatasaray University where there was a discussion on the works of [the famous Turkish author and translator] Nihal Yeginobali. [It was mentioned that] some fifty years ago, when [Turkish] society was more conservative, she published the book *Young Girls* (*Genç Kızlar*, Nihal Yeğinobalı, 1950) and several translations under the fake name of ‘Vincent Ewing’, so everyone thought she was American… Finally, after many years, in the course of events, she confessed that [in fact] these were her works…

Interviewee 10 also shares her personal experience, and the way in which she tried to handle this issue. In her words:

They proposed that I translate a [risky] book, but I declined and gave them the name of a friend… [For a Turkish translator], these [situations] create anxiety… Moreover, I am not able to manage these [kind of] utterances. [Other translators who do it] usually soften these [risky] words or pull them out completely and replace them with other words.

She also indicates that “in Turkey, the ruling parties publish only those publications that they like and those world views are close to theirs” and accordingly, “translators inevitably surrender to the publishers’ policy regarding self-censorship”.
Interviewee 13 reports: “I wrote two books about the prosecution of translators in Turkey” and “I am definitely against translator prosecutions”. He believes that “combining the subjectivity of translators automatically with that of authors is a great injustice”. In his view, “translators do not have to agree with everything written by the authors they translate”. He also thinks that “the concept of crime needs to be redefined and in a society that promotes freedom of opinion and expression, no one should be prosecuted due to his/her work of thought”. In his perspective, “responsibility for what appears in a translated book belongs to the author, not the translator”.

The legal aspects of translator prosecution in Turkey are raised by several interviewees, briefly by some and in detail by others. For instance, interviewee 4 indicates that “it is very important for a Turkish translator to know the laws and the regulations concerning censorship”, and interviewee 10 reports that "before professional institutionalisation was in place in Turkey, “The International Federation of Translators” gave legal support to Turkish translators, including financial help for court costs”.

Interviewee 15 explains that, to his understanding, “prosecution of and imposition of prohibitions on translators are incorrect according to the basic logic of law”. He elaborates on this point as follows:

Even if the existence of the idea of crimes of opinion is accepted, first of all, a judge should declare that a particular text is ‘criminal’, according to the basic logic of law. To do this, the judge must have read the text and in order for him to read the text, it must have been translated into Turkish. Hence, the translator cannot know that the text in question is objectionable while s/he is still in the process of translating it and the fact that a text still unwritten in the local language would be declared as objectionable is contrary to the basic logic of law.

Interviewee 14 also relates to the legal aspects of translator prosecution, and notes:

Before [Turkish] laws regarding copyrights and translations were properly configured, for every problem the authorities immediately arrested the translators… Later, these laws were changed and more responsibilities put on publishers’ shoulders. In the law, if the author does not live in Turkey, then the translator
becomes legally liable, which is, in my opinion, entirely wrong… In addition [to the legal aspects], Turkish translators also face many social sanctions, such as exclusion from society, and being condemned and insulted.

Interviewee 15 provides detailed information regarding the legal aspects related to the prosecution of the translators in Turkey. In his words:

Turbulent political periods in Turkey impacted in several ways and several translators were held responsible for the content of their translations. We have colleagues who were arrested and prosecuted by the [Turkish] state because the works that they translated were considered criminal. This situation still continues and has become even more frequent since September 12, 1980. The second article of the [Turkish] Press Law has not yet been changed. This article states that if the author of a work is abroad and s/he cannot be arrested, then the translator can be sentenced.

Two years ago, we started an extensive campaign that we called ‘Do not shoot the interpreter’ and I wrote its texts myself. At that time, I was the president of ‘the Association of Conference Interpreters’. But, [surprisingly], the most serious objection to this campaign came from translators themselves. Some translators declared that, in terms of responsibility and prosecution, they are like the authors, and therefore they can be condemned… In Turkey, in order to become important, you must either be killed or sent to jail; artists and intellectuals get noticed only in this way.

Another objection came from the academics; they said that “a translator is not a photocopy machine”. I certainly agree that, especially in literary translations, every translator’s work is at the same time a [personal] interpretation and a transfer in accordance with his/her own abilities and perceptions. However, this does not mean that s/he can be held responsible for the philosophical and intellectual content. That belongs only to the author.

If we assume that the translator of a work can be held responsible, then [it would mean that] they have a right to change the content of the original texts deliberately
according to their beliefs, but they do not have such a right. They must show loyalty and diligence to the content of the translation. Loyalty does not mean translating word-for-word, but it means using different methods and language games when necessary. The only reason you do that as a translator is your desire to be loyal to the [original] text and this is why you cannot interfere with its content, you cannot censor it or change it according to your own thoughts and beliefs. Therefore, you cannot be held responsible for the [translation’s] content.

Moreover, many translators [in Turkey] do not choose the texts [to be translated]; most of them translate texts chosen and provided to them by publishers, and when they do the translation [of the texts], it does not mean that they agree with each and every line. Holding translators responsible for translation work they perform is outdated and unacceptable behaviour.

He then adds social, cultural and ideological aspects to the equation and concludes:

The real reason behind such prohibitions is to prevent translators [in Turkey] from performing translations of particular texts, and also to apply sufficient pressure to [eventually,] start self-censorship… [We should keep in mind that] the majority of the [Turkish] population does not know a foreign language. [According to the statistics,] it is only one third of the population, and the degree to which they know these languages is questionable. Even if they [really] know them, they can know only one or two [foreign languages]; they cannot know all foreign languages.

Even if [a Turkish citizen] knows English or French, how will s/he understand a text that is in Chinese or in Arabic? Prohibitions, repressions and control mechanisms imposed on translators actually deprive the [Turkish] nation of the freedom and right to have access to thoughts and texts generated in other parts of the world.

Therefore, these are not only interferences with the freedom of thought, they are also direct interventions in the freedom of receiving news and information… At the same time, they are restrictions imposed on the [Turkish] nation’s freedom to make its voice heard in the world, which is against democracy… As a result of our
campaign, several cases against translators were withdrawn, but they did not disappear completely. We have not yet achieved significant or adequate results.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the socio-political and cultural environment in which translators operate in Turkey, based on semi-structured interviews and utilising Pierre Bourdieu’s seminal sociological framework on culture and power, and the relationship between power and translation. Considering translation via Bourdieu’s concepts of field of power and capital enabled the research to assess translation as entrenched within the power relations among translators and power-holders, other intra and extra-textual actors, and involving the patrons of ideology. Bourdieu’s perspective allows us to examine the social space in which interactions, transactions and events occur, to locate the object of investigation in its specific historical and local, national, international context, to interrogate the ways in which previous knowledge about the object under study had been generated, by whom and in whose interests. Moreover, the research exploited Lefevere’s perspective on Translation Studies, taking into account his concepts of ‘ideological’ and ‘economic’ patronage that explain the role of individuals and institutions that impact on the reading, writing and rewriting of literature.

In line with Bourdieu’s sociological framework and Lefevere’s concept of patronage, the chapter explored the translator as one of the main agents of the act of translating and positioned him/her within the broader translation process in Turkey. Looking at the translator from historical, sociological, ideological, political, legal and economic perspectives enables us to see the translator as an individual, and also to observe this individual’s web of relations within society; the peculiar relationships that exist between state, society and the individual—in this case the translator. In order to analyse the dynamics of Translation Studies, and the role of translators and their complex and multifaceted interactions with state and society, the interviewees are asked several questions in a semi-structured manner exploring—in alignment with Bourdieu’s sociological framework—the extent to which economic, socio-cultural and political conditions impact on translational behaviour and Translation Studies. Questions which were dealt with in details in chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4, chiefly focussed on interviewees’
personal values and attitudes and also on their professional habitus; their relations with publishers, society and the state.

In this regard, the main themes to emerge from the interviews are the following, which shall be examined later on in detail. Almost all interviewees are in favour of a state-led modernisation process; emphasise the crucial role of education in Translation Studies; highlight the impact of ideological patronage in the translation process including prosecution, censorship and self-censorship; and stress the role of ideology in shaping translation studies.

As can be seen from the interviewees’ reports, the policies and ideologies of the political establishment in Turkey seem to have a strong influence on the field of translation with regard to the strategies and behaviours of not only translators but also of publishing houses, which are the main employers of literary translators in Turkey.

This influence is particularly evident when we evaluate the interviewees’ reports on the following themes: “Quality of Translation in Turkey and Attributes of Qualified Translators”, “Quality of Translation Studies Education in Turkey”, “In/visibility of Translators’ Identities on Translations”, “Translation Associations and Organisations in Turkey”, “Ottoman Translation Associations, Turkish Republic’s Public Translation Activities and Actual State-Supported / Subsidised Translation Corporations in Turkey” and “Prosecution of Translators in Turkey, Censorship and Self-Censorship”. The last two themes markedly relate to the powerful influence policies and ideologies of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey had on the field of translation in Turkey.

In a remarkable way, almost all interviewees are knowledgeable about Ottoman translation associations and organisations, referring mainly to Ottoman literary and translation activities from the Tanzimat period, during which the Terceme Odası was of special importance because “it symbolised the orientation of the Ottoman state towards Europe, the adoption of a new mentality, and the ascendancy to power of a new civilian bureaucracy which was substantially different from the old imperial officials” (Karpat 2002: 259-260).
Markedly, the interviewees view very positively the *Tanzimat* period’s main ideology and policy of “orientation towards Europe”, or in their own terms, “the Westernisation process”. They relate similarly to the *Tercüme Bürosu* of Minister of Education, Hasan Ali Yücel, placing special emphasis on the positive contributions this particular institution made to social and cultural lives in Turkey in general, and on the field of translation in particular.

Clearly, they also take a stance on the European orientation of the *Tanzimat* period, and its adoption later by republican cadres as they struggled to create a modern and secular society in Turkey, referring particularly to the extensive reform programme carried out in the first decades of the Turkish Republic with an emphasis on language policies. For them, the *Tercüme Bürosu* was an essential part of this initiative and reflected the modernist attitude of the Republic of Turkey.

The interviewees refer to the above-mentioned initiatives and activities in positive terms not only because these helped the newly-established Turkish state to establish itself and approach the social and cultural levels of contemporary civilisations and societies quite rapidly, but also because the organisations established by these initiatives helped translators to gain—at least during these two historical periods—a position of relatively high social status and power in the country.

Pierre Bourdieu offered us one of the most influential frameworks for study of the factors conditioning the power relations inherent in both the practice and theory of translation. As Wolf (2007: 22) highlighted, Bourdieu’s sociology seems particularly fertile for an in-depth understanding of the social relevance and responsibility of the translation process. His theory of practice enables us to analyse the impact translation can have or actually has on social change, or the relation of social factors of dominance to the selection and ultimately the shaping of translations (Wolf 2007: 12).

Evidently, the interviewees in this research favour ideological and political initiatives which strengthen the positions of translators in the field and increase the impact that translation has on the society. The two main control factors, namely, “ideological patronage” and “economic patronage” suggested by André Lefevere can shed light on the above-mentioned phenomenon observed among the interviewees.
Lefevere defines patronage as “something like the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature” (Lefevere 1992a: 15). It controls the entire translation process, from developing trends in translation, and the thriving and decline of certain works of translated literature, to the life and social position of translators. Patrons “see to it that translations are commissioned or at least put before the general public. It stands to reason, therefore, that they will have at least a say in shaping the strategies different translators select to produce their translations” (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: 45). The “best, “successful” and “famous” translators chosen by the political patrons of the Ottoman Empire’s Tanzimat period and by those of the Republic of Turkey right after its establishment served to strengthen the status of both these translators and the field of translation itself in Turkish society.

Patronage manipulates the translational process by exerting influence on professional translators in particular, and patrons try to regulate the relationship between the literary system and other systems on the spectrum of culture. According to Lefevere, alongside the economic and the status components, the ideological component is one of the three basic elements that constitutes patronage, and it acts as a constraint on the choice and development of both the form and subject matter.

Moreover, it may be argued that since “the impact of a translated work of literature depends primarily on the image of it created by the translators” (Lefevere 1995: 8), the translators appointed to the above-mentioned translation institutions were expected to operate in such a way to create the desired image of the literature works to be translated. Suffice it to say here that this desired image consisted of nothing more than what the political establishment envisaged it to be.

Most of the interviewees note that the authors, translators and other scholars employed by the Turkish state in work for the two state-supported translation institutions mentioned above, were “the best ones of that period”, “successful” and “well-known”, and regard the the translation works produced by these institutions as “extremely valuable”, “successful” and “important”. Thuse, we see that the interviewees actually consider the ideology and policy of the Turkish state during these two periods as important factors in raising the quality of literary works and translation in the country.
On the other hand, interviewees who reveal their opinions regarding the “Quality of Translation in Turkey and Attributes of Qualified Translators” evaluate the quality of translation in Turkey in our era as relatively low, and below the level that it should be. Their implicit referrals to 1) the lack of efficient translation-related quality control mechanisms in the field as one reason for the low quality of translation in Turkey, and 2) the fact that in Western countries, translators having to pass many exams in order to receive the official title of “translator”, are both suggestive of an internal control mechanism, i.e. professional, rather than external. This is also reflected in the interviewees’ differing accounts of state-sponsored translation activities.

Those who are convinced that translation activities in Turkey should be managed only by the private sector believe that the state is not capable of managing such activities, and feel that were state-sponsored structures in existence today, they would be influenced by the ideologies of political parties and power groups. As opposed to their views regarding the ideologies of the Tanzimat period and of the early years of The Republic of Turkey, the interviewees see this as undesirable because the ideology of the current state is not necessarily one of Westernisation. With Lefevere’s emphasis on translation as a tool that inevitably serves political patrons, what can be deduced from the above thoughts is that it is the content, rather than the form itself that is being opposed by actors in the field of translation in Turkey.

Many interviewees in our research relate to the theme of “Quality of Translation Studies Education in Turkey” in an elaborate way and share their experiences, observations and opinions. It is worth mentioning that the field of education was of special interest to Bourdieu, confirmed by the multitude and significance of his investigations in this field (e.g. 1988; 1996b; Bourdieu & Passeron 1977; Bourdieu & Passeron 1979; Bourdieu et al. 1990a). This was mainly due to Bourdieu’s belief that, more than any other field, education reproduces itself, and the strength and the influence of its practices and discourses leave almost no social agent who occupies a dominant position is immune to its effects. (The State Nobility, 1996b).

It is in light of this perspective and its reminders that this thesis includes translation education in Turkey as an integral part of its field study. Translation education becomes a
translator’s social, cultural and symbolic capitals—with no direct implication, according to this study, that formal education in translation can directly add to a translator’s economic capital—and provides many valuable clues to understanding the sociology of translation and the dynamics of its field in Turkey.

One important piece of information we obtain from the interviewees who relate to this theme is that the Turkish state’s ideological attitude and policies dictate considerably the dynamics of the educational system in Turkey in all fields of study, and particularly in translation studies. Many interviewees mention the ineffectiveness of both the Turkish university entrance system and the students’ selection and placement criteria.

From the interviewees’ accounts, it is evident that many students find themselves in translation studies randomly, not necessarily because they rank it as their priority. This implies deficiency in the entrance and placement system in Turkey and also explains why in this research, it is widely reported that awareness and quality are low among students when they start their studies.

Moreover, most of the interviewees place emphasis on the importance of bridging the gap that exists between the academia of translation studies and the dynamics of the field of translation from a practical point of view. There is a consensus that many academics in the field of translation in Turkey are disconnected from the real sector outside. Various suggestions and constructive criticisms are provided by the interviewees on this issue.

Toury (1995: 250, as cited in Wolf 2007: 8-9) argues that translators undergo a socialisation process during which feedback procedures, motivated by norms, are assimilated. This helps them to develop strategies for coping with the various problems they encounter during actual translation, and in some cases translators might even adopt automatised techniques to resolve specific problems. This internalisation process is part of the translator’s habitus. The disconnection between academics in the field of translation and the professional translation sector as reported by the interviewees may point to the existence of differing socialisation processes and norms for the academics and professional translators in this field in Turkey, therefore, creating differing strategies for coping and habitus.
Simeoni (1998: 26) distinguishes habitus from norms by stressing the role of translators themselves. According to him, a habitus-governed account emphasises the extent to which translators themselves play a role in the maintenance and perhaps the creation of norms. In order to be accepted by society, to maintain a job as a professional translator, to be published, to obtain scholarships, to win friends and influence people, and possibly even avoid imprisonment, the translator must follow certain conventions (Milton and Bandia 2009: 8). The disconnection between academics in the field of translation and the professional translation sector as reported by the interviewees brings to mind that the conventions for academics and for professional translators in this field in Turkey can differ from each other, leading to the creation of differing capitals, habitus, and connections to the field of power.

Additionally, what Lefevere’s patronage reminds us of is the fact that although agents can sometimes be located at an extra-textual site, showing no sign of direct connection, they may yet have an impact on the selection, production, dissemination, and reception of translation products. Be they “agents of change” (Toury 2002: 151), who implicitly or explicitly attempt “culture planning”, the extent of their influence will highly depend on the position they occupy in the field, as a result of the amount of capital – used in a Bourdieusian sense – they hold. In this sense, the reported disconnection between academics and professional translators can imply differing levels of influence of ideological patronage (and probably economic patronage as well) on these two groups in the field of translation in Turkey.

Prosecution of translators in Turkey and censorship, self-imposed and otherwise, are certainly the most salient theme in the interviews, and expose the power and influence that the Turkish state has on translators in Turkey. Particularly with the use of the legal system and its related tools and mechanisms, the state in Turkey emerges as a powerful and forceful ideological patron. This is where it becomes evident that an extra-textual agent does indeed have an impact on the selection, production, dissemination, and reception of translation products (Toury 2002: 151).

According to the interviewees’ accounts, prosecutions of translators in Turkey cause publishers to apply censorship on translators and induce the latter to self-censor in their work as preventive or corrective measures. Since all interviewees are aware of the fact that
translators have been, are and will continue to be prosecuted in Turkey on various grounds, and none displays indifference or insensitivity towards the issue, we can deduce that the censorship strategies they and publishers use are significantly representative strategies in the field of translation in Turkey, shaping the translators’ habitus at varying levels, depending on their economic, cultural, social and symbolic capitals.

It is remarkable that some translators in Turkey develop alternative coping strategies, as creative as using a fake, usually foreign, name, and in this way, conceal their real names and identities, particularly for obscene or political publications. Those interviewees who indicate that they do not apply self-censorship and/or would not permit the publishers that they work with to apply censorship on their work actually also take a particular strategy with their statement and clearly, their habitus is shaped accordingly.

Daniel Simeoni (1998) takes Bourdieu’s concept of habitus into account from a different perspective. Simeoni claims that over the centuries the translatorial habitus has contributed to the internalisation of a submissive behaviour, thus generating low social prestige for translators. In other words, historical conditioning and willing acceptance of norms by the translators has significantly contributed to the secondariness of translation activity (Simeoni 1998: 6).

On the other hand, it should be noted that, although the translators may adopt differing strategies vis-a-vis the undesirable possibility of prosecution according to their habitus, position in the field, power relations, belief systems and ideologies, the ideological patronage enforced by the Turkish legal authorities and the related decision-making systems in Turkey do not appear to distinguish among translators in the field. As the interviewees report; famous, successful and powerful translators were and can be prosecuted, as well as translators having less capital.

Therefore, even though in general terms, players who begin the game with particular forms of capital are usually advantaged at the expense of others as they are able to use their capital advantage to gain/accumulate more and be relatively more successful, this fact does not appear to hold true in the case of prosecution of translators in Turkey.
The Bourdieusian framework—field, capital and habitus—integrates a theory of social structure (translation as a field), a theory of power relations (capital and translation), and a theory of the individual (habitus of the translator). To revisit these concepts shortly; capital is accumulated labour (in its materialised, or incorporated, embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labour.

Bourdieu believed that in order to understand interactions between people or to explain an event or social phenomenon, it is insufficient to look at what is said or what happened; instead it makes epistemic sense to examine the social space in which interactions, transactions and events occur (Bourdieu 2005: 148). For Bourdieu, in this respect, the analysis of social space means not only locating the object of investigation in its specific historical and local, national, and international context, but also interrogating the ways in which previous knowledge about the object under study had been generated, by whom and in whose interests (e.g. Bourdieu 1993, 1994, 2001). This specific understanding demonstrated by Bourdieu is applicable in this research.

Along with social, political and economic relations embedded in power relations, Heilbron and Sapiro (2007: 99) also focus on Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic capital (or symbolic power) and argue that the relative autonomy of cultural fields was wrested gradually from influence of the state and the market, which continue to govern the production and circulation of symbolic goods. Bourdieu (1991: 164) describes symbolic power as "the invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they themselves exercise it.” This complicity lies at the heart of practice and is explained not by any conscious concealment but by the structural relations between semiotic systems (including language), the habitus (including the perspectives it embodies), and the field (Hanks 2005: 76). Evidently, the symbolic capital that a translator in Turkey holds does not have an effect on his/her exposure to prosecution.

Moreover, although the overwhelming majority of the interviewees consider the prosecution of the translators as unacceptable, this view does not appear to have an effect on the strategies that they implement. This is because they are aware of the fact that self-censorship in Turkey is increased especially during times of high political pressure and that
censorship is applied almost every time a translation connotes anything that is negative about Turkishness or Turkey. Here, it is appropriate to remind ourselves of Bourdieu’s efforts to answer the question that lies at the heart of his intellectual exercise “How can behaviour be regulated without being the product of obedience to rules?” (Bourdieu 1994: 65) or to put it in Maton’s words, “How social structure and individual agency can be reconciled?” (Maton 2008: 50).

With respect to ideological patronage by the Turkish state and its legal system, and in accordance with the interviewees’ reports, we observe a picture of Turkey’s translation field in which one of the three following scenarios happen: The translator applies self-censorship to his/her work whenever there are sensitive issues—with a special emphasis on insulting Turkishness—or, if this is not done sufficiently, the publisher applies censorship on the work, and if neither of these happens, then both translator and publisher are exposed to the possibility of prosecution by the state.

This leads us to TCK 301, the infamous article of the Turkish Penal Code (Türk Ceza Kanunu). Until amended, as part of Turkey’s European Union membership candidacy-motivated reforms on September 26th, 2004, the article was in Book 2, Section 4, Chapter 3 under the heading “Crimes against the Symbols of Turkish Sovereignty and against the Dignity of Turkish Government Institutions” and under the title “insulting Turkishness, the Republic, and State Institutions”.

The article included the following items17: a person who publicly denigrates Turkishness, the Republic or the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, shall be punishable by imprisonment of between six months and three years; a person who publicly denigrates the Government of the Republic of Turkey, the judicial institutions of the State, the military or security organizations shall be punishable by imprisonment of between six months and two years; in cases where denigration of Turkishness is committed by a Turkish citizen in another country the punishment shall be increased by one third; expressions of thought intended to criticise shall not constitute a crime. A person who publicly denigrates Turkishness, the Republic or the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, shall be punishable by imprisonment of between six months and three years.

---

The vagueness of the terms emphasised – Turkishness, denigration, and criticism – resulted in many controversial and sensational cases, and was criticised by many in both national and international public and legal circles. Newspapers and press organizations stated that the revised law remained vague enough to allow for arbitrary court decisions, and this in turn might threaten freedom of expression (Euractiv 2005). Thousands of journalists, writers, academics, publishers, lawyers and translators in Turkey were investigated and brought to trial because of this problematic article. Although a translator, as opposed to a writer, journalist, artist, and academic, can deny responsibility for the original work, it is at that moment that s/he would possibly lose the will, agency, and potential for the profession.

One particular interviewee observes that usually, the prosecution of a translator happens because of disconnections in the system. She explains that a translator belongs to a bigger system that includes more players and therefore, s/he is only one part of the final translation product, behind which there are more players. The law-makers in Turkey should be aware of the fact that there is a whole mechanism operating behind a translation work. When a publishing house signs a contract with a translator, the translator becomes ‘institutionalised’, which means that s/he is no longer alone and in order to protect him/her, the translated texts are usually inspected before their publication. From this perspective, not the translator on his/her own as a separate player, but the whole mechanism which stands behind him/her (including the publishing house, the editor, other proofreaders, the lawyers, the association – if there is any involved in the particular translation work – and so forth) is in fact under the effect of “the ideological patronage”, as set forth by Lefevere in his theory.

According to Lefevere, the role of ideology in the shaping of a translation is an important factor. By “ideology”, Lefevere understands “a set of discourses which wrestle over interests which are in some way relevant to the maintenance or interrogation of power structures central to a whole form of social and historical life” (Gentzler 2004: 136). Lefevere’s term is not limited to the political sphere and according to him, ideology is anything that they may be in the form of conventions or beliefs that order our actions (Lefevere 1992a: 16). Ideology is often enforced by patrons, individuals or institutions that commission or publish translations.
Ideology is the key notion in Lefevere’s theory of manipulation, which refers to the translator’s ideology which s/he willingly accepts or the ideology imposed upon the translators by patronage. If translations are not in conflict with the culture’s ideology (standards for acceptable behaviour in the target culture), they are published more easily and accepted in the target culture. Therefore, ideology always determines the choice and reception of the subject matters of the original texts in translation (Zhang 2012: 298).

Lefevere states:

The ideology dictates the basic strategy the translator is going to use and therefore, also dictates solutions to problems concerned with both the ‘universe of discourse’ expressed in the original (objects, concepts, customs belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer of the original) and the language the original itself is expressed in. (Lefevere 1992a: 41)

Ideology in Lefevere’s terms is not limited to the political sphere, but can also be understood as systems of ideas based on value judgments and attitudes, or the propositions and assumptions people hold, that influence people’s thoughts and behaviours (Zhang 2012: 298). On the other hand, translation is also related with authority and legitimacy; namely with “power” (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: 2).

As Lefevere stressed, translation is not just a window opened on another world; it is not an isolated act, but part of an ongoing process of inter-cultural transfer. In the newer approaches to translation, the relation between the writer/reader and the translation is a focus and inevitably involves relations of power (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: xi). In particular, the notion of “rewriting” in Lefevere’s approach is one that denotes both manipulative interventions on the level of the text and cultural (literary) devices which direct and control the production procedure in the interplay of social forces. The patronage system at work within this interplay embraces individuals, collectives and institutions, which are determined mainly by ideology (Wolf 2007: 10).

In this respect, the interviewees advise translators in Turkey to be knowledgeable about their rights, to have attorneys or legal advisors and not to accept without questioning the
facts imposed on them. According to the interviewees’ reports, the whole issue should be considered in an integrative manner by the players in the field of translation as well as by the ideological patrons who dictate the mentioned issues and rules to the players.

Since the 1990s, as the rising of post-colonial studies and the growing impact of power theories such as Pierre Bourdieu’s culture and power theory, the relationship between power and translation has attracted the attention of a great number of scholars (Long 2012: 40). Analysing translation via Bourdieu’s field of power and capital concepts leads to an interpretative and broader analysis of the field of translation in Turkey and in order to gain a deeper understanding, it is necessary to think of translation as embedded within power relations among translators and power-holders, as well as all other intra and extra-textual actors, including the ideological patrons.

In Lefevere’s explanation of translation, patronage is presented as a control factor that operates mostly outside the literary system proper. By patronage, André Lefevere means “any kind of force that can be influential in encouraging and propagating, but also in discouraging, censoring and destroying works of literature” (Gentzler 2004: 137). The patronage is understood to mean something like “the powers (persons, institutions) which help or hinder the writing, reading and rewriting of literature”. Patronage is usually more interested in the ideology of literature than in its poetics (Lefevere 1985) and it consists of various elements, which are seen to interact in various combinations.

There is an ideological component, which acts as a constraint on the choice and development of both form and subject-matter. Patrons may be persons (influential and powerful individuals), groups of persons (a religious body, a political party, a social class, a royal court, and publishers), and the media. The role of patrons cannot be ignored when production of a cultural artefact is the case. Patrons will have central roles in regulating the literary system, prizes, the educational system and censorship.

Analysing the impact of censorship and self-censorship on translation has become an integral part of researching the ideological aspects of translation. However, as indicated by the interviewees in this research, we must distinguish between the self-censorship applied by a translator because of concern about the possibility of prosecution, and the self-
censorship applied due to his/her religious, philosophical or political views on the subject matter of the text to be translated.

Studying translation in the shadow of censorship means investigating the manipulatory mechanisms at work altering the meaning of original texts, and thus excluding the reader from the choices made in the source language. In the case of Turkey, censorship in translation has been used as a powerful tool to help safeguard the nation's culture from outside influences and promote the regimes’ sensitivities.

There is consensus among the interviewees that the ruling parties in Turkey generally publish only those publications they approve of and whose world views are close to theirs. Accordingly translators inevitably surrender to publishers’ policy regarding self-censorship. As reported by some of the interviewees, in addition to the legal aspects, Turkish translators are also faced with many social sanctions such as exclusion from society, and condemnation and insults.

One interviewee who provides a publisher’s view on this subject explains that the publishing houses describe translators as “experts” or “professionals”, and as such, should be able to defend his/her freedom of expression, and is not in a position to state that a work was performed unknowingly or unawares.

A possible explanation for why translators in Turkey, when exposed to prosecution, do not fight against it strongly enough is given by one of the interviewees, who reveals that the psychological stance of many translators in Turkey is one of incompleteness, faultiness and imperfection due to the intrinsic nature of translation. This can cause a translator to feel that s/he somehow downgrades the original text by his/her translation, feeling the impossibility of re-producing the exact effect in the target language. If such a sense of guilt actually exists among the translators in Turkey, or at least in some, then it is reasonable to assume that it may deter them from taking a stand and remaining submissive to the ideological patronage in the country.

Moreover, according to the interviewees’ accounts, many translators in Turkey do not choose the texts to be translated: most are chosen and provided to them by the publishers. According to Bourdieu, the social field consists of positions occupied by social agents
(people and institutions) and what happens in the field is consequently framed. For Bourdieu, the nature of the interaction that occurs in a field is competitive, with various social agents using competing strategies to maintain or improve their position. In this regard, the interactions that occur in the field of translation in Turkey, as reported by the interviewees, provide us with a picture in which publishers and translators are strictly and directly influenced by the power and ideology of the state, and hierarchically, translators are also strictly and directly influenced by the power of publishers, who themselves are compelled to obey the Turkish state’s ideology.

The interdependency between fields is especially important in making sense of how the field of power, the largest field in society, both shapes and is shaped by different social fields, which are at interplay as a result of collectives of people occupying more than one social field at any given time. Defined strictly in terms of power relations:

The field of power is a field of forces defined by the structure of the existing balance of forces between forms of power or between different species of capital. It is also simultaneously a field of struggle for power among holders of different forms of power. It is a space of play and competition in which the social agents and institutions confront one another in strategies aimed at preserving or transforming this balance of forces. (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992: 76)

This approach is instrumental in highlighting the correspondences or compatibility between a position in the field and the stance of the agent occupying that position. The hierarchical nature of the positions dictates the underlying logic of position-taking strategies, which make the field the main mediator of how social agents act in specific contexts.

With regard to translators’ habitus, shaped by the ideological patronage in Turkey, an overwhelming majority of the interviewees are convinced that prohibitions, repressions and control mechanisms imposed on translators actually deprive the Turkish nation of the freedom and right to have access to the thoughts and texts generated in other parts of the world. Therefore, they consider these not only as interferences with freedom of thought, but also as direct interventions in the freedom of receiving news and information.
While relating to the theme of “Translation Associations and Organisations in Turkey”, many interviewees refer to the challenges that translation associations in Turkey encounter in their attempts to unite under one roof, by becoming a federation or a professional chamber, and they reveal the impact of the Turkish state’s political and ideological power on these efforts and processes. One interviewee implicitly mentions the stalemate that the associations have reached because of ideologies and politics interfering in the processes of establishing a professional union for translators in Turkey and recognition of translation as a profession in Turkish law.

In his book *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, André Lefevere states that “[t]here appears to be a double control factor that sees to it that the literary system does not fall too far out of step with the other subsystems society consists of” (1992a: 14). What he suggests is that the control factor within the literary system is the “professional”, while the factor found outside the literary system is “patronage”.

Patronage, as described by Lefevere, can be exerted by an influential and powerful individual in a given historical era; in the case of Turkey, this category refers to the founding fathers of the Republic in general, and to Atatürk in particular. It should also be remembered that even after his death, his cult of personality was / is used as a tool for legitimisation. Patronage can also be exerted by groups of people including “a religious body, a political party, a social class, a royal court and publishers” (Lefevere 1992a:15); in the case of Turkey, this category is as influential as the former.

According to some interviewees, any criticism related to the content of a translation work should be directed to the author and not to the translator, as the translator is only an intermediary, and only if a translator changes the content of the text or manipulates it can s/he be held responsible for the content.

On the other hand, one interviewee reports the confusion that exists among translators in Turkey regarding their role, their degree of in/visibility and the ownership of the content of a translated text; most protest the fact that translators may be prosecuted, not only because this interferes with the legitimacy of freedom of thought and expression, but also because of the “intermediary status of a translator”. However, when it comes to responsibility and
in/visibility, translators in Turkey are reported to be convinced that a translator is “like an author” and is not “a photocopy machine”.

According to Lefevere (1992b: xi), translation is a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and, as such, manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power and, in its positive aspect, can help in the evolution of a literature and a society (Lefevere 1992b: xi).

With respect to translator subjectivity, it should be noted that translators tend to have relatively little freedom in their dealings with patrons, at least if they want to have their translations published. Patrons can encourage the publication of translations they consider acceptable, and can also quite effectively prevent the publication of translations they do not consider so (Lefevere 1992b: 19).

Although there is the power of patronage, agents of translation, i.e. translators, have their own subjective contributions. For instance, they may be going against the system by attempting to introduce works which are not accepted by the ideological system (Milton and Bandia 2009: 5). However, translators have to strike a balance between the ‘universe of discourse’ (i.e. the whole complex of concepts, ideologies, persons, and objects belonging to a particular culture) as acceptable to the author of the original, and that other ‘universe of discourse’ which is acceptable and familiar to the translator and his or her audience (Lefevere 1992b: 14).

Lefevere not only ascribes a social dimension to this notion (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: 48), but also extends it by means of Bourdieu’s concept of “cultural capital”, which he sees as the driving force for the distribution of translations within a specific culture, as “cultural capital is transmitted, distributed and regulated by means of translation, among other factors, not only between cultures, but also within one given culture” (Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: 41). In order to complement the perspective of the sociology of translation agents, it is necessary to attribute equal importance to the sociology of the translation product, which serves a cultural function by contributing to the construction of not only national and/or social, but also ideological and/or religious identity. This is mainly due to
the fact that neither the selected titles nor the discourses formed around them are ideology-free and may become objects of cultural structuring.

This PhD thesis attempts to use a multi-dimensional approach in its investigation of the translator as one of the main agents of the act of translating, and position him/her within a wider system of translation. The historical, sociological, ideological, political, legal and economic perspectives can solidify our understanding of the translator as an individual, and at the same time, they can also elucidate on the links this individual has with the society in which s/he lives. While we examine the role of human agency in translation activity and aim to re-establish the link between it and the structure, the economic aspect of the structure within which agents operate in a Turkish context needs to be closely targeted. In order to understand the effects of today’s economic structure on translation behaviour in Turkey, we need to highlight the relationships that exist between this structure, its main actuators, the related translation behaviour and the translator’s habitus.

As we glean from the interviews, while policies and ideologies of the political establishment in Turkey seem to have a strong influence on translation and translators, it would appear that the publishing houses—as the main employers of literary translators in Turkey—are the major actuators in the related economic structure, and they seem to have a strong influence on translators as well. In this respect, the theme “Relations between Translators and Publishing Houses / Editors in Turkey” strikingly uncovers the powerful influence of publishing houses’ economic policies on translators and shows to what extent economic patronage reflects on the habitus of the translators.

Recognition of the translator as an individual who acts within a society as any other individual, with similar social and economic concerns, has been argued for when considering translation activity. Toury’s norm-governed translation theory and Lefevere’s concept of patronage are instrumental in providing a framework for understanding how these economic concerns and individuals’ sensitivity towards them are closely linked with the economic environment in which translation is produced.

The first notable conclusion that we can come to concerning publishing houses in Turkey from the interviews is the consensus among those interviewed on the lack of competence in the field of translation in most publishing houses. Interviewees express their
dissatisfaction with the lack of professional knowledge in the field of translation among
publishers and their editors, yet these are the individuals / institutions who employ
translators, evaluate their performances and deal with their payments and financial
rewards. The interviewees who relate to this issue indicate that editors generally consider
theoretical knowledge “unnecessary” and that “they do not have the necessary knowledge
to discuss the relevant translation strategy with translators”. However, a particular group of
publishing houses, paradoxically belonging to banking institutions, is mentioned by the
interviewees as “competent and reputable” and “having infrastructures strong enough to
publish not only easy and fast-selling books, but also literary works of lasting rather than
commercial value”.

On the other hand, one interviewee, who relates to the topic of the publishers’ competence
from the perspective of a publisher, indicates that “the editors know exactly which
adjustments and corrections must be made in the texts” and that “there are several rules to
follow”. In her view, “a translation’s proofreading must be done considering the segment
to which it will appeal and the reason for which it will be used, namely its skopos”. She
actually implies that there are several rules to follow not only in terms of translation-
related professionalism, but also, or mainly, in terms of economic, commercial and
marketing-related considerations.

The economic component of Lefevere’s concept of patronage mainly concerns payment to
writers and rewriters (Lefevere 1992b: 14). Lefevere’s concept of patronage reminds us
that agents such as publishers may have a great deal of impact on the selection, production,
dissemination, and reception of translation products (Toury 2002: 151). According to the
interviewees, the translation field in Turkey is highly influenced by monetary concerns of
the economic patrons, i.e. the publishers, and by the choices and strategies arising from
these concerns.

In cases of extreme liberalisation in a book market, cultural goods may appear primarily as
commercial products obeying the law of profitability. The best illustration of this is the
process of manufacturing standardised worldwide bestsellers. The field of publishing is
dominated more and more by large business enterprises that impose criteria of profitability
that may harm the literary and cultural logic (Bourdieu 1999, as cited in Heilbron and
Sapiro 2007: 98). The overall impression received from the pictures drawn by the
interviewees is that the publishers in Turkey are generally oriented towards commercial books which will sell fast and many copies, with little importance attached to their literary value, while considering the work of translators mainly in materialistic terms with little importance attached to the quality of their work. These factors are not only a consequence of, but also the cause of, their lack of competence regarding the content or other translation-related professional matters.

While a considerable portion of interviewees mention that “their relationships with the publishers have been good”, “the publishers respect them” and “there were no issues regarding the contracts and payments”, also indicating that “even if deadlines are too short and the work under pressure, many translators working on an ongoing basis for a publisher are satisfied with their job”, they still believe that the static approach of publishing houses in Turkey should be analysed and questioned, editorial matters should be discussed and reintroduced, and there should be more cooperation between translators and publishing house editors.

On the other hand, interviewees note the important role publishers play in the field of translation, not only because they are the main employers in this industry in Turkey, but also because they are the link between the academic world of translation studies and the “real translation world outside”. Most interviewees mention the need for academics in the field of translation to stay connected with the publishing houses, and that translation studies students should do internships at publishing houses in order to gain practice in the field – also as stated in the theme “Translation Theories Versus Practice”. These points raised by the interviewees show us that the publishers are indeed the “patrons” in this industry, and they have multi-dimensional significance and effects on the translation field and translators in Turkey.

According to the majority of interviewees, publishers in Turkey have their own intellectual, political and economic troubles, which, in turn, lead them to a preference for working with inexperienced, cheap translators or with new graduates to whom they can pay low rates. All interviewees in this research are convinced that “this is the reason why most translated works in Turkey are of a low quality”. Therefore, there is a general consensus in the interviews that publishers in Turkey choose the translators they work with mainly, or rather merely, according to the parameter of “cheapness”.
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For Bourdieu, fields are shaped differently according to the nature of the game played within them, as they all have their own rules, symbolic or codified regulations, historical trajectories, prominent players, renowned or wicked legends, and lore, and can be recognised through their distinctiveness. This is also reflected in Bourdieu’s description of the economic field as “a cosmos” (2005: 5) and “a separate universe governed by its own laws” (2005: 7).

The economic conditions and economic patronage applied by the publishers as discussed above impact significantly on the field of translation and on translator behaviour in Turkey, as can be also deduced from the theme “Underpayment of Translation in Turkey”. The interviewees signify this topic as central to the structural problems of the field of translation in Turkey, and the overwhelming majority of them is convinced that “poor translations are mainly caused by low premiums”.

Among the main reasons suggested by interviewees for this phenomenon are the surplus of translators in Turkey and the existence of “pirate” translators who pretend that they can translate equally well at lower rates; the publishers’ inclination towards books that will sell fast and are of little literary value, and therefore easier to translate even by inexperienced and cheap translators; the readers’ lack of reaction to low-quality translation products and their lack of demand for high-quality translation products; and lastly, the academics’ lack of feedback and involvement in the economic aspects of translation work.

Most interviewees mention that “the fees paid to translators in Turkey are ridiculously low” and even the publishers among the interviewees agree that “publishers in Turkey pay translators extremely lowly”. There is no clear evidence in the interviews on the extent the amount of capitals held by the translators impact on their fees and therefore, we have no information about whether there are differences between the translation fees paid to the academics versus non-academics, to the experienced versus inexperienced translators and so forth. However, we can infer that the translation fees paid to the translators in Turkey are much lower than their personal expectations and assessments. In this regard, we also have also indications from interviewees describing fees as “ridiculously low, “extremely low” or “much lower than the average salary in Turkey”. In one case, an interviewee
provides the example of a well-known and best-selling translator who “still lives in a rented apartment” and indicates that this translator “should have made much more money”.

The role of patrons cannot be ignored when the production of a cultural artefact is the case. According to Lefevere, patrons have central roles in regulating the literary system, its prizes, censorship, its educational system and other related mechanisms. Thus, the impacts of the economic patrons, i.e. publishers, cannot be ignored, as they have a central role in regulating the translational system in Turkey. One interviewee even considers low payments by publishers as an important reason behind translation associations in Turkey having no considerable influence, and mentions that “money means power”.

Milton and Bandia (2009) indicate that there is power in patronage, but the agents of translation also have their own subjective contributions. For instance, they may be going against the system by attempting to introduce works which are not accepted by the system (Milton and Bandia 2009: 5). However, in this research, all interviewees similarly point to the economic aspects, and remarkably, no interviewee displays a disposition, or habitus, of going against the economic system and patronage applied by the publishers in Turkey.

The search for an approach which puts more emphasis on the role of the agent of translation, or translator, brings us again to Bourdieu (Milton and Bandia 2009: 8). Habitus of the translator, mode of acquisition of linguistic competence, type of education and training, publishing norms, national tradition with respect to translation norms all contribute to orienting the linguistic and stylistic choices of translators (Heilbron and Sapiro 2007: 104). In the case of Turkey, this research shows publishers emerging as the economic patrons in the driving seat of the translation industry in significant ways, and the low fees they pay to translators appear to cause the overall quality of translation products in this country to decline, evidently indicating that economic patronage applied by publishers has an instrumental impact on translator performance in Turkey.

This phenomenon is also noticeable in the theme “Quality of Translation in Turkey and Attributes of Qualified Translators”, where many interviewees report that publishers are not willing to pay translators high fees because “there are many translators out there who accept to work at lower fees” and “why would they spend fifty cents for a work that can be done at five cents?” as there is no demand for high quality from readers either. Most
interviewees’ opinions converge on the fact that publishers in Turkey pay low rates for translation work, resulting in products of low quality. Therefore, the economic patronage of publishers and their strategies directly and significantly affect not only translators’ behaviour and habitus, but also the translation field in Turkey, including the overall quality of the end product.

Although it was mentioned previously that no clear evidence exists in the interviews about the effect of the different capitals held by translators on the fees they receive, interviewees report differently on the power they have vis-à-vis publishers in the choice of books to be translated and in the general terms and conditions of their agreements with them, depending on the cultural and symbolic capitals they hold. They may not have sufficient power to negotiate with publishers and receive the proper fees for their work, but their cultural and symbolic capitals still seem to bestow them a certain power vis-à-vis the publishing houses.

In this respect, if we revisit the questions; “what is the status of the agents?” and “how is the status manifested?” (Chesterman 2006: 20) particularly for translators in Turkey, we can surmise that besides the obvious factors such as educational background and / or experience in the translation field, other elements which can affect directly or indirectly the translator’s symbolic capital are worth mentioning too. One of these can be found in the theme “Translation Review / Criticism in Turkey” and another in the theme “Translation Awards in Turkey”.

Interviewees who relate to the issue of translation review / criticism report that the practice of translation review is not adequately developed in Turkey, translation magazines and reviews are not widespread, readers usually attach importance to literary works themselves and not their reviews, and that translation review is usually performed ineffectively and improperly in Turkey. However, one interviewee reports that “some of my translations were published once in a review where the reviewer showed my mistakes”, but he had given a concrete response showing that “the reviewer had actually misunderstood the whole work”. What is noticeable here is the fact that the interviewee also adds that “my response was later spoken about considerably in the translation field in Turkey”, which brings to mind the possibility that the whole incident may have brought to the interviewee a certain reputation which might serve him later as capital in the field.
Similarly, translation awards could also be considered to bring translators a positive reputation in the field. The interviewees who relate to this issue mention that awards are encouraging factors in the sense that they can affect a translator’s professional life by giving him/her greater motivation and a feeling that s/he is not alone, but also provide the winner of the award with certain economic benefits and create additional employment opportunities in the future.

In order to elaborate on the position of the translator, it is necessary to distinguish between the social status of the translator and his/her autonomy in terms of text production. In the introduction to “The Scandals of Translation” (1998), Venuti states that one of his aims is to win for translators greater cultural authority and a more favourable legal status (Venuti 1998: 3-4). Venuti is the first to make such a conscious attempt to elevate the translator’s status. Accordingly, the position of the translator cannot be thought of as independent of his/her status within the cultural and social contexts.

The fact that Venuti draws attention to the social and legal positions of translators is noteworthy, in that it is a much-neglected issue in the field of translation studies. One attempt of this thesis is to relate the social and legal positions of translators in the context of Turkey, and flesh out the problematic areas that lie within the system in order to shed light on possible reasons, and hence solutions. Under the theme “Lack of Legal Recognition of Translation as a Profession in Turkey”, many interviewees relate to the fact that translation is as yet unrecognised as a profession in Turkey and they indicate this as a problematic and negative issue, leading as it does to further problematic areas.

Among possible reasons for the lack of recognition of translation as a profession in Turkey, interviewees mention the relatively late establishment of departments of translation studies in Turkish universities. This means, in their words that these are “young departments that have not yet taken root”. They believe that the late formation of this field as a separate entity in the academic world in Turkey may be one of the reasons why translation has not yet gained recognition as a profession in this country.

All interviewees who relate to this issue make it clear that as the field of translation becomes more popular in Turkey, the need for institutionalisation, and therefore
recognition as a profession, will become more pressing. They relate to this non-recognition as an important problem because as long as this situation remains, the translation field cannot become institutionalised and hence cannot have a professional chamber. According to interviewees’ reports on this theme, as discussed so far, we can also deduce that this leads to translators in Turkey not having an “official address” or “competent authority” to whom they can turn for support and protection of their rights. Moreover, it is evident from the reports and information provided in the theme “Translation Associations and Organisations in Turkey” that neither are associations yet able to do this on behalf of translators in Turkey.

As the interviewees reveal, in order to increase the quality of translation work in Turkey, this field must be officially recognised as a profession, and this should be proven by determining appropriate norms and criteria, promoting the related education, obligating candidates for the profession to pass exams in order to work as a “translator”, all of which can be achieved only through the joint efforts of translators, translation agencies, publishers, associations, organisations, and academics in the field of translation studies in Turkey.

At this point, it is important to highlight the significance of these efforts of translators and cooperation among themselves in order to “achieve much more in the field of translation”, as expressed by many interviewees on different occasions during the interviews. The theme “Relations and Cooperation among Translators and Scholars in Turkey” relates exactly to this issue. Notably, the interviewees underline the insufficiency of cooperation among translators and scholars in Turkey. A somewhat higher level of cooperation is reported among professional translators than among academics in the field; while several interviewees indicate that “there is mutual support and help among translators”, but only to some degree because “there is materialism in the picture” and that “the relations in the sector are usually friendly and supportive”, most interviewees who relate to the topic are in consensus on the fact that in the academic world, even less cooperation is observed “due to power wars”.

Cooperation in the field of translation is noticeably seen as positive and desired by the interviewees. They state that only through sharing, collaboration and support can translators in Turkey solve problems that exist in the field, gain more power vis-à-vis the
ideological and economic patronage applied in the field, receive legal recognition as a profession—and therefore secure more rights—and strengthen their position, status and working conditions, as well as those of the professional associations and organisations. The overall consensus among interviewees is that translators and scholars in the field of translation in Turkey should use their talents and faculties in cooperative ways in order to achieve improvements in the field.
Conclusion

Summary of the Research

A historically significant country, strategically positioned straddling Europe and Asia, and with a population of almost 80 million, Turkey is undergoing profound, and almost radical, social, political, and economic change at an intense pace. Yet, not all longstanding realities are evaporating in this reshaping of the country at the hands of the political elites. On the one hand, urbanisation, globalisation, the European Union accession process, technological developments and so forth are transforming the international image of Turkey; while on the other, issues such as income and gender inequality, discriminative practices on religious grounds, freedom of expression and imprisonment of journalists, writers, and translators are attracting worldwide criticism. Although these issues have been and are being critically examined in several academic disciplines, Translation Studies academia in Turkey, with rare exceptions, has largely failed to keep pace with others in dealing with issues of concern to it.

Against this background, the present study has attempted to investigate the specifics of the translation field in Turkey, with a critical investigation of the social, cultural, economic and political factors that impact on translators and translation. Since translation is an activity that reveals how Turkey positions itself in a global system of social and cultural exchanges, significant issues of identity have come to the fore. Accordingly, one should not omit the fact that translators form a professional group, from which is expected the actions of a mediator between Turkey and other cultures. In this respect, the thesis has taken the translator as one of the main agents of the act of translating, before positioning him/her within a wider system of translation, in order to disclose the perceived influence of control factors on the field of translation and translational behaviour in Turkey. In such a framework, the historical dimension has been unearthed in the name of recognizing developments related to translation studies in Turkey; along with an instrumental deployment of sociological, cultural, economic, and political perspectives that facilitate treatment of the translator as an individual. Additionally, the adoption of a legal perspective establishes the link between this individual and both the social environment of which s/he is a part, and the political apparatus which claims to act on his/her behalf.
A qualitative and exploratory approach was used to conduct 16 in-depth interviews, with a focus on understanding, in the sociological sense, and in line with an attempt to document the world from the point of view of the people studied. A thematic analysis method for exposure of the forces at work in the field of translation and their reciprocity with the power structures in the context of Turkey was employed to explore several emerging themes. As an outcome, political / ideological, economic and social control factors were found to significantly impact on the field of translation and translational behaviour in Turkey.

Setting forth Lefevere’s conceptualisation of patronage, Chapter 2 focused on the theoretical framework and approach, and presented where the translator is in different theories of translation. Thereafter, with a critical consideration of the human agency within wider structures, Bourdieu’s sociological approach on the depersonalisation of translation production is explored. This chapter also described the main outlook of the academia of Translation Studies in Turkey, wherein a high focus on linguistics-driven approaches became apparent.

Chapter 3 explored the historical background of the translation field in Turkey. It provided a genealogy of translation during the Ottoman period with an emphasis on the social, cultural, economic, political, and translation-related discourses, while shedding light on various translation institutions and individuals. With Bourdieu’s emphasis on the historical trajectory of the social space being decisive over its specific shape, the chapter then presented the political establishment’s view of translation practice from a historical perspective. For the sake of laying open the ground on which the interviewees commented in the following chapter, this chapter concluded with the topography of translation in today’s Turkey.

Chapter 4, after clarification of the methodology, research questions, and design used for data collection, delved into the thematic analysis. The chapter clearly revealed that from the point of view of the active agents within the field of translation in Turkey, social, economic, and political concerns—in no particular order—were, by far, more dominant than intra-textual concerns.
Overall, these chapters underlined the importance of inclusion of the individuality of the operating agents, as any neglect of this in any study within these frameworks, is bound to be defective, even within acceptable academic limitations. Additionally, this PhD thesis demonstrated that a developing Sociology of Translation is vital for the further development of Translation Studies as an interdisciplinary academic field.

**Limitations of the Study and Implications for Further Research**

It has been repeatedly argued throughout the thesis that this research has adopted a rather qualitative approach in terms of both data collection and analysis, which was the outcome of an epistemologically relativist attitude. In line with this, it aimed to hear voices from within the field of translation in Turkey, as opposed to presenting the readers with the loud voice of the author. In this respect, it is exploratory and introductory, rather than assertive and explanatory. It does not claim to be representative.

A more quantitative approach could lead to a more representative piece of research, yet this too would have been to some extent and with other limitations. Efforts were made with some translator organisations to distribute a demographic survey among their members, but problems with communication and organisation led to an unfruitful outcome in timing of the return of survey material. Due to limitations in time, space, and funding, this approach was abandoned altogether. Otherwise, the research could have provided the readers with some demographic and socio-economic status-based data as well. As a consequence, a demographic survey, perhaps with a more focused scope, on practising translators is still ahead as a project.

Additionally, the research concentrated primarily on literary translation, omitting, to a great extent, interpreters and translators that work outside the literary field and with texts of a multimodal nature, as is the case with dubbing and subtitling. Keeping in mind the increase in Turkey’s congress / conference tourism and giant movie and television sectors, these deserve equal attention if we are to have a complete picture of the translation field, especially because some of them (interpreting) may be more visible than traditional translation and others, such as subtitling, are even more invisible than ‘paper’ translation.
Additionally, not only because Istanbul is, by far, the main centre for publication and translation education activity, as the data in Chapter 2 demonstrated, but also due to limitations with time and funding, almost all in-depth interviewees were residents of Istanbul, where the author of this research also resides. This should not be considered an underestimation of the other two hubs, namely Ankara and Izmir. Any further study, especially a quantitative one, should take into consideration translators and interpreters in these cities and others as well.

In essence, the golden mean of the metamorphosis in Turkey, although schizophrenically static with regard to some key issues in political, social and cultural life, demands a greatly refurbished Translation Studies to further critical research on key aspects and actors in the translation field.
## Appendix 1. Translation Departments in Turkey and 2014 Quotas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Boğaziçi Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. Stu. (En.)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakarya</td>
<td>Sakarya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. Stu. (Ger.)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sakarya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. Stu. (Ger.) EP</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Yeditepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. Stu. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeditepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. Stu. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeditepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. Stu. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>Abant İzzet Baysal Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>Atılım Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atılım Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 75% Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atılım Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>Avrasya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avrasya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Beykent Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beykent Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beykent Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beykent Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivas</td>
<td>Cumhuriyet Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.-Fr.-Tr.)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumhuriyet Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.-Fr.-Tr.) EP</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>Çankaya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Çankaya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>Dokuz Eylül Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Tr.-Ger.-En.)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dokuz Eylül Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Tr.-Ger.-En.) EP</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>Ege Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ege Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ege Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>Hacettepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hacettepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hacettepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hacettepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hacettepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Haliç Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haliç Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haliç Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>İ. D. Bilkent Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.-Fr.-Tr.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>İ. D. Bilkent Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.-Fr.-Tr.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul 29 Mayıs Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ar.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>İstanbul 29 Mayıs Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ar.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>İstanbul 29 Mayıs Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>İstanbul 29 Mayıs Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>İstanbul 29 Mayıs Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 25% Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1. Continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Arel Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Arel Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Aydin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Aydin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Aydin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Aydin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Aydin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Aydin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Aydin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) 25% Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>İstanbul Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>İzmir Ekonomi Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>İzmir Ekonomi Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>İzmir Ekonomi Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kars</td>
<td>Kafkas Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Tr.-En.-Fr.)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırıkkale</td>
<td>Kırıkkale Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ar.)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırıkkale</td>
<td>Kırıkkale Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ar.) EP</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırıkkale</td>
<td>Kırıkkale Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Persian)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırıkkale</td>
<td>Kırıkkale Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırıkkale</td>
<td>Kırıkkale Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırıkkale</td>
<td>Kırıkkale Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Marmara Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>Mersin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>Mersin Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ar.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ar.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ar.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Chi.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Chi.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Chi.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Okan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ru.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edirne</td>
<td>Trakya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Ger.)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edirne</td>
<td>Trakya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Bulgarian)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edirne</td>
<td>Trakya Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1. Continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>Yaşar Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yaşar Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yaşar Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yaşar Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 25% Scho.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Yeditepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeditepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 75% Scho.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeditepe Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>Yıldız Teknik Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yıldız Teknik Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Fr.) TRNC Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishkek /</td>
<td>Manas Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Tr.-Ru.)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Manas Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (Kyrgyz-Tr.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famagusta/</td>
<td>Doğu Akdeniz Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazimağusa TRNC</td>
<td>Doğu Akdeniz Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doğu Akdeniz Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrenia/Girne TRNC</td>
<td>Girne Amerikan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Tui.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girne Amerikan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girne Amerikan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 75% Scho.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girne Amerikan Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 50% Scho.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia/Lefkoşa TRNC</td>
<td>Yakın Doğu Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) Full Scho.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yakın Doğu Uni.</td>
<td>Trans. &amp; Interp. (En.) 75% Scho.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data obtained from the Higher Education Council (Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu – YÖK) upon personal request.

Abbreviations

- En. – English : Full Scho. – Full Scholarship
- Ger. – German : 75% Scho. – 75% Scholarship
- Fr. – French : 50% Scho. – 50% Scholarship
- Ar. – Arabic : 25% Scho – 25% Scholarship
- Ru. – Russian : Trans. & Interp. – Translation and Interpretation
- Tr. – Turkish : Trans. Stu. – Translation Studies
- Chi. – Chinese : Uni. – University
- EP – Evening Program : TRNC – Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
- Full Tui. – Full Tuition : TRNC Nat. – Nationals of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
Appendix 2. Geographical Distribution of Private Translation Offices in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afyonkarahisar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksaray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antalya</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aydın</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balıkesir</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denizli</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Düzce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskişehir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaziantep</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isparta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmir</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahramanmaraş</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayseri</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kırşehir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konya</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manisa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muğla</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakarya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekirdağ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalova</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yozgat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonguldak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data obtained from the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği – TOBB) upon personal request.
Appendix 3. Demographics of the Interviewees and Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Professional Involvement</th>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Selection Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A, T, C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T, E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T, E, C, W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cr, Ex, ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A, T, C, W</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cr, ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T, E, W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cr, ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A, T, I, W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender:** Female (F); Male (M)

**Professional Involvement:** Translator (T); Interpreter (I); Academic (A); Critic (C); Editor (E); Writer (W)

**Educational Background:** Bachelor’s Degree (B); Master’s Degree (M); Doctoral Degree (P)

**Selection Criterion:** Stakeholder sampling (S); Expert sampling (Ex); Criterion sampling (Cr); Extreme or Deviant sampling (ED); Typical Case sampling (Tc)
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