

“Foreign Language Creation” and “Textless Back Translation”: A Case Study on Turkish Translations of Jason Goodwin’s Ottoman-Themed Works Written in English

Merve Avşaroğlu^{1*}, Ayşe Banu Karadağ²

¹Graduate School of Social Sciences, Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Turkey

²Department of Translation and Interpreting (French), Yıldız Technical University, Davutpaşa Campus B-1015, Esenler, İstanbul, Turkey

Corresponding Author: Merve Avşaroğlu, E-mail: merveavsaroglu@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: July 17, 2019

Accepted: September 06, 2019

Published: October 31, 2019

Volume: 10 Issue: 5

Advance access: October 2019

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Key words:

Foreign Language Creation,
Rootless Back Translation/Textless
Back Translation,
Translation Studies,
Translation Methods,
Jason Goodwin

ABSTRACT

The aim of this article is to examine the first two books in Jason Goodwin’s detective Yashim series and their Turkish translations in terms of “back translation”. Research subjects are *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and its Turkish translations by Çiğdem Öztekin dated 2006 and by Fethi Aytuna dated 2016 as well as *The Snake Stone* (2007) and its Turkish translations by Ali Cevat Akkoyunlu dated 2007 and by Fethi Aytuna dated 2017. The theoretical framework is based on the concepts of “foreign language creation”, a text describing a specific culture in a foreign language, and “textless back translation”, translation of a “foreign language creation” back into the language of that specific culture. Describing the Ottoman culture in English, Goodwin’s books can be considered as “foreign language creation” while their Turkish translations, which bring the culture back into its own land, can be considered as “textless back translation”. Depicting a foreign culture in his own language, thereby acting as a translator, the writer’s decisions are discussed within the choice of translation method in “foreign language creation”. Translating a “foreign language creation” back into Turkish, the translators’ decisions are discussed within the choice of translation method in “textless back translation”. In this respect, Ting Guo’s (2017) article entitled “On Foreign Language Creation and Rootless Back Translation—A Case Study of *Snow Flower and the Secret Fan*” is taken as the reference point and the categories of translation methods are expanded with regard to textual findings. It is concluded that individual translation decisions of the Turkish translators support the idea that translators from the domestic culture might take the initiative to rearrange the source text information in their target text.

INTRODUCTION

A text can have its roots in a language and culture different from the ones it is produced in. Although it is written in a certain language and presented to the native or non-native speakers of the same language as target readers, it can be composed of many miscellaneous words, cultural items, prominent figures, famous places, historical events and so on, belonging to another language and culture. In such cases, what the readers might take as an original work the author produced in his or her own language within the literary system it belongs to can actually be considered as the representation, the translation or the translated representation of the specific culture it narrates. By the same token, what the readers hold in their hands can be considered as a target text rather than a source text and the author can be said to take the role of a translator as much as a writer. In the same sense, the translation of such a text can be regarded as the return of a text to its own literary system and cultural domain, which renders this act of translating into “back translation” and the translated text into a back translated text.

Jason Goodwin’s detective Yashim series composed of five books, i.e., *The Janissary Tree* (2006), *The Snake Stone*

(2007), *The Bellini Card* (2008), *An Evil Eye* (2011), and *The Baklava Club* (2014), are worthy of attention in this regard. In the books, which are presented as historical crime fiction with the theme of nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire, an Ottoman eunuch called Yashim takes the role of a detective. The books display an Ottoman world through an Ottoman protagonist, many Turkish words, Ottoman social and religious practices, Ottoman cultural items, food, institutions, historical figures of the Ottoman Empire, historical events in the Ottoman history and so forth. Although the books were written in English and are accessible for native or non-native speakers of English, their textual and contextual features indicate the Turkish language and the Ottoman culture as the source. Out of the five books in the series, *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007) are the ones which were translated into Turkish.

The conceptual framework of “back translation” has been enhanced. Recent studies¹ have shown that the translation of a text representing a particular culture and written in a foreign language back into the language of that culture is considered as a “back translation” since the said culture which was previously depicted in a foreign language is

brought back to its land through translation. Such kind of a translation process has made “back translation” evolve into a different translation concept: “textless back translation”²².

The scope of this paper is restricted to the Turkish translations of *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007). While *The Janissary Tree* (2006) was first translated by Çiğdem Öztekin in 2006 and the second translation was produced by Fethi Aytuna in 2016, *The Snake Stone* (2007) was first translated by Ali Cevat Akkoyunlu in 2007 and the second translation was also carried out by Fethi Aytuna in 2017. This study is based on the concept of “textless back translation” suggested in 2015 by Hongyin Wang upon re-visiting the concept of “rootless back translation” he first proposed in 2009 (Tu & Li 2017). According to this concept, when a foreign culture-themed text written in a language other than the language of that culture is translated into the language of the said culture, this translation represents a special kind of “back translation” since this translational activity is actually based on a physically non-existing source text.

In this paper, considering the claim that some translators of “textless back translation” “tend to take liberty with the original as if to suggest that they know the ‘real’ original better” (Sun 2014: 115), we aim to inquire whether the Turkish translators of Goodwin’s Ottoman-themed works have taken translation decisions which reveal handling the source text with liberty in a way that enables them to be entitled as “cultural spokesmen” (Sun 2014: 116). In this regard, with a particular focus on the choice of translation methods, our primary goal is first to determine,

- 1) how the writer of the source texts narrates a historical period and scenes rooted in the Ottoman culture in his own language just like what a translator does when he translates a text into another language and,
- 2) how the translators deal with the textual depiction of their own culture in a foreign language.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this study, Goodwin’s *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007), which derive their material from the Ottoman culture as the source, are approached from the perspective of “back translation” and the research methodology is based on the concepts of “foreign language creation” and “textless back translation”. Our study takes Ting Guo’s (2017) research article entitled “On Foreign Language Creation and Rootless Back Translation—A Case Study of *Snow Flower and the Secret Fan*” as its reference point. Guo (2017) analyzes the China-themed English text *Snow Flower and the Secret Fan* by exploring the choice of language and the choice of translation method in both “foreign language creation” and “textless back translation”. In the analysis of “foreign language creation”, he focuses on the methods of literal translation through transliteration, literal translation accompanied by explanation, free translation, substitution and integrated translation. In the analysis of “textless back translation”, he focuses on the methods of substitution, omission, free translation, amplification and literal translation. The language pair of our research material in the present study is English–Turkish and we restrict our research to the

choice of translation methods. Moreover, we intend to add the methods of exoticism, cultural borrowing and addition in the analysis of “foreign language creation” and the methods of established equivalent, explicitation and addition in the analysis of “textless back translation” since these seem to be other important methods standing out in the writer’s and the translators’ decisions. This being the case, the writer’s decisions are discussed within the scope of the choice of translation method in “foreign language creation” while the translators’ decisions are discussed within the scope of the choice of translation method in “textless back translation”.

Basic Concepts: “Foreign Language Creation” and “Textless Back Translation”

The concepts of “foreign language creation” and “rootless back translation” were first proposed by the Chinese scholar Hongyin Wang in 2009 (Tu & Li 2017) in a way that is observed to have contributed a different dimension to both writing and translating practices of conventional kind.

“Foreign language creation” can be defined as “local cultural content described by foreign language” (Guo 2017: 1354). Texts of this type, which are written in a language different from the one that represents the narrated theme and culture, might be produced by domestic writers, overseas domestic writers, foreign writers of domestic origin or foreign writers (Tu & Li 2017). Writers of “foreign language creation” deal with a particular local culture and write in a foreign language. From this perspective, writing process of these writers can be deemed as reflecting the features of a translation process or an “invisible translation” (Guo 2017: 1355). Therefore, this kind of writing, which makes writers engaged in translation of a different culture by using several methods, seems to enable the end product to be designated as a translation itself. These writers translate the raw material of a culture into a foreign language, mostly their own native language, and present these texts, which have undergone a transition from one culture to a new domain, to users of that foreign language. In this sense, an important point in “foreign language creation” appears to be “the travel of culture” (Sun 2014: 107). It can be argued that readers of “foreign language creation” are well aware of this travel of culture since “traces and remnants of the ‘original’ are everywhere” (Sun 2014: 110). It is this cultural dimension of “foreign language creation” that, from the perspective of translation studies, blurs the distinction between source texts and target texts.

Since “foreign language creation” already implies a translating activity on the part of writers, translation of a “foreign language creation” enhances the scope of “back translation” by paving the way for, first, the concept of “rootless back translation” and then “textless back translation”. Translation of a text considered as a “foreign language creation” was previously termed “rootless back translation”, as observable in the following passage:

“In the 1930s, Lin Yutang wrote the English novel *Moment in Peking* on foreign land. This novel now boasts three Chinese translations. The novel focuses on Chinese culture and the life of Old Beijing, but it is written

in English. Translation of this kind signifies the return only on cultural terms, rather than on linguistic terms and is therefore named “rootless back translation” – namely a kind of back translation that draws on no original text” (Wang, as cited in Tu & Li 2017: 2).

Based on this relationship between Chinese culture and English language created through translational activity on the part of both English text writer of Chinese origin and Chinese translators, it is implied that “‘foreign language creation’ refers to a novel of Chinese culture written in English, and its Chinese translation belongs to ‘rootless back translation’, that is, back translation of English version into the non-existent Chinese ‘original version’” (Guo 2017: 1355). One noteworthy point here is that translational dimension in “rootless back translation” is grounded on cultural terms rather than on linguistic terms and that “rootless back translation” implies the return of cultural materials to their own land. Therefore, “back translation” of this type is identified as “a return of culture to its original habitat” (Sun 2014: 116). This cultural focus in studies on “rootless back translation” can possibly give way to the realization that “though there is no existing Chinese text for translators to draw on, back translation of this kind still retains its cultural roots” (Tu & Li 2017: 3). In this sense, the basis of cultural return is provided by “invisible or intangible but recognizable cultural source texts” (Sun 2014: 112). The fact that cultural contact with the source language is preserved despite the non-existence of an original text and there is indeed a source culture which is the basis of “foreign language creation” points to the reason behind Wang’s replacement of “rootless back translation” with “textless back translation” (Tu & Li 2017).

“Textless back translation”, which is characterized by “the general lack of a visible or a tangible source text” (Sun 2014: 110), can be exemplified as “the kind of back translation in which translators translate China-themed literary works written in foreign languages back into Chinese and resell the translated texts to the Chinese readers” (Tu & Li 2017: 3). Thus, within the framework of “textless back translation”, translators get involved into a translation process in which their role is “to translate translation” (Sun 2014: 113).

Due to the fact that “foreign language creation”, i.e. writer’s depiction of a particular culture in a foreign language, is considered as the product of writer’s translation process, there might be translation processes in which some translators of “foreign language creation” might consider cultural content to have been “distorted and alienated” (Sun 2014: 115) awaiting the use of certain methods, such as omission, substitution, addition and so forth, on their part. In this regard, the importance of cultural knowledge is highlighted as follows:

“Cultural knowledge is the key to effective translation and in many cases, linguistic translation is shown not to be efficacious if the innate cultural differences involved are not well understood and tackled properly” (Sun 2014: 112).

Drawing on the aspect of cultural knowledge, a “foreign language creation” translator’s role of “self-appointed cultural spokesman” is explained as in the statement below:

“The translator acts as a self-appointed cultural spokesman drawing attention to an alleged cultural populist tendency in back translation. The liberating provision for the needs of the target reader to re-decode culture that has travelled extensively and is now treated as a homeward journey” (Sun 2014: 116).

On this basis, what is worthy of attention is the translational decisions of the translators some of whom “tend to take liberty with the original as if to suggest that they know the ‘real’ original better” (Sun 2014: 115).

THE AUTHOR AND THE SOURCE TEXTS

Jason Goodwin

Jason Goodwin (1964–) is an English writer with a degree in Byzantine History from Cambridge University. He is the author of the Ottoman fiction series consisting of the books *The Janissary Tree* (2006), *The Snake Stone* (2007), *The Bellini Card* (2008), *An Evil Eye* (2011), *The Baklava Club* (2014) and the non-fiction books *A Time for Tea* (1980), *The Gunpowder Gardens* (1990), *On Foot to the Golden Horn* (1993), *Lords of the Horizons* (1998), *Otis* (2001), *Greenback* (2003), *Yashim Cooks Istanbul* (2016), *A Pilgrim’s Guide to Sacred London* (2017) (with John Michell). He is also the writer of several Ottoman-themed essays published in *Cornucopia*, an online magazine offering essays on Turkey by writers from all over the world. Goodwin’s *On Foot to the Golden Horn* (1993) received John Llewellyn Rhys Award in 1993 and *The Janissary Tree* (2006) received Edgar Allen Poe Award in 2007.

With regard to his priorities about historical fiction, Goodwin states that “the story would always come first, the history second” and expresses “the atmosphere, the major public events and even major public figures” as the authentic features (Dillard n.d.).

In almost all his works, İstanbul stands at the centre of the stories. Goodwin seems to reveal the reason behind this in his description of İstanbul as “that peerless city, torn between past and future, between Asia and Europe, between nations, races, creeds... İstanbul in the early 19th century was so riven with divisions that it almost writes its own plot! [...]” (Dillard n.d.).

The Janissary Tree (2006)

The Janissary Tree (2006) is the first book of Yashim series which is succeeded by *The Snake Stone* (2007), *The Bellini Card* (2008), *An Evil Eye* (2011), and *The Baklava Club* (2014). The book offers the reader an atmosphere of 1836’s İstanbul, a particular feature of which is the act of closely following the European developments. The author Goodwin points out the central position of the janissaries in the Ottoman Empire giving the book its name as follows: “In *The Janissary Tree* (2006) I have written a coup attempt planned and carried out in Istanbul. There is a matter of treason”³ (Palabıyık 2016).

Yashim Togalu, as the eunuch protagonist, is the Ottoman Turk charged with the mission to solve mysterious murders

in the imperial land, which earns him the titles “detective Yashim” and “the eunuch investigator”. Goodwin explains the main reason why Yashim is a eunuch as follows:

“The reason it works is that men and women in Istanbul in the 19th century were pretty well segregated. If Yashim was to have interesting adventures, and talk to people of both sexes, he needed to be able to enter harems without comment. For that, unfortunately, he had to be a eunuch” (Dillard n.d.).

Besides being a eunuch, Yashim’s another important feature is his ability to cook delicious Ottoman food. In his words below, Goodwin sheds light on the relationship between Yashim’s cooking abilities and the reader’s opportunity to get familiar with the 19th century İstanbul:

“The cooking was a sort of lucky break – an ideal way to take readers into the city, to have them smell and taste it. And when Yashim collects his ingredients together in the market, and goes home to cook, it changes the pace of the story. It relaxes. You can’t rack up the tension all the time, you need breathing spaces. Cooking provides that for him” (Dillard n.d.).

***The Snake Stone* (2007)**

The Snake Stone (2007) is the second book of Yashim series. Yashim is charged with the mission, this time, to discover the true intentions of Maximilien Lefèvre, a French archeologist coming to İstanbul to find a lost Byzantine treasure. Yashim is hired to investigate this foreign guest since, being a eunuch, he has easy access to a variety of places including even the imperial harem. The book offers the reader Yashim’s adventures in 1838’s İstanbul upon the discovery of the archeologist’s mysterious dead body. Yashim’s investigations get complicated with an attack against a Greek vegetable seller named George, disappearance of an Albanian waterman named Enver Xani and the existence of an anti-Ottoman secret Greek society called Hetira trying to revive the Byzantine Empire, which further intrigue Yashim, who questions the possible connections of these with Lefèvre’s death. Besides the main events, Goodwin also creates a vivid atmosphere of the Ottoman Empire with a number of details such as the Sultan lying on the deathbed in his palace at Beşiktaş, muezzins calling to prayer from the minarets of the mosques or harem carriages moving about the streets.

THE JANISSARY TREE (2006) AND THE SNAKE STONE (2007) WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF “TEXTLESS BACK TRANSLATION”

What makes *The Janissary Tree*⁴ (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007) special for an academic research within translation studies is the Ottoman culture described in English which points out “an invisible translating activity” (Guo 2017: 1357) on the part of the author. Both works suggest a representation of the Ottoman world on the pages written in English by a foreign writer specialized in history. This is noticeable even on their covers which offer the readers an exotic world through mystery, *The Janissary Tree* (2006) with four blue beads worn against evil eye and an Ottoman

woman revealing a sexual posture and *The Snake Stone* (2007) with an Ottoman man wearing a head cloth and an interesting moustache, and a picture of a mosque, dome and minarets over which rises the moon in the shape of a crescent. As the first two books in the Yashim the Eunuch series, *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007) draw a picture of the nineteenth century İstanbul where the mysterious murders in the city urge the Ottoman palace to hire a eunuch called Yashim to investigate the incidents for the welfare of the empire. Special places, historical figures, official titles, authentic daily clothes, traditional food and drinks and several other themes all peculiar to the Ottoman history and culture, when accompanied by many Turkish words, make these books of historical crime fiction a significant case of study in terms of translation studies. The fact that these books, which are seemingly the source texts, derive their source from the Ottoman culture generates an interesting translational phenomenon which blurs the clear-cut distinction between the source and the target. In this respect, the related concepts of “foreign language creation” and “textless back translation” are believed to enlighten the translation-alike process of the author’s writing practice and the textless back translating activity of the Turkish translators, respectively. In this sense, a great many Ottoman-themed words reappearing throughout the books within Ottoman-related contexts, historical events and figures of the Ottoman Empire, Turkish words and transliterated Turkish words are only part of the textual evidences that enable us to consider *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007) as the literary works of “foreign language creation”, thereby their Turkish translations as “textless back translation”.

THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE JANISSARY TREE (2006) AND THE SNAKE STONE (2007) IN THE TURKISH LITERARY SYSTEM

Çiğdem Öztekin: Translator of Target Text 1 (TT1) of *The Janissary Tree* (2006)

There are two Turkish translations of Goodwin’s book titled *The Janissary Tree* (2006). The first translation titled *Yeniçeri Ağacı* dated 2006 belongs to Çiğdem Öztekin, who has both her BA and MA degrees in the field of Management and whose interest in translation dates back to her high school years. Stephan Zweig, Agatha Christie and James Baldwin are among the well-known writers whose books Öztekin has translated into Turkish. Apart from translating literary works, Öztekin also translates technical texts of various kinds including business, glass industry and textile (the introductory page for the author and the translator in *Yeniçeri Ağacı* (2006)).

Ali Cevat Akkoyunlu: Translator of Target Text 1 (TT1) of *The Snake Stone* (2007)

There are two Turkish translations of *The Snake Stone* (2007), the sequel of *The Janissary Tree* (2006) in Goodwin’s detective Yashim series. Ali Cevat Akkoyunlu is the translator of *Yılanlı Sütun* published in 2007. He studied at St.

Joseph, Boğaziçi University and Diplomatische Akademie. Akkoyunlu, who is also the author of *Hedef İblis* (2004), has translated many books from English, German and French into Turkish, among which there are works of writers such as Bill Clinton, Glenn Meade, Jean-Christophe Grangé and Björn Larsson (the introductory page for the author and the translator in *Yılanlı Sütun* (2007)).

Fethi Aytuna: Translator of Target Text 2 (TT2) of both *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007)

Fethi Aytuna is the translator of both *The Janissary Tree* (2006) published under the title *Yeniçeri Ağacı* in 2016 and *The Snake Stone* (2007) published under the title *Yılanlı Sütun* in 2017. He is a graduate of the Faculty of Fine Arts of Dokuz Eylül University. Aytuna, who is deeply interested in football as understood from his articles on his website named *Dinyakos*, is also the author of the book *Vefa'nın Galip'i: Galip Haktanır'ın Anıları* (2015). He also co-wrote *Bitmeyen Sevda: Yeşil-Siyah* (2016).

COMPARATIVE ANALYSES OF THE JANISSARY TREE (2006) AND THE SNAKE STONE (2007) AND THEIR TURKISH TRANSLATIONS

Writer’s Choice of Translation Method in “Foreign Language Creation”

Within the scope of “foreign language creation”, any writer is considered to get involved in a type of translating activity since that writer describes a foreign culture in his or her own language and this necessitates some sort of translating on the part of the writer, which adds a role of translator to the role of writer. Such a fact can be said to enable discussing writer’s choice of translation method.

Literal translation (through transliteration)

Literal translation is a translation “that follows the original words exactly” (Wehmeier 2000: 692). Transliteration is also considered as a kind of literal translation (Guo 2017). The verb “transliterate” means “to write words or letters using letters of a different alphabet or language” (Wehmeier 2000: 1274). In his books, Goodwin either uses loan words from Turkish without making any morphological changes or transliterates by using, for example, “sh” for the sound “ş” (as in “padishah” for “padişah”), “gh” for the sounds “g” or “ğ” (as in “ghazi” for “gazi”), “u” for the sound “ü” (as in “muezzin” for “müezzin”), “i” for the sound “ı” (as in “kadi” for “kadi”), “c” for the sound “k” (as in “beylic” for “beylik”), “d” for the sound “t” (as in “Hadice” for “Hatice”) and so on. In this way, Goodwin takes Turkish words more into line with English patterns of pronunciation and spelling by means of transliteration. Accordingly, transliterated words “maintain their particular culture flavor” (Guo 2017: 1357).

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), information is given about the Ottoman armed forces. Official titles of the persons in chief in Sultan’s navy and troops are introduced. Goodwin transliterates “kaptan” as

“kapudan”, “paşa” as “pasha” and “serasker” as “seraskier”. In Turkish, “kaptan paşa” is known as an interchangeable word with “kaptanı derya”, which is “the greatest military and administrative chief of naval forces in the Ottoman Empire” (*Turkish Language Association’s Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1311). Likewise, “serasker” is defined as “the vizier who is not responsible as grand vizier and is the commander of the Ottoman army” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2069). Goodwin resorts to transliteration in his translation of the Ottoman titles.

“His navy was commanded by the **kapudan pasha**, and his troops controlled by the **seraskier**” (Goodwin 2006: 7).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), there is a dialogue between Yashim and Widow Matalya about the lack of water due to the blocked spigot in the yard. In reply to Widow Matalya’s wish “tomorrow, we shall have water again, inshallah”, Yashim also expresses good wishes. Goodwin transliterates “inşallah” as “inshallah” and “hanım” as “hanum”. In Turkish, “inşallah” is “an expression of wish meaning ‘God willing’” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1198) and “hanım” is “a title for girls and women” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1042). Goodwin prefers transliteration in the translation of this culture-bound word for wishing and this daily used title in the same sentence.

“**Inshallah, hanum,**” Yashim replied” (Goodwin 2007: 43).

Literal translation (accompanied by explanation)

Transliteration is considered as a literal translation and literal translation is seen as a source language-oriented method. It is put that in literal translation “usually, explanation words are added to provide background for the target reader to understand” (Guo 2017: 1357). In Goodwin’s books, transliteration is also observed to be accompanied by explanations.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), information is provided about the educational life in the Ottoman Empire. After references to imams and gunnery instructors as examples of teachers, “madrassas” are introduced as educational institutions. Goodwin transliterates “medrese” as “madrassa” and adds the explanation “the schools attached to the city mosques”. In Turkish, “medrese” denotes “a place in Islamic countries for teaching generally the sciences convenient for the religious rules of Islam” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1643). Goodwin not only employs transliteration but also adds explanation of this special kind of school in the Ottoman Empire between commas so as to ease target readers’ understanding.

“And at the **madrassas, the schools attached to the city mosques**, clever boys learned the rudiments of logic, rhetoric, and Arabic” (Goodwin 2006: 164).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), description of an Ottoman home is provided. After a mentioning of rooms with different functions such as dining rooms, sitting rooms, and drawing rooms, the division between public and private spaces at home is presented. Goodwin transliterates “selamlık” as “selamlık” and borrows the word “haremlık” as it is in Turkish. Moreover,

he adds the explanations “what was public” for “selamlık” and “what was reserved for the family” for “haremlık”. In Turkish, “selamlık” stands for “the place reserved for men in a palace or a mansion” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2061) and “haremlık” means “wifehood” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1049), which corresponds to the place reserved for women in opposition to “selamlık”. Goodwin’s decision of using transliterated and loan words together with their explanations enables English readers to see the Turkish words and understand what they mean at the same time.

“People divided their lives **between what was public, and what was reserved for the family, between selamlık and haremlık**: in the poorest homes, they were divided only by a curtain” (Goodwin 2007: 102).

Free translation

Identified as an origin concept’s “translation of symbolic significance”, free translation’s orientation towards target language is evident in the claim that “compared with transliteration and literal translation which show great respect to the source language, free translation emphasizes the target language” (Guo 2017: 1358). Here, Guo (2017) focuses on specific customs in a particular culture. Free translation examples, though few in number when compared to methods such as transliteration, cultural borrowing or addition, can also be found in Goodwin’s writing.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Goodwin describes a scene of Yashim performing an Islamic religious practice in which one should first get cleaned in accordance with Islamic rules and then pray. This cleaning practice is known as “abdest almak”⁶ in Turkish, which means “Muslims’ practice of washing their certain organs and wetting some others in an order before worship” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 3). Goodwin not only depicts this religious routine but also provides the readers with the following steps performed by a Muslim.

“When everything was done he picked up a swan-necked ewer and very carefully **washed first his hands, then his mouth, his face, his neck and, lastly, his private parts**. He took out his mat and prayed. When he had finished, he rolled up the mat once more and put it away in a niche” (Goodwin 2006: 16).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), Goodwin portrays a scene in which Sultan’s wives greet Valide Sultan, Sultan’s mother, with a customary practice known as “eteklemek” in Turkish, which signifies “kissing or pretending to kiss one’s hem as a sign of respect” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 829). The expression “bowing and bringing her hem to their lips” describes this practice in a way that conveys the symbolic significance mentioned above. “In addition, with the help of explanative narration, the target reader can better understand the customs” (Guo 2017: 1358).

“The remaining three Kadnefendis entered softly to greet their mother-in-law, one by one **bowing and bringing her hem to their lips**. They moved with graceful calm, silent and unhurried, and stood back to attention” (Goodwin 2007: 236).

Substitution

Guo (2017) takes substitution as the equivalent expressions found in the target language. Substitution is considered as a way “to shorten the distance of cognition” (Guo 2017: 1358) on the part of target readers. In his books, Goodwin is also observed to substitute some Ottoman-themed words with their English equivalents.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Yashim’s wandering through the streets after his struggle for saving his friend Preen from an assassin is depicted. Goodwin uses “coffeehouse” in place of “kahvehane”, which is used interchangeably with the word “kahve” denoting “a place where people drink coffee, tea, lime tea, beer or smoke water pipe, can eat snacks and play gammon, dominoes, billiards, card games etc.” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1269). Considering the meaning of “coffeehouse”, “a restaurant serving coffee, etc., especially one of a type popular in Britain in the 18th century or one in a city in Central Europe” (Wehmeier 2000: 212), Goodwin’s use of “coffeehouse” in place of “kahvehane” stands as a sort of substitution.

“At a corner lit by the torches of a **coffeehouse** he caught sight of people turning their heads back to focus on him and he thought: I’m closing” (Goodwin 2006: 148).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), Sultan, who is about to die, asks Dr. Millingen to call his son in order to speak one last time before his death. Goodwin uses “crown prince” to refer to “şehzade”, which is “the title for the sons of sultans and their own sons” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2212). Goodwin’s substitution of this Ottoman title with its equivalent in English can be said to make it easier for readers to understand the character’s official position.

“The **crown prince**. Summon him now” (Goodwin 2007: 215).

Integrated translation

Integrated translation is referred to as the combination of at least two of the above mentioned methods. Integration of transliteration and literal translation is considered as one way of integrated translation (Guo 2017).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), there is a dialogue between Yashim and Madame Lefèvre, the wife of the French archeologist Maximilien Lefèvre, about the Turkish food Yashim cooks in the kitchen. Goodwin remarks foreign nature of Turkish cuisine where Madame Lefèvre has difficulty in understanding the meaning of the Turkish food “imambayıldı” and “hünkârbeğendi”, transliterated as “imam bayıldı” and “hünkâr beyendi”, respectively. In Turkish, “imambayıldı” means “olive oil dish made from aubergines fried as a whole and stuffed with onion, garlic, tomato” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1181) and “hünkârbeğendi” means “a type of food made from grilled aubergine on which meat is put together with sauce” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1121). Yashim’s explanations involve English literal translations of the words in the Turkish name of the food. Yashim tries to help Madame Lefèvre understand

the meaning by translating “imam bayildi” as “imam fainted” and “hünkar beyendi” as “the sultan approved”.

[...] ‘Not imam bayildi,’ he said, raising a finger. ‘Hünkar beyendi.’

‘**Hünkar beyendi**,’ she repeated. ‘Tell me again, what does it mean?’

‘It means—the sultan approved.’

‘And **imam bayildi**? The **imam fainted**?’

Yashim smiled. ‘Yes. He was so happy.’

‘Ah, yes. And when you cook—hünkar beyendi?—are you not happy too? Or do you merely approve? [...]’ (Goodwin 2007: 152).

Cultural borrowing

Goodwin includes many miscellaneous Turkish words in his books. The following examples of cultural borrowing are only part of the Turkish expressions for each book, revealing that the writer enjoys the freedom to borrow Turkish culture-bound words and use them in his English works.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), within the context of a Phanariot merchant-prince George Mavrocordato’s party organized for a “paşa”⁷ to impress him, Goodwin uses the word “köçek” in italics and provides the reader with a comment on this type of dancers and information about its history. In Turkish, “köçek” means “a man who masquerades as a woman and dances” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1494) and Goodwin integrates this cultural word directly in his work.

“Of all the traditions that bound Istanbul together, the long history of the *köçek* dancers was probably the least celebrated and possibly the oldest” (Goodwin 2006: 56).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), Yashim suggests to bring water to Widow Matalya upon a lack of water due to technical problems. Goodwin uses the expression “su yolcu”, which means “the person responsible for maintenance, repair and management of İstanbul’s water channels and the related institutions” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2177). Without using any English explanatory expression, the writer exposes the reader to an Ottoman phenomenon by borrowing a cultural word.

‘I’ll go and find a **su yolcu** in the street. Can I get some water for you, hanum?’ (Goodwin 2007: 43).

Exoticism

Goodwin is observed to include exotic elements in his writings. Exotic means “from or in another country, especially a tropical one; seeming exciting and unusual because it is connected with foreign countries” (Wehmeier 2000: 404) and Goodwin’s decisions in his books can be said to make the readers well aware of the cultural elements introduced from another country.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Goodwin uses the expression “*cariyeler*” in italics while giving information about the roommates of the harem girl whose dead body was found within the context of Yashim’s investigations. In Turkish, “*cariye*” means “a woman who is abducted from foreign countries, is deprived of freedom, can

be bought and sold and is subject to the desires of her master in every respect” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 445). He uses not only the word “*cariye*” but also the Turkish suffix of plurality, “-ler”, whereby he exposes English readers to both the Turkish word and Turkish grammar. Likewise, the Turkish word “*gözde*”, which is written also in italics, means “the woman admired by an important person” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 984) and implies another exotic element in terms of both its meaning and form.

“As *cariyeler*, harem maids, her roommates had not yet been advanced to the rank of *gözde*: but they were hopping” (Goodwin 2006: 53).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), a scene of fire which makes people panic is provided. Goodwin uses the expression “Yangin-var!”, which literally means “There is fire”. In Turkish, “yangın” is “a huge and damaging fire” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2520) and rather than using just the transliterated word itself, Goodwin includes a whole Turkish sentence which is a frequently used expression in case of a fire. This example has an exclusive dimension since readers, who are continuously exposed to many miscellaneous transliteration and loan words throughout the book, are able, this time, to read a whole sentence not native to their land and thus, this expression bears an exotic flavor.

“**Yangin-var!**” he roared. Stamboulists knew to dread that cry. ‘Fire! Fire!’” (Goodwin 2007: 160).

Addition

Addition is one of the mostly used methods in Goodwin’s books in which it is observed to take the shape of addition of the English translation. In this sense, the writer prefers to use the Turkish word and add its English translation beside.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Goodwin provides interesting information about what happened in the past in the streets where the characters Preen and Mina try to run away from fire. Besides the name “Yıldırım”, which is the English transliteration of “Yıldırım”, meaning “thunderbolt between the sky and the ground accompanied by thunder and lightning” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2591), he adds “Thunderbolt”, the English translation which helps English readers better understand the meaning of “Yıldırım”.

“A notorious miser known as **Yıldırım, the Thunderbolt**, lost a wooden chest he was carrying to a cheerful thief who later found it contained nothing but a silk scarf with a very tight knot in it; the miser died later in an asylum and the thief in Sevastapol, of dysentery, still wearing the knotted scarf” (Goodwin 2006: 268).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), Yashim is seen preparing something to eat at the breakfast in the morning. Goodwin, this time, uses first the English expression “white cheese” and then adds the Turkish expression “beyaz peynir”, “a highly nutritious type of cheese made of the milk of sheep, goat, cow or buffalo” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 321-322), and again exposes the reader to both the English and Turkish expressions at the same time.

“In an earthenware dish, under a domed lid, lay a slab of crumbly **white cheese, beyaz peynir**” (Goodwin 2007: 284).

Translators' Choice of Translation Method in "Textless Back Translation"⁸

Substitution

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), a famous saying of Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, a sufi poet and philosopher of Islam, is translated into English by Goodwin. This is on the opening page immediately after the dedication page. It is obvious that the text in the source is a translation itself and translators just need to back translate it by tracing the original version of this particular saying. In case of translators' literal translation, it is likely that the Turkish reader "will not be able to match the new version with his memory and will not accept it" and thus, "what the translator should do is to make efforts to find out or trace back the exact or original poem, remarks and quotations and then use them directly, so as to make his translation accurate" (Guo 2017: 1361). In TT1, Öztekin replaces ST with a Turkish proverb frequently used by Turkish people to mean that "even a simple word is enough to affect considerate people while whatever said is useless for inconsiderate people" (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 128) and adds the name "Hacı Bektaş Veli" as in the ST. Although this translation conveys the meaning of the source text, it is a proverb rather than a saying of Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. On the other hand, in TT2, Aytuna inserts the exact lines that belong to Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli.

ST: "For those who have Awareness,
a hint is quite enough.
For the multitudes of heedless
mere knowledge is useless.
HAJİ BEKTASH VELİ" (Goodwin 2006).

TT1: "Anlayana,
sivrisinek saz.
Anlamayana,
davul zurna az.
Hacı Bektaş Veli" (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006).

TT2: "Sen seni bilirsen yüzün Hüdâ'dır,
Sen seni bilmezsen Hak senden cüdâdır.
Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli" (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016).

Omission

Omission is referred to as non-translation of some words in the ST "because the translation has its meaning though without the word, or the meaning is self-evident in the translation" (Guo 2017: 1361). ST writer's explanatory language adopted to ease the readers' understanding turns out to be redundancy in the "back translation" since Turkish readers already understand the Turkish expressions without explanatory measures and this requires resorting to omission in translators' decision making process.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), there is information about important quarters of the Ottoman Empire. Beside the expression "the old palace", Goodwin adds its English translation by using the loan word "eski" for the word "old" and the transliterated word "serai" for the word "saray". In both target texts, both translators just use the expression "Eski Saray" and avoid, through omission, what would be redundant in the Turkish target texts unlike in the English source text.

ST: "The old palace, or Eski Serai, later served as a sort of annex to Topkapı" (Goodwin 2006: 83).

TT1: "Eski Saray olarak da adlandırılan bu yapı sonraları Topkapı'nın ek binası olarak kullanıldı" (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006: 102).

TT2: "Eski Saray ise daha sonra Topkapı'nın bir tür eklentisi olarak hizmet gördü" (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016: 112).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), Goodwin gives details of the food Yashim prepares when the French archeologist Maximilien Lefèvre pays a visit to his house. The writer uses several Turkish words, either by borrowing or transliterating, such as "meze", "uskumru dolması", "börek", "karnıyarık", "kabak ciceği dolması". For the loan word "karnıyarık", "a type of food made from vertically riven fried aubergines filled with minced stuff" (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1335), Goodwin provides a description and states that it is made from "tiny aubergines". As to the transliterated expression "kabak ciceği dolması", he literally translates the words so that the ST readers are able understand that this "dolma", "a food prepared by filling animals such as chicken and lamb or vegetables such as peppers and tomatoes with rice or other stuff" (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 701), is made from courgette flowers. Both translators omit the information of "tiny aubergines". Turkish readers are already familiar with the food "karnıyarık" and know that the main ingredients are aubergines. Moreover, translators avoid redundancy in the translation of "kabak ciceği dolması, or stuffed courgette flowers" by using just "kabak çiçeği dolması" without repetition, as it is already explicit in Turkish.

ST: "Yashim brought out a tray on which he had set a selection of meze – the crisped skin of a mackerel rolled loose from its flesh, then stuffed with nuts and spices – uskumru dolması; some tiny böreks stuffed with white cheese and dill; mussel shells folded over a mixture of pine nuts; karnıyarık, tiny aubergines filled with spiced lamb; and a little dish of kabak ciceği dolması, or stuffed courgette flowers" (Goodwin 2007: 20).

TT1: "Yasin üzerine mezeleri dizdiği bir tepsi getirdi: Etinden ayrılmış derinin içine fıstık ve baharat doldurularak yapılmış uskumru dolması, beyaz peynir ve kıyılmış dereotlu börekler, çam fıstıklı midye dolması, baharatlı kuzu etiyle yapılmış karnıyarık; bir küçük tabak da kabak çiçeği dolması" (Goodwin (tr. Akkoyunlu) 2007: 22).

TT2: "Yaşım içine mezeler koyduğu tepsiyi getirdi. Eti çıkarıldıktan sonra içine ceviz ve baharat konmuş uskumru dolması, beyaz peynirle doldurulup dilimlenmiş çok küçük biberler, çamfıstıklı midye dolması, kuzu kıymasıyla pişirilmiş karnıyarık ve küçük bir tabakta kabak çiçeği dolması" (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2017: 33).

Free translation

Free translation is referred to as a way of translating based on the claim that "the translator has more right to speak in the truthfulness and accuracy of the original information"

and that “if the information is wrong or inappropriate, in order to take the reader’s cognitive harmony into account and adapt to the target culture, the translator probably will take the initiative to adjust the content, even without explanation” (Guo 2017: 1362).

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), there is a statement about mysterious disappearance of four officers of the New Guard, which intrigues Yashim further upon the discovery of one officer’s dead body. Goodwin uses the Turkish word “*temizlik*” in italics together with its seemingly English translation “the cleaners”, which is actually not. In Turkish, “*temizlik*” means “the act of cleaning” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2319). While “*temizlik*” refers to the act of cleaning, “the cleaners” refers to the people who perform this act of cleaning. However, Goodwin uses “*temizlik*” and “the cleaners” in succession in a way which implies that the meaning of these expressions is the same. Indeed, rather than “*temizlik*”, the correct Turkish word is “*temizlikçi*”, “the person who performs the act of cleaning” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2319). In TT1, Öztekin’s translation involves the word “*nöbetçi*”, “the person on duty and who has the turn on duty” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1780), together with “*yatakhane temizleyicileri*”, which literally means “dormitory cleaners”. Considering that the cleaners in the ST work in a dormitory and their job might also remind of being on duty, Öztekin’s translation can be seen as a free translation. Moreover, in TT2, Aytuna uses the word “*temizlikçi*” in his translation and clarifies the misunderstanding in the ST.

ST: “Four good men vanished from their barracks last night. When they did not appear this morning, I asked one of the *temizlik*, the cleaners, and found out that they had not slept in their dormitory” (Goodwin 2006: 12).

TT1: “Bu dört iyi adam dün gece kışladan sırta kadem basmışlar. Sabah da ortaya çıkmayınca, *nöbetçilerden*, *yatakhane temizleyicilerinden* birine sordum ve dün gece koğuştta uyumadıklarını öğrendim” (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006: 19).

TT2: “Dün gece bu dört iyi adam kışladan çıkıp ortadan kayboldu. Bu sabah ortalıkta gözükmeyince *temizlikçilerden* birine sordum ve gece koğuştta uyumadıklarını öğrendim” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016: 19).

Amplification

The verb “amplify” means “to add details to a story, statement, etc.” (Wehmeier 2000: 35). Within the scope of translation studies, amplification stands as a way of translating in which a translator adds some words in the target text that actually do not appear in the source text. It is seen as “the direct explanation within the text” which might be adopted “to add local favor, because the translator is too familiar with it” (Guo 2017: 1362).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), Goodwin describes the things that come to Yashim’s mind when he goes to Topkapı Palace. He lists several things peculiar to İstanbul life. One of them is “harem carriages”. In TT1, Akkoyunlu translates this expression as “harem faytonları”. In Turkish, “fayton” means “a carriage with one boot

and four wheels which is generally pulled by two horses” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 855). Therefore, Akkoyunlu’s translation represents a literal translation. On the other hand, in TT2, Aytuna uses the expression “*etrafi perdelerle örtülü arabalar*”, which means “vehicles covered by curtains”. In ST, there is no information about the curtains covering the harem carriages. Therefore, Aytuna expands the ST by using details. He makes it explicit that these carriages, which carry women, are covered by some sort of curtains by amplifying the ST expression with extra words, thus information, in his translation.

ST: “He crossed the cobbles in the shade of the planes, remembering when the great court had been full of people – [...] **harem carriages** rattling off towards some sheltered picnic spot by the Sweet Waters, [...] the ordinary people of İstanbul, whose conversation was an underlying murmur like the sea” (Goodwin 2007: 97-98).

TT1: “Çınarların gölgesindeki arnavutkaldırımlarından geçerken, büyük avlunun insan dolu olduğu günleri hatırladı: [...] Tatlı Sular taraflarında gözlerden uzak bir mesire yerine giden **harem faytonları**, [...] denizin mırıltısı gibi boğuk konuşmalarıyla, İstanbul’un her zamanki ahalisi” (Goodwin (tr. Akkoyunlu) 2007: 95).

TT2: “Çınar ağaçlarının gölgesindeki parke taşların üstünde yürürken insanla dolup taşan bu koca avlunun eski günlerini hatırladı. [...] **Etrafi perdelerle örtülü arabalar** hanımları Kâğıthane’deki gözlerden uzak mesire yerine götürürdü. [...] İstanbul’un sıradan halkının konuşmaları denizin uğultusu gibi dipten duyulurdu” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2017: 129).

Literal translation

It can be claimed that, in certain situations, literal translation “that follows the original words exactly” (Wehmeier 2000: 692) can turn out to be a way of translating which might lead to translationese. Therefore, in cases where “the translator does not trace back the origin [...], and adopts literal translation”, it is suggested that “to avoid translationese, the translator has to try best to make choice of language and translation method to adapt to the target language” (Guo 2017: 1363).

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Mustafa’s, the guild master of soup makers, thoughts about patience while working are given. Mustafa tastes the soup an apprentice prepares and after a few suggestions, allows his formal induction into the guild. Goodwin uses the expression “patience was his second skin” in the ST. In TT1, Öztekin uses literal translation by conveying each word in this expression into Turkish which results in “*sabır onun ikinci derisiydi*”. Literal translation of this English idiom leads to an awkward expression in Turkish. In TT2, with the expression “*sabır benim göbek adım*”, Aytuna replaces “second skin” with “*göbek adı*”, “the name given for the new born baby when the cord is cut” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 954), as part of the Turkish idiom “*göbek adı olmak*”, which is used metaphorically in Turkish to mean “second name” in order to indicate that a person handles a specific task in the best way possible. Therefore, he avoids a

translationese observed in TT1. Moreover, Goodwin uses the expression “in positively redemptive quantities” in the ST. In TT1, Öztekin also translates this expression literally by using the Turkish translation of every single word which results in an expression that does not sound natural. In TT2, Aytuna makes use of the Turkish idiom “sevap kazanmak”, “acting benevolently” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2080), which conveys the general meaning in a more natural way.

ST: “Mustafa tugged at his mustache and squinted at the young man. Did he have patience? As for himself, he thought, **patience was his second skin**. How could he have lived his life and not acquired patience **in positively redemptive quantities**?” (Goodwin 2006: 36).

TT1: “Mustafa bıyıklarını çekiştirirdi ve gözlerini hafifçe kısarak genç adama baktı. Acaba sabrı var mıydı? Kendine gelince, **sabır onun ikinci derisiydi**. Olumlu olarak **kurtarıcı miktarlarda** sabır kazanmadan hayatını nasıl yaşayabilirdi?” (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006: 49).

TT2: “Mustafa bıyığını çekiştirip gözlerini kısarak genç adama baktı. Acaba onun sabrı var mıydı? Kendisine gelince, **sabır benim göbek adım** diye düşündü. Kendisine **büyük sevap kazandıracak** kadar sabra sahip olmasaydı hayatını nasıl sürdürürdü?” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016: 50).

Established equivalent

Established equivalent is defined as “using a term or expression recognized (by dictionaries or language in use) as an equivalent in the TL” (Molina & Hurtado Albir 2002: 510). The translators’ decisions reveal that established equivalents of certain terms or expressions are preferred in the target texts.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Goodwin provides a job description of the janissaries in the Ottoman Empire and states that they were also responsible for fire-related works by using the word “firemen”. In TT1, Öztekin both uses the expression “itfaiye teşkilatı”, in which “itfaiye” means “institution for extinguishing fire” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1231) and “teşkilat” means “organization” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2339), and adds the established equivalent “tulumbacı”, “a person who takes the fire engines in the neighborhoods to places on fire and help to extinguish the fire” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2385). Likewise, in TT2, Aytuna also uses the term “tulumbacı”.

ST: “The unlamented Janissaries had been the city’s **firemen**, too: [...]” (Goodwin 2006: 14).

TT1: “Arkalarından kimsenin ağlayıp sızlanmadığı yeniçeriler aynı zamanda şehrin **itfaiye teşkilatı, yani tulumbacılarıydılar**; [...]” (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006: 22).

TT2: “Katledilmelerine kimsenin üzülmeyeceği yeniçeriler aynı zamanda şehrin **tulumbacılarıydı**. [...]” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016: 22).

In the following example from *The Snake Stone* (2007), the imam Faisal al-Mehmed’s wishes about the proper conduct of groups of people entering into the Great Mosque for prayer are given. Goodwin uses the expression “wash themselves” to refer to a religious routine performed before

Muslim religious practices. Washing oneself is a general expression which might also be used in non-religious contexts. Both translators use the expression “abdest almak”⁹, which means “Muslims’ practice of washing their certain organs and wetting some others in an order before worship” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 3).

ST: “For himself, he wished that they did not chat so much; he wished, above all, that they had **washed themselves** in the fountain before they took the step of entering the holy precinct – but there it was, he was an old man and people had changed” (Goodwin 2007: 186).

TT1: “Ona kalsa, bu kadar gevezelik etmemelerini yeğlerdi; her şeyden önce de, kutsal tapınağa girmeden önce, şadırvanda **abdest almış** olmalarını isterdi – ama böyleydi işte, kendisi yaşlanmış, insanlar da değişmişti” (Goodwin (tr. Akkoyunlu) 2007: 178).

TT2: “Ona kalsa o kadar konuşmalarını istemezdi. O her şeyden çok kutsal mekâna adım atmadan önce şadırvanda **abdest almalarını** isterdi ama ne yaparsın, artık yaşlanmış ve insanlar değişmişti” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2017: 242).

Explicitation

Explicitation is defined as “the technique of making explicit in the target text information that is implicit in the source text” (Klaudy 2001: 80). Translators can make what is implicit in the source text explicit in the target text.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Goodwin gives information about the important imperial quarters one of which is the old palace. He states the functions and the users of this palace. Goodwin uses the expression “the women of previous sultans”, in which the detail of these women is unknown. In TT1, Öztekin produces a literal translation of this expression, where these women remain implicit as to who they are. However, in TT2, Aytuna makes it explicit that these women are “valide” or “haseki”. In Turkish, “valide sultan” is “the title of sultan’s mother” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 2467) and “haseki sultan” is “the title of the slave woman giving birth to sultan’s child” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1053). Therefore, based on the reference to the royal inhabitants of the Eski Serai in the ST, Aytuna’s inference of “the women of previous sultans” is reflected in his explicating translation as “eski valide ve haseki sultanlar”.

ST: “It was a school where palace slaves were trained; a company of Janissaries was stationed in its walls; but its only royal inhabitants were **the women of previous sultans**, dispatched from Topkapı on the death of their lord and master to gloomy retirement in the Eski Serai” (Goodwin 2006: 83-84).

TT1: “Burası kölelerinin eğitildiği bir okuldu; duvarları arasına bir yeniçeri alayı yerleştirilmişti; ama asıl sahipleri efendilerinin ölümü üzerine Topkapı’dan ayrılıp eski kasvetli Eski Saray’da inzivaya çekilmek zorunda kalan **eski sultanların kadınları** olmuştu” (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006: 102).

TT2: “Burası kölelerin eğitildiği bir okuldu. Duvarları içinde bir yeniçeri bölüğü görev yapıyordu. Fakat bu-

ranın yegâne hanedan mensubu sakinleri, **eski valide ve haseki sultanlardı**; efendilerinin ölümü üzerine Topkapı’dan kasvetli bir inziva hayatı yaşamak üzere Eski Saray’a gönderiliyorlardı” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016: 112).

Addition

Translators can decide on adding in the target text some information which does not exist in the source text. This addition can take the shape of introducing a term, giving detail, or providing explanation.

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), Goodwin mentions a particular event in the Ottoman history and uses the expression “the Patrona Rebellion”. In Turkish, “patrona” is “a title of naval officer in the Ottoman Empire similar to a rear admiral upper half” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1901). In the Ottoman history, the Patrona Rebellion is better known as “Patrona Halil İsyanı”, which derives its name from the janissary Patrona Halil, the leader of the rebellion. In TT1, Öztekin adds the information “Halil” which does not exist in the ST while in TT2, Aytuna literally translates “Patrona Rebellion” as “Patrona İsyanı”.

ST: “**The Patrona Rebellion** had been in 1730” (Goodwin 2006: 201).

TT1: “**Patrona Halil İsyanı** 1730’da olmuştu” (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006: 233).

TT2: “**Patrona İsyanı** 1730’da patlak vermişti” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016: 255).

In the following example from *The Janissary Tree* (2006), there is a dialogue between Yashim and Mustafa the Albanian, the soup master, about who Ali Paşa is. Goodwin uses the nickname “Lion” to refer to Ali Paşa, an Ottoman paşa prevailing in Yanya (known as “Janina”) district. In Turkish, “paşa” is “a title given to civilian officers of high rank or soldiers with a rank higher than colonels” (*TLA Turkish Dictionary* 2011: 1897). In TT1, Öztekin prefers a literal translation of “Lion”, which is “Aslan” in Turkish. In TT2, Aytuna adds the information “Yanya” in his translation and uses the expression “Yanya Aslanı”.

ST: “**The Lion,** Mustafa rumbled. ‘We called him that. I soldiered in his army—it was my country. But Ali Pasha was foxy, too. He gave us peace. I wanted war. In 1806 I went to Danube. That is where I joined the corps’” (Goodwin 2006: 46).

TT1: “**Aslan,** diye kükredi. ‘Biz onu öyle çağırırdık. Onun ordusunda askerdim—orası benim ülkem. Ama Ali Paşa aynı zamanda bir tilki kadar kurnazdı. Bize barış getirdi. Ben savaş istedim. 1806’da Tuna boylarına gittim ve orada orduya katıldım’” (Goodwin (tr. Öztekin) 2006: 60).

TT2: “**Yanya Aslanı,** diye kükredi Mustafa. ‘Biz ona öyle derdik. Onun ordusunda askerdim—orası benim memleketimdi. Fakat Ali Paşa aynı zamanda tilki gibiydi. Bize barış getirdi. Ben savaşmak istiyordum. 1806’da Tuna’ya gittim. Orada ocağa katıldım’” (Goodwin (tr. Aytuna) 2016: 63).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is obvious from not only the presentation of the Ottoman historical crime fiction but also the historical events, figures, culture-bound concepts and Turkish words that the first two books of Goodwin’s Yashim series, *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007), use the Ottoman culture as the source material. While Goodwin can be said to expose the readers of these Ottoman-themed English books to a foreign culture and the language of this culture through an act of “foreign language creation”, the adoption of different translation methods for different textual units can be explained in terms of translators’ individual decisions.

Considering “foreign language creation”, while narrating a historical period and various scenes rooted in the Ottoman culture, Goodwin is observed to act as a kind of translator who depicts a foreign culture in his own language. In this sense, his writing process which is named as “foreign language creation” reveals a kind of translation process in which he adopts certain methods. It can be suggested that free translation, substitution, integrated translation, addition and transliteration accompanied by explanation serve the needs of the target readers who are unfamiliar with the Ottoman culture. Transliteration with explanation indicates both introducing a foreign culture element and explaining it for target readers. Free translation and substitution point out target language orientation. Addition, which comes to the fore in the case of adding English translations of Turkish words, serves as a way of helping English readers better understand the meaning of the expressions used in Turkish. On the other hand, mere transliteration, exoticism and cultural borrowing are observed to create a direct relationship between English readers and the Ottoman culture. Turkish words and grammar used in narration increase the exotic nature of the texts. Cultural borrowings of Turkish words appearing on every page enable readers to experience an exotic reading which makes them aware that the origins of the text belong to a different land and culture.

In terms of “textless back translation”, the translators are observed to have used certain translation methods while dealing with the textual depiction of their own culture in a foreign language. It is noticed that adopting literal translation causes translationese since the source text itself is a translation and its the literal translation leads to unnatural expressions in the target culture and language which serve as the actual source. On the other hand, substitution of an English expression in the source text by its Turkish origin implies the return of culture. Omission, which is adopted to leave out the English translations added between commas besides the Turkish words in the source texts, indicates translators’ avoiding the redundancy in the Turkish target texts since Turkish readers already know the meaning of the Turkish expressions in question. Free translation is observed to enable translators to clarify the misunderstandings in the source text or to adopt a target-oriented way of expression. Translators’ use of established equivalents can be said to demonstrate that the related expressions in the source texts are themselves English translations and that the established equivalents in Turkish target texts imply some sort of cultural restoration.

Moreover, amplification of the source text, addition of information that is non-existing in the source text or making the implicit information in the source text explicit in the target texts, reminds translators' role as "a self-appointed cultural spokesman" (Sun 2014: 116) and support the claim that some translators of "textless back translations" "tend to take liberty with the original as if to suggest that they know the 'real' original better" (Sun 2014: 115).

In this paper, Turkish translations of Goodwin's *The Janissary Tree* (2006) and *The Snake Stone* (2007) have been approached merely from the perspective of "textless back translation". Goodwin's works, representing an English depiction of the Ottoman culture, also prove an important area of study within the scope of the West's translation of the East¹⁰ which can be examined through tracing the use of language with an oriental approach in the source text and its "back translation" in the target text. This provides us with an interesting starting point as the subject of our future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is based on the PhD dissertation of the first author submitted to Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul, Turkey. The second author is the advisor of the PhD dissertation.

END NOTES

1. See Guo 2017; Tu & Li 2017; Sun 2014.
2. For different case studies within this conceptual framework conducted by Turkish scholars, see Alimen 2019; Avşaroğlu & Karadağ 2018; Baydere 2018; Gökduman 2018; Karadağ 2018; 2019; Sayın 2019.
3. Unless otherwise stated, English translations of the quotes from Turkish sources are of the authors'.
4. This book has been the research subject of a previous study conducted from a different perspective in which its both Turkish and French translations are approached in terms of semiotics of translation. See Kasar 2012. For further studies by the same scholar on the same book, see also Kasar 2015; 2018.
5. Turkish Language Association will be henceforth abbreviated as TLA.
6. For "abdest almak", see also the explanation under the title "Established equivalent" in 6.2.
7. For "paşa", see also the explanation under the title "Addition" in 6.2.
8. The quotations from the source text, the first translation and the second translation will be henceforth stated as ST, TT1 and TT2, respectively.
9. For "abdest almak", see also the explanation under the title "Free translation" in 6.1.
10. For a case study on "textless back translation" as a concept that enables identification of the writings of the West on the East as a translation process, see Alimen 2019.

REFERENCES

Akkoyunlu, Ali Cevat. *Hedef İblis*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2004.

- Alimen, Nilüfer. "Batı'nın Doğu Çevirisi Olarak Oryantalizm ve Oryantalist Metinlerin Türkçeye Çevirileri." *Çeviribilimde Araştırmalar*. Ed. Seda Taş. İstanbul: Hiperyayın, 2019. 61-92.
- Avşaroğlu, Merve & Ayşe Banu Karadağ. "Tarihsel Romanların (Geri) Çevirileri Üzerine Betimleyici Bir Çalışma." 5th Yıldız Social Sciences Congress. Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul. 2018, December 13.
- Aytuna, Fethi. *Bitmeyen Sevda: Yeşil-Siyah*. İstanbul: Darüşşafaka Sports Club/Myra, 2016.
- Aytuna, Fethi. *Vefa'nın Galip'i: Galip Haktanır'ın Anıları*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2015.
- Baydere, Muhammed. "Geri Çevirilerde Çevirmenin İzini Sürmek." *Çeviribilimde Güncel Tartışmalardan Kavramsal Sorgulamalara*. Ed. Seda Taş. İstanbul: Hiperyayın, 2018. 317-346.
- Dillard, Duke. "Interview with Author Jason Goodwin." [Online] Available: [https://www.captivatingcappadocia.com/interview-jason-goodwin/\(n.d.\)](https://www.captivatingcappadocia.com/interview-jason-goodwin/(n.d.)).
- Goodwin, Jason. *The Janissary Tree*. New York: Sarah Crichton Books, 2006.
- Goodwin, Jason. *The Snake Stone*. London: Faber and Faber, 2007.
- Goodwin, Jason. *Yeniçeri Ağacı*. Trans. Çiğdem Öztekin. İstanbul: Merkez Kitaplar, 2006.
- Goodwin, Jason. *Yeniçeri Ağacı*. Trans. Fethi Aytuna. İstanbul: Pegasus, 2016.
- Goodwin, Jason. *Yılanlı Sütun*. Trans. Ali Cevat Akkoyunlu. İstanbul: Turkuvaz Kitap, 2007.
- Goodwin, Jason. *Yılanlı Sütun*. Trans. Fethi Aytuna. İstanbul: Pegasus, 2017.
- Gökduman, Umut Can. "'Yabancı Dil Yaratımı' ve 'Köken-siz Geri Çeviri' Kavramları Üzerinden Bir Çeviriyi Okumak." *Çeviribilimde Güncel Tartışmalardan Kavramsal Sorgulamalara*. Ed. Seda Taş. İstanbul: Hiperyayın, 2018. 347-376.
- Guo, Ting. "On Foreign Language Creation and Rootless Back Translation—A Case Study of *Snow Flower and the Secret Fan*." *Journal of Literature and Art Studies* 7. 10 (2017): 1354-1364.
- Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. "Çeviri, Edebiyat ve Tarih: Temsiliyetlerin Çeviribilim Bağlamında Yeniden Okunması." 1st International Rumeli [Language, Literature and Translation Studies] Symposium. Kırklareli University, Kırklareli. 2018, May 12.
- Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. "Çeviri Yoluyla Geçmiş, Şimdi ve Gelecek Arasında Köprüler Kurmak." *Çeviribilimde Araştırmalar*. Ed. Seda Taş. İstanbul: Hiperyayın, 2019. 33-58.
- Kasar, Sündüz. "Çeviribilimde Yeni Bir Kavram: Özde Çeviri." 1st International Rumeli [Language, Literature and Translation Studies] Symposium. Kırklareli University, Kırklareli. 2018, May 12.
- Kasar, Sündüz. "İstanbul dans *Janissary Tree* de Jason Goodwin." Séminaire de master Est/ouest: Espaces et échanges dans le monde et les villes. Valencia. 2015, November 12.
- Kasar, Sündüz. "Traduction de la ville sous le point de vue sémiotique: Istanbul à travers ses signes en trois langues."

- Défis et enjeux de la médiation interculturelle: Perspectives plurilingues et transdisciplinaires*. Eds. Nadine Rentel & Stephanie Shwerter. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012. 267-285.
- Klaudy, Kinga. “Explicitation.” *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. 80-84.
- Molina, Lucia & Amparo Hurtado Albir. “Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach.” *Meta* 47. 4 (2002): 498-512.
- Palabıyık, Osman. “Jason Goodwin ile Röportaj Yaptık.” [Online] Available: <http://www.izdiham.com/jason-goodwin-ile-roportaj-yaptik/> (August 28, 2016).
- Sayın, Ayşe Betül. “Çevirinin Yuvaya Dönüşü: Sömürgecilik Sonrası Çeviri Kuramında ‘Metinsiz Geri Çeviriler’.” *Çeviribilimde Araştırmalar*. Ed. Seda Taş. İstanbul: Hiperyayın, 2019. 237-250.
- Sun, Yifeng. “Translation and Back Translation: Transcultural Reinventions in Some Chinese American Literary Works.” *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies* 1. 2 (2014): 107-121.
- Tu, Qingyin & Changbao Li. “A Review on Textless Back Translation of China-Themed Works Written in English.” *Studies in Literature and Language* 14. 1 (2017): 1-7.
- Turkish Language Association. *Türkçe Sözlük* (11th ed.). Ankara: Turkish Language Association Press, 2011.
- Wehmeier, Sally. (Ed.). *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (6th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.