A CDA approach to the translations of taboos in literary texts within the historical and socio-political Turkish context

Reyhan Funda Isbuga-Erel
University of East Anglia

Abstract

This paper explores the combination of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies (DETS) by relating translated/target literary texts to societies as both products and processes. Translated/target texts (TTs) will be related in particular to the prevailing ideology or ideologies in the society where the TTs are produced. Based upon the intrinsic relationship of prevailing ideologies, power relations and censorship laws to translators' choices, the study tests the data to see whether it might help researchers relate literary translation to constraining factors of social origin. The data consist of Turkish translations of taboos relating to incest in translated literary texts. To this end, a socio-cognitive theoretical framework with an emphasis on the dialectical relationship between society and discourse is employed. The theoretical approaches that are found applicable are Wodak's discourse-historical CDA model (2001) and van Dijk's socio-cognitive CDA model (1998). The study also employs a diachronic retrospective methodology based on Toury's comparative model (1980, 1995) which allows a reconstruction of the regularities in translators' choices. The findings gathered from the analysis of the data show that translators' choices in literary texts are governed by the constraints of social origin. They also show that literary texts, whether original or translated, can offer as much information about the relationship between ideology, power relations and discourse as non-literary texts.

Introductory remarks

This paper explores the combination of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with Descriptive-Explanatory Translation Studies (DETS) by relating translated/target literary texts as products and processes to the societies in which they are produced, as well as the prevailing ideologies in these social contexts. Four major arguments can be put forward in this regard. First, translating in general, and literary translation in particular, is an ideologically-embedded undertaking (see also Schäffner, 2003). Second, CDA is applicable to DETS in general and translated literature in particular at the level of both theory and practice. Third, if a scholar of translation wishes to deal with translation within the framework of CDA, his/her approach must be *target-oriented*, i.e. focusing on a perspective that regards translations as "facts or products of the target culture" (Toury, 1995: 29), whose language the source text (ST) is translated into. Finally, translators are hardly powerful enough to introduce new ideologies or challenge existing ones through their translational decisions. Nevertheless, there are exceptions to this, namely when translated literature helps original literature to emerge or improve (The introduction of new genres, such as the novel, tragedy, comedy, and Western poetry, into the Turkish literary system during the Reformation period is a conspicuous example of how a translated literature may hold a central position in the literary system of a particular culture).

Translation Studies (TS), introduced by Holmes in 1972, grew out of one of the functionalist translation theories based on description. This discipline has considerably evolved over the last thirty five years, and in line with changes in perspective, its name has changed as well. While it has been common to call it Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), here I refer to it as DETS, considering the incorporation of the explanatory plane by Toury (1995, 1998). This contextualised DETS regards the historically-changing socio-cultural/political context of target texts (TTs) as an indispensable factor in creating, describing, and explaining translations. In light of this, it can be claimed that the practice of translation in a given society changes over time depending on the changes in the socio-cultural/political context of that society.

Translation is an ideologically-embedded socio-cultural/-political practice. Any translation is ideological (Schäffner, 2003: 23), because the choice of a ST is determined by the interests, aims and objectives of social agents or clients (cf. Toury's preliminary norms, 1980: 53-54, 1995: 58). In addition to the choice of the ST, the function or use of the TT in the target society is also decisive, and this function is again determined by the same factors. Besides these externally-imposed constraints, translators' own worldviews, values, prejudices and ideological orientations acquired during their socialisation process in the society they live in, are also at work. These are termed internal factors in this study.

I explore the changing practice of translation in Turkish society as a consequence of changes in the socio-cultural/political context in that society over a period of fifty-five years from 1945 to 2000. I conduct this exploration by analysing different TTs of the same literary ST, with the ultimate aim of demonstrating the benefits of applying a CDA approach to DETS in general, and translated literature in

particular. As I examine historical, cultural, political and ideological progress or changes in Turkish society and the effects of such progress or changes upon the practice of translation, the model employed should be diachronic in nature. Wodak's discourse-historical model is particularly apt for exploring the changing external (social) factors influencing the practice of translation. I apply Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model in exploring the internal (cognitive) factors determining the translator's particular solutions in the translation process. By relating the translator's discursive translational solutions (socio-cognitive/internal level of translation) to the ideological surrounding (social/external level of translation), I try to ascertain the importance of external factors in determining internal ones.

There are already some socially-oriented theories or models in DETS such as feminist theory, gender theory, and post-colonial theory, but they are related to immediate areas of interest, relating translation to society from a specific angle. Generally speaking, CDA perspective complements these partial theories, because it offers a general theory and thus helps TS expand towards a critical social theory. More specifically speaking, Wodak's and Van Dijk's models are beneficial in having more explanatory power in relation to the socio-historical factors and socio-cognitive processes which are at play when translating. Nevertheless, it cannot be disregarded that the opposite approach is also true. Critical analysis of language use in literary translated texts can be a very prolific source for critical social research into ideology and power relations. Thus, these two approaches complement and enrich each other.

Relating socio-cognitive and discourse-historical CDA approaches to translation as an ideologically-embedded social practice

Critical study of language use in texts should be connected both to the historically changing social conditions, which affect the reception and production processes of texts, and to the cognitive accounts of the role of the writer in producing texts, and of the reader in comprehending, reacting and interpreting them. Therefore, as Fairclough (2001: 16) argues, in CDA, the analyst should be concerned not only with texts themselves but also with the processes of producing and interpreting those texts, and with how these cognitive processes are socially shaped and historically changed.

Among the variations within the functionalist approach, DTS, polysystem theory, and particularly DETS seem compatible with socio-cognitive and historical CDA theories or models. The primary reasons for this compatibility are, first, that both CDA and TS models emphasise the socio-political and cultural background as the governing factor in text or discourse production and consumption; second, they can shed light on translation both as product and process, without preferring one aspect over the other; and finally both are descriptive and explanatory in nature. The most important difference between DETS, the main premise of which is "translations are facts of target culture" (Toury, 1995: 29), and DTS and polysystem theory, is its strong emphasis on the explanation of translations. In other words, while polysystem and DTS make possible the description of [literary] translations in relation to the target

culture, trying to answer "*how*" – ("how is it translated?"), DETS explains translations in relation to the context of the target culture (in addition to describing them) and tries to answer "*why*" – ("why is it translated thus?"). This is where TS meets CDA, because the answer to this question inevitably links translation phenomena to ideology and power relations.

I argue that translated texts offer a readily available and reliable source of research to bring ideology to the surface and to explore social and political conditions in a given society at a given time. This builds on the basic argument of CDA that the text offers a mediated interpretation (or a variable version) of the objective reality (Fairclough, 2004: 104). Moreover, as Fairclough points out, changes in language use are linked to wider social and cultural processes in a dialogical relation; that is, society influences discourse and discourse influences society (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 1992), mediated by ideology (van Dijk, 1998). Looking at translated literary texts rather than any other text type as the source of data demonstrates that literary texts are no different from non-literary ones in reflecting and construing social reality, either by conforming to or challenging it. Thus, they can offer as much information for CDA analysts as non-literary texts. There has already been some work within CDA on fiction (e.g. Talbot on fictional texts, 1995, 1997; Sunderland on gender, 2004; Brisset on drama translation, 1990; Isbuga-Erel on literary translation, 2008a, 2008b; Kosetzi on fictional texts; for more extensive references and discussion see Kosetzi, 2007, 2008), but still literature is not so extensively analysed within CDA, including translated literature.

Regarding the relationship between ideology and translation, Mason (1992: 23) avows, "ideology impinges on the translation process in subtle ways," adding that the text users consciously or subconsciously bring their own assumptions, predispositions and general world-views to bear on their processing of texts at all levels, including lexical choices, cohesive relations, syntactic organisation and text type. The translator, as both reader and producer of a text has "the double duty of perceiving the meaning potential of particular choices within the cultural and linguistic community of the ST and relaying that same potential, by suitable linguistic means, to a target readership" (ibid.). Given the argument that translators perform their task in specific socio-political contexts to produce TTs for specific purposes as identified by their clients (Schäffner, 2003: 24), and that they draw on their socially-acquired personal ideological predisposition, consciously or subconsciously, in the translation process, we can thus claim that it is inevitable that ideology permeates this process which will end up with systematic shifts from the ST. Given such an intrusion by ideology at all levels of text production (from lexical choices to text type), it would not be unreasonable to surmise that the examination of surface linguistic realisations in TTs, that is, of translators' final choices or decisions, can reveal the prevailing ideology or ideologies. More specifically, it will help reveal the social effects of ideological conditioning on translators' cognition and accordingly on their decision-making process, during which they should also bear in mind the text consumption tendencies, or expectations, of the target readers.

Van Dijk introduces a multidisciplinary approach to the notion of "ideology," involving insights from cognitive and social psychology, sociology and discourse analysis. He utilises a three-part approach for analysing ideologies: social analysis,

cognitive analysis, and discourse analysis. Whereas social analysis in this model pertains to examining the "overall societal structures" (the non-linguistic context), discourse analysis is primarily text-based. However, what makes van Dijk's approach unique is his cognitive analysis. He asserts (1998: 126) that in order to explain the proper nature of ideologies and their relation to social practices and discourse, we first need a revealing insight into their mental or cognitive dimension. The main point here is that ideologies indirectly influence the personal cognition of group members in the act of comprehension and production of discourse.

Van Dijk essentially perceives discourse analysis as the analysis of ideology, and argues throughout his works (1995, 1998) that one of the crucial social practices influenced by ideologies is discourse, which, in turn, influences how we acquire, learn, take on, change and reproduce ideologies. Thus, by analysing the discursive dimensions of ideologies in texts, we can prove how they can affect society and its members and at the same time how they may also be reproduced or legitimised or challenged in society. For van Dijk, a text or discourse means the original. In translation, in contrast, it is hard to claim this two-way relationship, for translated texts are usually less powerful than the originals in challenging or changing the prevailing ideologies; hence, most of the time, they **re**produce or legitimate the ideologies in question. It is this peripheral status (see also Even-Zohar, 1990) of translation which brings about some constraints on translators, thus leading them to manipulate the ST with the aim of conforming to existing ideologies in the target culture. In addition this explains why translation is regarded as an ideologically-embedded socio-cultural and political practice. Similarly, Bassnett and Lefevere (1992: vii) argue that translation is a rewriting of an original text and, like all rewritings, is a manipulation undertaken in the service of power, thereby reflecting a certain ideology.

Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, which emphasises the cognitive interface between discourse structures and social structures, is adopted with the aim of explaining how ideology impinges upon the translation process. In particular, the model considers how ideology is reproduced or legitimised and/or challenged through the discursive manifestations which are the outcome of the mediation by individual translators who manipulate the ST under the constraints of their own personal cognitions governed by their own assumptions, worldviews, values, goals, beliefs and (ideological) predispositions (which are socially and ideologically conditioned and shared). Thus I explore the effects the external factors have over the internal ones. These interrelationships can only be uncovered by linking observable data to the less observable or non-observable ones. The observable data in the present study are discursive manifestations in the TTs, which are the surface realisations of the translators' final decisions taken as a consequence of several (socio-)cognitive processes. The less observable or non-observable data are the several (socio-)cognitive processes governed by the translators' assumptions, worldviews, values, goals, beliefs and (ideological) predispositions, as well as the ideologies which shape and govern them. Such an analysis inspired by van Dijk's society-cognition-discourse triangle is, therefore, expected to provide insights into the ideological conditioning of translation as a social practice.

Translations are far more exposed to constraints than original texts. Thus, they are more productive when analysing particular discursive usages and ideologies, in reaching an understanding of the intricate interrelationship between discourse and ideology in general. The advantage of translated literary texts in such research is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the extent of the cognitive and social processes occurring in the production and consumption of the translated discourse is two times higher than that in original literary texts. When we consider the whole course of action in the production and consumption of an original literary text, we can identify a number of processes that take place as follows:

(i) interpretation of the real world by the author, governed by his/her personal experience of the real world and the social representations in his/her mind.

(ii) creation of the literary text or discourse by its author. As Althusser (1971, cited in Eagleton, 1998: 466) states, a literary text or discourse is a reflection or expression of the experience of the real world in an imaginary way; so a literary text or discourse is only an instance of many possible imaginary ways of expression through which ideologies as well as the way power is exercised are (re)produced.

(iii) interpretation of the literary text or discourse by its readers. In this process, readers' cognitive processes, as mentioned above, are at work. Thus, as social representations differ from reader to reader, so may the meaning of the communicative event. Meaning is thus negotiated between producer and receiver at this stage.

(iv) reception, by the reader, of the effects of the meaning intended by the author.

These phases are repeated for the production and consumption of the literary translated text or discourse. In other words, the translator as reader goes through phases (i) to (iv), during which the meaning intended by the ST author is located in the reader-translator's subjective reading. The process of production or translation then begins, governed by the translator's own personal experience of the real world and the social representations in his or her mind which differ from those of the ST author. Thus, during and after the processes of interpretation [of the ST] and production [of the TT], which are organised, coordinated and regulated by the social representations peculiar to him or her, the translator will have manipulated the reality in the ST discourse, itself already a version of reality manipulated by the ST author (a repetition of step i). In addition, this new version of reality is expressed by the translator in a new, imaginary way (repeating step ii). The course of action is completed when the TT reader interprets and receives the meaning intended both by the ST author and the translator (a repetition of steps iii and iv, but this time in step iii, the meaning is negotiated between the TT reader and both the ST author and translator). The processes of production and consumption of the literary translated discourse can be seen in the following chart. From this, it is clear that the interpretation variant is counted for both the ST author and the translator, and the consumption variant for both the translator and the TT reader:

Addresser /author	Speaking /writing process:	Text (ST)	Interpretation process:	Addressee /reader/ translator	Translation process:	Text (TT)	Interpretation process:	Addressee/ TT reader
	Choosing the utterance at various levels with representations one has stored in the long-term memory (social representations: knowledge of language and society, personal experience of the real world, attitudes, ideologies, etc.)		Matching features of the utterance at various levels with representations one has stored in the long term memory (social representations: knowledge of language, personal experience of the real world, attitudes, ideologies, etc.)		Choosing the utterance at various levels with representations one has stored in the long-term memory (social representation: knowledge of language, personal experience of the real world, attitudes, ideologies, etc.)		Matching features of the utterance at various levels with representations one has stored in the long term memory (social representation: knowledge of Language and society, personal experience of the real world, attitudes, ideologies, etc.)	

Stages of production and consumption of discourse in the process of translation, based on Fairclough's premise of language as social process (2001: 18-22) and van Dijk's cognitive account of the production and interpretation of discourse (1993a: 38-39, 1993b: 110-111, 1998: 79).

Although van Dijk's model is well-suited to explain translators' decisions as products of the socially-acquired representations in their minds (in particular ideologies), it lacks the historical dimension necessary for a diachronic study that would explore the impact of changes in socio-historical and political conditions on the practice of translation.

Among CDA scholars Wodak is known for focusing upon the historical dimension of discourse. Her model emphasises that the inclusion of the historical perspective is necessary in CDA as "social processes are dynamic, not static" and this "has to be reflected in the theory and in the methodology" (Wodak, 1989: xvi). Moreover, seeing language as the medium for the constitution and manifestation of these dynamic social processes and interaction, Wodak and Ludwig (1999: 12-13) claim that:

(i)   discourse "always involves power and ideologies. No interaction exists where power relations do not prevail and where values and norms do not have a relevant role."

(ii)   discourse is unavoidably historical or historically produced and interpreted, that is, "it is connected synchronically and diachronically with other communicative events which are happening at the same time or which have happened before" (ibid.), so it is not produced without context and cannot be understood without taking the context into consideration. In this respect, intertextuality and sociocultural knowledge are at work within the concept of context.

(iii)   readers and listeners might have different interpretations of the same communicative event, depending on their background knowledge and information, and position and role within the society. In other words, "THE RIGHT interpretation does not exist; a hermeneutic approach is necessary. Interpretations can be more or less plausible and adequate, but they cannot be true" (emphasis in original).

Besides these three principles, like van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, Wodak's model demands the methodological interdisciplinarity of CDA by combining historical, sociopolitical and linguistic perspectives in investigating a particular discourse practice. Such a triangulation is based on the concept of context (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001: 41; Weiss and Wodak, 2003: 22), involving intra-textual, inter-textual and extra-textual contexts (see also Wodak, 2001: 67-68). Thus, the discourse-historical model is highly suitable and relevant to the nature of the present study. I analyse the translations of two extracts of STs – for each ST I take two TTs from two different periods of the Turkish history. Thus, I observe the diachronic dimension of changing social context, aiming to explain how ideology is reconstructed through translated literature by impinging on both the process during which the translator interprets the ST (cf. hermeneutic quality) and the process of translation (cf. ideologically-generated discourse).

Socio-political Turkish context in the republican era

Given the importance of historical background in discourse, some knowledge of the historical context of Turkish society is necessary to understand the societal constraints, particularly censorship, imposed on translators. These influence translators' decisions during the translation process through the social representations in their minds, which, in turn, are internalised versions of the socio-political context of the society of which the individual translators are members . Thus, a brief history of the Turkish context under examination is provided below.

The Law of Establishment of Public Order, which came into force in 1925, gave the government limitless authority to restrict the freedom of the press and end the publication of any newspaper (Kabacalı, 1992: 963-964). Nevertheless, censorship was never confined to the press. It also affected radio and television, films, plays and books (see also Yayla, 1992).

From the second half of the 1940s - during the transition from the one-party to the multi-party system in Turkey - extraordinary restrictions, martial law, and despotism prevailed in the political arena. Many newspapers were banned for comments not approved by the government. As stated in *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı* (1999: 223, 244), after the General Directorate of Press and Publication started to operate under the authority of the Prime Ministry, the government increased its control over the press. Furthermore, during the war years the despotic regime not only restricted political thought but also intervened in every area of daily life, and the world of literature had to bear its share of government scrutiny. Thus, for example, the translation of Pierre Louys' *Afrodit*, about the customs of ancient times, was legally challenged in 1940 on grounds of obscenity. Along with the publisher and translator of the book, Sabiha Zekeriya Sertel, a writer and journalist, was also prosecuted for her article about the trial, in which she criticised the pressures imposed by the government on the writers, publishers and translators (see also *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı*, 1999: 227, 250-252).

The despotic conduct of the Democratic Party (1950-1960), which was economically liberal but culturally conservative, led to the design of different educational and cultural policies (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2003: 125) and was only brought to an end by a military coup on 27 May 1960. As Kabacalı states (ibid.), The National Unity Committee, which succeeded it, agreed to the immediate release of imprisoned journalists, and abolished most of the anti-democratic provisions in the Law concerning Crimes Committed through Publications and Radio and in the Press Law. As a consequence of these, Kabacalı (1992: 965) notes that the era which began with this coup was a milestone in the history of the Turkish Republic.

After the military coup a new constitution was drafted and accepted by the majority of voters in 1961. While standard and political rights were more comprehensively defined than before, articles guaranteeing freedom of the press and prohibiting censorship were also added, thus initiating a real process of democratisation in social and political life (see also *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı*, 1999: 480-481). This era, however, was brought to an end by another coup in 1980. During these

nineteen years (1961-1980), a multi-party system was set up, society became to some extent autonomous, and a process of rapid urbanisation began (Insel, 1999: 476).

As Yayla (1992: 956) notes, the civil conflicts which broke out throughout the country after 1970 started to threaten the unity and democratic nature of the state. Martial law was introduced until finally, when turmoil could no longer be prevented, the military again seized power on 12 September 1980. The coup led to another new constitution. The Constitution of 1982 gave lawmakers an opportunity to re-examine the laws pertaining to freedom of the press and publication. While the basic principle of freedom of the press and prohibition of censorship remained as set out in the 1961 Constitution, the issuing and releasing of news that might threaten national unity or national security, and that might incite offences and revolt, was to be prevented by the decision of the authorised administrative court (see also Yayla, 1992: 956). Prosecutions for books branded 'obscene' or 'pornographic' started to decline noticeably from the late 1980s. From then on, and particularly during the 1990s, the books subjected to confiscation decisions under the propaganda ban in article 142/1 of the Turkish Criminal Code were mostly socialist classics (for an extensive list of these books, see Tanör, 1997: 88) and their Turkish translations.

A consideration of the current decade demonstrates how much the political milieu in Turkey has changed since the 1940s. The transformation in political life as a result of the completion of the democratisation process has led to changes in social life. Turkey had, and still has, big problems concerning freedom of the press and publication, freedom of expression and freedom in the sciences and arts. Nevertheless, there have been improvements in these areas, mainly as a consequence of Constitutional amendments introduced in 1995 as part of the EU adjustment programme. These opened a new stage in the process of democratisation of Turkey.

An exhibition of a selection of 100 books banned and confiscated in Turkey from 1938 to 2001 was organised by the Istanbul City Directorate of Culture and Tourism, and opened to the public on 17 May 2005 (http://www.milliyet.com.tr /2005/05/22/guncel/gun03.html). This exhibition, functioning as concrete evidence of the considerable progress made in areas such as freedom of thought and expression, along with freedom of the press and publication, should be seen as a significant event in recent Turkish history, not least because it was organised by a government agency and was free to the public. Indeed, it has been interpreted by the public and the media as an effort to compensate for the mistakes of governments in the past. On the other hand, this does not mean that books or films are no longer banned for obscenity, which does still occur, even if it is much less frequent.

Methodology and data

The CDA approaches of van Dijk and Wodak (see section on CDA above) seem most appropriate for the systematic analysis of concrete discursive manifestations of ideologies in literary TTs. This serves the ultimate aim of this study, which is to juxtapose CDA with DETS in general and substantiate the suitability of translated

literature as a practical source of data for CDA scholars in particular.

While a combined theory from CDA is applied in this study, the methodology is taken from DETS. It is Toury's comparative micro-analysis model (1980, 1995, 1998), which is retrospective and diachronic in nature. After some regularities in translators' choices are reconstructed, these will be related to ideologies as "clusters of beliefs in our minds" (van Dijk, 1998: 48) and as the socially-acquired and shared "mental representations" (van Dijk, 1998: 9), which govern the successive cognitive processes in the translator's mind when making his/her translational decisions. This model also seems to match both van Dijk's and Wodak's approaches.

The comparison is carried out in two steps. First, two different TTs produced in different periods by different translators are compared. Second, the TTs are compared to their ST. The examples included here are three novels from 20th Century English and American literature and their respective translations into Turkish. The STs selected are Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (BNW) (1932/1993), and pertinent TTs (1945) and (2000); Nabokov's *Lolita* (L) (1955/1992) and pertinent TTs (1959) and (2000); and Erskine Caldwell's *God's Little Acre* (GLA) (1933/1995) and the pertinent TTs (1949) and (1986).

In this paper I present the analysis of a few selected extracts from the above mentioned STs (see Appendix) at the level of words, expressions and concepts which would have been considered sexual taboos in Turkish society under prevailing ideologies and social norms in the 1940s and 1950s. Topics emerging as taboo from the analysis are 'incest,' 'homosexuality,' 'group sex,' 'orgasm,' 'male and female genitalia,' 'sexual intercourse,' and any slang or vulgar words and expressions with sexual connotations. In this paper, though, I focus on the translation of incest-related ST units. The other topics have been and will be dealt with in detail in other studies (Isbuga-Erel, 2008a; Isbuga-Erel, 2008b).

Looking at the history of Turkish socio-political life in the 1940s and 1950s, we see that the most influential ideologies which could exert constraints on press and publication were conservative, spiritual, nationalist and anti-communist. There were in addition some social and ethical values, violation of which would result in social sanctions. For instance, family was considered one of the most prestigious institutions, so mention of extra-marital relationships and extra-marital pregnancy, homosexuality, and incest would not be tolerated by the average Turkish person. Indeed, adultery used to be counted as a public crime, while incest still is. However, while incest used to be utter taboo and the victims used to keep their experiences a secret during the 1940s and 1950s, it has become less of a taboo in the later years and has been discussed in the media and on TV programmes and included in research projects at universities. The victims are indisputably protected by law and as a result feel much freer to sue their assailants.

The detailed analysis of the books under examination showed that there are different types and degrees of *incest* experienced by the characters in the novels: incest between father and daughter, grandfather and grand-daughter, and father-in-law and daughter-in-law.

The table below shows the examples of the ST units relating to incest and their respective translations.

No. of examples	STs	Earlier TTs	Back translation (BT)	Later TTs	Back translation (BT)
1	Incestuous	zina	adulterous	ensest (adjective)	incestuous
2	Incest	zina	Adultery	baba kız aşkı	father-daughter love
3a	the normal girl is usually extremely anxious to please her father	Segment omitted	-	sağlıklı küçük kızlar, genellikle babalarını hoşnut etmek için çırpınırlar	healthy little girls usually make a great effort to please their father
3b	She feels in him the forerunner of the desired elusive male	Segment omitted	-	babalarını o ebedi, o ele geçirilmez erkeğin öncülü olarak görürler	These girls see their father as the forerunner of that eternal, elusive male
3c	realizing that the girl forms her ideals of romance and of men from her association with her father	Segment omitted	-	Romantic hülyalarını ve erkekler konusundaki düşüncelerini babalarıyla kurdukları ilişkilerden türettiklerini bilerek	realizing that their daughter derives her romantic reveries and her ideas about men from her relations she established with her father
3d	sexual relationships between a father and his daughter	Segment omitted	-	babayla kız arasındaki cinsel ilişkiler	sexual relationships between a father and his daughter
4	I might have her produce eventually a nymphet with my blood in her exquisite veins, a Lolita the Second...salivating Dr. Humbert, practising on supremely lovely Lolita the Third the art of being a granddad…	Segment omitted	-	Lolita'ma sonuçta şahane damarlarında benim kanım dolaşan bir ikinci Lolita doğurtabilecegim... Dr. Humbert'in olağanüstü güzellikteki Lolita Üç üzerinde ağzının suyu akarak büyükbabalık sanatının inceliklerini çeşitlediği…	I might have my Lolita produce eventually a second Lolita with my blood in her exquisite veins…Dr. Humbert drooling over supremely lovely Lolita the Third while practicing the art of being a granddad…
5	getting right down there and then and licking something	yere çöküp bir şeyler yalamak istermiş gibi bir his duydum	kneeling down and then licking something	hemen oracıkta diz çökeyim de oranı öpeyim istedim	kneeling right down there and then kiss yours
6	Humbert was perfectly capable of intercourse with Eve, but it was Lilith he longed for.	Segment omitted	-	Humbert, Havva ile cinsel ilişki kurabilmesi pekâlâ da mümkünken ne yazık ki sadece onun küçük kız kardeşini arzuluyordu.	It was of course possible for Humbert to have sexual intercourse with Eve, but it was her younger sister he longed for.

Examples 1 and 2

As seen, the ST unit 'incest' in both examples appears as 'zina' (adultery/ adulterous) in the earlier TTs . The translator's choice to change the ST unit can be based on the fact that people used to avoid talking or even thinking about incest in the 1940s. As seen, the translator of the later translation in example no. 1 retained the sense in the ST while the meaning was not only retained but also explained in example no. 2.

Example 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d

Humbert (H.H.), the protagonist, describes an incestuous relationship between stepfather and stepdaughter in the ST. Citing some stories from other cultures or from history, he suggests that a sexual relationship between father and daughter is normal and should be encouraged by families and society itself. Thus, there is no doubt that H.H. talks about the necessity of incest. We know that by doing this, he tries to justify his incestuous manner towards Lolita, his stepdaughter. As seen, while the whole passage was omitted by the translator of the earlier TT, it was retained by the translator of the later one.

Example 4

This is another typical example of incest as taboo. The long ST unit reveals H.H's dreams or plans of having Lolita produce a girl, Lolita the Second (his potential step-granddaughter) with whom, in his mind/dreams, he would have sexual relations in the future to bring Lolita the Third (his potential step-great-granddaughter) into life, ostensibly denoting a further incestuous relationship. As seen from the example, the translator of the earlier TT preferred to omit the passage entirely, while the translator of the later TT remained faithful to the ST.

Example 5

This is a typical example of familial taboos of incest. The father-in-law, Ty Ty, talks overtly about his daughter-in-law Griselda's genitals when many people are around and confesses that he wanted to lick these parts. As seen, this ST unit was translated as 'bir şeyler' (the plural form of 'something' in Turkish) in the earlier TT. This plural ending functions as a sort of euphemism by distracting the target reader's attention from a specific area of Griselda's body. When we look at the later TT, we see that it appears as 'oran' (yours/your…), which in this context, means 'your sexual organ,' denoting Griselda's genitals. By translating the ST unit 'something' as 'oran' (yours/your…), the translator of the later TT seems to have preferred to make Ty Ty's remark much more explicit for the TT readers.

Example 6

In this example, Nabokov's Humbert and Annabel, Humbert's childhood lover, play out their variations on a Biblical theme. Here, we see that Humbert symbolises Adam and Annabel Eve (Proffer, 1968: 10), while Lolita is Lilith, the sister of Eve. Lilith is a female devil who, according to an ancient Jewish tradition, was the first wife of Adam, and a vampire who attacked children, as well as being portrayed as a famous witch in the demonology of the Middle Ages (Appel, 1970: 43). The long passage in the ST, which includes this Biblical allusion, was omitted by the translator of the earlier TT. The translator of the TT of 2000, on the other hand, paraphrased it, replacing 'Lilith' with 'onun küçük kız kardeşi' (her younger sister). He might have intended to provide some guidance for target readers who do not know who Lilith is.

Findings and discussion

From the examples above, we can see that there is regularity in the strategies applied by different translators when dealing with ST units regarding incest. In all the examples, the translators of the earlier TTs seem to deliberately change/omit/euphemise the words or phrases or sentences relating to incest. This suggests some constraints imposed on translators of the earlier TTs when translating the ST units denoting or connoting incest. In contrast, the translators of the later TTs seem to have tried to remain faithful to the ST, if not making it even more explicit than the ST author himself. Although society is still very sensitive to familial relationships and values, talking about incest is no longer an utter taboo, which may be an immediate result of the liberal ideology in today's Turkish society.

Although the main concern of this paper is not religious taboos, example no. 6 typifies both taboos on incest and on anything considered contrary to the ideal and perfect life depicted in the sacred books. The way the translator of the earlier TT chose to handle the passage, containing some negative remarks about some religious figures, might be directly linked to the conservative and spiritual ideologies prevailing in Turkish society in the 1940s and 1950s. This was a sensitive time to criticise or question religion and nobody would dare to say anything against it or make negative remarks about religious figures in public. Today, however, while religion, and not only Islam, is still highly respected in Turkish society, readers of literature would not be bothered by such passages in a literary text like the one in question.

Thus, I argue that the shifts from the STs that display regularity in the earlier TTs seem unlikely to be there by chance unless they are the translators' arbitrary choices. The possible reasons for these regular shifts, from the point of view of translators, can be summarised as follows:

(i)   the pressure not to go against the objectives of clients (mostly publishing houses or government institutions)
(ii) concerns over running counter to target readers' expectations

(iii) fears about exposure to governmental censorship due to the concept of 'obscene' or 'immoral' novels, plays, films etc.

(iv) the pressure of, and concerns about, lawsuits filed against writers, or translators and publishers

(v) personal ideological predispositions

All of these factors, therefore, may have forced the translators to impose 'self-censorship,' thus enabling them to avoid negative sanctions either from clients, readers or authorities, and to conform to their own ideological and ethical predispositions. Hence, in order to fulfil this task, they may have had to manipulate the linguistic material of the STs by negotiating the meaning between the ST authors and the impositions of the target culture and society. This, in turn, would have entailed re-writing the relevant parts through change, omission, and euphemism.

As to the strategies applied by the translators of the later TTs, from the late 1980s up to 2000, we can see that all the linguistic material in the STs has been retained. The reason for this faithfulness to the ST may be explained again through the prevailing socio-political/cultural conditions of the time. When compared to the readers of the 1940s and 1950s, Turkish readers of recent years are more open-minded, more aware of freedom of thought and speech, and have either eliminated, or wished to eliminate, taboos. Most importantly, they are the generations who have largely grown up with the Constitution of 1961, which brought freedom of thought and freedom of expression. In this respect, we may assume that the translators of the later TTs most probably had no reason to worry about ethical prejudices, censorship and lawsuits.

In conclusion, differences in the type and frequency of the choices or shifts in the earlier and later TTs (TT discourse) can be related to different social representations in translators' minds which are the internalised cognitive versions of particular societal structures and processes, including ideologies and power relations (cf. socio-cognitive aspect of van Dijk's CDA model and Wodak's hermeneutic approach), which historically change (cf. historical aspect of Wodak's CDA model).

Conclusion

There is no doubt that political and social formations motivate or discourage cultural and artistic creation. In the light of this fact and taking into account the tenet that translated literature cannot be isolated from the body of domestic writing of the target culture, I have argued that both original and translated literature are inevitably governed by the social and political situations particular to the society in which they are produced. This, in turn, requires the translation scholar to adopt a target-oriented approach for its applicability in making connections between translation and social structures and processes in general, and prevailing ideologies and power relations in particular, within the target society. This explains why translations, as rewritings, are very effective as a source of data for critical research into ideology, if handled from a

target-oriented point of view.

The findings of the analysis of different translations of the same original novels also suggest that, as with non-literary texts, literary texts, whether original or translated, can also tell us a great deal about a society and its characteristics, as society governs their production. Therefore, given the fact that the studies covered in CDA have mostly been carried out on non-literary texts, one reason for choosing literary translated texts as a source of data is to provide evidence that they can also be analysed by means of CDA. In this way, one can gain insights into how ideologies impinge on the processes of text production; and in turn, how ideologies can be as reflected, legitimised or challenged as effectively in literary texts as in non-literary ones. However, for literary translations, this function *usually* reveals itself as reflecting and legitimising but not challenging due to the generally peripheral or secondary position of literary translations within the body of domestic writing of the target culture.

In this study I have tried to show the ideology-text production relationship by relating translation solutions/decisions (discursive usages) to ideological reasoning, the predispositions of individual translators (cognitive processes) and to the prevailing ideologies, at a given time in a particular society, which together govern the cognitive processes of the translator, and thus the end product (TT). Revealing this relationship, the analysis has thus provided evidence for the argument that there is no apparent reason for the non-applicability of CDA to DETS in general and (translated) literature in particular. Taking into consideration both the nature of the social processes and the way those processes are transferred to and manifested in language, critical research into the link between society and discourse should include historical, social and cognitive dimensions. In this respect, the unification of van Dijk's socio-cognitive model and Wodak's discourse-historical model into a more comprehensive new model could help researchers investigating ideology and the society-cognition-discourse relationship.

Primary Texts

Caldwell, E. (1949), *Allaha Adanan Toprak* (1933). [Transl. by Fikret Uray]. İstanbul: Remzi.

Caldwell, E. (1986), *Tanrıya Adanan Toprak* (1933). [Transl. by Nihal Yeğinobalı]. İstanbul: Remzi.

Caldwell, E. (1995), *God's Little Acre* (1933). London: Brown Thrasher Books.

Huxley, A. (1945), *Yeni Dünya* (1932). [Transl. by O. Burian]. Ankara: MEB.

Huxley, A. (1993), *Brave New World* (1932). London: Flamingo.

Huxley, A. (2000), *Cesur Yeni Dünya* (1932). [Transl. by Ű. Tosun]. Istanbul: Ihtaki

Nabokov, V. (1959), *Lolita* (1955). [Transl. by L. Niven]. İstanbul: Aydın.

Nabokov, V. (1992), *Lolita* (1955). London: Everyman's Library.

Nabokov, V. (2000), *Lolita* (1955). [Transl. by F. Özgüven]. İstanbul: İletişim.

References

Althusser, L. (1971), *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. B. Brewster, London: New Left Books.

Appel, A. (ed.) (1970), *The Annotated Lolita*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. (1992), 'General editor's preface,' in S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere (eds.), *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London: Routledge, pp. vii-viii.

Brisset, A. (1990), *Sociocritique de la traduction. Théâtre et altérité au Québec*, (*1968-1988*). [Transl. Rosalind Gill and Robert Gannon]. Toronto and Buffalo etc.: University of Toronto Press.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999), *Discourse in late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı (75th Anniversary of the Republic) (1999), vol. II and III, İstanbul: YKY

Eagleton, T. (1998), 'Literature and History' (1976) in D. Keesey (ed.) *Contexts for Criticism*, 3rd edition, London: Mayfield, pp. 460-467.

Even-Zohar, I. (1990), 'Polysystem Theory,' *Poetics Today,* 11:1, pp. 9-51.

Fairclough, N. (1992), *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.

Fairclough, N. (2001), *Language and Power*. 2nd edition. London: Longman

Fairclough, N. (2004), 'Critical Linguistics/Critical Discourse Analysis,' in K. Malmkjær (ed.), *The Linguistics Encyclopedia.* London: Routledge, pp. 105-106.

Holmes, S. J. (1972/2000), 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies,' in L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 172-185.

Insel, A. (1999), 'Demokrasinin Sancılı Yılları' (Distressing Years of Democracy), *Cumhuriyetin 75 Yılı*, vol. II, İstanbul: YKY, pp. 476 – 478.

Isbuga-Erel, R.F. (2008a), *Translating taboo and ideology: a socio-cognitive diachronic Critical Discourse Analysis framework for translations of English and American novels*. PhD Thesis, Norwich, UK: University of East Anglia.

Isbuga-Erel, R.F. (2008b), 'Where Translation Meets Critical Social Theory,' in R.H. Parker and K.G. Garcia (eds.) *Thinking Translation*, Florida: BrownWalker, pp. 69-85.

Kabacalı, A. (1992), 'Türkiye'de Basın Sansürü' (Censorship in the Press in Turkey) *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IV, İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 959-966.

Kosetzi, K. (2007), *Representatives of women in terms of gender roles and sexual practices in Σχεδόν Ποτέ (ΣΠ) ('Almost Never'): the text and the audience.* PhD Thesis, Lancaster University.

Kosetzi, K. (2008), 'Harnessing a Critical Discourse Analysis of Gender in Television Fiction,' in K. Harrington, L. Litosseliti, H. Sauntson, and J. Sunderland (eds.) *Gender and Language Research Methodologies*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Mason, I. (1992), 'Discourse, Ideology and Translation,' in R. de Beaugrande, A. Shunnaq, M.H. Heliel (eds.) *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East*, Masterdam: Jojn Benjamin, pp. 23-34.

Milliyet, the national daily newspaper, 22.05.2005, at http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2005/05/22/ guncel/ gun03.html, (accessed May 2005).

Proffer, R. C. (1968), *Keys to Lolita*. London: Indiana University Press.

Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2001), *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism.* London: Routledge.

Schäffner, C. (2003), 'Third Ways and New Centres: Ideological Unity or Difference,' in M. Calzade-Pérez (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*, Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 23-41.

Sunderland, J. (2004), *Gendered Discourses*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. (2003), 'The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol,' in M. Calzada-Pérez (ed.) *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 113-129.

Talbot, M. (1995), *Fictions at Work*. London: Longman.

Talbot, M. (1997), '"An Explosion Deep Inside Her": Women's Desire in Popular Romance Fiction,' in K. Harvey and C. Shalom (eds.), *Language and Desire: Encoding Sex, Romance and Intimacy*. London: Routledge. pp. 106-122.

Tanör, B. (1997), *Perspectives on Democratization in Turkey: Progress Report.* İstanbul: TUSİAD

Toury, G. (1980), *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetic and Semiotics.

Toury, G. (1995), *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Toury, G. (1998), 'A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms',' in C. Schäffner (ed.) *Current Issues in Language and Society: Translation and Norms*, 5:1 & 2, 9-31.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993a), *Elite Discourse and Racism*. London: Sage.

van Dijk, T.A. (1993b), 'Discourse and cognition in society,' in D. Crowley & D. Mitchell (eds.) *Communication Theory Today.* Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 107-126.

van Dijk, T.A. (1995), 'Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis,' in C. Schäffner and A. L. Wenden (eds.) *Language and Peace*, Dartmouth: Aldershot, pp. 17-33.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998), *Ideology.* London: Sage.

Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2003), 'Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis,' in G. Weiss and R. Wodak (eds.) *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 1-32.

Wodak, R. (1989), *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse.*

Wodak, R. (2001), 'What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments,' in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage, pp. 1-13.

Wodak, R. and Ludwig, C. (1999), *Challenges in a Changing World: Issues in Critical Discourse Analysis.* Vienna: Passagenverlag.

Yayla, Y. (1992), 'Sansür' (Censorship), *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, vol. IV, İstanbul: İletişim, pp. 954-958.

APPENDIX

Example 1
(ST – BNW) - Or in the <u>incestuous</u> pleasure of his bed….(p. 115)

(TT – 1945)…<u>zina</u> bulaşık zevkini sürerken (p. 166)
(Back Translation/BT) While he enjoys his <u>adulterous</u> pleasure.

(TT – 2000) Veya yatağında <u>ensestten </u>keyifli (p. 180)
(BT) Or in <u>the incestuous </u>pleasure in his bed…

Example 2
(ST – L) Parody of <u>incest</u> (p. 305)

(TT – 1959) <u>Zina</u> taklidi (p. 237)
(BT) Parody of <u>adultery</u>

(TT – 2000) <u>Baba kız aşkı</u> bozuntusu (p. 331)
(BT) Parody of father-daughter love

Example 3
(ST – L) Look, darling, what it says. I quote: the normal girl - normal, mark you - <u>the normal girl is usually</u> <u>extremely anxious to please her father</u> (a). She feels in <u>him</u> the forerunner of the <u>desired elusive male</u> (b) ('elusive' is good, by Polonius!). The wise mother (and your poor mother would have been wise, had she lived) will encourage a companionship between father and daughter, realizing - excuse the corny style - that <u>the girl forms her ideals of romance and of men from her association with her father</u> (c). Now, what association does this cheery book mean - and recommend? I quote again: Among Sicilians <u>sexual</u> <u>relationships between a father and his daughter are accepted as a matter of course, and the girl who</u> <u>participates in such relationship is not looked upon with disapproval by the society of which she is part</u> (d) (p. 158).

(TT – 1959) Segment omitted (p. 126).

(TT – 2000) Bak sevgilim neler diyor! Okuyorum: Sağlıklı küçük kızlar - sağlıklı diyor, duydun mu - <u>sağlıklı küçük kızlar, genellikle babalarını hoşnut etmek icin çırpınırlar</u> (a). Bu kızlar, küçükten beri <u>babalarını o ebedi, o ele geçirilmez erkeğin</u> (b) (Polonius aşkına, 'ele geçirilmez' diyor!), <u>erkeğin öncülü</u> <u>olarak görürler</u>. Aklı başında anneler (Zavallı anneciğinin de aklı başında olacaktı yaşasaydı!) kızlarının, <u>romantik hülyalarını</u> (üslubun bayağılığı için özür dilerim!) <u>ve erkekler konusundaki düsüncelerini</u> <u>babalarıyla kurdukları ilişkilerden</u> (c) türettiklerini bilerek, babayla kız arasındaki ilişkileri destekleyeceklerdir. Bu kitabın ne türlü ilişkileri kastettiğini ve önerdiğini gördük, değil mi? Okumaya devam ediyorum; Sicilyalılar'da, <u>babayla kız arasındaki cinsel iliskiler son derece doğal sayılır ve bu tür</u> <u>ilişkilere girişen kıza üyesi olduğu topluluk tarafından kötü gözle bakılmaz</u> (d) (p. 173).

(BT) Look, my darling, what it says! I am reading: healthy little girls - says healthy, have you heard - <u>healthy little girls usually make a great effort to please their father</u> (a). These girls see their <u>father as the</u> <u>forerunner of that eternal, elusive male</u> (b) (for Polonius's sake! it says 'elusive'!). The wise mothers (your poor mother would have been wise, too, had she lived!) will encourage relations between father and daughter, realizing that their daughter derives her <u>romantic reveries </u>(excuse the corny style!) <u>and her</u> <u>ideas about men from her relations she established with her father</u> (c). We understood what type of relations this book means and recommends, did we? I keep reading: Among Sicilians <u>sexual relationships</u> <u>between a father and his daughter are accepted as a matter of course, and the girl who participates in such</u> <u>a relationship is not condemned</u> (d).

Example 4

(ST – L) …to the thought that with patience and luck I might have her produce eventually a nymphet with my blood in her exquisite veins, a Lolita the Second, who would be eight or nine around 1960, when I would still be dans la force de l'âge; indeed, the telescopy of my mind, or un-mind, was strong enough to distinguish in the remoteness of time a vieillard encore vert - or was it green rot? - bizarre, tender, salivating Dr. Humbert, practising on supremely lovely Lolita the Third the art of being a granddad (p. 184).

(TT – 1959) Segment omitted (p.144).

(TT – 2000) …birazcık sabırla ve sanşımın da yaver gitmesi koşuluyla Lolita'ma sonuçta şahane damarlarında benim kanım dolaşan bir ikinci Lolita doğurtabileceğime kadar…Lolita İki 1960 başlarında sekiz ya da dokuz yaşına gelmiş olur, ben de hala olgunluk çağımda olurdum. Zihnimin ya da zihin yerine taşıdığım o korkunç şeyin dürbününden baktığımda, zamanın uzaklığı içinde bir ihtiyar delikanlının - yoksa ihtiyar bir rezil mi demeliyim? - garip, gülünç, sevecen bir Dr. Humbert'in olağanüstü güzellikteki Lolita Üç üzerinde ağzının suyu akarak büyükbabalık sanatının inceliklerini çeşitlediğini de görebiliyordum (p. 201).

(BT) …to the fact that with a little patience and providing I was lucky, I might have my Lolita produce eventually a second Lolita with my blood in her exquisite veins…Lolita the Second would be eight or nine in the early 1960s and I would still be in the age of maturity. When I looked through the telescope of my mind or of that terrible thing I carried as a mind, I can see, in the remoteness of time, an evergreen old man - or should I say an old villain? - bizarre, funny, tender Dr. Humbert drooling over supremely lovely Lolita the Third while practicing the art of being a granddad.

Example 5

(ST – GLA) ...I felt like getting right down there and then and licking something. (p. 30)

(TT – 1949) …hemen orada yere çöküp bir şeyler yalamak istermiş gibi bir his duydum. (p. 43)
(BT) I felt like kneeling down and then licking something.

(TT – 1986) içimden öyle geldi ki hemen oracıkta diz çökeyim de oranı öpeyim istedim. (p. 33)
(BT) I felt like kneeling right down there and then kiss yours.

Example 6

(ST – L) Humbert was perfectly capable of intercourse with Eve, but it was Lilith he longed for. (p. 20-21)

(TT – 1959) Segment omitted (p. 12).

(TT – 2000) Humbert, Havva ile cinsel ilişki kurabilmesi pekâlâ da mümkünken ne yazık ki sadece onun küçük kız kardeşini arzuluyordu (p. 24)

(BT) It was of course possible for Humbert to have sexual intercourse with Eve, but it was her younger sister he longed for.