

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2021.2.1.24>

SPECYFIKA TŁUMACZEŃ NA JĘZYK TURECKI DZIEŁ SZTUKI: ASPEKT NARODOWY

Iryna Prushkovska

*doktor nauk filologicznych, docent, profesor Katedry Języków Obcych
Instytutu Stosunków Międzynarodowych Kijowskiego Uniwersytetu Narodowego
imienia Tarasa Szewczenki (Kijów, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1949-0911
e-mail: irademirkiev@gmail.com*

Adnotacja. Badanie koncentruje się na tłumaczeniach dzieł literackich z języków europejskich (angielski, francuski) i słowiańskich (rosyjski, ukraiński) na język turecki w okresie reform w Państwie Osmańskim, ze szczególnym naciskiem na analizę tłumaczeń artystycznych przeprowadzonych w drugiej połowie XX i na początku XXI wieku z perspektywy strategii tłumaczeniowych, które są określone przez specyfikę narodową Turków. Główny nacisk kładziono na elementy oryginalnych tekstów mających narodowy wpływ na podłoże kulturowe języka przekładu. Praca z proponowanym materiałem faktycznym stanowiła podstawę wniosków, że tłumacze tureccy świadomie wprowadzali i nadal wprowadzają zmiany w tekście tłumaczenia w celu ochrony interesów narodowych.

Słowa kluczowe: udomowienie, forenizacja, literatura europejska, tłumaczenia tureckie, modernizacja ochronna, kultura wschodnia.

SPECIFICS OF LITERARY TRANSLATIONS INTO TURKISH: NATIONAL ASPECT

Iryna Prushkovska

*Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor,
Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages
Institute of International Relations
of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1949-0911
e-mail: irademirkiev@gmail.com*

Abstract. This study focuses on translations of literary works from European (English, French) and Slavic (Russian, Ukrainian) languages into Turkish during the period of reforms in the Ottoman state, on the analysis of individual translations of the middle and second half of the 20th century, as well as the beginning of 21 century, on translation strategies that are determined by the national specifics of the Turks to confirm the idea that Turkish translators deliberately make changes to the text in order to protect national interests. The main attention is focused on those elements of the original texts that have a national influence on the cultural soil of the target language.

Key words: domestication, foreignization, European literature, Turkish translations, defensive modernization, oriental culture.

СПЕЦИФІКА ПЕРЕКЛАДІВ ТУРЕЦЬКОЮ МОВОЮ ХУДОЖНІХ ТВОРІВ: НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Ірина Прушковська

*докторка філологічних наук, доцентка,
професорка кафедри іноземних мов
Інституту міжнародних відносин
Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (Київ, Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1949-0911
e-mail: irademirkiev@gmail.com*

Анотація. Дослідження присвячено перекладам літературних творів з європейської (англійської, французької) та слов'янської (російської, української) мов на турецьку мову в період реформ в Османській державі, окрему увагу зосереджено на аналізі художніх перекладів, здійснених у другій половині XX – початку XXI століття з ракурсу стратегій перекладу, які визначаються національною специфікою турків. Основний акцент зроблено на елементах оригінальних текстів, які мають національний вплив на культурний ґрунт мови перекладу. Робота із запропонованим фактичним матеріалом лягла в основу висновків про те, що турецькі перекладачі свідомо вносили і продовжують вносити зміни до тексту перекладу з метою захисту національних інтересів.

Ключові слова: одомашнення, форенізація, європейська література, турецькі переклади, захисна модернізація, східна культура.

Introduction. The value of translation lies in facilitating the process of interaction between individuals, the process of exchange of cultural values, in meeting the spiritual needs of a person, a source of accumulation of knowledge about other civilizations and peoples. An important accumulator of culturological information is the fiction of other nations, and the translation of such literature, respectively, acts as an intermediary in interlanguage and intercultural communication. This study will focus not so much on theoretical models of literary translation, but rather on the practical side of the issue of translation strategies for literary texts of radically different linguocultural coordinates, namely, the texts of Western and Slavic cultures translated into Turkish, language. In the course of the research, the author of the article will provide some historical data that are necessary to analyse the general situation around literary translation in the Ottoman state and later in the Turkish Republic. Because, as shown by most of the studies of scientists in different fields, the cultural development of Turkish society from the beginning to this day is closely related to the political situation in the state, and it is politics that is the main formative factor of influence on all other spheres.

Main part.

1. The historical background of Turkish literary translations

The close acquaintance of the Turks with Western languages, first with French, and, accordingly, with Western literature, took place in the 19th century, before that the Arabic and Persian languages occupied the main niche in the cultural life of the Ottoman Turks. The translation of Western fiction in the Ottoman state in the 19th century played a very important role in the formation of new literary genres for Turkish culture (drama, novel), a new, Europeanized model of life, which readers learned about from translated works and which they tried to imitate, in the emergence of new literary currents. It is important to note that the so-called “window to Europe” was broken through in the Ottoman state under the influence of the French Revolution and the close contacts of the sultans (Ahmet III, Abdulhamid I, Selim III, Mahmud II, Abdulmecit) with Europe. All subsequent padishahs actively used the opportunity to interact with Europe. Thus, Abdulaziz (reigned in 1861-1876) was the first padishah of the Ottoman state who visited Europe for non-military purposes. Taking advantage of the invitation of Napoleon III to an international exhibition in Paris, as well as a separate invitation from Queen Victoria, Abdulaziz spent more than a month in Europe (France, Great Britain, Belgium, Prussia and Austria). His trip can be considered a step towards the establishment of diplomatic ties between the Ottoman Empire and European states (*Avrupa'ya Seyahat Eden*). During his reign, about two hundred literary works were translated and written in the European manner, mainly plays (Aldağ: 29). Indeed, it was in the second half of the 19th century that the Turkish author's drama was born, which consisted primarily of translated, adapted plays by famous French playwrights; plays were actively performed on the stages of local theatres in Istanbul, increasingly expanding the circle of recipients (Prushkovska: 28). It was during the reign of Abdulaziz that the Translation Chamber, established in 1821 to provide diplomatic translation, became a translation bureau, on the basis of which Ahmet Vefik Pasha, Namyk Kemal and others were educated as specialists. Working in the office broadened their horizons, contributed to a deeper study of French and English, the opportunity to travel in Europe and study and work in France. The translation work was also benefited by the intensification of the work of local public libraries (Anamerich: 8), and their replenishment of European literature in Turkish translations was followed by conscious readers and all those who were fascinated by European culture. At the same time, Abdulaziz was concerned with the integrity of the country, so any attempts to destroy this unity were punished by him quite severely (Akyüz: 23). During his reign, translations of Shakespearean plays about the murder of members of the ruler's family out of greed for power were negatively received; banned the Turkish comedy “Aziz Aga” due to certain parallels with the ruler Abdulaziz; for certain political reasons they changed the title of the play “Tosun Aga” (Sezer: 171). By order of Abdulaziz on April 28, 1873, for the “anti-state” motives of the play “Fatherland”, the famous writer Namyk Kemal was exiled, followed by the writers, poets Ebuuzzi Tefvik Bey and Ahmet Mithat Effendi. The Europeanization of Turkish society continued during the reign of Abdulhamit II (1876–1909). He, like some of his predecessors, becoming more and more familiar with European culture, realized its originality and novelty for the entrenched Eastern canon (he himself knew how to play the violin and piano, was actively interested in Western music, preferring it to Turkish) (Bayındır: 16), understood the impossibility of stopping the process of learning by the Turks of this innovation, but at the same time, like Abdulaziz, he was worried that, under the influence of Western culture, revolutionary moments could arise in Turkish society, therefore he was very wary of what and how translated from literature, and especially from drama. That is, in the mentioned period there was no talk of adaptive translation or domestication, the translated works were carefully researched, analysed by the special commission of Dahili created by Abdulhamit II, and translators or authors of adaptations were punished. The censors paid special attention to the presence in the works of such themes or even words as homeland, assassination, attack, anarchy, socialism, dynamite, independence, uprising, removal of the king, assassination of the royal family, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, etc., which could undermine according to the sultan, the integrity of the state (Bayındır: 18). Because of this, Shakespeare's plays (Hamlet, Macbeth, King Lear), which were considered dangerous not only lexically but also plot-wise, were on the special black list because of this. Abdulhamid II can be called the first ruler to propose a model of “protective modernization” in the Ottoman state. This model included moderate liberal reforms carried out “from above”, but with the main goal of eliminating the dangerous technical (primarily in the military sphere) and economic lag behind the leading Western powers of that time without fundamentally changing traditional society and reforming the ruling regime. Abdulhamid II saw in everything the possibility of betrayal and an attempt to remove him from the throne. He even moved to Yildiz Palace, which, unlike Dolmabahce, where he was supposed to be, was not

particularly luxurious, but was surrounded by a high and strong wall, away from the sea and in a safer location. He was a hermit king, who was therefore considered eccentric (Salik). Having his own theatre and orchestra on the territory of Yildiz Palace, Abdulhamid II was well aware of the power and influence of culture on the minds of people. Therefore, he was afraid of the penetration of “wrong” ideas through translated works. Thus, frightened by the propaganda about the independence of the Circassians, which he saw in the plot of Ahmet Mithat’s play “Çerkes Özdenleri” and the operetta “Chengi”, Abdulhamid II ordered to destruct of the theatre where the works were presented, and it was burned at night. Abdulhamid II hated the writer and translator Theodore Kasap for his translation of Moliere's “The Miser”, later imprisoning him for three years on suspicion of anti-government activities (Bayındır: 16). However, as is known from historical sources, the Turkish intelligence, having already tasted the new, European, did not restrain itself in new attempts to translate, adapt the works of famous writers, it was not restrained even by repression and exile. Thus, Namyk Kemal, Ebuziya Tevfik Bey, Ahmet Mithat Effendi continued to write works far from home, and their friend, theatrical activist Gullu Agop staged their plays in Istanbul (Molière, *Cimri*. Yaşar Nabi: 40).

2. The fate of literary translations in the last decades of the Ottoman state, during the Republic

In the second half of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, mostly Turkish poets and writers of that time worked on translations of literary texts into Turkish (Ibrahim Shinasi – the first translator of European poetry, Yusuf Kamil Pasha – the first translator of novels, Ahmet Vefik Pasha – the first translator of drama, Namyk Kemal, Shemseddin Sami, Ebuziya Tevfik, Ali Haidar Bey, Mehmet Rifat, Hassat Bedhret Butcher, etc.), who were fluent in French, some in English (Halide Edip Adyvar studied at the American College and translated from English from the age of 13, Abdulkhak Hamit Tarkhan and Samipashazadeh Sezai worked at the London Embassy (1860-1936) and knew English well and translated, Namyk Kemal and Ziya Pasha spent a long time in London after the order about their exile) (Akkaya: 80), as well as some specialists from other nationalities who were fluent in Turkish and translated from Russian (Gulnar Hanım).

Thus, in the period from 1860 to 1901, 149 novels by Western authors were translated into Turkish (Akkaya: 50), from 1866 to 1877, more than two hundred plays were translated into Turkish (Aldağ: 29), and about the same number of poetic works. The translation methods of transferring literary texts from a foreign (mainly from French) language into Turkish in the last century of the existence of the Ottoman state can be conditionally designated as follows:

1. Imitation, adaptation, used in the translation of plays, novels, short stories.

2. Domestication of translated works in order to facilitate the adaptation of Turkish society to new literary forms, new, unknown and not always clear culture of European countries, as well as to enable the existence of the translated work within the framework of censorship and total control. And, finally, to prevent the influence of religious and political moments present in the works of the original, on Eastern Muslim society.

In this context, we will analyse the translation processes in the Ottoman state in the second half of the nineteenth – early twentieth century. In terms of translation techniques used by translators to bring the original text closer to the realities of the Eastern world. We will also see whether there are similar ways of translating foreign fiction in the second half of the twentieth century and in modern Turkey. The main attention will be focused on how, within the framework of defensive modernization, translators dealt with the themes of religion, morality, and national values.

In less than a hundred years of the translation tradition of fiction into Turkish, recipients who knew the languages of the originals of works and could compare the original and the text of the translation raised a lot of complaints and wishes about improving the quality of translations (Gordlevsky: 510). This proves that translators often resorted to adapting the text, bypassing some linguistic and cultural aspects, not always in the correct translation way. Turkish literary critic Cevdet Kudret, analysing from the point of view of translation studies the period from the mid-nineteenth century and to the beginning of the twentieth century, emphasizes that the level of “morality” was one of the most decisive factors in choosing a work of European literature for translation into Turkish: Therefore, it is not necessary to bring wrong views into the Muslim world, it is better to translate what has important historical and cultural information” (Kudret: 16).

The decision of the Minister of Education of Turkey, Hasan Ali Yuzdzel, who was the son of the famous writer Ali Ryza Bey, to create a translation bureau (February 28, 1940) played a role in changing the quality of literary translation in Turkey. The best of the best writers of that time with knowledge of several foreign languages worked in this bureau; they were presented with a translation plan for several years, on which they worked day and night. The Minister of Education himself, as historical sources show, often joined his colleagues after working hours, in the evenings, participated in the discussion of already translated literature, as well as in the discussion of the choice of new lists of books for translation. Over the twenty-seven years of its existence, the bureau has translated about a thousand works, most of which were from French classics (in total 171 literary works: English (56) and German (53) (Demir). Hassan Ali Yucel's contribution to the development of the cultural revival of Turkey, his primacy in the formation of the foundation for the implementation of translation activities in the literary world was noted by the UNESCO organization and proclaimed 1997 as the year of Hasan Ali Yucel in all the world.

Due to a certain breakthrough in the translation sphere of the period of the Republic, a decrease in the influence of censorship, literary translations of European literature into Turkish can be characterized as better quality and closer to the original. As the Turkolog Mikhailov M.S. notes, that Turkish translations of Russian literature, published in the 40s of the 20th century, are distinguished by sufficient accuracy and are close to the original (Mikhailov: 95.):

“Translations of the famous plays of A.P. Chekhov, as included in the series “Russian classics” and those published by the publishing house “Remzi” are made from the Russian language with sufficient accuracy and convincingness. Let us name a successful translation of “The Sea-Gull”, which was made in 1944 by Nihal Yaluza Talui and Kemal Kaya. Zeka Bashtymar's translation of the story “The Duel” leaves the same pleasant impression”. For example, Bulent Bozkurt (professor, doctor of philology) also supports foreignization and the most accurate transmission of the original text. Thus, in the preface to the Turkish translation of Shakespeare's Hamlet, B. Bozkurt notes that his main goal was not to bring the work closer to the Turkish language and culture, but “to try not to change, not to distort the meaning” (Shakespeare, Çev. Bozkurt, 6).

However, as noted by Turkish researchers Sergul Vural, Kara Erdinch Aslan, in translations of Moliere's plays made in the second half of the 20th century (Selahattin Eyüboğlu 1961) and early 21 century (Nur Nirven 2002) still dominates the domestication method (Vural: 272). This opinion cannot be disagreed with, because there are specific examples that clearly reflect the desire of the Turks to protect their national and cultural heritage as much as possible today, limiting criticism or incorrect attitude in their opinion. Take, for example, an example from three different translations made at different times, of Loughlesch's replica of Moliere's play “The Miser”: In Moliere's translation “The Miser”, three translators (Y.N. Nayir (1946), S. Eyupoglu (1961), T. Turk (2010), who presented their separate versions of this work in Turkish, omitted the word “Turk”, which sounded in Lafleche's remark «*Il est Turc, là-dessus, mais d'une turquerie à désespérer tout le monde; et l'on pourrait crever, qu'il n'en branlerait pas*»: “Para dedin mi herifin yüreği taş kesilir; hem öylesine ki onunla kimse baş edemez; karşısında gebersen kılı kıpırdamaz” (Nayir 1961: 50). “Para dedin mi taş kesilir; taş oğlu taş; karşısında gebersen kılı kıpırdamaz” (Eyüboğlu, 1983: 49). “Bu Harpagon yok mu; dünyanın en az olan insanı, dünyadaki cimrilerin en cimrisi. Kendini paralasan ona kese filan açtıramazsın” (Türk, 2010: 48).

In our article, we consider three topics, on the “correct” transmission of which the Turkish translators worked the most, namely: the religious topic, the topic of national values, the topic of morality and ethics.

3. Religious theme

In the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, Turkish translators of Western works avoided the religious motives of the non-Muslim world as much as possible. This can be explained primarily by the situation in the Ottoman state at the time, namely the intensification of Protestant and Catholic missionaries. Missionaries opened educational institutions (at the beginning of the 20th century, their number was 337 with more than 20,000 students), and thanks to the opening of their own printing house, they popularized their own religious literature (Sezer: 174). Their activities were already quite influential on the Turkish community, so Turkish translators tried not to expose their own people to the “danger” of losing their own faith and religion, at least when presenting translated literature. For example, in “Don Juan” there are remarks about godlessness, disbelief in religion, which Ahmet Vefik Pasha, given the peculiarities of the era in which he lived and translated, as well as the danger of undermining the religious basis of the Ottoman state, omitted completely: In the original “Sganarelle... You yourself know what you are doing, and if you don't believe in anything, you have your reasons for this ...”, in the Turkish translation this remark is completely omitted (Uluğtekin).

In “The affected young ladies” in the dialogue between Madlon and Gorgibus, the topic of baptism is touched upon, which the translator bypasses by omitting the religious content: *Madlon. I beg you, father: forget those ridiculous names and call us differently. Gorgibus. That is, how – ridiculous? Why, these names were given to you at baptism! – “bunlar sizin...” “vazu isminiz” (“verilmiş adınız”)* (these are the names that were given to you).

In Moliere's “Le Médecin malgré lui”, the Turkish translator Ahmet Vefik Pasha resorts to domestication when it comes to non-traditional concepts for Turkish society. Thus, in the episode where the heroine of Moliere's play Martin praises her husband as a talented doctor who cured a twelve-year-old boy who fell from the bell tower, A. Vefik Pasha replaces the bell tower with an ordinary tower, taking into account the Muslim specifics of the translation language. A similar technique was used by A. Pasha in Lucindra's remark, which does not yield to her father's persuasion to marry an unloved man and threatens to go to a monastery: his heroine, Nurdil (the translator replaced Moliere's names with Turkish ones), frightens her father into jumping into a well; such an adaptive technique is inspired by Turkic folklore.

In “Tartuffe” in Cleant's remark that insults should be forgotten because they are Christian, the translator (Ahmet Vefik Pasha) omitted the phrase “Christian” – “*affetmek yok mu?*” – literally: *what about forgiveness?*), although Islam also has such a rule, so it could be at least replaced by a phrase, for example, “*according to the rules of religion*”, generalizing the religious dogmas of both world religions.

In the text of the translation into Turkish of “The Merchant of Venice” by Shakespeare in 1884, the translator Hasan Syrry in order to bypass religious moments, taking into account not only the need to preserve Islam, but also the necessary respect for other religions at that time, representatives of which were quite numerous in Ottoman state, resorted to replacing the words of religious connotations. In most Shakespearean replicas with the word Jew he replaced the name of the hero – Shylock, probably in order to bypass possible conflicting moments. After all, Hasan Syrry himself occupied the position of a civil servant at the time of the translation and, given the national diversity of the Ottoman state at that time, his decision to “avoid sharp corners” was correct.

The specifics of religious moments include elements of dishes that are forbidden by Islam, such as pork. So, at Moliere “The affected young ladies” in a replica of one of heroes there is a word “pig”: During the time that we are in Paris, they have consumed at least a dozen piglets for fat, and the legs of lamb, which they know what they are doing, could feed four servants. Despite the fact that the original text is not about Muslims at all, Moliere's translator

Ahmet Vefik Pasha omits the phrase “a dozen piglets”, generalizing to the phrase “a lot of food”: “*Biz buraya geleli beş eve zahire olur şeyler kullandılar. Kaynattıkları paçadan günde üç kişi doyar. Bu nedir bu artık!*” (Uluğtekin).

Looking at later translations, we can trace a certain relaxation of the theme of food prohibited by Islam. Thus, in the translation of P. Zagrebelniy’s “Roksolana” into Turkish, the translator did not apply any special filters and did not veil the vocabulary: – *Лісовського жартома звав той торговий люд “отцем свинопаствением” (Lisovsky jokingly called that merchant “a swineherd father”). (Zagrebelniy 2013: 40). – Panayırda babası Papaz Lisovskiy’e bazen ‘Domuzcu papaz’ diye takılırlardı (Zagrebelniy 2011: 37).*

– *Гаврило поткнувся до вікарія, той заломив ціну вже не в одну свиню, а в цілих шість. “Шість свинок за науку його латинську”, – потрясав маленькими кулачками отець Лісовський. – За язик слов’янський свиню одну, а за латину аж шість? (– Gavrilo stumbled upon the vicar, who broke the price not for one pig, but for as many as six. “Six pigs for his Latin science,” Father Lisovsky shook his small fists. “One pig for a Slavic language, and six for Latin?”) (Zagrebelniy 2013: 47). – Gavrilo o yarı papaz öğretmene vardığında Skarbskiy artık bir domuz değil tam altı domuz istemişti. Gavrilo Lisovskiy yumruklarını sıkıp, ‘Latince için altı domuz mu? Diyerek bir çığlık attı. Ve ekledi, ‘Slavca dersi için bir domuz, Latince için tam altı ha!’ (Zagrebelniy 2011: 43).*

A freer representation of a prohibited product in the translation of a literary text is probably due to the fact that the topic of pork meat is not so remote in modern Turkey. Despite the fact that pork remains a banned product for Muslims, there are more than 80 pig farms in Turkey itself, more than 1 million pigs are slaughtered every year and all meat is used in Turkey (*Türkiye’de domuz*).

A similar situation is with alcohol. Drinking alcoholic beverages was considered immoral behaviour in the Ottoman state, moreover, alcohol is prohibited in Islam, respectively, and the topic of alcohol was included at that time in the sphere of taboo. Apparently, based on these considerations, when translating “Tartuffe” in Dorini’s remark about Tartuffe’s behaviour, Ahmet Vefik Pasha replaced several glasses of wine with several cups of tea (Uluğtekin). As will be seen from the examples of the following sections, the topic of alcohol in fiction could be softened, like the topic of pork, if it did not act as a formative factor.

As we can see, the time and conditions in the country dictate less or more their own rules for the existence of literary texts. Censorship, religious dogmas, control by the ruling forces make their own adjustments to those works of a world scale that do not correspond to the microclimate of the country into which the text is being translated.

4. Protection of national values

The Turks have had a strong nationalism since the reign of Selim III, and especially during the reign of Kemal Atatürk, which is a political ideology that promotes the glorification of the Turkish people. Also, the Turks are characterized by boundless patriotism, which is based on real and sincere love for their country and people (the book *Oba Ali* in the internet data). Any desecration of the flag of Turkey, of the name of Atatürk (the first president of the Turkish Republic), recently, criticism against the ruling forces is punishable by law (Turkish Criminal Code, article 301). It is precisely this maximal patriotism and nationalism that can explain the desire of Turkish translators of European literature to rework those parts of works where the national and patriotic feelings of the Turks themselves are at least somehow affected. So, for example, in the translation of Moliere’s play *Don Juan*, as noted by M. G. Uluğtekin, Ahmet Vefik Pasha resorts to a word substitution that is offensive to the Turkish nation as a whole. In the original, *Don Juan*’s servant Sganarelle describes his master as follows: “*The greatest wicked that the earth has ever born, a thug, a dog, a devil, a Turk, a heretic who does not believe in the afterlife, in the saints, in God, or in devil, leading the most beastly existence, hog Epicure, a real voluptuary, stopping his ears to all Christian admonitions and considering everything that we believe in as nonsense*”. Whereas in the Turkish translation the word “Turk” is replaced by the word “French”: “*Don Civani yeryüzünün en büyük asi, fasik habislerinin biridir, sana haber vereyim. O, bir pervasız, azgın, zebani, imansız Fransızdır. Yere göğe inanmaz, mevlasından çekinmez, şeytandan korkmaz, ömrünü kudurmuş hayvanlar, rint mündarlar gibi sürer, geçirir nemrudun biridir. Din ve takva nasihatına kulak asmaz, itikada saçma tabir eder*” (Uluğtekin).

In the mentioned translation of “The Merchant of Venice” by Hasan Sirri it is also interesting to observe his accuracy in relation to the Turkish cultural heritage. For example, in such lines from “The Merchant of Venice” as:

*By this scimitar that slew the Sophy, and a Persian prince
That won three fields of Sultan Solyman!...
And pluck commiseration of his state
From brassy bosoms and rough hearts of flint,
From stubborn Turks, and Tartars never train’d
To offices of tender courtesy...*

Hasan Sirri completely omits Turkish realities without replacing them in other words. In the Turkish translation of *Roksolana* by the famous Ukrainian author Pavlo Zagrebelny, we observe domestication and adaptation to the cultural realities of the Turkish people. Despite the fact that the work was translated in the 21 century, the desire to obscure those culturological moments that, in the opinion of the Turks, cover Turkish history and memory in a negative form, is impressive. *Roksolana*’s translator, Omer Dermendzhi, a Turk by birth who had lived in Ukraine for a long time and, most importantly, was able to communicate with the author of the novel before his death and ask permission to make some changes to the translation. Thus, in the novel the word wine occurs more than 60 times, which the translator bypasses each time in different ways (omits, finds a replacement, re-phases).

The translator pays special attention to the presentation of the image of the Turkish sultans in the original work and in the ways of transferring these images into Turkish. It should be noted that the author of the novel himself

said more than once that he formed the images of the rulers of the Ottoman state according to the literature known at that time in the Soviet Union, which, as it turned out later, distorted the historical truth and represented the Turks more from a negative than a positive side. When talking with the translator, Pavlo Zagrebely allowed him to make adjustments to the images in the translation, agreeing that they were not historically justified. But on the other hand, such persistent interaction between the translator and the author proves once again that in the 21st century, when information flows are limitless, when absolutely diverse points of view about the peculiarities or individualities of a particular country are not limited, the Turks continue to defend their historical and national interests, even when it comes to a historical novel by a foreign author. Separately, it should be noted that it was in the second half of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century that the direction of “returning to historical sources, culture” became more active in Turkey, given that before that there was total Europeanization in the country, within the framework of which it was permissible in the literature and the press to negatively comment on Ottoman culture. To cite, for example, the reaction of the ruling party in Turkey to the TV series *The Magnificent Century*, which shows the times of Suleiman's reign: “I condemn both the directors and the owners of the channels who are behind the production of this series, Suleiman was not at all like that, and he did not behave as shown in the film. For such a game with the values of the people, they must answer before the law” (Başbakan). Apparently, proceeding from the same considerations, O. Dermendzhi changes certain words and parts of the novel to build the “correct” image of the sultans. So, in the remark of one of the heroes about the fact that he was sitting with Sultan Ibrahim, drinking wine, the word wine is omitted. The translator O. Dermendzhi also used other methods of translating “unwanted” words: replacing the word “wine” with “coffee, sherbet, food”, which are harmless and close to Turkish culture. It could be assumed that O. Dermendzhi decided to completely cultivate his version of the translation, avoiding alcohol topics prohibited by Islam. But his translation of that part of the novel, where it is not about Muslims (about the Cossack who came from Ukraine to Roksolana), once again proves that it is about preserving the image of Turkish culture, and not some other: *“Break the chains, you son of hell!” Clumsy figures swarmed around Baida, a dull iron rang, there was a heavy echo in the dungeons, someone gave the Cossack a leg of lamb, but he pushed away, grabbed a jar of wine, drank long and delicious (Zagrebely 2013: 679). Kes şu zincirleri canı cehenneme herif! Bayda'nın çevresinde iri bedenler saga sola koşuştular. Sağır kütle sesleri, ardından yankıları duyuldu. Adamı zincirlerinden kurtardıktan sonar bir koyun budu uzattılar: O ise geri çekildi, but yerine bir şarap testis aldı. Uzun uzun içti” (Zagrebely 2011: 485).*

The Turkish people, as can be seen from the examples above, suppressed and continues to suppress the distortion of the historical heritage, stands for the protection of national values that shape the mentality and worldview of the Turkish nation. It is the preservation of historically established national values that determines the high level of consciousness and moral foundations of the ethnos, ensuring its further development.

5. Protection of morality

The topic of morality in Turkish society is closely related to the religious dogmas of Islam, which form the foundations of moral behaviour. Ideally, Islam is not only a religion, but also a way of life that Turkish citizens aspire to. In Islamic ethics, a separate place is occupied by the maximum protection from immorality, the prohibition of licentiousness, immorality, and debauchery. Even today, in the 21st century, separate emphasis is placed on the control of immoral information in the press and literature (protests in the spring of 2020 against the TV series *Love 101*, which demoralizes Turkish youth by taking advantage of the quarantine period) (Temur). It is known that literary works have a significant impact on the reader due to the reflection of reality that is why Turkish translators, since the beginning of the Europeanization of Turkish society, have been especially attentive to those moments in literature that, by their reality, could shake the moral stability of their nation. For example, in Vefik Pasha's translation of *“Le mariage forcé”* into Turkish, as Melahat Gül Uluğtekin points out in his research (a very good pack), there is an omission of certain information of an intimate nature so as not to undermine the Muslim view of the relationship between man and woman. In the original play, a hero named Sganarel speaks quite frankly about his intentions to live with the heroine of the work. Whereas Vefik Pasha's remark sounds modest and concise.

Sometimes Turkish translators resorted to more peculiar ways of transferring a Western literary work into Turkish: they added a preface of their own, separate chapters in which they carefully directed the topic related to the work in the direction they needed. So, for example, Gulliver's translator Mahmud Nedim did, publishing in 1882 the translation of six of Gulliver's eight chapters, adding to them two chapters from himself, in which he wrote reflections on the morality of Lilliputians and the importance of education in society (Akkaya: 93), thereby directing the thinking of Turkish readers in the right direction at that time, reducing the Anglo-Saxon Protestant influence.

In the translation of “Roksolana” O. Dermendzhi resorts to the method of omitting information in order to preserve the moral character of the rulers of the Ottoman Empire. Despite the fact that the information that, according to the translator, discriminates against their national values and undermines the idea of high morality, occupies more than three pages of the work, it is completely removed in the translated version, leaving no hint of its existence.

As we can see, the theme of morality in literature was present in the second half of the 19th century, and continues to be present today. The only difference is that during the period of the first acquaintance of the Turkish nation with the originality of Western culture, the translators maximally protected the Turks from any immoral topics, while the translation approaches used in the 21st century show the desire of the Turks to protect the moral character of their predecessors, who are an important part of their cultural life, honour the names of the rulers of the Ottoman state and the memory of them, as well as in all possible ways limit the entry into their cultural sphere of information, literature, which could darken these bright images.

Conclusions. The cultural value of translation is manifested in facilitating the process of interaction of nations with each other; translation is a means that satisfies the spiritual needs of a person, serves as a source of obtaining and accumulating knowledge. At the same time, translation of literary texts is a complex process of comprehending a different social environment, which often does not allow an “alien body” to enter its borders, fearing a violation of its integrity. Nations that have a strong historical foundation adhere to a policy of defensive modernization, improving society with the help of certain borrowed elements and protecting it from destructive influences for them. A vivid example of this is domestication in the translation of literary works.

Today, the entire world community is offered a de-ideologized liberal standard as a universal model for arranging states and individuals, the essence of which lies in the priority of earthly interests over moral and religious values, as well as over the sovereignty of states and patriotic feelings. But Turkey has its own point of view on this issue, for it one of the most important factors of development is the spiritual and moral sphere, the revival of the original Turkish civilization on the traditional, not universal, values of its culture. And any attempts to move in an unconventional direction (as it was at the end of the 19th – first half of the 20th century) are fraught, in the opinion of the Turks, with a moral and ethical degradation of society. Therefore, in modern Turkey, as in the Ottoman state, cultural borrowings of the world literary heritage undergo a certain filtration and domestication, especially when it comes to the national and religious characteristics and values of the Turkish nation.

Bibliography:

1. Загребельний П. Роксолана. Київ : А-ба-ба-га-ла-ма-га, 2013. 800 с.
2. Михайлов М. А.П. Чехов в Турции. Научные доклады высшей школы. *Филологические науки*. 1960. № 4.
3. Прушковська І.В. Незамкненість канону: поетика турецької драматургії. Київ : Український письменник, 2015. 392 с.
4. Akkaya T.M. Tanzimat'tan 20. yüzyıl başına kadar (1839 – 1900) yeni Türk edebiyatında İngiliz dili ve İngilizce edebiyatin varlığı ve etkileri. Doktora tezi. Ankara, 2019.
5. Akyüz K. Modern Türk edebiyatının ana çizgileri (860–1923). İstanbul, 1995. 270 s.
6. Aldağ Z. Türk tiyatrosunda Kurtuluş savaşı. İstanbul, 2008. 400 s.
7. Anameriç H. Tanzimat'tan Mütareke Dönemine Kadar Kütüphanelere Yönelik Çalışmalar (1839–1922). Erdem, 2012. P. 3–46.
8. And M. Osmanlı tiyatrosu kuruluşu gelişimine katkısı. Ankara, 1976. 280 s.
9. Avrupa'ya Seyahat Eden İlk Padişah: Sultan Abdülaziz. 10.10.2019. URL: <https://www.millisaraylar.gov.tr/blog/avrupaya-seyahat-eden-ilk-padisah-sultan-abdulaziz>
10. Başbakan Erdoğan'dan Muhteşem Yüzyıl'a ağır eleştirisi. Hürriyet gazetesi, 25.11.2012. URL: <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/basbakan-erdogandan-muhtesem-yuzyila-agir-elestiri-22009998>
11. Bayındır Uluskan S. II. Abdülhamit'in sanata ve sanatçıya bakışı. Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2018. Bahar. P. 5–28.
12. Can M.Z. İdeolojik çeviri Tanzimat ve Cumhuriyet dönemi örneğinde. Doktora tezi. Ekim, 2015.
13. Çiftçi C. Tasavvuf kitabı. İstanbul, 2003. 220 s.
14. Demir A. Hasan Ali Yücel döneminde dil ve çeviri çalışmaları. 29 Mayıs 2012. URL: <http://pralidemir.blogspot.com/2012/05/hasan-ali-yucel-doneminde-dil-ve.html>
15. Kudret C. Türk Edebiyatında Hikâye ve Roman. İstanbul : İnkılâp Kitabevi, 2009. 360 s.
16. Molière. Cimri. (Tuncay Türk, çev.) 2. Bs. İstanbul : Oda, 2010. 210 s.
17. Molière. Cimri. Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, çev.İstanbul : Remzi Kitabevi, 4. Baskı, 1983. 200 s.
18. Molière. Cimri. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, çev. İstanbul : Varlık Yayınları, 1961. 167 s.
19. Refik A. Türk tiyatrosu tarihi. İstanbul, 1934. 134 s.
20. Salik R. II. Abdülhamid hakkında bilmedikleriniz. Molatik. Tarih. 23.02.2017. URL: <https://www.milliyet.com.tr/ii-abdulhamid-hakkinda-bilmedikleriniz--molatik-4551/?Sayfa=2>
21. Sefer H. Moliere'in Cimri'sinin Çevirileri Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir İnceleme. Rumelide Journal of Language and Literature Studies. 2016. 4 (April). Special issue 1.
22. Sezer A. Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e; Misyonerlerin Türkiye'deki eğitim ve öğretim faaliyetleri. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. S. 169–183.
23. Shakespeare, William. Hamlet. Çev. Bülent Bozkurt, İstanbul : Remzi Kitabevi, 1999. S. 6.
24. Temur C. Manevi değerlerimize hakaret eden ahlaksız diziyeye karşı tepkiler devam ediyor. İlkha, 16 nisan 2020. URL: <https://ilkha.com/guncel/manevi-degerlerimize-hakaret-eden-ahlaksiz-diziyeye-karsi-tepkiler-devam-ediyor-121723>
25. Türkiye'de domuz çiftlikleri [Pig farms in Turkey]. Gıda raporu. 08.07.2003. URL: https://www.gidaraporu.com/turkiye-domuz-ciftlikleri_g.htm
26. Uluğtekin M.G. Ahmet Vefik Paşa'nın çevirilerinde osmanlılaşan Molière. Ülkücü Dünya Görüşü. 28.03.2011. URL: <https://www.ulkucudunya.com/index.php?page=haber-detay&kod=4371>
27. Vural K.S. Aslan E. Moliere'in l'avare eseri ışığında tiyatro metinleri çevirilerinin dil kullanımları açısından değerlendirilmesi. Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırma Dergisi. Cilt 8. Sayı 36. Şubat 2015. S. 272.
28. Zahrebelniy P. Rohatin'den Payittahta bir talih hikayesi Hürrem Sultan. İstanbul, 2011. 613 s.

References:

1. AKKAYA, Tarkan Murat. *Tanzimat'tan 20. yüzyıl başına kadar (1839 – 1900) yeni Türk edebiyatında İngiliz dili ve İngilizce edebiyatin varlığı ve etkileri [The existence and effects of English language and English literature in new Turkish literature from the Tanzimat to the early 20th century (1839 – 1900)]*. Doktora tezi. Ankara, 2019. [in Turkish]

2. AKYÜZ, Kenan. *Modern Türk edebiyatının ana çizgileri (1860-1923)*[The main lines of modern Turkish literature (1860-1923)]. İstanbul. 1995. [in Turkish]
3. ALDAĞ, Zeynep. *Türk tiyatrosunda Kurtuluş savaşı* [Independence war in Turkish theater]. İstanbul. 2008. [in Turkish]
4. ANAMERİÇ, Hakan. *Tanzimat'tan Mütareke Dönemine Kadar Kütüphanelere Yönelik Çalışmalar (1839-1922)*. [Studies on Libraries from the Tanzimat to the Armistice Period (1839-1922)] Erdem. 2012. P. 3-46. [in Turkish]
5. AND, Metin. *Osmanlı tiyatrosu kuruluşu gelişimine katkısı* [Contribution to the development of the Ottoman theater establishment]. Ankara. 1976. [in Turkish]
6. *Avrupa'ya Seyahat Eden İlk Padişah: Sultan Abdülaziz* [The First Sultan to Travel to Europe: Sultan Abdulaziz]. 10.10.2019. Available at: <https://www.millisaraylar.gov.tr/blog/avrupaya-seyahat-eden-ilk-padisah-sultan-abdulaziz> [in Turkish]
7. *Başbakan Erdoğan'dan Muhteşem Yüzyıl'a ağır eleştiri* [Heavy criticism from Prime Minister Erdogan to Magnificent Century]. Hürriyet gazetesi, 25.11.2012. <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/basbakan-erdogandan-muhtesem-yuzyila-agir-elistiri-22009998>. [in Turkish]
8. BAYINDIR ULUSKAN, Seda. *II. Abdülhamit'in sanata ve sanatçıya bakışı* [II. Abdulhamit's view of art and the artist]. Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi. 2018. Bahar. P. 5-28. [in Turkish]
9. CAN, Muhammed Zahit. *İdeolojik çeviri Tanzimat ve Cumhuriyet dönemi örneğinde* [Ideological translation in the example of the Tanzimat and Republic period.]. Doktora tezi. Ekim. 2015. [in Turkish]
10. ÇİFTÇİ C. *Tasavvuf kitabı* [Sufism book]. İstanbul. 2003. [in Turkish]
11. DEMİR, Ali. *Hasan Ali Yücel döneminde dil ve çeviri çalışmaları* [Language and translation studies in the period of Hasan Ali Yücel]. 29 Mayıs 2012. Available at: <http://pralidemir.blogspot.com/2012/05/hasan-ali-yucel-doneminde-dil-ve.html>. [in Turkish]
12. KUDRET, Cevdet. *Türk Edebiyatında Hikâye ve Roman* [Story and Novel in Turkish Literature]. İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi, 2009. [in Turkish]
13. MIKHAILOV, Mikhail. *A.P. Chehov v Turtsii*. [A.P. Chekhov in Turkey]. Scientific reports of higher education. Philological sciences. 1960. No. 4. P. 95. [in Russian]
14. MOLİÈRE. *Cimri* [Stingy] (Tuncay Türk, çev.) 2. Bs. İstanbul: Oda. 2010. [in Turkish]
15. MOLİÈRE. *Cimri* [Stingy]. Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, çev. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 4. Baskı. 1983. [in Turkish]
16. MOLİÈRE. *Cimri* [Stingy]. Yaşar Nabi Nayır, çev. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları. 1961. [in Turkish]
17. PRUSHKOVSKA, Irina. *Nezamknenist kanonu: poetika turetskoyi dramaturgii* [Unclosedness to the canon: the poet of Turkish drama]. Kyiv, 2015. [in Ukrainian]
18. REFİK, Ahmet. *Türk tiyatrosu tarihi* [Turkish theater history]. İstanbul. 1934. [in Turkish]
19. SALİK, R. *II. Abdülhamid hakkında bilmedikleriniz* [II. What you do not know about Abdulhamid]. Molatik. Tarih. 23.02.2017. Available at: <https://www.milliyet.com.tr/ii--abdulhamid-hakkinda-bilmedikleriniz--molatik-4551/?Sayfa=2> [in Turkish]
20. SEFER, Hasan. *Moliere'in Cimri'sinin Çevirileri Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir İnceleme* [A Comparative Study on the Translations of Moliere's Miser]. RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies. 2016. 4 (April). Special issue 1. [in Turkish]
21. SEZER, Ayten. *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e; Misyonerlerin Türkiye'deki eğitim ve öğretim faaliyetleri* [From the Ottoman to the Republic; education and training of missionary activities in Turkey]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. P. 169-183. [in Turkish]
22. SHAKESPEARE, William. *Hamlet*. Çev. Bülent Bozkurt, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1999, p. 6. [in Turkish]
23. TEMUR, Cebail. *Manevi değerlerimize hakaret eden ahlaksız diziyeye karşı tepkiler devam ediyor* [The reactions against the immoral series that insult our spiritual values continue]. İLKHA, 16 nisan 2020. Available at: <https://ilkha.com/guncel/manevi-degerlerimize-hakaret-eden-ahlaksiz-diziyeye-karsi-tepkiler-devam-ediyor-121723> [in Turkish].
24. *Türkiye'de domuz çiftlikleri* [Pig farms in Turkey]. Gıda raporu. 08.07.2003. Available at: https://www.gidaraporu.com/turkiye-domuz-ciftlikleri_g.htm [in Turkish].
25. ULUĞTEKİN, Melahat Gül. *Ahmet Vefik Paşa'nın çevirilerinde osmanlılaşan Molière* [Molière, who became Ottoman in Ahmet Vefik Pasha's translations]. Ülkücü Dünya Görüşü. 28.03.2011. Available at: <https://www.ulkucudunya.com/index.php?page=haber-detay&kod=4371> [in Turkish].
26. VURAL KARA, Sergül; ASLAN, Erdinç. *Moliere'in l'avare eseri ışığında tiyatro metinleri çevirilerinin dil kullanımları açısından değerlendirilmesi* [Evaluation of language usage of theatre texts translations in the light of l'avare de moliere]. Uluslararası Sosyal araştırma Dergisi. Cilt 8. Sayı 36. Şubat 2015. P. 272 [in Turkish].
27. ZAGREBELNY, Pavlo. *Roksolana*. Kyiv: A-ba-ba-ha-la-ma-ha, 2013 [in Ukrainian].
28. ZAHREBELNİY, Pavlo. *Rohatin'den Payittahta bir talih hikayesi Hürrem Sultan*. İstanbul. 2011 [in Turkish].