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MÜNTEHABAT-I TERACİM-I MEŞAHİR: AN EXPLORATION OF ITS PARATEXT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CULTURAL MEMORY

Cemal DEMİRCİOĞLU*

Abstract

This paper will briefly look at one of the key works that has not been studied formerly from the late Ottoman tradition of translation: Müntehabat-i Teracim-i Meşahir (The Collection of Famous Translations), edited by İbrahim Fehim and İsmail Hakki, and published in 1889/90. This work appears as the second collection of translations from the west approximately thirty years after İbrahim Şinasi’s Terceme-i Manzume (Translation of Verse), which was the first collection of Turkish translations of Western poetry in 1859. This paper does not only bring to the fore an Ottoman work that remained in the margin, introducing it to scholarly circles with a special focus on the paratextual data. It also intends to draw attention to translation history in the Turkish context, as a powerful way to recover the hidden or erased past of translation, especially when looked at from the perspective of forgetting and remembering in the course of the Turkish transition from empire to nation-state.
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1. Introduction

This paper is based on reviewing one of the works not formerly studied from the late Ottoman literary tradition: Müntehabat-ı Teracim-i Mesahir (The Collection of Famous Translations). The work is the second collection of translations from the West, edited by İbrahim Fehim and İsmail Hakkı and published in 1889/90 with the support of an Armenian publisher, Arakel Tozluyan Efendi. The Collection came out approximately thirty years after İbrahim Şinasi’s Terceme-i Manzume (Translation of Verse), the first collection of Turkish translations of Western poetry circulated as stone-print in 1859. With its content and composition, Müntehabat offers an account of Ottoman translation practice from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, thus helping us to see how translation/s contributed to the making of Ottoman literary “repertoires” (Even-Zohar 2002: 166), in connection with European culture and literature. Especially the prefaces, one by Kemal Paşazade Said, member of the Sublime Council and well-known authority on translations from French, and others by the editors, provide important data to see translation discourse and conceptions at that time. Additionally, the Collection shows us the position of the well-known literary translations from Europe that were still in circulation during the 1890s.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold: first, it aims to introduce Müntehabat to contemporary scholarly circles so as to bring to light a forgotten work, especially through the analysis of the paratextual data. In this sense, the paper attempts to convey a kind of “microhistory” to be the field leading to “historical awareness”, dealing with the issues in the margin and helping to recover fragmented relations with the past as defined by Sergio Adamo (Adamo 2006: 84). In a similar vein, Lieven D’hulst considers “awareness” an implication of translation history. Arguing that translation studies returns to history, D’hulst thinks of history as a fruitful subfield that provides researchers with an intellectual flexibility in adapting ideas to new perspectives and hence contributing to the development of “a culture of translation” (D’hulst 2001: 21, 22).

---

1 I will refer to this work as Müntehabat in this article. The initiation of this paper goes back to my presentation at the international conference organized by Boğaziçi University, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies in 2008: Translation, History and Culture: A Colloquium in tribute to Saliha Paker.
Secondly, the paper intends to draw attention to the exposing functions of translation history, arguing that translation history in the Turkish context functions obviously as a powerful way to recover the hidden or erased past of translation in the course of Turkish nation-building. In this framework, “archaeology”, an indispensable subfield of translation history (Pym 1988: 5), appears to be an important instrument that can best serve to see the accumulated texts, images and back-or-foregrounded aspects of translation in the shaping of a Turkish cultural memory based on translation. In his Method in Translation History, Anthony Pym defines “translation archaeology” as “the set of discourses concerned with answering all or part of the complex question ‘who translated what, how, where, when, for whom, and with what effect?’” (ibid.). In Pym’s framework, archaeology tends to be seen just as a research field that includes difficult detective-like efforts and hard-work in the service for various areas of translation history. However, in the case of Müntehabat —maybe in the case of other Ottoman works on translation to be discovered— archaeology has a potential to violate ideological constructions around the culture’s memory on translation or through translation, especially when looked at from the perspective of remembering and forgetting during the process of Turkish nation-building.

In this manner, Müntehabat allows for a double point of departure: (i) On the one hand, by presenting a history of Ottoman translation activity in the context of westernization, this work recaptures its very own recent past. Textual predilections of the book can be read as the indications of an effort for the shaping of a “collective memory” (Halbwachs 1992) during the time of Ottoman modernization. The Collection with its discourse seems to indicate a new horizon so that the Ottomans could measure their degree of modernization by looking at the cultural and literary texts imported from Europe since the mid-19th century. (ii) On the other hand, the Collection also provides today’s translation scholars, especially conducting a Turkish-oriented translation history, with an opportunity to remember the forgotten, erased or manipulated aspects of translation in the period of transition from empire to nation-state. Hence, I think that Müntehabat stimulates a kind of awareness, helping us not only to examine how the late Ottoman context of translation was represented in the discourse of republican historians, but also to see the changing conceptions of translation in the Turkish tradition in general.
Translation history appears as a field related to the realm of cultural memory studies, which has been extensively developed on a global scale since the mid-20th century. The idea behind such a perspective may be due to an awareness of the shaping and image-making power of history as André Lefevere points out in his concept of rewriting (Lefevere 1990: preface, 15). Although there are not many studies examining translation history from the cultural memory perspective, certain translation scholars, speaking from a postmodern standpoint, have been questioning the traditional tendencies of history which regard it to be an objective account of the past. In search of a model for comparative translation historiography, Judy Wakabayashi considers history-writing as a ‘translation’ of things, past into present, that allows various selective interpretations, bringing to the fore the question of “how we reconstruct history” (Wakabayashi 2004: 2). Michaela Wolf, in the writing of history, mentions a “crisis of representation” by postulating “representation not as the reconstruction of some pre-existing reality, but as a literary construct” (Wolf 2002: 181). In the same vein, Saliha Paker addresses the Turkish cultural system, questioning for the first time, the function of historical studies with reference to Andreas Huyssen’s discussion of memory and amnesia in postmodernity (Paker 2004).

The above mentioned studies indicate more or less that translation history is linked with the past of a given culture by means of several reconstructed narratives. For Renate Lachmann, historical narratives function as a “mnemonic medium” that “not only creates new texts to be remembered, but also recovers suppressed knowledge” (Lachmann 2004: 172, 173). Similarly, from Jan Assmann’s framework of cultural memory, we can see that such narratives appear as “figures of memory” taking part in “the concretion of identity” (Assmann 1995: 129-130). Referring to Maurice Halbwachs’s definition of collective memory, Assmann points out that societies reconstruct their past within their contemporary frame of reference and thus cultural memory operates by reconstructing the knowledge of the past and tailoring the past to an actual situation (ibid.).

What seems important here is Assmann’s definition of the two modes by which cultural memory exists. For him, cultural memory exists first, “in the mode of potentiality of the archive whose accumulated elements such as texts, images… act as a total horizon, and second in the mode of actuality,
whereby each contemporary context puts the objectivized meaning into its own perspective, giving it its own relevance” (ibid.). I think that the mode of actuality enlightens us to see cultures as the entities that survive not only by remembering their own past but also by forgetting it. Ernest Renan discusses the dynamics of remembering and forgetting in relation to becoming a nation in his influential essay *Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?* (What is a nation?), first delivered at the Sorbonne in 1882 (see Renan 1996: 41-55). Renan speaks of a nation, defining it as a “soul” and a “spiritual principle” (ibid.). He points out that the inhabitants of a nation must share a common past, a rich legacy of memories --even without sharing any borders--, and also have a present-day consent or a desire to live together. According to Renan, to be a nation, it is necessary that people must forget as well as remember a shared history. In his view, forgetting appears to be a key factor in the creation of a nation; and unity is always related to such a brutality that is in some way associated with forgetting. Paul Ricoeur sees forgetting as a necessary component of cultural memory, emphasizing that to remember is also to know what you need to forget (Ricoeur 2006). From the perspective of Itamar Even-Zohar’s theory of “culture repertoire”, remembering and forgetting may also be considered as “options” which serve for the organization of social life and by which the life of societies is shaped and organized (Even-Zohar 2002: 166).

Regarding the ideological, political, and cultural turn in the Turkish nation-building process, several questions need to be asked within the framework outlined above. In the Turkish cultural context, can we think of the historical narratives of translation as a means to see the invented, remembered, or forgotten elements of Turkish cultural identity? From the point of view of translation, by rethinking the relations between the Turkish Republic and the Ottoman Empire, and by describing the Ottoman Empire to be the cultural other of the Turkish Republic, can we say that forgetting is much more than remembering in our cultural memory, and why? Can we think that *our westernized cultural memory of translation* is mostly reshaped by the discourse of early-republican historians? Such questions obviously imply a complex situation in which our memories of translation tend to be ‘captured’ by the dramatic and drastic rupture between our past and present, which emerged in the transition from empire to nation-state in the last century. In terms of rupture and erasure, Andreas Huyssen mentions that if the past is forced to be forgotten, then the past would be in danger of
being erased from memory (Huyssen 2003). This explains the unique situation experienced during the Turkish nation-building process that includes the ideological erasure of Arabic/Persian cultural, linguistic, and literary elements. For Huyssen, the legitimization of the present time is achieved by “destruct[ing] past ways of living and being in the world”, resulting in many ways to forget the cultural, political, and social settings of the new (Huyssen 2003: 1-2). In this context, what has been forgotten or what has been erased from memory in the Turkish context of translation appears to be an interesting case to examine. Saliha Paker objects to erasures in the Turkish culture with a strong emphasis on a rich tradition of translations from Arabic and Persian into Turkish, drawing attention to the faults in the historical writings of culture, literature, and translation in the republican period. In her view, a general agreement does exist in the modern Turkish scholarly discourse on translation. That is, Turkish translation history starts with the translations from Europe in the Tanzimat period (Paker 2004: 277; also see Paker and Toska 1997).

Another tendency of erasure is evident in the republican interpretations of Ottoman translation context. The culture-specific strategies of Ottoman translation practice, for instance imitation (taklid), emulation (tanzir), commentary (serh), borrowing (iktitas), conveying (nakl), conversion (tatbik), summary (hulasa) and dialogue (muhavere), are nearly depreciated in the literary discourse of the Republic since these strategies are seen as the indication of a derivative literature which is lack of creation (Demircioğlu 2009: 174-75). For the present situation, all these strategies represent the imperial ways of appropriating texts from Arabic and Persian, which were the model-cultures for the Ottomans for centuries and sharing the similar epistemic domain. The intricate attachments of translation to the construction of cultural memory and identity by means of remembering and forgetting, thus, seem important, especially for the cultures which undergo great socio-political, ideological transformations similar to those experienced by the Turks. One can distinguish continuing/discontinuing aspects of translation between the republic and its cultural other, the Ottoman Empire, if the representation of the late Ottoman translation practice that appears in the discourse of historians from both periods is analyzed. Such an analysis will help us to see how the reconstruction of the past is achieved within a contemporary frame of reference as pointed out by Assmann, Huyssen, and Paker.
The underlying idea in the late Ottoman context of translation, which can also be observed in the “paratextual” data of Müntehabat, was concerned with translations and their innovative functions to fill the gaps of the target system. In the Ottoman discourse on translation, the cultural exchange was interpreted on the basis of renewal, resulted in contact with Europe throughout the 19th century. However, in the process of nation-building, especially since the 1920s, a gradual shift is clearly seen in many interpretations of the Ottomans’ contact with Europe. The import of cultural and literary materials from Europe turns out to be considered as an acculturation. Thus, the Ottoman literature and the translation practice as part of it were considered imitative since many literary historians with nationalistic inclinations were thinking of the Ottomans as appropriating a literature from Arabic and Persian through import. In the eyes of the intellectuals of this kind, the culture-specific strategies of Ottoman translation practice were seen as outdated and the traditional ways of textual transfer performed for centuries between the members of a common Islamic domain. Such disapproval against imitation can also be clearly seen especially in Mehmed Fuad Köprülü’s discourse on Ottoman translation practices (see Paker 2007).

During the first decades of the republic, historical narratives are seen as extremely engaging in western translations, offering many inventories of the Ottoman translated corpora mainly from Europe. This situation can be regarded as the powerful efforts intending to uplift the westernization of translation through reshaping a new discourse. As “literary construct[s]” (Wolf 2002: 181), such narratives functioned as providing young republican generations with a “Turkish” cultural and literary background that promotes Europeanization. As presenting a “total horizon”, this discourse seems to emphasize that modern Turkish culture had originated from the West and had been established mainly through European translations since the mid-19th century. An obvious change on the titles of history books (from the history of Ottoman literature to the history of Turkish literature) evidently demonstrates this radical change in “figures of memory”, proving

---

2 See the analysis of the “paratext” in the following part and also the primary data in the transcribed versions presented in the appendix. I use the term “paratext” as reinterpreted by Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar with reference to Gerard Genette’s concept of paratext to be the presentational elements accompanying translated texts and meta-discourse formed around translations (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002).
the reconstruction of the new identity in connection with the ideological, political and cultural climate of the Turkish nation-building. It is crucial to note that the genitive "our" is also present in the republican representation of the recent past.

In this framework, I think that each work belonging to the Ottoman translation tradition can have an innate potential to violate the cultural memory shaped by the republican discourse on translation. The paratextual analysis of Müntehabat below will reveal that there is a different basis by looking at translation and modernization --even a possible continuity is observed in connection with the westernization of translation between the past and present political bodies.

2. An Analysis of the Paratextual Data

i. The cover page

Müntehabat is about 117 pages. It was published in 1307 (Julien calendar) (approximately 1891/92 in the Gregorian calendar)3 by Arakel Tozluyan Efendi, also known as Kitapçı Arakel, one of the Armenian publishers who had contributed a lot to the Ottoman cultural and literary development since the 1870s.

The title page attracts attention since it includes data concerning the norms that the editors, İbrahim Fehim and İsmail Hakkı, would follow. The name of the editors are emphasized as they are the graduates of Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şahane (Imperial School for Civil Service), a famous school opened in 1859 for the education of the Ottoman civil servants.

---

3 In Ottoman literature, it is generally a problem to identify the publication date of a work since different calendars were used. On the cover page, the publication date is given just as 1307. But the dates including day and month in both Said's and the editors' prefaces remind us that the writers tended to use the Julien calendar, and also wrote the preface a year before the publication date. For calendar conversion, please see the website at http://193.255.138.2/takvim.asp visited on 29 April 2013.
At the top, the title is highlighted with an ornamented calligraphy and a special emphasis is put on the expression “teracim-i meşahir” (famous translations) and adorned with a big and bold Arabic font just after the expression “Müntehabat-i” (The collection of). A brief note under the main title declares that the collection proudly offers its readers not only famous translations by the famous names of Ottoman literature, but also provides an assessment (mütaalaaname) on translation written by the editors. On the title page, the selection of the most demanded translations is highly emphasized as it targets Ottoman readers.

Another special emphasis is put on the presentation of translations together with their French originals on each page, indicating on the title page: “this book includes not only the demanded translations by the great Ottoman writers/translators whose works are the best contributions, but also includes French originals, providing an assessment on translation [“Tercüme hakkında bir mütaalaa ile aşar-i kalem-i yeleri ziver-i müdevvinat-i Osmaniyé olan zevat-i kiramin aşar-i mergube-i mütercemelerini Fransızca asıllari ile beraber havidir”]. Kemal Paşazade Said’s epithet is also seen in a striking quote. The epithet indicates certain difficulties in selecting works for any collection: “Yazmak bir fikre muhtaç ise tercüme etmek iki fikre ve hüsn-i intihab üç fikre muhtaçtır denilebilir” [It can be considered that writing needs one idea, translating two, but a good compilation needs three]

---

4  See the transliteration of this assessment in the appendix.
5  The transcribed version and the English translations of the quotations from Ottoman Turkish are mine unless otherwise stated.
ii. Prefaces

a. Kemal Paşazade Saïd’s preface

As articulated by the editors to be the head of the Council of State, Kemal Paşazade Saïd’s preface is illuminating. His discourse helps us to see the idea about translating from Europe and its decidedly formative roles on Ottoman cultural and literary life at that time. Said dated his preface as 15 May 1306 (i.e. 27 May 1890).

As a well-known translator, member of the Council of State, lecturer at Mekteb-i Sultani and Mekteb-i Mülkiye and writer of the newspaper Vakit, Kemal Paşazade Saïd considers translation in its relation to cultural context and its innovative roles in the Ottomans’ socio-cultural progress from the Tanzimat period onwards. He thinks of translation as an instrument conveying and facilitating (nakl ve isal) western progress. For him, translation does not only provide know-how for the development of the Ottoman Army, but it also brings improvement to education, serving the progress of Ottoman civilization at that time. It is clearly seen in his discourse that translation offers information about the latest innovations and helps the Ottomans to reorganize several bodies of the state by bringing new visions to the bureaucracy. Saïd states that ninety percent of the news and data in the newspapers are provided by means of translations, making the Ottoman people interested in political, scientific and technical issues.
It is clear that Said’s account sheds a light on how translation plays a role in Ottoman society, how it serves Ottoman modernization and how the Ottomans fulfilled their needs through the import of new ideas from the West. His discourse demonstrates that newspapers and journals have emerged as promoting means for translation, hence playing pivotal roles not only in providing the Ottomans with reading materials, but also in making European science and culture known to society. It is obvious that translation is closely associated with the idea of progress without having any connection to nationalism. His discourse reminds us that the position of translations from the West was of primary interest during the 1890s.

b. The editors’ preface

The editors’ preface consists of two parts: “İfade” (foreword) and “Medhal” (introduction). In the first part, “İfade”, the editors bring to the fore again, that the collection includes both the most demanded translations of the famous literary works in French and also the translations of some scientific and political texts. It is worth mentioning that each translation is presented as parallel to its French original on each page. The editors introduce themselves as the supporters of the Translation Chamber at the Sublime Port (Babiali Tercüme Odası), opened in 1833. This fact can be regarded as an indication of the shaping power of the Translation Chamber as an influential school on Ottoman translation practices at the turn of the 20th century. Giving credit to Kemal Paşazade Said’s appreciation of this collection, the editors also give special thanks to Arakel Tozluyan Efendi, an Armenian publisher, for his great support in publishing this Collection, also reminding the readers of his contribution to the development of the Ottoman publishing sector. In the second part, titled “Medhal”, the editors start with describing translation at that time. They see translation as a transfer of the idea of the original from one language to another with some change, and they consider a translated text both as transferred and changed.

The editors also declare that in the former practices of translation in the Ottoman culture, translation was usually seen as converting the language of a work from one to another and also it was regarded as an easy task compared to writing an original work. It is apparent that the editors are critical of such earlier perceptions of Ottoman translation practices with an emphasis on translation as
a difficult task. According to them, a successful translation must have certain characteristics: i. to be faithful to the original, ii. to use an adequate literary language, iii. to have deep and consistent background information. The editors think of the task of the translator as first examining, then discovering (tedkik ve keşf), the author’s point of view (cihêt-i nazar) that was adopted by the author through the writing process of the original, and then conveying and converting (nakl ve tebdil) it by being faithful to his/her discovery in a literal (aynen) and entire way (tamamen). In their discourse, that kind of procedure brings to the surface an essential difference between the author and the translator in processing a text. But for the editors, a successful translation must also have the translator’s expertise on a particular field and his or her familiarity with the linguistic features of the original. Additionally, the editors point out that the translator should also have a good command of rhetoric in the target language in order to best transmit what s/he grasps from the original. The editors also draw attention to both technical translation and the requirements for being a technical translator. They expect a technical translator to be a professional, even a scholar, in that particular field. Their discourse puts a strong emphasis on expertise if many benefits are expected from technical translations. For them, the translation of literary texts is also a necessity.

iii. On the content

The content page (fihristi) is placed at the end of the main body giving a quick reference to the idea of the composition. We see first that the number of verse translations, i.e., 14, is higher than prose translations, i.e. 10. This could be an indication that verse still has priority over prose writing with regard to the expectations of the target reader. That’s why the famous and canonical French authors/poets seem to have been chosen, not surprisingly from the romantic and the Parnassus school. This could also indicate the general tendency of the Ottoman literature of that time. The editors’ selection, even if it includes partial translations of prose, reflects that they have a tendency to publish the most typical examples of European culture and literature which was in great demand by Ottoman readers.\(^6\) Below, Table 1, demonstrates the distribution of source authors or poets.

---

\(^6\) Please see the tables in the appendix for the source texts the editors selected for translation.
Table 1: List of the authors and poets of the source texts selected for translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Authors (Prose)</th>
<th>Source Poets (Poetry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre Dumas</td>
<td>Alfred de Musset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François-René de Chateaubriand</td>
<td>Alphonse de Lamartine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Fénelon</td>
<td>C. Hubert Millevoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Jacques Rousseau</td>
<td>Jean de La Fontaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier de Maistre</td>
<td>Mlle Sasserno de Turin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sully Prudhomme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xavier de Maistre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As translators, well-known names appear having played significant roles in introducing new literary models to Ottoman prose and verse. The list includes twelve names, five of which are quite known as the prominent bureaucrats supporting Ottoman modernization such as Münif Pasha, Pertev Pasha, Yusuf Kamil Pasha, Ahmed Vefik Pasha and Sadullah Pasha. The names of two translators are not given but from the context it can be deduced that they may be editors.
One of the texts whose translator is unknown is a French translation of the letter sent to a German convert by the Sheyku’l-Islam replying the convert’s specific questions about Islam. Another text translated into French is an imperial decree sent to an Ottoman commander, Bali Bey, in the mid-16th century. The reasons behind the selection of these texts for French translation could first be an Ottoman attitude to correct religious misrepresentation of Islam, and secondly a need for remembering the Ottomans’ power in Europe, especially at the time of Ottoman decadence that would continue during the 19th century.

Apart from the so-called Ottoman bureaucrats engaged mostly in literary translation from French, there are also other translators not a part of the Ottoman bureaucracy, but active in the production of western-based Ottoman
literature. Table 2 shows the distribution of all of the translators classified, based on the genre they translated:

**Table 2: List of the translators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators (Prose)</th>
<th>Translators (Poetry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Midhat</td>
<td>Ali Kemal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Vefik Pasha</td>
<td>Nigar binti Osman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebüzziya Tevfik</td>
<td>Muallim Naci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahim Fehim, İsmail Hakkı (eds.)</td>
<td>Pertev Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemal Paşazade Said</td>
<td>Recaizade Ekrem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münif Pasha</td>
<td>Sadullah Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertev Pasha</td>
<td>Sami Paşazade Sezai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recaizade Ekrem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf Kamil Pasha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to male writers/translators, Nigâr Hanım has a special place in literature as a famous Ottoman woman poet/translator. Her visibility can be considered to some extent as a contradiction to the conventions of Ottoman cultural and literary tradition of that time. In the Ottoman tradition, literature was regarded as a man’s craft, and, therefore, women were not expected to write a novel or translate a literary work. A good example is the case of Fatma Aliye Hanım, who is regarded as the first woman novelist in modern Turkish literary discourse. Fatma Aliye rebels against the secondary and invisible role Ottoman women writers/translators played, especially in her preface to the translation of Georges Ohnes’s *Volonté*, translated under the title *Meram* in 1889 (see Gençtürk-Demircioğlu 2010: 105). Therefore, the editors seem to have promoted Nigâr Hanım to be a Muslim woman poet-translator, making her voice visible in the literary circle, and consequently reflecting a kind of disapproval of the Ottoman literary discourse traditionally constructed by men.
Including texts translated from French, the collection also contains texts translated into French. One of them is an interesting case related to the French translation of a letter sent from Sheyku’l-Islam to a Christian German-convert asking for his approval to become Muslim in a letter dated 4 September 1876. The language of the original letter that was sent formerly to the Sheyku’l-Islam is not mentioned. In his reply, the Sheyku’l-Islam congratulates the convert, describing the basic principles of Islam in an informative dialogue with the convert. The subtext of the letter’s tone carries a critical look at the European perception of Islam, assuming that Europeans have inaccurate information about Islamic rules and principles. This letter can also be seen in the chain of continuing replies to the Europeans about Islam. The first of such attempts is seen in Nâmîk Kemal’s response in his Renan Müdafenamesi (Replies to Ernest Renan), then followed by Ahmed Midhat’s interesting discussion in his Niza-i İlm ü Din (The conflict between science and religion). All of them indicate a strong defence against the inaccurate perception of Islam in the Western world. Another text translated into French is an imperial decree sent from the Sultan, Süleyman the Magnificent, to Bali Bey, the governor of Semendre (Sanjak of Albania), after the Ottoman conquest of Belgrade in 1521.

The number of translations per translator also seems to be interesting. Recaizade Ekrem is given more space with his 8 translations in comparison with the others. An important situation is also present in the case of Ahmed Midhat Efendi who was the novelist, translator, publisher, journalist and the owner of the newspaper Tercüman-ı Hakikat (Interpreter of Truth). In modern Turkish literary discourse, Ahmed Midhat Efendi is generally accepted not as a canonical writer but as a pen of Ottoman popular literature. The editors published his partial translation of La Dame aux camélias by Alexandre Dumas. This indicates that he was well read and his translation of La Dame aux camélias was regarded as one of the famous and mostly demanded translations of his time. Table 3 shows the list of translators and the number of the translations published in the collection:
Table 3: List of translations per translator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators (Prose)</th>
<th>Nr of translations</th>
<th>Translators (Poetry)</th>
<th>Nr of translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Midhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ali Kemal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Vefik Pasha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nigâr binti Osman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EbüZZiya Tevfik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muallim Naci</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahim Fehim, İsmail Hakkı (eds.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pertev Pasha</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemal Paşazade Said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recaizade Ekrem</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münif Pasha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sadullah Pasha</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertev Pasha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sami Paşazade Sezai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recaizade Ekrem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf Kamil Pasha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also significant that the editors proposed two Turkish translations of the same source poem: “La chute des feuilles” by C. Hubert Millevoye. The titles of two versions indicate that Sami Paşazade Sezai’s version, “Yapraklar Düşerken” (when the leaves fall), uses a plain Turkish in comparison with Ali Kemal’s version, “Sukut-ı Evrak” (The fall of the leaves), which is a version including many Arabic and Persian words. Additionally, Recaizade Ekrem’s translation of Alfred de Musset’s poem “Rappelle-toi” (Remember me) appears as a response poem or emulation (“nazire”) as its title indicates: “Ekrem Beyefendinin nazireleri” (Ekrem Bey’s emulation of...). This information indicates that the original, the translation, and the emulation were all published together. It is interesting to note that writing emulation to a poem is received as a translation related practice as the editors emphasize that Ekrem Bey was the great master enhancing the literary value of the original poem with his emulation.

In the Collection, collocations used for describing the act of translation are also remarkable. Here are some examples:
Collocations related to translation act

| “süret-i dil-pezir ile tercüme buyurulmuşlardır ki” (p.16) | to translate in an acceptable way |
| “tarz-ı belagat-perverisiyle tercüme buyurulmuşlardır ki” (p.18) | to translate with an ornamented style |
| “tarz-ı vicdan-rüba ile tercüme buyurulmuşlardır ki” (p.21) | to translate conscientiously |
| “süret-i dil-nişanede tercüme buyurmak” (p.88) | to translate with an impressive point on language |
| kıymet-i edebiyesi itibariyle tercümenin asılına rüçanı ol[mak] (p.18) | to translate keeping the original text’s literary value |
| vech-i dilarasıyla tercüme buyurmak (p.59) | to translate with an ornamented style |

3. Concluding remarks

A brief look at Müntehabat through its paratext broadens our views not only of our understanding the degree of Ottoman literary westernization in the late 19th century but also, it opens doors to see the shaping of a new collective memory deeply anchored in the European culture. The discourse of Kemal Paşazade Said and of the editors indicates strong intellectual efforts fortifying a westernized identity with the help of the texts translated from the European sources. Müntehabat emerges as a history-writing, and hence a rewrite, reconstructing the old and the recent past within a contemporary frame of reference. Especially, the Ottoman conception of translation in paratexts gives important clues about the diverging and converging aspects between the past and the present in the Turkish tradition at the turn of the 20th century.

Müntehabat also reveals that translation history in the Turkish context emerges as a multi-dimensional field of research, enabling us to recover the
hidden or erased past of the act of translation. As the case of Müntehabat shows, small scale excavations on translation/s offer a potentiality of new perspectives when considered from the view point of cultural memory, especially from the dynamics of remembering versus forgetting. Such a perspective will make us aware of the importance of further studies in examining the validity of historical narratives of our culture by way of translation; it will also direct us towards an appreciation of historical studies by way of primary sources that may help to reconstruct the past and provide compelling bases for our cultural background.
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### Appendix 1: The description of translations in terms of text types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT TYPE: PROSE</th>
<th>From French into Ottoman Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Text Author</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source Text</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J. Rousseau</td>
<td>Nouvelle Héloïse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fénelon</td>
<td>Les Aventures de Télémaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateaubriand</td>
<td>Voyage en Amérique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre Dumas</td>
<td>La Dame aux camélias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Ottoman Turkish into French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given [possibly the Şehyü'l-islam]</td>
<td>“Suret-i mektub-i fetvapenahi”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suleyman The Magnificent</td>
<td>“Suret-i hatt-i Hümâyün”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Text Author</td>
<td>Source Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonse de Lamartine</td>
<td>“Prière de l’enfant à son réveil”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Le Lac”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlle Sasserno de Turin</td>
<td>“L’enfant aveugle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier de Maistre</td>
<td>“Le ciel étoilé”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fontaine</td>
<td>“Le Chêne et le Roseau”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“La mort et le buchéron”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred de Musset</td>
<td>“Rappelle-toi”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A response poem to “Rappelle-toi”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hubert Millevoye</td>
<td>“Le retour”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“La chute des feuilles”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Hugo</td>
<td>“Sur le tombeau d’un petit enfant”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Le sommeil de l’enfant”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sully Prudhomme</td>
<td>“Les yeux”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3: Kemal Pasazade Said’s preface

(3) Şura-yı Devlet Bidyayı Mahkemesi Reisi fezayl-şiarı ustadı muhterem ve mübecelemiz saadetli Said Beyefendi Hazretlerinin kitabımız hakkında tesvid buyurdıkları mütalaanamenin suretildir

Nur-ı aynın efendilerim,

Şöyle bir güzel himmete takdir-han olmak vezaif-i vatankâveriden olmakla evvel-be-evvel arz-ı takdir ederim.

Suver-i gunağun ile arz-ı kemal ile kemal edegelen terakkiyet-i garbiyeyi bize nakl ve isal eden şey tércümedir.

Darbe-i iyî-i sütunları bir zamanlar cihâni lerzenek eyleyen bahadiran-ı asakirimizı maarif-i cedide-i askeriye ile arâyışyab-ı celal eden şey tércümedir.

Târîk-ı maarifperveride tay-yı mesafat ettirerek yevmen-fi-yevmen esbat-ı temedddünü-müzü istıkmal eden şey tércümedir.

Zuhurat-ı yevmiyeden halkımızı külliyevevin haberdar eyleyen, telgrafları lisânımızı nakl ile umuma malumat istişsal eden şey tércümedir.

Uluq ve furnace-ı haziranın vesayt-i tatbikyesini mülkmüze tamim ile şubat-ı umur-ı devlet ve memleket-i islah-ı ahval eden şey tércümedir.

Gazetelerin havadis ve mebahisi yüze doksan nisbetinde mahsul-ı himem-i mütercimin olup halkımızı siyasiyat ve ilmiyat ve fenniyata meyval eden şey tércümedir.

(4) Fransız lisani garbardan sarhaka nakl-ı miyâh-ı maarif ve terakki için bir mizab hükümden olduğundan lesen-ı cenine denilince Fransız lisani mütebadir-i hatır olduğu gibi (mutlak zikrolunan şey kemaline masruf olmak) kaidesince (tercüme) denildiği halde Fransızcadan Türkçeye tercüme manası tahahhatılır kimnîmak tabiidiyir.

Kalemlerini tércümeye vakfeden mustaidan, heyet-i huzara-i edebiyemizi teşkil eden zevat olup mentece-i edebiyat-ı huzara Tercüme Odası’dır.

Kaffe-i erbat-ı kaleminiz ya oradan yetişin veyahad oradan yetişenlere şakirdlık edenlerdir. Lakin her memlekte heyet-i erbat-ı kalem (mütekaddimin) ve (müteahhirin) namyla iki sınıfra tefrik edilmek ihtiza eder.

Mütercimlerimiz daha bu veçhle ikâye taksim mümkün olur ise eski Tercüme Odası ve tabir-i kadim üzere Bab-ı Ali Akademiyası mahsûlüler olanlara (mütekaddimin) nami verilmek lazım gelir. Nice zamanları beri usul-ı tahririmizde ve imlarimizda alabildiğine

7 Page numbers in the original text are given in parenthesis.
tagayyurat görüldüğü gibi bu tagayyurat tercümelere dahi sirayet etmiş ve yeni mütercimlerin asarıyla, (mütekaddim) tesmiye ettiğim sufixin asarı arasındaki farklı göstermek mecmuuanız gibi her nev tercüme asarını cami kitaplara mümkün olacağınından eser-i aliniz bu yüzden husule getireceğiş fevaid, kıymetini dübala etmeye müsaad bulunmuştur.


Her neyse eser-i aliniz güzel tercümelerindeki letafeti ve bizaa-i ifade ve istihasleri olmâdíği halde kalêm-bedest tercüme olanların eserlerindeki gülzât irae için bir mirat ve derece derece ihraz-ı iktidar etmek arzusunda bulunan mütercimler bir mûrâkat haline getirilmek iktiza edeceğinden bu netice-i maksûdeye taych-ı veche-i ihtimam etmeniz mütehätttim-ı zimmet-i himmetimizdir.

Layık-ı mütalaa ve şayeste-i muayyesa asar-ı müterceme intihabi her mütehhibin kâri ve her şahbaz-ı evc-i maarifin şikari olmâdílarından bu eserin hüsn-i neşrine ve maksad-ı asliye tâmanen hismetine muvaffak olur iseniz kendiniizi bihakkın baltîyar addededibilirsiniz.

Yazmak bir fikre muhtat ise tercüme etmek iki fikre ve hüsn-i intihab üç fikre muhtatırdır" denilebilir.

fi 15 Mayıs sene 1306
İ cazabad
 Said
Appendix 4: The editors’ prefaces

İfade (6)

Takrirat-ı müsevikkanelerine daima müştak olduğunuz marifetperveran-ı ebna-yı vatanına ilk mahsalı gayret olmak üzere şu “Münhebatı-ı Teracim-ı Meşahir”i arz ve ihla ile kesb-i meflharet eyler ve birinci defa olarak huzur-ı mukakemesine çıktığımız mahkeme-i efbär-ı umumiyenin hakkımızda bir hükm-i müssad-i müsevikkâne ıstour etmesi temennisi-ni piraye-i zeban-ı emir ederiz.


Kitabımızı pişgah-i fistafıde alacak zevat-ı kiram için medar-ı suhulet olmak üzere intihab eylediğimiz asarı Fransizca asılları ile suret-i tercümeleri karşı karşı yazılarak iktiza eden nukat satır başıitti haz kilınımsız ve gerek bu babda ve gerekse kitabın hüsün-i tabi hususunda neşrettiği asarı fevaid ve kıymeti herkesce maruf olan kitapçı Arakel Efendinin himmet-i vakasına karşı daha alenen beyan-ı teşekkür etmek münasib görülmüştur.


fi 16 mayis sene 1306
Mekteb-i Mülkiye-i Şahane mezunlarından
İsmail Hakkı, İbrahim Fehim

ii. Introduction

Medhal (7)

Bir lisan ile yazılmış bir fikri aher bir lisan üzre ifade için nakl ve tebdil eylemeye “tercümee” ve nakl ve tebdil olunan asara dahi “asar-ı müterceme” denilmektedir.

Vehle-i âlada tercüme mevcut bir eserin adiyan lisan-ı beyanını tebdil eylemekten ibaret görüldüğü için telife nazaran nihayetsiz derecede asan zannolunur. Halbuki tercümenin
mükemmeliyeti asıla tamamı mutabakatı, hakiki bir ehliyet-i edebiye ile malumat-i vasiy-aya lisan-şinaslıkta ve isabet-i fıkırden münbais bir dikkat-i nazara muhtaç olduğundan telifie nazaran sehl addolumaktan ise daha ziyade suubetli görülese revadır.

Bir müellif müvaccine-i fıkrine düşen bir hakikati kendi tavr-i tetkiki dahilinde istediği gibi ifade eder. Bir şair hissiyat-ı kalbiyesiyle tasavvurat-ı hayalperveranesini teşhīm için kendi selikasından başka bir rehber kabul edemez.


Halbuki böyle kudretli müellfler veyahut teessürperver şairler tarafından bir şetaret-i aliyanı ve bir vecd-i şair-pesendanı mızalip da vücuda getirilen sahaf-ı bedayi-nümayi mertebe-i (8) meziyet-i hakikiyesine halel getirmekem şartıyla tercume edebilmek çok kere bel iktihami mümkün olanaman mesall-i müşkileden olur.


Bir de bir eserin hüsn-i tercümnesine muvaffak olabilmek için yalnız o eserin yazılımiş olduğunu lisannın kavaid-i fesehatine ve vele-ı beyannın yuvuk kafi değildir. Asar-ı tercumeleri zinetdemüdevvinat olabilmek ve eserleri bais-i istifade olmak için müticimlerin tercümnesine himmet buyurdukları eserin muhteviyat-ı ilmiye ve mezaya-ı edebiyesine
vakıf bulunmaları ve anladıklarını hüsn-i teblig için dahi kendi lisanlarına vayedar-ı mezaya-ı belagat olmaları ıktıza eder.


İste tercümenin tadat olunan müşkilatına ve pekçe asar-ı mütercemenin ekseriyetle şerait-i hüsn-i tercümeyi cami olamamasına mebni merhum Fuad Paşa bir eserin aslini kanaviçenin yüzüne ve tércümesini tersine teşbih eylemek istemişlerdir.