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GOING BEYOND THE PARATEXTUAL PRESENCE: TRANSLATORS’ DIFFERENT ROLES IN TARGET TEXTS

Yan-metinsel Bulunuş’un Ötesine Geçmek:
Çevirmenlerin Erek Metinlerdeki Farklı Rolleri

Seda Taş

Abstract

The notion of paratextuality put forward by French scholar Gérard Genette in 1990s first gained importance in the field of literature and has been one of the most prominent research areas in translation studies ever after because paratextual elements are seen as effective tools in directing presentation and reception not only of a text but also of a translated text. Paratexts are other elements such as titles, headings, epigraphs, prefaces, epilogues, reviews, acknowledgements, footnotes, illustrations, etc. coming with and outside the text in order to present the text and ensure or direct its reception. It is the threshold readers pass before the main body of the text. When the translator’s presence takes place in the elements surrounding the main body of the text, it is possible to name this presence as “paratextual presence” just as suggested by researcher Cees Koster. The researcher’s main aim in the present study is to focus on translator’s presence in the translated text with regard to paratextual elements, question the boundaries of the paratextual presence of the translator and explore how far the translators can go beyond this paratextual presence. Another objective is to search translators’ possible different roles in translation. In line with these purposes, a chosen source text and target text will be utilized for translation analysis. The source text called The Rise of the Ottoman Empire written by Paul Wittek in 1938 and the target text translated into Turkish by translator Fahriye Arık in 1947 will be examined comparatively in terms of paratextual elements. This study will try to tackle paratextuality and its significance in translation and also draw attention to translators’ different roles. In this respect, it is thought that this study will give a new impulse to the researches of translation studies on these topics.
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Going Beyond The Paratextual Presence: Translators’ Different Roles in Target Texts

Introduction

Translation studies researcher Theo Hermans defines the presence of the translator in translated texts as “discursive presence of the translator” and “translator’s voice” arguing that “translated narrative discourse always implies more than one voice in the text, more than one discursive presence” (Hermans, 1996: 27). Similarly, studies concerning that translators somehow, leave their traces at some points of the text consciously or unconsciously, have become even more significant in translation studies. Following Hermans’ cornerstone study, translator’s presence with reference to textual and paratextual marks has been discussed with a reference to translator’s voice (Hermans 1996, Schiavi 1996, O’Sullivan 2003) and point of view or style (Bosseaux 2007, Munday 2008).

In this study, the presence of translator is examined through a close attention to paratextual elements of the translated text. Naming the presence of translator in the elements covering the texts or outside the texts as “paratextual presence”, it aims to understand the boundaries of this existence. By comparing source and target texts, what paratextual elements can tell about the translator’s different roles in translation has been tried to search. In line with this purpose, first paratexts and the significance of paratexts in translation studies are discussed. Then possible roles of translators within the scope of paratexts are explored. Afterwards paratextual elements of source and target text are analyzed comparatively.

Exploring Paratexts and Their Significance for Translation Studies

Paratextuality is a term coined in 1990's by Gerard Genette who dwells on the concept of intertextuality proposed by Julia Kristeva and carries intertextuality into a part of a wider concept called “transtextuality.” To Gerard Genette, transtextuality is an umbrella term consisting of five categories as “architextuality”, “paratextuality”, “metatextuality”, “hypertextuality” and “intertextuality”. Among these, being a threshold for the text, paratextuality brings a detailed and systematic approach to identify the elements within and outside the text.

Paratextuality means other elements coming with and outside the main text in order to present the text, ensure or direct its reception and create new meanings. It is the threshold readers pass before texts. Paratexts are texts surrounding the body of texts such as titles, headings, epigraphs, prefaces, reviews, acknowledgements, footnotes, illustrations, etc. Genette (1991: 261) clarifies their significance and function as:

“The literary work consists, exhaustively or essentially, of a text, that is to say (a very minimal definition) in a more or less lengthy sequence of verbal utterances more or less containing meaning. But this text rarely appears in its naked state, without the reinforcement and accompaniment of a certain number of productions, themselves verbal or not, like an author’s name, a preface, illustrations. One does not always know if one should consider that they belong to the text or not, but in any case they surround it and prolong it, precisely in order to present it, in the usual sense of this verb, but also in its
strongest meaning: to make it present, to assure its presence in the world, its “reception” and its consumption, in the form, nowadays, at least, of a book”.

Genette goes further in paratextuality by making a distinction between peritextuality and epitextuality. The former means title, chapter title, preface, epigraph, footnotes and notes which are directly and closely related to the meaning building of the texts. The latter, on the other hand, isn’t directly bound up with the main body of the text and it can be seen as additional or supportive. Epitexual elements include news about the book or author, reports, reviews, letters, cover design, etc. Genette explains this division as:

“Those liminal devices and conventions, both within the book (peritext) and outside it (epitext), that mediate the book to the reader: titles and subtitles, pseudonyms, forewords, dedications, epigraphs, prefaces, intertitles, notes, epilogues, and afterwords—all those framing elements that so engaged Sterne; but also the elements in the public and private history of the book, its “epitext,” ... “public epitexts” as well as “private epitexts” (Genette, 1997: XVIII. in foreword by Richard Macksey).

Whether it is peritext or epitext, paratexts are significant in directing presentation and reception not only of a text but also of a translated text. They offer readers an idea while determining whether the text is a translation or not. As Pym (1998:62) puts it: “close attention to paratexts might be able to locate a key difference between translation and non-translation.” Moreover, paratexts provide readers opinions whether it is worth buying the text or not. Some readers may have preferences in terms of translators, publishers and writers. Others may want to read prefaces and epilogues of translators before buying. Some others also may want to hear translator’s autobiography and translating experiences or performances. However, “marginal, paratextual comments by translators on their own performance are bound to rupture the apparently seamless web of the translated discourse (Hermans, 2002:12). “While these paratexts inform readers whether a text is worth reading, its value and importance in literary world, the writer’s intention for writing, they sometimes may lead to misunderstandings and misinterpretations” (Taş, 2015:73). Thus, many positive or negative reasons with regard to paratexts can be taken into account that predestine and become a threshold for the life of translated texts.

The significance of paratexts for translation also lies in their potential and ability in enlightening on certain periods, point of views at a specific time, attitudes of authors, publishers and translators, norms, etc. Turkish translation studies researcher İsn Bengi (1990) in her doctoral thesis uses paratextual elements so as to re-evaluate the concept of equivalence in translation and translational norms through novelist, journalist and translator Ahmet Midhat’s translations. Bengi benefits from the paratextual data such as prefaces and epilogues and tries to identify norms shaping the target literary system of that time. In the same vein, Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar (2002) explores the use of paratexts in historical translation research focusing of two cases from translated Turkish literature in the 1940s. According to the researcher, “a critical description of paratextual elements surrounding translations can be instrumental in bringing to light the divergent concepts and definitions of translation in a specific period within a culture” (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2002: 44). Another prominent Turkish scholar Ayşe Banu Karadağ draws on paratexts, namely “translator’s prefaces” within the framework of modern translation theories of translation studies to examine the translations of translator Ahmed İhsan. She aspires to clarify “in the witness of the prefaces, the role of translator as an “expert” in “intercultural communication” and the contributions of translations in the formation of a new “culture repertoire” within the Ottoman Turkish literary and cultural polysystem” (Karadağ, 2012:46).

Genette (1997:3) points out that “the paratextual messages change depending on period, culture, genre, author, work, and edition.” Similarly Kovala (1996: 120) claims that “they
reflect the conventions of the target culture at a certain time.” For instance Ayşe Naz Koş (20007) centering upon the translations of Simone de Beauvoir’s, she examines “the woman question” and feminism within the Turkish cultural climate in Turkey between 1962 and 2001 by means of paratexts. This kind of researches may constitute precious information and insight about dominant ideas or point of views of a society and culture at a certain time of period.

Among paratexts, there is a division between paratexts belonging to the author called as “authorial paratexts” and paratexts by editors, publishers, etc. named as “editorial paratexts.” When it comes to its translation and translator, it is ambiguous to decide where to include translators. Are translators’ prefaces and epilogues accepted as authorial or editorial paratexts? In this circumstance, it is possible to say that, like the common idea claiming that translators occupy a secondary position and thus, should be invisible, translators are again has an obscure position and are seen as subsequent to authors. This also reminds translation studies researcher Lawrence Venuti’s term “translator's invisibility”. With his own words: “the individualistic conception of authorship (which) devalues translation” (Venuti, 1995, 7). As a consequence, there occurs an uncertainty. “In response to this indeterminateness, I would like to supplement Genette’s paradigm with a “translatorial paratext”, thereby placing stronger emphasis on the tangible and meditative paratextual presence of the translator” (Deane-Cox, 2014:29).

Being a new center of interest in translation researches, the idea of paratexts has brought a distinctive dimension in translation studies. Jose Yuste Frias (2012) mentions an emerging concept called “paratranslating” by a research group at the University of Vigo and analyzes paratextual elements in children’s literature within the framework of paratranslating titles in his recent study. Researcher explains the utilities of paratranslation as:

“Paratranslation provides information about the activities that are present at the threshold of translation, as well as about what they represent and teach in terms of the translator’s subjectivity and the nature of the translated product” (Yuste Frias, 2012:118-119).

Clearly, this point of view gives a divergent place to translator's subjectivity in translating paratexts and underlines the essentiality of handing it to translators in terms of their visibility in translated texts. “Thanks to the concept of paratranslation, translators can vindicate, once and for all, their visible figure within the books’ physical and material space.” (Yuste Frias, 2012:132). In this direction, translation of paratexts may help a translator create a symbolic reference to the presence of translator in translated text. Above all and foremost, translating paratexts comprises a decision making process and thus may describe and define virtual presence of the translator by reflecting translator’s footprints, attitudes, point of views or shortly, subjectivity. This presence can be called as “paratextual presence.” “There is a sort of middle ground between extratextual and textual presence of the translator, which might be coined the paratextual presence of the translator” (Koster, 2002:33). In this case, this new concept brings to mind such questions: “What are the boundaries of “the paratextual presence of the translator?” “How can this presence be identified?” and “Can the translators go beyond the paratextual presence?” To find satisfactory answers to these kinds of questions, it is beneficial to look at possible roles of translators in translation procedure.

**Translators’ Possible Different Roles**

Translators are not the only translators in the complex process of translation: they have a major role as “readers”. As translators read the text they will translate, they become readers of the source text just like any other reader. Probably they are more than just
ordinary readers but careful, competent and ideal readers because they are engaged in reading and understanding the text profoundly before translating. This gives them the role of readership.

Once translators try to find their way in the meaning world of the text, make an inference from their own reading of the source text and restructure it in a new language, culture and environment for the target readers, they make close readings in order to recreate a text reasonably analogous with the source text. This process demands them to go through an interpretation process since any act of reading inheres in a sort of interpretation and thus, that grants them another role as “interpreters”.

Apart from the double role of being both readers and interpreters of the source text, translators can act just like any writer in terms of producing meaning and context for they also create a new and original text. In the process of translation, they are taking actual writing steps with the objective of constructing a similar world of the source text in the target culture. Accordingly, they can be regarded as the closest to being original writers or co-writers. In the same manner that a writer behaves, translators display another text which is creative and original. In this way, they play another major role as “writers”. Sulaibi (2012) argues that:

“The translator, like the writer, has such power and authority that he could manipulate the original text. The writer has control over his text – the ST – he can write it and manipulate it any way he would to fit what he has in mind and what he has to say. The translator, in turn, also has an authority over his work – the TT – he has the power to write the TL text in the way that best fits the culture and language in which he writes” (Sulaibi, 2012:16).

Sulaibi approaches the double role of being both a writer and translator from the perspective of authority. In his book called The Translator as a Writer (2012), he sees translation as a decision making and creative force behind translation. He states this as:

“As Álvarez and Vidal (1996: 2) suggest, a translator can be “the authority who manipulates the culture, politics, literature and their acceptance (or lack thereof) in the target culture.” A translator does have an authority over his work – the TL text - as long as he determines the implicit meanings of the final version, since then he will be having a kind of authority over the work he is involved in (ibid: 4)” (a.g.e).

Accordingly, the target text is a product of individualistic reading and translating that bear marks of translators and translator-writers. The translated text is “a work of art emanating from another author’s context and brought into the readers’ universe by its other author, the translator” (Zeller, 2000:139).

On some occasions, translators may choose to take on the function of “textual critic”: correcting the words and sentences, introducing textual meaning, changing the dates, commenting on issues, showing readers alternative or controversial ideas in footnotes, etc. They intend to achieve the readability of text by their intervention in the target culture because the text has fragmentations in the translator’s own opinion. The translator is there as a critic to help readers understand the text and guide them. This intervention is mostly transparent for the general target reader and visible for some model readers. However, when interventions are intensely placed on text, as they become visible, translators’ potential role as “textual critics” comes to light.

Consequently, as in the case of accepting that the target text has a secondary position, it is “a derivative text; a translation is a representation, or a reconstruction, or a reproduction, of another text (Koster, 2002:25) and thus has a hybrid or double status,
then we need to concede that it is possible for translators to have many different roles as readers, interpreters, writers, textual critics and translators in the translation process.

Comparative Analysis

Comparative analysis of the source and target text is significant because it yields in-depth information for researchers. “The aim of any comparative method is somehow related to the effort of making visible the textual presence of the translator” (Koster, 2002: 33). In this study, comparative analysis of paratextual elements is carried out so as to depict translator’s paratextual presence and his/her roles in target text. Before a careful look at the paratextual elements, it is beneficial to present some information about the book in question, its writer and translator.

About The Book, The Writer and The Translator

The source text The rise of the Ottoman Empire written by Paul Wittek in 1938 basically tries to provide explanation for the formation and the rise of the Ottoman Empire focusing on its origins, tribal roots and warfare issues. It has 58 pages in total. In his preface, Wittek expresses that the book comes from the lectures he delivered at the University of London and includes references to his preceding publications. In his book, the writer presents his point of view about the Ottoman history by linking the formation and expansion of the Ottoman state to the gaza which is a term he put forward to mean “holy war”. He offers ideas on Islamic inclination and also he rejects Oghuz-Kayı origins of the Ottoman Empire. Although these views are accepted as controversial, the writer’s book can be regarded as a valuable work that initiated a debate and various researches on the formation of the Ottoman Empire. However it is not the purpose of this study to discuss them.

Wittek is an Australian historian, professor and writer. He was a military adviser to the Ottoman Empire and worked in Istanbul and Syria until the First World War ended. During the war years he learned Ottoman Turkish. Afterwards, he studied ancient history in Vienna and completed his doctorate there. Later he worked as co-editor and author of the first scholarly journal in this field called “Messages to Ottoman history” and then became a journalist and also worked with Turkish historians. With the rise of Nazism in 1934 Wittek went to Belgium, then London and found a job at the University of London. He published his only books “The Principality Menteşe” and “The Rise of the Ottoman Empire” in the 1930s and many other articles. His theories about the nature and rise of the Ottoman Empire are known as the Ghazi thesis that see the Ottoman’s raison d’être in Islamic tradition. They were the dominant explanations for the emergence of the Ottoman Empire, but also widely criticized.

The book was translated into Turkish in 1947 by Fahriye Arık with the name of Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Doğuşu. It has 128 pages in total. When it comes to the translator Arık, it is hard to find certain information about the translator’s biography. However it can be estimated form the Turkish name that the translator was a woman. Moreover, it is thought that the translator was also a history writer because one book called On Beşinci Asır Tarihçilerinden Nesrinin Hayatı ve Eserleri: Osman Bey ve Orhan Bey Devirlerinin İncelenmesi published in 1936 was written by Fahriye Arık. This book takes place in the Ottoman history resources. Therefore the translator is believed to be both a translator and history writer. To support this idea, further information from the translator’s own explanations from the texts will be provided.

---

The Source and The Target Text Analysis

The source text’s cover includes the book’s name in capital letters at the top. Then the writer’s name in capitals and inside the parenthesis information as “Of the Institut de Philologie et d’Histoire Orientales et Slaves de l’Université Libre de Bruxelles” are given. Afterwards the publication information is placed at the bottom of the cover (See Appendices A1.). The target text’s cover is similar to the source text’s cover. At the top, the book’s name, the same information in parenthesis and the writer’s name are provided. In the middle of the page some information about the translator and added chapter are placed in the form of “Türkçeye çeviren: ve OĞUZ BOYLARI VE OSMAN OĞULLARI SEÇERESİ’ni ekleyen Fahriye Arık (“The person that translated into Turkish and added “OGHUZ TRIBE AND OTTOMANS GENEALOGY is Fahriye Arık”4). Although translator’s name is seen minisculely, the added chapter’s name is in capitals which attract the reader’s attention through this emphasis. At the bottom of the page, the publication page, publishing house and publication date are shown. (See Appendices A2.) Thus, the comparison of the covers gives the impression that the translator was tried to bring into the forefront in the target text and culture. The purpose may be to attract the attraction to the translator and the added chapter produced by the translator. In this way, it is possible to say that the translator became visible and her place was highlighted as both the translator and the writer of the target text.

The source text consists of three chapters as “Criticism of the Tradition and Exposition of the Problem”, “Turkish Asia Minor up to Osmanlis” and “From the Emirate of the March-Warriors to the Empire.” In the beginning of the book, a “preface” belonging to the writer is supplied. (Wittek, 1938/1966: v) Here, the writer explains that the book is a compile from the lectures he delivered at the University of London on May 4th, 5th and 6th, 1937. It has 53 pages together with 2 pages of notes at the end showing the references of the resources mentioned in the book.

On the other hand, the target text has 4 chapters and 3 of these chapters are the same with the source text. The chapters in the source text have references and they were provided at the end of book in the part of “notes” according to their numbers. In the target text references are given as footnotes. However, the translator adds some more footnotes like corrections and explanations. For instance, in the source text “the peace of Carlowitz in 1966” (Wittek, 1938/1966: 3) was translated as “1699 Pasarofça barışıle”5 and in the footnote “Karlofça olacak, çeviren”, (“needs to be Karlofça, translator”) was written. (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 7). The translator both translates and corrects the word. However, whether the translator corrects her own translation or the writer’s word seems ambiguous. The possibility of correcting herself is higher as the pronunciation appears to be similar. In another example, the translator provides explanation about a book mentioned in the source text. “This book was translated into Turkish...” and the translator gives extra information about the translator, publication date and place for the target reader. (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 9). Similarly, the translator tries to explain what the writer tries to say. The source text contains a sentence that says “in the territory Old Moslem civilization” (Wittek, 1938/1966: 21) and was translated as “Eski Müslüman medeniyeti ülkesinde” (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 29). In the footnote the translator’s explanation is “He means the countries where

---

4 Unless expressly provided otherwise, English translation from the target text (Turkish text) was made by the researcher.
5 The writing format wasn’t changed.
Old Muslim civilization develops”. These kinds of examples give the impression that the translator prioritizes the target culture and the reader.

Furthermore, it is worthy of note that the translator also makes a reference to her own chapter which is the fourth chapter in the target text. The footnote was given as: “See. Fahriye Arık. Oghuz tribes and Ottoman genealogy, the second part of the book. The translator.” Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 13). This footnote actually makes clear that Fahriye Arık is the translator of the first three chapters and the writer of the last chapter.

The first three chapters of the target text are “Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun doğuşu Rivayetinin tenkidi ve meslenin izahı”, “Osmanlılara gelinceye kadar Türk Küçükasya” and “Üç Beğliğinden İmparatorluğu”. The chapter names are almost the same with the source text chapter names though some words differentiate in translation. For instance “the tradition” is translated as “rivayet”. “Rivayet” means “rumor” or “hearsay” in English. So it can be claimed that the meaning is changed or weakened by the translator’s interpretation. In this study, a detailed textual analysis of translated text wasn’t done as it wasn’t the main objective. However, it is necessary to state that the language of the source text contains words belonging to Ottoman Turkish and thus, some words can be incomprehensible for today’s readers though the whole source text can be understandable in general.

When it comes to the end of third chapter, the translator puts a note for thanking his friends Bn. Boyar, B. Atsız and her brother Baki Arık because of their help during the translation process (See Appendices A3.) It can be inferred that translating a historical text, especially a text that belongs to the history of the land a person lives and his/her ancestors lived, could be a difficult and delicate process since the translator should try to be impartial and the translation of such texts requires a lot of information about the history. Therefore, it is understandable for the translator to research and get some help during the translation.

After these chapters, there is one extra chapter added by the translator. It is named as “Oğuz Boyları ve Osmanlı Oğulları Seceresi” (“Oghuz Tribe and Ottomans Genealogy”) and has 60 pages. In this chapter, firstly there is 1 page of “kısaltmalar” (“abreviations”) that describe terminology of the chapter the translator wrote (See Appendices A4.). The chapter starts with the translator’s explanation that says “In order to examine genealogy belonging to Ottomans, I needed to determine twenty four Oghuz Tribe. Because in the work of P. Wittek that I translated:...”. (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 69). Then the translator mentions the claims of Wittek respectively (See Appendices A5.). Thus, the translator accepts that she is the writer of this chapter and has a deliberate purpose for writing. This is to show that Wittek was wrong in some issues and the translator wants to correct them by writing a chapter which is almost equally long as the source text.

On the next page, the translator continues to explain her purpose in writing this chapter: “Here, in the light of history we wanted to revise the genealogy belonging to 24 tribes of Oghuz and the changes of tribes’ names for which Wittek says as invention and unrelated to the Ottomans insistently” (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 70). Afterwards, the translator presents each tribe in analphabetic order and gives detailed information about them. The information is based on many resources because the translator mentions the references in footnotes and some of them include extra explanations (See Appendices A6.). Through this chapter, the translator uses almost 26 footnotes to show proof for her claims and increase the reliability. She also tries to clarify her purpose once more after Oghuz tribes were summarized. At the end of her remarks, she says:
“A few sentences written here is enough to show that there is some research about Oghuz tribes, but 24 tribes were not enlightened equally. As I previously mentioned, I will not investigate them thoroughly. However, I will try to find the existence of the unknown issues by providing the essence of the known.” (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 71-72)

For the sake of clarity and proving the existence of these tribes, the translator uses classifications and adds diagrams indicating phonetic changes according to village names. Villages’ names differentiate in time as various tribes settled. Furthermore, she appeals to the other resources in order to form a table that shows comparatively the village names with phonetic differentiation. Some examples are included from the target text (See Appendices A7.)

Through the end of the chapter, the translator comes to the conclusion that the writer was mistaken at some points. One of the translator claims can be exemplified: “Because Prof. Wittek didn’t assume that the tradition of Oghuz in Ottomans as old, he accepted that century as the birth of a romantic tendency in which significance was paid to Oghuz tradition.” (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947:108). The translator goes further to support her ideas by offering resources from historians of XIV century working on Ottoman genealogy and Oghuz tradition. Thereafter, she makes eight different deductions to summarize that Prof. Wittek’s claims about the Ottoman roots and Oghuz were not satisfactory and didn’t reflect reality since they weren’t based on resources. (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 109-112). The translator reaches a conclusion asserting that Prof. Fuad Köprülü gave an answer to Prof. Wittek’s claims. Yet, the translator also praises Prof. Wittek for his effort and researches on Ottoman history. In the translator’s own words:

Prof. Wittek’s researches undoubtedly are very precious in regard to showing psychical factors in Ottoman victories. However these factors warrant that they were neither Oghuz nor Kayı tribes. Prof. Fuad Köprülü who finds Prof. Wittek’s insistence that the Ottomans belong to Kayı tribes as groundless gave an answer to Wittek in his writing named “Ethnic Origin of Ottomans”. The Oghuz tradition in the first Ottoman resources agreeing in connecting Osman to Oghuz with Kayı and Kayı prints on Ottoman coins that we chose confirm the claims of Köprülü.” (Wittek/Fahriye Arık (Trans.), 1947: 112). (See Appendices A8.)

After this chapter, there is an index for “people’s name”, “tribe, origin and nation names”, writers’ name mentioned in the chapter and lastly corrections which included page number, line, wrong words and corrected words. This index is alphabetically organized by the translator. In this respect, it can be said that the translator put a great effort not only for the index but also the corrections. What the translator did for this chapter was a meticulous work that contained research and detailed information. The translator does her best for writing it providing arguments, references and a variety of sources just as any writer would do for his/her own piece of writing. Thus, the translator needs to be seen as the writer of this chapter, not a person adding or just the translator.

All in all, taking into account all paratextual elements in the target text, namely the translator’s place in the cover, explanations and correction in the footnotes, translator’s note, the added chapter with all its references, index, footnotes, it can easily be deduced that the translator is not just a person translating. Above all, the translator can be first

---

6 Kayı was written as “Qayi” in the source text. The researcher prefers to use “Kayı” in her translation.
the reader, interpreter and critic of the source text, then the translator and the writer of the target text.

Conclusion

Throughout this paper, translator’s presence in the translated text and translators’ possible different roles in translation with regard to paratextual elements have been tried to searched. Paratextual elements are titles, headings, epigraphs, prefaces, epilogues, reviews, acknowledgements, footnotes, illustrations, etc. and when the translator’s presence is felt through these elements, they may create a symbolic reference to the paratextual presence of translator in translated text. In this study, the boundaries of the paratextual presence of the translator and how far the translators can go beyond this paratextual presence are also questioned. In line with the objectives of the study, the source text called The Rise of the Ottoman Empire (1938) written by Paul Wittek and the target text translated into Turkish by translator Fahriye Arık in 1947 were examined comparatively in terms of paratextual elements. Paratextual elements are crucial for translation for they have potential and ability in enlightening on certain periods, point of views at a specific time, attitudes of authors, publishers and translators, norms, etc.

The findings showed that the target text is longer than the source text as it contains an added chapter written by the translator. This added chapter has 60 pages of research and detailed information together with the resources, explanations, arguments, classifications and tables provided. The translator clarifies her purpose as correcting the writer and showing proof for the writer’s claims. Also, in the part the writer wrote, the translator makes references to the part written by her. Therefore, it can be claimed that the translator went far beyond the paratextual presence by her interference between the writer and target readers, her own piece of writing and her responses to the writer in the writer’s and her part. The type of text being historical, the other job of the translator being a history writer and nationalist ideas or feelings of the translator may have affected all this translation process. Thus, it is possible to say that although it becomes difficult to draw a clear-cut line between the possible roles of the translator, in one translated text the translator had many different roles as reader, interpreter, writer, textual critic and translator. It is worthwhile to note that these roles went far beyond too. As a conclusion, “a translation cannot be value-free, or neutral, or transparent; nor can the translator be spirited away” (Hermans, 2002:16). Translators with their own agenda, preferences and decisions, consciously or unconsciously, are always there inside the text and outside the text, namely in paratexts.
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