



Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of Translation and Interpreting

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF
ERZURUM FOLK RIDDLES IN THE LIGHT OF RAYMOND VAN
DEN BROECK'S TRANSLATION CRITICISM MODEL**

Duygu DALASLAN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2015

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF ERZURUM FOLK
RIDDLES IN THE LIGHT OF RAYMOND VAN DEN BROECK'S TRANSLATION
CRITICISM MODEL

Duygu DALASLAN


Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of Translation and Interpreting

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2015

KABUL VE ONAY


Duygu DALASLAN tarafından hazırlanan “An Analysis of the English Translations of Erzurum Folk Riddles in the light of Raymond van den Broeck’s Translation Criticism Model” başlıklı bu çalışma, 29.06.2015 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Elif ERSÖZLÜ (Başkan)



Prof. Dr. Asalet ERTEN (Danışman)



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hilal ERKAZANCI DURMUŞ



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zeynep DOYURAN



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özlem ŞAHİN SOY

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. Yusuf ÇELİK


Enstitü Müdürü

BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin/raporun tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin/raporumun kağıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

- Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezim/Raporum sadece Hacettepe Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.
- Tezimin/Raporumun 3 yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin/raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

29.06.2015



Duygu DALASLAN

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate my thesis to deceased Asst. Prof. Dr. İsmail BOZTAŞ who supported me a lot throughout my academic life. I feel very proud to be one of his students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this thesis is one of the most difficult tasks of my life but I have been lucky for being surrounded by wonderful people who have never given up helping me during the course of writing my thesis.

First of all, I would like to express my sincere feelings of appreciation to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Asalet ERTEN who has never hesitated to take the time to read all the sentences in my thesis one by one and to guide me through all of the difficulties I have experienced until the end. I am highly grateful for her patience.

I would also like to thank all of the academicians, especially Asst. Prof. Dr. Hilal ERKAZANCI and Asst. Prof. Dr. Elif ERSÖZLÜ in the Department of Translation and Interpretation in English. This thesis would not have existed without their guidance and suggestions.

I would also like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my precious friend, Esra ÇETİNKAYA who has always been very supportive during my studies.

I also owe very special thanks to my friends Aykut SİĞİN, Gizem AKÇİL and Ceren ERDEMİR who have always helped me with both academic and life issues.

Lastly, I must express my gratitude for my beloved mother Nesrin DALASLAN and father Emin DALASLAN. Thank you for loving me and encouraging me while facing the challenges of life. I feel blessed because you are my parents. Also, my dear grandmother Sultan ÇİLTAŞ, I would have never been able to write this thesis without your inspirations.

ÖZET

DALASLAN, Duygu. *Raymond van den Broeck'un Çeviri Eleştirisi Modeli Doğrultusunda Erzurum Halk Bilmecelerinin İngilizce Çevirilerinin İncelenmesi*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2015.

Çeviri eleştirisi, özellikle son yıllarda ülkemizde birçok edebiyatçının ve akademisyenin ilgi alanına girmektedir. Ancak, çeviri eleştirisiyle ilgili olarak herhangi bir standarda ulaşamadığı gözlemlenmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, en son 1960'lı yıllarda yapılan bilmece çevirilerine dikkat çekmektir. Bu yıllarda, İlhan Başgöz ve Andreas Tietze liderliğinde, birçok bölgeye ait bilmecelerin çevirileri yapılmıştır. Bu çeviriler, 1973 yılında *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* isimli kitapta yayınlanmıştır. Bu kitap, bilmece çevirisi konusunda bir ilktir. Ancak, çalışmanın kapsamındaki bilmecelerin hepsini bu teze dâhil etmek mümkün olmadığından, sadece Erzurum yöresine ait bilmecelerin çevirilerinin eleştirisi yapılmıştır. Bu doğrultuda yapılan çeviri eleştirisi ise bu alanla ilgili olarak tarafsız birtakım kriterleri ilk defa dile getiren ve çeviri eleştirisini belli bir standarda bağlamayı amaçlayan Raymond van den Broeck'un modeline dayanmaktadır. Kaynak metin ve erek metin arasında karşılaştırmalı dilbilimsel analizi temel alan bu nesnel çalışmaya göre, eleştirmenin amacı, kaynak metinden yola çıkarak, erek metni analiz ettikten sonra, aralarındaki farklılıklara dayanarak, ortaya konan en son ürünün erek dizgenin normlarına uyularak oluşturulmuş kabul edilebilir bir çeviri veya kaynak dile ve kültüre bağlı kalınmakla beraber erek sistemin dayatmaları sonucunda ortaya konmuş yeterli bir çeviri olup olmadığını tespit etmektir. Çalışmanın bulguları, erek metin ve kaynak metin arasında, dil deęişkeleri, morfolojik özellikler, sesbilimsel, sözcüksel ve anlamsal açıdan farklılıklar bulunmakta ve yapılan birtakım zorunlu deyiş kaydırmalarının sonucu olarak, Erzurum bilmecelerinin çevirilerinin yeterli ölçütte olduğunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler

Çeviri eleştirisi, bilmece, kabul edilebilir çeviri, yeterli çeviri, deyiş kaydırma.

ABSTRACT

DALASLAN, Duygu. *An Analysis of the English Translations of Erzurum Folk Riddles in the light of Raymond van den Broeck's Translation Criticism Model*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2015.

Translation criticism has been a field of interest of many scholars in recent years. However, it is observed that certain standards for translation criticism have not been set yet. The purpose of this thesis is to draw attention to the translations of riddles that were done in 1960s. In these years, a lot of riddles from various regions of Turkey were translated under the leadership of İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze. These translations were published in the book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* in 1973. Riddle translation had never been handled until that book. As it is not possible to include all of those riddles in this thesis, only the translations of Erzurum riddles were the focus of criticism. Within this respect, the criticism is based on the model of Raymond van den Broeck who is the first to have put forward some objective criteria for translation criticism and who aimed to set standards for this field. According to this objective study that is based on the comparative linguistic analysis between the source text and the target text, the critic's aim is to determine whether the final product is an acceptable translation which is formed pursuant to the target language norms or an adequate translation provided as a result of impositions of the target system, depending on the differences between the source text and the target text. The facts of the study convey that there are differences between the source text and the target text in terms of language varieties, morphological, phonological, lexical and semantic components and as a result of some obligatory shifts of expression, the translations of Erzurum riddles have been proven adequate.

Key Words

Translation criticism, riddle, acceptable translation, adequate translation, shift of expression.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KABUL VE ONAY	i
BİLDİRİM	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ÖZET	v
ABSTRACT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
I) GENERAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY	1
II) PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	3
III) RESEARCH QUESTIONS	3
IV) METHOD	4
V) LIMITATIONS	5
VI) OUTLINE OF THE THESIS	5
1. CHAPTER 1: FOLKLORE	7
1.1. DEFINITION OF FOLKLORE	7
1.2. A HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF FOLKLORE	9
1.2.1. Europe.....	9
1.2.2. Turkey.....	10
1.3. FOLKLORE AND LITERATURE	12
1.4. GENRES OF FOLK LITERATURE	14
1.4.1. Western Folk Literature Genres.....	14
1.4.1.1. Folktales.....	14
1.4.1.2. Fairy Tales and Fables.....	15
1.4.1.3. Epics.....	16

1.4.1.4. Ballads.....	16
1.4.2. Turkish Folk Literature Genres.....	16
1.4.2.1. Jokes.....	17
1.4.2.2. Ditties.....	18
1.4.2.3. Requiems.....	20
1.4.3. Riddles.....	21
1.4.3.1. Definition of Riddles.....	21
1.4.3.2. Characteristics of Riddles.....	24
1.4.3.3. Riddles in Literature.....	26
1.4.3.3.1. Children’s Literature.....	26
1.4.3.3.2. Adult’s Literature.....	27
1.4.3.3.2.1. Anglo-American Riddle Forms.....	27
1.4.3.3.2.2. Turkish Riddle Forms.....	29
1.4.3.4. Translation of Riddles.....	31
2. CHAPTER 2: TRANSLATION CRITICISM AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE TRANSLATIONS OF ERZURUM RIDDLES.....	33
2.1. CRITICISM, TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATION CRITICISM..	33
2.2. DESCRIPTION OF RAYMOND VAN DEN BROECK’S MODEL OF TRANSLATION CRITICISM.....	37
2.3. ERZURUM REGION AND ITS LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES ON PHONOLOGICAL LEVEL.....	41
2.4. LÜTFULLAH SAMI AKALIN, THE COMPILER OF ERZURUM RIDDLES.....	42
2.5. İLHAN BAŞGÖZ, THE COMPILER OF ERZURUM RIDDLES.....	42
2.6. <i>BİLMECE: A CORPUS OF TURKISH RIDDLES</i>, THE SOURCE BOOK.....	43

2.7. ANDREAS TIETZE, THE TRANSLATOR OF RIDDLES	44
2.8. PERTEV NAILI BORATAV, THE TRANSLATOR OF RIDDLES ...	45
2.9. GIDEON TOURY’S NORMS: “ADEQUACY” AND “ACCEPTABILITY”	45
2.10. THE APPLICATION OF RAYMOND VAN DEN BROECK’S MODEL OF TRANSLATION CRITICISM TO ERZURUM RIDDLES	47
2.10.1. Language Varieties	48
2.10.1.1. Dialect	49
2.10.1.2. Register	60
2.10.2. Morphological Components	62
2.10.2.1. Reduplications	63
2.10.2.1.1. Emphatic Reduplication	63
2.10.2.1.2. <i>m</i>-Reduplication	65
2.10.2.1.3. Doublings	67
2.10.3. Phonological and Lexical Components	71
2.10.3.1. Rhyme	74
2.10.3.2. Onomatopoeia	77
2.10.3.3. Neologism – Non-Sense Words	82
2.10.4. Semantic Components	93
2.10.4.1. Figurative Language	93
2.10.4.1.1. Metaphor	94
2.10.4.1.2. Puns	100

2.10.4.2. Other Cultural Elements.....	101
2.10.4.2.1. Proper Names.....	101
2.10.4.2.2. Historical Elements.....	108
2.10.4.2.3. Islamic Motifs.....	109
CONCLUSION.....	113
REFERENCES.....	119
EK 1: ORJİNALLİK RAPORU.....	124
EK 2: ETİK KURUL İZİN MUAFİYETİ FORMU.....	126

INTRODUCTION

Riddles have a special place in folk literature. Folk literature is actually oral literature through which human beings express their thoughts and feelings with a distinctive style. As a sub-genre of oral literature, riddles are questions formed by benefiting from fictions, oppositions and sound plays.

Mental traits, especially the one which enables people to solve problems distinguish them from animals. From the psychological point of view, people feel happy as they find answers. This feeling coming from the ability of reasoning prompts people to wonder more. That is why people are inclined to mysterious things that raise curiosity in them. This characteristic of people has initially reflected on their manners and then on literature. Riddles are one of the best examples in which words are manipulated in a way to create mystery in folk literature. Hence, in folk literature, “mystery” is associated with riddles.

Mystery is not an ordinary notion: It causes excitement. Owing to this reason, riddles have become means of entertainment over time. Hence, in folk literature, “entertainment” is also associated with riddles.

Owing to their rhyming style, riddles are regarded as folk poetry but there are constant shifts between riddles and other sub-genres of folk literature. An expression in a riddle can be mentioned in a proverb, idiom or in a tongue-twister. However, riddles are distinguished from other genres by reason of their form and style.

I) GENERAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

In this study, Erzurum riddles by İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze (1973) and their English translations done by Andreas Tietze and Pertev Naili Boratav were analyzed regarding Raymond van den Broeck’s translation criticism model. Erzurum riddles were compiled by Lütfullah Sami Akalın (1954) and İlhan Başgöz (1947). Thus, the collectors of each riddle were mentioned in brackets with the answers. In their book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* (1973), İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze collected Turkish folk riddles from every region of Turkey and they made use of printed

materials which belonged to various authors. After they finished collecting the riddles, they translated all of the riddles in the book. Although they did not mention who translated which riddle, they clearly stated their common translation method at the beginning of the book and they stated that they applied the literal translation method and were faithful to the source text. Thus, while criticizing all the riddles carefully, this method was taken into consideration.

Erzurum riddles are born out of Erzurum people's daily lives and of everything that affects their lives. Various utensils and tools that simplify the life such as *churn, spoon, bagpipe, lamp, cradle, book, chair, carpet, besom, mop, umbrella, padlock, stove, door, automobile, fur coat, mill, gun, razor, sandal, trowel, awl, saw, beddings, ceiling* or even *letter* can be the examples. As agriculture and stockbreeding are practiced in Erzurum, the riddles can refer to animals, physical characteristics of an animal or the equipment used in agriculture such as *goat's horn, gizzard* and *oxcart*. Those animals can be the ones Erzurum people come across in nature and in their surroundings such as *ant, flea, mouse or rat, sorb, tick, chicken, bear, black beetle, duck, hedgehog, bee* or *spider*. Sometimes the subject can be a reflection of their faith such as *the Sirat Bridge, angel of death, destiny* or *Ramadan*. Food and drinks or instruments for smoking such as *onion, pomegranate, cabbage, butter, salt, apple, cherry, popcorn, egg, leek, bread, coffee* or *hookah* are also prevalent in riddles. Another subject matter is the parts of the body such as *eye, breast, beard, mouth and teeth*, and *shadow*. Natural and weather events such as *wind, winter, snow, ice, fire, hail, rain* or *cloud* are other thematic constituents of Erzurum riddles along with the objects or the people they consider distinguished such as *gold* or *bridegroom*. Even though those subjects might seem common, they are worded in different manners depending upon the linguistic style of Erzurum. The dialect can be easily observed in each riddle and it is different from Standard Turkish. In accordance with the nature of riddles, poetic structures such as rhyme, onomatopoeia and nonce-formations (newly created words) are shaped by the dialect. Moreover, a language is not only about vocabulary and it is not only a means of communication but also a cultural accumulation. The history, geography, economy, dietary patterns, that is, every aspect of life style constitutes the culture and thus the language of a society. Riddles can be regarded as a transmission of culture to next generations so the matters of each riddle are specific to Erzurum culture. When all of

these distinctive characteristics of riddles are added together, a rich linguistic fact along with its cultural roots appears. For this reason, the translator undertakes a challenging task. On the other side, the translator might face some other problems stemming from two different language systems because Turkish belongs to Ural-Altai languages while English is one of Indo-European languages. The major problem for the translator might be the grammar. Thus, it becomes significant to find out how the translator applied the translation method to riddles, whether he encountered any challenging or problematic parts, which strategies he used when he had a difficulty in the translation, and whether Erzurum riddles could finally be reflected in the target language as close as they were in the source language. Such an analysis could propound the adequacy and/or the acceptability of the translation. “Adequacy” and “acceptability” are two basic norms proposed by Gideon Toury. In Toury’s view, “adequacy” exhibits fidelity to the norms of the source language and culture; “acceptability” conveys the adherence of the translation (or the translator) to the norms of the target language and culture.

II) PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to criticize the way how Erzurum riddles were translated into English in order to draw attention to the translations of riddles which had not been done by any other translators until Andreas Tietze and Pertev Naili Boratav and which were not done after them. In order to achieve this goal, the analysis was made as much objective as possible based on the systemic model of translation criticism that was proposed by Raymond van den Broeck.

III) RESEARCH QUESTIONS

At the beginning of the source book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* from where the riddles were taken, it was stated that “the translations attempt to give a literal translation, but such a faithful rendering has not always been possible” (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 12). Thus, the following questions were answered in the light of the purpose of this study:

Research Question:

In line with the translation strategy which was applied to the translations of Erzurum riddles, did the translator provide an adequate or an acceptable translation?

Sub Questions:

1. Which parts of the source text were challenging for the translator?
2. What kind of strategies did the translator apply when he encountered these challenges?
3. As a result of the strategies that the translator needed to use when the translation challenged him, which differences arose between the source text and the target text?

IV) METHOD

In order to criticize the translations of Erzurum folk riddles, a descriptive analysis was made to form the basis of the data providing the necessary information to find out whether an adequate translation (the translator's adherence to the source text norms) or an acceptable translation (the translator's conformation to the target text norms) was provided. Within this respect, all Erzurum riddles and their English translations were analyzed in the source book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* (1973). The translations which directly reflected the source text and were intelligible for the target text reader and the ones which differed from the source text and were not intelligible for the target text reader were separated. The latter problematic translations with their source texts were included in this study. In the analysis chapter of this study, each of Turkish riddles and their translations were described. Following the descriptions, each of the source texts and the target texts were compared and the differences between the source texts and the target texts were explained under specific categories. These categories were formed according to Raymond van den Broeck's translation criticism model with a general-to-specific approach by taking into account the following criteria.

Firstly, the differences between Turkish and English were considered because riddle translations in this study were embedded in two separate languages that differed from each other in terms of grammar, phonology and vocabulary.

Secondly, the main characteristics of riddles in general were taken into consideration. Primarily, riddles could be regarded as question-and-answer-sessions where answers would be connoted with metaphors and puns. Furthermore, riddles could also be regarded as poetry in which sound plays (rhyme, onomatopoeia, neologisms and non-sense words) could avail.

Thirdly, the main characteristics of Erzurum riddles, the Erzurum dialect and some culture-specific items related to Erzurum, were noted. In addition to these three criteria that form the basis of the description analysis, other elements that shaped the source text such as the compilers of riddles, the translators, and the common translation method were mentioned within the framework of the analysis.

V) LIMITATIONS

Riddles are common both in oral literature such as folk songs or oral poetry and in written literature such as poetry or tales. In order to limit the variety of riddles, this thesis chose to analyze folk riddles from oral literature, not the literary ones from the written literature. As there are not any other studies on folk riddles along with their translations, the book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* (1973) by İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze was chosen. The book consists of 12,200 riddles in total that were collected from each region in Turkey along with their translations. Since it would be difficult to cover all riddles in this study, only Erzurum riddles and their translations were analyzed and criticized according to the categories which were put forward by Raymond van den Broeck.

VI) OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

This thesis consisted of four parts. In the introduction, the topic of the thesis, the purpose of the criticism and the method of analysis were introduced.

In the first chapter, as the riddle was a piece of folk literature and thus folklore, the definition of folklore was made. After touching upon how folklore functioned, a historical background was provided. As folklore was born in Europe, the historical knowledge began with the history of folklore in Europe. Then, how it entered into

Turkey and Turkish literature was mentioned. Before switching to “folk literature” from “folklore”, the associations between folklore and literature were pointed out. As the riddle was a sub-genre of folk literature, the other genres of folk literature in the West and in Turkey were stated before more detailed explanation of the riddle, its characteristics and its translations.

In the second chapter, after mentioning the situation of translation criticism in Turkey and in the world, the model upon which the criticism of translations of Erzurum riddles were based, was explained in detail. The translations of Erzurum riddles were analyzed under four categories taken from Raymond van den Broeck who proposed the aforementioned model. These categories were the challenging parts for the translator. In the translations of Erzurum riddles under these categories, some shifts were observed along with some deviations that were specified according to the categorization made by Geoffrey N. Leech.

In the conclusion, the findings obtained from the translation criticism of Erzurum riddles were given place with respect to the answers given for the research and sub-questions that were asked in the introduction part.

CHAPTER 1

FOLKLORE

Folklore has existed in many forms for ages. People have entertained, given advice and even taught how to speak, sing and dance with folklore. The riddle is a form of folklore and in Turkish it is called “bilmece” which should not be confused with “bulmaca” that is “crossword” that can be accessed as hard copy and in which initial or terminative letters clue in other answers. In this chapter, before explaining riddles in detail, folklore, its history and the genres other than riddles were mentioned.

1.1. DEFINITION OF FOLKLORE

“Pupulus”, “vulgus” and “volk” are the equivalents of the term “folk” in old Western languages. “In Orkhun Scripts ‘kara budun’ is used for this term. Modern Turkish dictionaries prefer the expression ‘the created’” (Güzel and Torun, 2003: 145). The modern dictionaries relate the term “folk” to “people”. “Lore” means “knowledge and information related to a particular subject, especially when it is not written down; the stories and traditions of a particular group of people” (Hornby and Wehmeir, 2005: 875).

Given the aforementioned statements, “folk” means “people” and “lore” means “knowledge”. Thus, it can be deduced that “folklore” means “knowledge about people”. A representative modern definition of “folklore” is that of Ralph Steele Boggs in the following manner:

As a body of materials, folklore is the lore, erudition, knowledge, or teachings, of a folk, large social unit, kindred group, tribe, race, or nation, primitive or civilized, throughout its history. It is the whole body of traditional culture, or conventional modes of human thought and action (quoted in Edmonson, 1971: 34).

In Turkey, when the word “folklore” is uttered, people imagine the traditional Turkish dance or customs and traditions. It is generally accepted that “folklore” is a set of unwritten norms in the society and that it includes anything about the culture itself, from

its literature to beliefs and even to the ways of behavior. Evil eye, i.e., is a typical folkloristic item.

American anthropologists define “folklore” only by including the art and literature and by excluding custom, belief, and crafts. In 1953, William Bascom stated:

Folklore, to the anthropologist, is a part of culture but not the whole of culture. It includes myths, legends, tales, proverbs, riddles, the texts of ballads and other songs, and other forms of lesser importance, but not folk art, folk dance, folk music, folk costume, folk medicine, folk custom, or folk belief. All of these are unquestionably worthy of study, whether in literate or nonliterate societies.... All folklore is orally transmitted, but not all that is orally transmitted is folklore (quoted in Utley, 1961: 195).

From these different definitions from different perspectives, it can be deduced that folklore represents the folk among whom it finds its roots but it means more than only representation: The late ethnomusicologist Alan Merriam grouped the functions of folklore into eight categories:

1. aesthetic enjoyment;
2. entertainment;
3. communication;
4. symbolic representation;
5. physical response;
6. enforcing continuity of social norms;
7. validation of social institutions and religious rituals,
8. contribution to the continuity of and stability of culture (Başgöz, 1998: 339-340).

As folklore functions for the sake of social norms, religious rituals and culture, it can be regarded as a social fact. As a social fact, it makes use of some materials. Francis Lee Utley, in his article entitled *Folk Literature: An Operational Definition* arranges the various materials of folklore as follows:

- 1) Literature and the other arts;
- 2) beliefs, customs and rites;
- 3) crafts like weaving and the mode of stacking hay, and
- 4) language or folk speech (1961: 194).

The grouping was made under “folk literature” not merely as “folklore” because both of them are considered the same. Actually, folk literature is a piece of folklore among its

other branches. In this thesis, as the topic is “riddles”, folklore will only be regarded as “folk literature” and as a social fact, folk literature has a history in the world.

1.2. A HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF FOLKLORE

1.2.1. Europe

As a discipline, folklore was born in Europe. Basics of reasons paving the way for the emergence of the discipline go back to the post-Renaissance era. This era experienced an intimate contact with the ideas of mankind upon the rediscovery of classics; exploration of world trade and world politics. This salvation of Europe from its isolation gave rise to radical structural and mental changes in the European society. As Europe discovered the rest of the world, the rest of the world discovered Europe. In this way, “ours” and “theirs” emerged. As “ours” was put into the center, the sense of wonder about “theirs” deepened and by the early nineteenth century, the science of folklore developed.

The historical background given above is about the birth of folklore as a science. Men obviously produced folkloristic materials since ancient times. “Aesop’s *Fables*, the *Vedas*, *Brahmanas*, *Upanishads*, *Jatakas*, the *Mahabharata* and *Panchatantra*, the *Thousand and One Nights*, the *Avesta*, the *Old Testament*, the sagas and *Eddas*, the romances, exempla, fabliaux, the *Gesta Romanorum*, the *Shih Ching*, *Tripitaka*, and the *Pert em Hru* or ‘book of the dead’” (Edmonson, 1971: 31) are inheritance of ancient literature to men. Through new translations of oral traditions which belong to the cultures which are not very well known, civilizations are still being discovered and folklore is still and will be under development.

Upon the discovery of new trade routes, European explorers, missionaries, travelers, tradesmen, and scientists became familiar with other cultures such as Africans, American Indians, and Arabs. By the sixteenth century, the Dark Age was totally left behind and the conservative scholastic thought gave way to Humanism which promoted scholarship with the desire of research and exploration. By the seventeenth century, Europeans were taking an active interest in seeking out foreign oral literature like “the works of Joseph Justus Scaliger and Thomas Erpinus’ *Two Centuries of Arabic*

Proverbs (1614) as there was also a continuing tradition of literary exploitation of Europe's own folklore, of which the *Pentamorene* of Giambattista Basile (1634-1636)" (Edmonson, 1971: 32) may be taken as characteristic. In the eighteenth century, the interest in folklore continued with the Romantic Movement, attested by Goethe and by Hans Christian Andersen with his popular *Fairy Tales*. Toward the end of this century, nationalistic sentiments arose in Europe. The exaltation of what is national became popular so in this process, folklore studies served a very important purpose. Upon the foundation of the first folklore society in Finland in the world, followed by the Baltic and Balkan states, the interest in folklore spread to the world. "If the seeds of folklore studies lie in antiquarian curiosity, the growth of the young plant was fertilized by politics" (Edmonson, 1971: 34). From dictators to republicans, the concept was courted by politicians.

As the folk literature of different civilizations unfolded, the difference between the oral and written expression became evident. The controlling hypothesis of the science of folklore has been that "oral literature is conservative and therefore constitutes a strategic datum for the understanding of whatever primitive, exotic, ancient, and childish" (Edmonson, 1971: 32). The passion of representing "primitive, exotic, ancient, and childish" traditions continued to lay the foundation of literature in the nineteenth century. As a new science was born, it had many representatives among whom Francis James Child was notably known with his *English and Scottish Ballads* (1857-1859).

1.2.2. Turkey

The interest in folklore grew at the second half of the nineteenth century in Turkey. The purpose was to form a national language that anyone could easily read, write and understand. This need was felt by the public itself. The language they used was under the influence of Arabic and Persian but it was only used by the Ottoman intellectuals. One century later, another reason why the rate of literacy was low would be assigned by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk to the difficulty in learning that language.

The proclamation of the Imperial Edict of Reorganization in 1839 brought grand reforms to Ottoman literary life. New generation Ottoman authors who closely followed

the modernization in Europe appreciated the contributions of literature to this process. Thus, they introduced new forms to the Ottoman literature such as novels, stories and plays by making use of translation. But there was a little number of people who could understand them.

So the need for reforming the language and the activities related to the linguistic education emerged on that platform in 1860. In this respect, Ahmet Mithat Efendi (1884-1913) pointed out:

Our literature is not a national language. It is neither Arabic, nor Persian or Turkish. Our masterpieces are not understood by Arabs or Persians. We cannot claim that it is our literature because we don't understand it either. Is it possible to be a nation without a language? No because our people have their own language. So we can substitute our literary language to their language and create a national language besides that language (quoted in Başgöz, 1972: 556).

In this way, folklore entered into the literary life. Şinasi (1826-71) wrote drama, compiled proverbs; Ziya Paşa (1829-80) is another representative of this movement; Hüseyin Rahmi (1864-1944) used shadow puppetry techniques; Ahmet Mithat Efendi wrote short stories by making use of proverbs; Mehmet Emin (1869-1944) assumed the title of “national poet” with his poems expressing national feelings.

On the other hand, there were those who regarded folklore as “unnecessary” in Turkish literature. In İlhan Başgöz's words:

According to Namık Kemal (1840-88), folklore was surreal and unsuccessful in distinctly specifying man's emotions, customs and morals; “They are the products of lazy people and lies told only to ignorant people,” said Süleyman Faik on this matter, and upon the arrival of Hungarian folklorist Ignacz Kunos in Turkey in 1880 in order to compile Turkish folklore, some Ottoman authors suggested him to mind more serious businesses (Başgöz, 1972: 560).

The National Movement which swept away the whole European continent towards the end of the eighteenth century could not be an important power until the First World War in Turkey because the Ottoman Empire had a heterogenic structure consisting of many nations. If one of those nations had been foregrounded, it would have meant the dismemberment of the empire. What the ruled people were entitled to do was to serve the sultan slavishly. So, the notion of “nation” did not develop either within the social or

within the political framework. But with the phenomenon of “nationalism” which became evident subsequent to the First World War, the discourses of “Turkism” increased.

The pioneer of folklore in literature is Ziya Gökalp. He published and compiled many materials in this direction. “Scientific activities in folklore began with the foundation of ‘Türkoloji Enstitüsü’ (Institute of Turkology) in Istanbul University in 1924 under the presidency of Prof. Dr. Fuat Köprülü” (Başgöz, 1972: 562). In 1927, “Halk Bilgisi Derneği” (The Association of Folk Science) was founded by Fuat Köprülü. In 1932, Turkish Institutions for Public Education were founded. In 1938, folklore was added to the Institute in Ankara University and in 1947 Prof. Dr. Pertev Naili Boratav became the chairman of the department. Boratav who was inspired by Van Gennep and French Ecole of History introduced folklore as an independent discipline to Turkey. But upon the closing of Turkish Institutions for Public Education, studies of folklore were undermined. Boratav continued to carry out his studies in Paris. As folklore appeared on the stage of history and as the literary scholars took interest in folklore, folklore and literature united.

1.3. FOLKLORE AND LITERATURE

Associated in the romantic and nationalistic contexts, folk literature, folk art and oral tradition have arisen. “They were regarded as unconscious (therefore free of artifice), sincere (and so not corrupted), and unself-conscious (and therefore genuine); thus, folklore was the product of plowmen, mid-wives and blacksmiths” (Rosenberg, 1991: 8). Even though some literary scholars judge folklore as “vulgar” by taking its creators into consideration, there is not a direct relationship between “civilization” and “birth of folklore”. But if one insists on some distinctions between folklore and literature, another differentiation is made on the basis of genres. Genres of folklore contain folktales, fables, epics, myths and legends. There are animals which can speak, monsters which are terrifying enough, witches, fairies, dragons and so on.

Another striking point of differentiation is that while literary critics and scholars deal with dateable documents, folklorists can not access to the date, the creator or the

location because oral tradition goes back to the early years of man when documentation was not possible. In 1916, a literary scholar John Robert Moore wrote that:

I have yet to find a clear case where a ballad can be shown to have improved as a result of oral transmission... As far as the narrative element is concerned, tradition works nothing but corruption in the ballad (Rosenberg, 1991: 9).

While literary scholars mention “errors”, “degeneration” and “corruption”, folklorists think that change inevitably takes place; compared to other literary genres, folk narratives are composed anew at each rendering. Thus folklore is flexible.

Like other literary genres, folklore deals with human kind except for one difference: As folktales and fairytales prove it, reality and fantasy are interwoven in folkloric materials. An ogre kills his own children by mistake as their hats have been exchanged; a beautiful princess who pricked herself in the finger and lay in a deep sleep is awakened by a prince and they live happily until they die; when a mirror tells the queen that Snow White is the fairest of all, the queen makes her eat the forbidden apple (similar to “Adam and Eve”) and as Snow White falls into the trap as she doesn’t follow the advice that was given before; a white rabbit guides a little girl and she manages to kill the dragon which is the symbol of evil.

Folklore has both oral and written genres although it is mostly known as oral literature. Fairytales and folktales are found in print now while the tradition of performing artists’ confrontation is oral. As their originating point is the unlettered folk itself, these confrontations are folkloric materials and pieces of oral tradition.

While literary critics and scholars study texts in print, folklorists study the communicative events live. They make use of some aids such as recorder or camera to capture the moment. The call-and-response duet realized by minstrels with their stringed instruments (called “saz” in Turkish) in Anatolia is an outstanding example. There are three components in this production: the minstrel (who is the performer), the instrument and the audience. This confrontation is mostly performed in the following way: A contest takes place between two minstrels who face each other before an audience. One is the visitor, the other is the challenger. The challenger creates or selects a riddle, or a question. Usually the visiting minstrel sings the first song. The challenger responds by

singing another song that has the same metrical and rhyming patterns. Thus, at the beginning of the contest, each minstrel tests and learns about the talents of his rival. Then, in the second part of the contest, they ridicule one another. This continues until one fails to find the correct answer. The loser usually presents his instrument to the winner as a sign of submission (Başgöz, 2008). İlhan Başgöz, a notable folklorist in Turkish Studies, compiled 50 performances in his book entitled *Hikaye: Turkish Folk Romance as Performance Art* (2008). He collected all these performances by recording all of them on his own.

Although folklore and literature seems to drift apart in many ways, both of them intrinsically deal with aspects of human life: love, death, power, and even nature. Now it is considered that folklore (the oral literature) precedes and feeds the written literature.

1.4. GENRES OF FOLK LITERATURE

1.4.1. Western Folk Literature Genres

1.4.1.1. Folktales

In Scotland, there are two different storytelling traditions. In Gaelic, storytelling is performed before an audience and at the end of this performance, the individuals win prize. The plots are long and complicated, entrusted to the patience of the listeners. However, Scots use a simpler language; folktales are created afresh by the teller and they are performed in an improvised manner. Neil Philip stated that:

Being an oral form, folktale is essentially a performance art. In the nineteenth century, scholars strived for collecting folktales by trying to preserve the words of the narrators and they used recorders. But it isn't easy to find out whether the record is the correct version or not because it also can be the corrupted version. Folktale is a national, a local and a personal art; the aims and artistry of the storyteller, the social setting and function of the storytelling, the imaginative impact of the story are all defined by unique pressures (1995: XVI – XVII).

After a brief introduction to this traditional art, Philip distinguished the language use in both of these different storytelling types as follows:

There are poetic passages known as ‘runs’ which act as markers in the story. On the other hand, in Scots, the stories are brief; the language is pure but the performance is improvised. The formulaic openings and closures in each form ease the audience into and out of the fairytale world: The story opens ‘There were ance...’ and ends ‘... so they a’ lived happily a’ the rest o’ their days (1995: XIX).

Folktales have subgenres among which there are fairy tales and fables that will be explained below.

1.4.1.2. Fairy Tales and Fables

In Germany, the Weimar period (1919-1933) is famous for leading to the emergence of National Socialism. The country was politically and financially unstable and this situation had negative impact on every aspects of social life. From these conflicts, the fairy tales and fables were developed, portraying the mistakes and the class conflicts of that time. As Jack Zipes points out:

The oral folktales told by the peasants over the past centuries have always had a political and utopian aspect, and the literary fairy tales, which originated for adults and children at the end of the eighteenth century, were highly political: Fairy tales, for example, written for children were intended to socialize children according to the norms of Protestant ethic (1989: 9).

Grimm’s Fairy Tales, *Cinderella*, *Little Red Riding Hood*, *Sleeping Beauty*, *Rumpelstiltskin*, *the Frog King*, *Rapunzel*, *Snow White* are examples for patriarchal order where prince (or the male character) is the hero and princess (or the female character) is weak and defenseless. All of them teach moral lessons with different characters. In fables, the characters are animals because their usage makes the message more effective. The first known collection of fables in the Western world is *Aesop’s Fables* of ancient Greece. La Fontaine’s *Fables* were issued in the 1600s. However, there was *Calileh va Demneh* which is said to have inspired the other famous fables.

1.4.1.3. Epics

Some epics evolved as oral tradition and then they were put into literary form but some began as literary works and then they were orally transmitted. “Epic is a genre which is closely bound to the religious beliefs and mythology and it glorifies battles and the violent super heroes” (Jackson, 1994: XIII). It is generally in poetry or prose form. The man is depicted as larger than himself; the sins or weaknesses are avoided. Warriors and heroes are glorified however; women and children are depicted as “trouble-makers”. According to Guida M. Jackson, especially the heroic epics play an important role “in colonialist societies, where regimes often attempted to eliminate all vestiges of native culture” (1994: XIV) because they are considered to be able to reunite the people who lost their identities in colonialist societies.

1.4.1.4. Ballads

Ballads are narrative poems which picturize the jealousy, adventures or sorrows of a certain nation. “It is in the folk-song of the nation that the truest expression lies” (Todd, 1893: IV). They come instinctively and unconsciously from the tongues of folk. They are reshaped in each tongue so there might be some shifts, omissions or additions. One of the most famous Scottish ballads is *King Henrie*.

In American oral tradition, “ballads are most alive in the mountainous regions of the Southeast and on Western ranches” (Pound, 1922: XVI). They are mostly sung at social gatherings, at games or at dances.

1.4.2. Turkish Folk Literature Genres

Abdurrahman Güzel and Ali Torun categorized the general characteristics of Turkish Folk Literature as follows:

Turkish Folk Literature has existed since before Islam.
 Turkish Folk Literature has been transmitted orally by minstrels singing their poems with their stringed instruments. Composers of their own poems, these poets have addressed to a group of people.

Turkish Folk Literature is anonymous: folk songs, poems and tales, as their name say so, are the common literary products of Turkish people. When, how and with the initiative of whom these works emerged are not known. As those have been passed down, changes into their forms and themes have occurred over time (2003: 146-147).

Yet, this categorization is not enough because there are various genres:

1.4.2.1. Jokes

Compared to other genres, jokes are shorter. They don't have conventional, rigid styles or formulaic openings or closures. They don't develop in a path demarked by traditions. The narrator adapts the joke to his/her taste, shapes it in line with his/her linguistic and expressive talents, and puts it in a convenient place in his/her speech. Jokes have never been the subject for a faith or a non-religious belief like epics. Telling jokes don't have a right place or time defined by the conditions of social milieu. It is not a career field. Everyone embroiders their speech with jokes in order to express an opinion better, to support an idea and to strengthen a satire (Başgöz, 1986).

Jokes are also instructive. "Old resources explain it as 'Nef'i kelam oldur ki, yahut kıssadan hisse oldur ki'" (Başgöz, 1986: 140). Literally it means "A useful remark is the moral itself". Radcliff Brown, the famous American theorist of function assessed that:

Just as a small screw contributes to the running of a machine, every social behavior contributes to the regular course of a society. This contribution to the entirety is called function. Bodies which don't function in societies die and fossilize. By educating people within the culture of tradition, transmitting attitudes and tastes of a society, making people practice laughing and tolerating, jokes soften antagonisms. That's why jokes are alive (quoted in Başgöz, 1986: 140).

Jokes can be grouped into two: those which discuss social conflicts and animal tales. Social conflict suggests the things happened between the rulers and the ruled like the tax collector and the peasant in front of him. Also the riots against Ottoman Empire have become the subject for some jokes. "Dadaloğlu's famous remark 'Ferman padişahımsa, dağlar bizimdir' which means 'As the sultan has the decree, we have the mountains' is clearly mentioned in one of the jokes" (Başgöz, 1986: 143). In addition, when a woman complains about her husband who beats her, it can be a matter of jokes.

Animal tales are actually the ones known as Aesop's fables. Each animal represents a character with their chats and behaviors.

1.4.2.2. Ditties

Ditties are emotional verses which can be easily composed and remembered. Rather, ditties stand out with their functions. Lovers express their feelings to each other through ditties. The society which has banned explicit relationships between woman and man breaks the bans with ditties. Next door yards, low walls, roofs on which people can easily step up, glassless windows, streets without lights which enable secret follows and chats, and common village fountains are proper conditions for the exchanges of ditties. Most people know Ferhat and Şirin who are traditional ditty narrators.

Bahçe bar için ağlar
Ayva nar için ağlar
Karlı dağ güneş için
Gönül yar için ağlar (Başgöz, 1986: 227)

Its translation can be as:

The garden cries for public
The quince cries for pomegranate
As the snowy mountain cries for the sun
The heart cries for the beloved one. (The translation hereinafter belongs to the writer of this thesis).

Ditties serve not only for expressing love but also for correspondance:

A mektubum var da gel
Haberini al da gel
Bir idik iki olduk
Üç olduk mu sor da gel (Başgöz, 1986: 226)

It can be translated as:

Oh, my letter, go and return

Don't forget to take the news
 We were one but then became two
 Ask if we became three or not. (The translation hereinafter belongs to the
 writer of this thesis).

This ditty is an example of a man who implicitly asks his wife whether they had a child
 or not.

Ah etsem ah olur mu
 Desem günah olur mu
 Verdiğini alıyor
 Böyle Allah olur mu (Başgöz, 1986: 232)

It can be translated as:

If I curse, will it be a curse
 If I express it, will it be a sin
 Takes back whatever he gives
 What a God is it! (The translation hereinafter belongs to the writer of this
 thesis).

The insurgency in this ditty is so great that it breaches the religious rules.

When a man who has asked for a girl's hand is refused down, he says:

Öldürürüm babanı
 Alırım abulanı (Başgöz, 1986: 234)

which can be stated in English as:

I can kill your father
 And marry your sister. (The translation hereinafter belongs to the writer of
 this thesis).

But the girl values her parents' love and consent above:

Ben sana varır mıyım

Anneme sormayınca (Başgöz, 1986: 234)

that she says:

I won't marry you

Before getting my mother's permission. (The translation hereinafter belongs to the writer of this thesis)

But sometimes obstacles can be financial:

Konsul üstünde pekmez

Muhabbet candan gitmez

Senin aldığın para

Benim süsüme yetmez (Başgöz, 1986: 237)

It can be expressed in English as:

Molasse on the chest of drawers

Love doesn't fade out

Your income

is not enough for my fuss and feathers. (The translation hereinafter belongs to the writer of this thesis)

Yunus Emre stated many times that “ditties of Turkish folk literature date back to the thirteenth century and that they are widespread in society” (Başgöz, 1986: 244). However, quadrants in the form of ditties were employed in *Kutadgu Bilig* and *Atabat al-Hakayık* which were composed in the eleventh century.

1.4.2.3. Requiems

Requiems are sung by women to express pain after a dying person. The two verses below belong to a mother in Erzurum, who expresses her sorrow after she takes the news of her son's death, who died a martyr.

Eledim eledim, höllük eledim,

Aynalı beşikte canan bebek beledim.

Büyüttüm besledim asker eyledim,
 Gitti de gelmedi canan buna ne çare,
 Yandı ciğerim de canan buna ne çare.
 Bir güzel simâdır aklımı alan,
 Aşkın ateşini canan sineme saran.
 Bizi kınamasın ehl-i dil olan.
 Gitti de gelmedi canan buna ne çare,
 Yandı ciğerim de canan buna ne çare.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=umQTBRerHnM>) (Retrieved on: June 15, 2015)

This requiem can be translated as:

I sifted and sifted the sand
 And I, sweetheart, diapered baby in the mirrored cradle
 I raised him and fed him and sent off to military
 He's gone, sweetheart, and never returned; it can't be helped
 It cut me, sweetheart, to the bone but it can't be helped.
 A lovely face which charmed me
 And wrapped the love around my bosom.
 Don't you condemn us you the poet.
 He's gone, sweetheart, never came back; but it can't be helped
 It cut me, sweetheart, to the bone but it can't be helped. (The
 translation hereinafter belongs to the writer of this thesis).

Another striking genre of folk literature is "riddles". Riddles exist both in Western and in Turkish Literature so rather than mentioning it as a continuity of this part, a wide coverage were given to riddles below.

1.4.3. Riddles

1.4.3.1. Definition of Riddles

Riddles are short and funny expressions which are songful and which have simple answers. Even though that definition is true, it is not enough. The reason for that

deficiency can be that like other folkloric works, riddles have sunk into oblivion. As Naki Tezel points out:

As the relationships between the cities and villages have become frequent, broadcast media such as newspapers have gone everywhere; civilization means such as radio have become widespread; folkloric materials which are the products of social mind are left to be forgotten (1969: 3).

Given the above statement, those who were born in the early years of the Republic will remember riddles better. Riddles are anonymous literary folkloric works. They reveal mentality of a society. They are not independent of everyday life and beliefs. They were not put forward for only children. The way they strike children's fancy and the way they play an educational role are among their peculiarities. On winter nights, the whole family -grandparents, parents, and children- gather together around the stove; the tea is brewed; after heart-to-heart talks, tales are told; riddles are solved to have a whale of time together.

However, regarding riddles as only means of distraction springs them from their roots. According to Dilek Türkyılmaz, "culture, language and thus riddles were born out of a game in which primitive man finds magical power for the continuity of universal order; he believes that magical knowledge contests affirm the continuity of universe; that's why, first examples of riddles are found in the carols of the Rigveda which is the Holy Scripture of Brahmins" (2009: 43). Thus, it can be said that before taking their present shape, riddles used to have a mystical structure. As primitive man was in the dark about the world surrounding him, he was afraid of everything so everything was divine and scary for him. He believed that the world was hanging on the horn of an ox. When earthquake hit, it meant that the ox had shaken its head. Thunder meant the struggle between Gods. Similarly, as he was afraid of drawing the attention of super powers towards himself, he did not directly call the names of, for instance, wild animals: As it can be seen in the next chapter, the bear was described as "enişte" in one of Erzurum riddles. "Enişte" is somebody's sister's or aunt's husband. Thus, that symbolic language which carried the traces of mythology found its place in riddles. Put it differently, "riddles and mythology converged as (1) symbolic expressions turned into riddles in time, (2) mythic stories became the subject for riddles, (3) animistic and totemic understanding reflected on texts of riddles" (Türkyılmaz, 2009: 45).

In addition to their mystical nature, riddles used to have serious tasks like managing confidential messaging between statesmen. Yet more, before wars, they sent riddles to each other but if any answers had not been provided, war would have been declared.

The Yucatean Mayan priesthoods who maintained a considerable control over all Mayan society tested officials in knowledge of ritual riddles, a necessary proof of legitimate authority:

These are the riddles
 And enigmas
 Of the cycle which ends today,
 And today is the time
 For questioning with the riddles the Axe Men of the towns
 To see if they know them
 So as to deserve power.
 Whether they know them by inheritance,
 Whether they know and understand them,
 The Axe Men
 And Land Chiefs,
 As the chiefs they are.
 If it is true that the Axe Men descend from lords,
 Lord princes,
 Really from Land Chiefs, they must prove it.
 This is the first riddle put to them.
 They are asked for food.
 “Bring me the sun,” the Land Chief will say
 To the Axe Men.
 “Bring me the sun, my sons,
 That I may have it on my plate.
 It must have the lance of the high cross sunk into
 The center of its heart
 Where Green Jaguar sits, drinking blood.”
 This is the language of Zuyua.
 This is what they are asked for:
 The Sun is a fried egg.
 And the lance of the high cross sunk in its heart,
 which is mentioned, is the benediction.
 And the Green Jaguar sitting on top drinking blood
 Is green chile just beginning to turn red.
 Thus is the language of Zuyua (Edmonson, 1971: 227).

The first Turkish riddles were recorded in “Divân-ı Lügati’t Türk”, the first Turkish dictionary which was written in Arabic by Kaşgarlı Mahmud in the eleventh century. Here is an example: “Ol manğa söz tabuzdı” (Türkyılmaz, 2009: 42). For native Turkish

speakers, it can be literally translated into modern Turkish as “O bana bilmece sordu”. It can be literally translated into English as “S/he asked me a riddle”.

Even though they have been recorded in print materials, riddles are actually the products of oral literature. All of them were uttered by individuals but it is not possible to find who those people are because once they are uttered and they get widespread, riddles become anonymous. So, giving an exact definition for these old, mystical, playful but also serious questions or question like anonymous verses which are difficult to understand and which have surprising answers is not an easy task. İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze state that:

The Turkish standard term for riddle is *bilmece* from the word *bil-* ‘to find’, and, in some dialects of north eastern Turkey, a corresponding term *tapmaca* is used. In wide areas of Anatolia a term borrowed from Arabic (*mathal* ‘image; proverbial sentence’) is commonly employed; it appears in the variants *matal*, *metel*, *metal*, *masal*, *mesel* (1973: 13).

As for Ayhan Karakaş’s definition:

We meet various definitions in sources related to riddles. Riddles are entertaining products of oral literature, which implicit something, without mentioning its name, leaving the responder to guess what it is. Riddles are somewhat play-based, traditionally handed down patterns, mostly written in verse, having a major role in developing the mental abilities, and evoking the abstract and concrete notions along with some affiliations and alienations (2011: 45).

1.4.3.2. Characteristics of Riddles

Structure and Style in Riddles

Riddles are basically in poetic and prose forms. Prose forms are rare and as they are regarded as folk poetry, riddles are mostly characterized by the phraseology of folk poetry. They often make use of opening remarks and closing remarks. Most of them employ onomatopoeic words, i.e. the words that contain sounds similar to the noises they describe, and the ones in poetic form are constructed in individual verses which are held together by rhyme. In that way, they are remembered easily and they live longer in people’s memories. So, neologisms (the invention of new words or expressions) and

meaningless words are common. They are in the form of repetitions and exaggerated statements.

Riddling Process

The person who asks a riddle is a “riddler” and the person who will find the answer is a “riddlee”.The riddlee is allowed to think for some time. As the time gets longer and the silence gets deeper, the riddler gives some clues. The riddlee continues to come up with guesses until s/he finds the acceptable solution. The unacceptable solutions are rejected by the riddler.

The session can develop in one of these following ways: The riddler restructures the riddle and adds a hyperbole (an exaggerated expression) at the end of his/her riddle such as “bunu bilmeyen eşek sıpası” which can be literally translated as “one who cannot find the solution is a donkey-foal” or the riddler wants something from the riddlee such as the riddlee’s field or one of his/her other possessions. If the session is acted between children, the riddlee has to give his/her most favorite toy. Before surrendering, the riddlee may want to take his/her last chance and request some information for clarification but if the riddler insists on his/her authoritative position, s/he can refuse to supply the information. It is unknown whether the riddlee pays for his/her defeat but if they perform before an audience and one knows the answer, s/he can act superior on the riddlee.

Guessing the Riddles

Riddles can be subdivided into two groups as “the ones that can be guessed easily” and as “the ones that cannot be guessed easily”.

Here is an example for the first group:

Başa yapışık
Bir sapsız kaşık (Tezel, 1969: 6)

It can be literally translated as: “Attached to the head / A spoon without a handle”. The answer “ear” can be easily guessed.

Here is another example for the second group:

Gitti gelmez,
Geldi gitmez (Tezel, 1969: 6).

It can be literally translated as: “It has gone and it will not return / It has returned and it will not go”. The answer is “youth and elderliness”. As this riddle is open to comments, it cannot be easily guessed.

1.4.3.3. Riddles in Literature

1.4.3.3.1. Children’s Literature

Children’s literature has long been neglected but it has already started shifting to the centre of literature. A lot of publications addressing children have been published since Tanzimat. Among them, stories and tales take a primary importance. Before Tanzimat, oral literature was dominant. Tongue twisters, proverbs and Nasreddin Hodja stories were being told at home while Hacivat-Karagöz was displayed at public places.

Children have imagination and they see the world in a different manner. It does not mean that the children’s literature is different from adult’s literature. On the contrary, it is the same as the adult’s literature apart from the higher number of images and colourful elements. Yet, the basic functions of children’s literature such as gaining reading habit, teaching basic things or vocabulary and developing the child’s mental capacity should not be forgotten.

Riddles, poetic and mysterious, sound like tongue twisters which also help develop children’s linguistic competences and performances: While contemplating the solution, children try to distinguish the abstract thing from concrete objects in a way that they perceive the surrounding area much better. As they learn new notions, children’s ability to develop new notions increases. They become imaginative. Children do not read the riddles as literary works because they are not aware of the very literature itself yet. So, riddles lay the foundations of literature in children.

1.4.3.3.2. Adult's Literature

Riddles are actually lyrical products. Although there are riddles peculiar to many cultures around the world, there is not a distinct category in literature called “riddles” but they show their presence in poems, ballads or idioms. That’s why there is not a clear distinction such as “riddles in children’s literature” or “riddles in adult’s literature”. Whatever aforementioned about the riddles is also true for the riddles in adult’s literature so various forms of riddles which will be mentioned below can be generalized for both children’s literature and adult’s literature.

1.4.3.3.2.1. Anglo-American Riddle Forms

Roger D. Abrahams and Alan Dundes (1972) group riddles in the following manner (129-137):

Descriptive Riddles

“Descriptive riddles” are enigmas which permit the riddlee (the person who solves the riddle) to guess the answer of the riddle by describing a certain animal or an object. Here is an example:

In spring I am gay,
In handsome array;
In summer more clothing I wear;
When colder it grows,
I fling off my clothes;
And in winter I quite naked appear (Answer: Tree) (Abrahams and Dundes, 1972: 132).

Neck-riddles

One sub- type of riddles is “neck riddles” which are seen in northern European and African traditions. The executioner asks a riddle like the following one and if the riddlee solves it, he saves his neck but if he cannot find the answer, he is executed:

Horn ate horn up a white oak tree.
 You guess this riddle and you can hang me. (Abrahams and Dundes, 1972: 133)

Neck-riddles do not have any answers but they are based on the riddler's experience or something that the riddler has witnessed. This riddle is common in the United States which is about a "Mr. Horn" who climbs trees and cooks goats.

Knowledge-based riddles

Another type of riddles is based on the knowledge of the riddled person. Here is an example:

Who was born before his father and died before
 his mother? (Answer: Abel) (Abrahams and Dundes, 1972:134)

This riddle necessitates some knowledge on Bible.

The beginning of every end,
 The end of every place,
 The beginning of eternity,
 The end of time and space. (Abrahams and Dundes, 1972: 135)

The answer of this riddle is "letter E" and it necessitates some orthographic knowledge.

Visual Riddles and Doodles

Visual riddles are enigmas in which the riddler (the person who asks a riddle) does not use words but use his/her gestures for description. In doodles, the picture of the subject is drawn as a rough sketch.

Joking Questions

"Joking questions" are "cause-effect riddles" in which the effect is given and the answer is its cause. Here is an example:

Why does a freight car need no locomotive?

-----Because the freight makes the car-go (Abrahams and Dundes, 1972: 136)

Wisdom Questions

Wisdom questions are based on memorization of already learned facts because the answer cannot be inferred from the content. Here is an example:

How many outs in an inning of baseball? Answer: Six (Abrahams and Dundes, 1972: 137)

This riddle involves background knowledge on the field of baseball.

1.4.3.3.2.2. Turkish Riddle Forms

In many books on Turkish riddles, the riddles are grouped according to their subjects. The most detailed grouping was made by İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze. In their book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles*, İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze (1973) divides riddles into sub-categories as “Single Concepts”, “Multiple Concepts”, “Knowledge Test Riddles”, “Word Component Riddles”, and “Mock Riddles” (59-949).

Single Concepts

Single-concept-riddles describe a concept in a paradoxical way. Here is an example:

(Airplane)

Dakikada on iki günlük yol alır.
In a minute it travels a distance of twelve days. (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 71)

Multiple Concepts

Different from single-concept-riddles, multiple-concept-riddles depict more than one concept and they are followed by an unexpected, but clear-cut answer. Here is an example:

(Rain, vapor)

Yerden göğe çıkar, gökten yere serpilir.
It rises from earth to the sky, it is scattered from the sky onto the earth.
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 829)

Knowledge Test Riddles

As can be understood from their names, these riddles test the knowledge of the riddlee but they also lead him/her to the answer. Here is an example:

(Grandfather, father, son)

Bize üç konuk geldi/iki oğul/iki baba.
Three guests came to our house, two sons and two fathers. (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973:921)

Word Component Riddles

Word component riddles focus on the name of something but they do not view the thing itself. Here is an example:

(Istanbul)

Tren gelir is diye. Makinist vurur tan diye. Kömürcü anahtarını kaybetmiş,
konduktör bağırır bul diye.
The train comes, saying "Is!". The engineer strikes (the lever), saying
"Tan!". The stoker has lost the key. The conductor shouts at him, "Find it!"
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 929)

Mock Riddles

Mock riddles make fun of the riddlee and of the concept they describe. Here is an example:

(A hole)

Boş cepte ne bulunur.
What is found in an empty pocket? (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 945)

1.4.3.3.3. Translation of Riddles

As riddles are constructed by verses combined by rhyme, word plays, onomatopoeia and figurative language, they have many points in common with poetry so translation of riddles coincides with translation of poetry.

Translation of poetry has been disputable because it has been deemed to be a difficult and an impossible task by many scholars such as Mallarmé who has argued that “poetry cannot be translated as it is composed of verses combined by the words which are attached to each other with harmony and rhythm” (Süreya, 2008: 95) while it has been successfully practiced for a long time: “Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* (1859) and Pound’s *Cantos* (1925 - 70) are obvious examples” (Connolly, 1998: 170). Another significant example for poetry translation can be Melih Cevdet Anday’s translation of *Annabel Lee*. These examples are significant because they have influenced the poetic canon in the target languages to a great extent.

The disputes about this task stem from the nature of the poetry. Poetry can be regarded a special and a separate case in literature. Asalet Erten has stated that “poetry is not written in order to transfer information. What it transfers is what is lived. Emotions, images, and dreams express that living. This is what the poet shares with his readers.” (http://www.formatd.net/metafor/yazi/11120s_siir_cevirisi.htm) (Retrieved on: May 1, 2015). The way these slices of life are reflected on language brings along a poetic art. Poetry is represented in words which have hidden meanings that are far from their uses in ordinary language, and in a compact and a condensed structure.

The characteristics of poetry spark another debate in the way the poetry is translated. According to Hegel, “poetry can be rendered in prose” (Rifat, 2008: 94). Pierre Jean Jouve’s translations of Shakespeare’s sonnets into French in prose can set an example for this type of poetry translation.

Cemal Süreya (2008) stated that “it is not possible to re-create a poem in another language but it is possible to re-write it in the target language. However, the translator is deemed to be someone who knows the poetry well” (97). That is, the translation of

poetry can also be enabled by a translator who is a poet at the same time. Baudelaire from the West, Orhan Veli Kanık and Melih Cevdet Anday from Turkey are among those poets who are also translators.

However, “no translation of a poem, though, can ever be ‘the same as’ the poem itself” (Connolly, 1998: 174) because it can be hard for the translator to fulfil the same stylistic and cultural structures of the source poem in the target language. What s/he is entitled to do might be to create a similar effect in the target language, which is also required for the translation of riddles. But the creation of this effect involves some phases that the translator needs to go under. These phases have been put forward by Ranka Kuic as “the preparatory or research phase, the phase of identification or the actor’s phase, the doubly creative phase, and the final or critical phase” (Iacob, 2010: 248). These four phases are actually the ones that the poets go under. The preparatory phase includes the pre-translation process in which the translator conducts research on the poet; the identification phase is the one that the translator exerts himself/herself to be more familiar with the poet because this phase includes the creation process; in the doubly creative phase, the translator creates the spirit of the poem in the target language; in the critical phase which forms the final phase, the translator compares his work to the source text. If the translator does not undergo these four phases, s/he will not be able to follow the next phases which are about “the law of the three kinds of faithfulness; that is his translation will be true (a) to the meaning of the original, (b) to the music of the original, and (c) to the spirit of his mother tongue” (Iacob, 2010: 248).

As it can be understood, translation of poetry is a highly demanding process, which is also true for the translation of riddles. In the next chapter, all of the phases that the translator underwent so far during the translations of Erzurum riddles were analysed in detail because without such an analysis the criticism process might be deficient.

CHAPTER 2

TRANSLATION CRITICISM AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE TRANSLATIONS OF ERZURUM RIDDLES

2.1. CRITICISM, TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATION CRITICISM

Within the purpose of this thesis, the translations of Erzurum riddles are criticized by making a comparative analysis of the source text and the target text in this chapter. This study is based on the systemic model which was put forward by Raymond van den Broeck.

The meaning of the word “criticism” equals to ancient Greek word “elimination” but the most common definition of criticism is to distinguish “good” from “bad”; “correct” from “wrong”. Criticism helps to separate a work of art into pieces and it handles them individually. This is the basic part of the criticism process. In this part, the critic does not reach to the “criticizing step”. He introduces every single unit to the reader. However, the key to his success will be to introduce the author. Knowing the author prior to criticize him/her is very important. Otherwise, the critic will run out of a deep knowledge, which may lead to some wrong judgments.

An author reflects himself on his work. Readers always come across with his/her beliefs, experiences or the influences that have shaped him and even his tone in the work. However, knowing an author requires more time. The critic needs to know when the author put down the work on paper because this is one of the ways in which his style can be figured out. For example, Halide Edip Adivar uses a literary style with her compound sentences in Ottoman Turkish. Her style may not make her one of the best-seller authors now but it cannot be an issue because it used to be the prevailing style. Her style cannot be criticized compared to Ayşe Kulin who writes with a more flowing style in simpler sentences because she lives in a modern era and that’s the style of choice nowadays. Therefore, taking these examples, the critic should analyze the author in “time context” before criticism. That is, criticizing an author who created works in the 1970s with today’s criteria might not yield objective or scientific results.

Until now, the critic has been busy with “getting the author to know” in different contexts. After that, s/he starts criticizing taking some facts into consideration. The critic, first of all, should consider the fact that the aim is not to look for the negative parts. Criticism is a kind of observation and interpretation of a work which has been created by someone else. Thus, one could have both positive and negative observations.

In an age when the world is constantly growing smaller, when nations are increasingly drawn closer together and the necessity for exchanging information and ideas across borders in both oral and written forms has become a fact of life, communication has become inconceivable without translation. When there is a new technological development in Japan, other countries borrow it through translation. Statesmen communicate with each other with the help of translation. In the Ottoman period, theatre, as a new genre, was introduced by translation. The world’s classics have been translated into various languages and now they are read by students all around the world.

Hence, translation as a means of communication has an undebatable importance. Similarly, the quality of translation is a matter of special attention. Translation has been practiced since very old ages of the human kind and it has included not only the good but also the bad ones. However, it needs to be elucidated according to which criteria a translated work is good or bad. That is, objective and concrete criteria can help in conducting a study of criticism without being unfair to the translator and the translation. In this regard, it needs to be considered that as translation requires great care, effort and attention, for being able to criticize a translated work, one needs to know the importance, requirements and limitations of this area.

In the narrowest sense, translation is the transfer of a message in the source text to its equivalence in the target text. Translation also consists of elements which form the source text. The former of the source text is its author. His/her life, other authors who impressed him/her, his/her education, other works, and style form the author. In addition, the aim of the author and his/her target readers also require special attention. For instance, an author, who wants to transfer feminist discourse to the national literature and to create a canon in it, will make use of some strategies of feminist literary style. When another author wants to pen a children’s book, s/he will not make use of

footnotes or prefaces as his target readers are children. The translator needs to step back and look at this process from the place where s/he stays and s/he should bear the trio of “author-message-target reader” in mind. However, translation is a process in which the translator is also involved. So, s/he is as closely involved in this process as the author. The way his style is closer to the source culture or to the target culture (that is, the culture from which s/he comes); his/her education (which culture s/he has a full command of); to what extent s/he is attached to both his/her and the author’s norms are directly involved in the translation process. Knowing them can help the critic with his/her task. Translation is a process in which linguistic and literary acts are transferred within a cultural context. As there cannot be two same languages or cultures, the translator can encounter with a set of problems so his/her strategies to overcome these problems cannot be disregarded by the critic.

Another important part here is the text type. Since a text which has a literary value can be different from a technical text, they will be translated with different translation methods even though both of them are penned by the same author. The text with literary value can be translated with free-translation method while the translation of a technical text can require a more faithful or a literal translation method.

The differences text types and the ways of translation brought along the practice of translation criticism but unlike the criticism of literature, the translation criticism has not developed as an art. In daily and weekly periodicals, there are bulks of criticisms on translations. They are not actually “criticisms” in the strict sense because critics usually judge translations with some stereotyped phrases such as “successful”, “well translated”, “reads like the original” or they hunt errors and conclude that “it is a poor translation which is full of mistakes”. Without reference to explicit criteria, those judgements do not go beyond personal tastes. It is easy to speak two languages and to discuss the errors and to correct them with the help of dictionaries in order to criticize a translated work but it also undermines the quality of the work.

“In addition, such judgements have often appeared, and continue to appear, in forms not specifically identified as evaluative, such as translators’ prefaces and annotations, complimentary poems and essays about the work of other translators, scholarly writing about translation theory and practice, and appraisals embedded in fictional

commentary” (Maier, 1998: 206). Those judgements which stem from the lack of some standard criteria seem insufficient.

Thus, objectivity is required for translation criticism. Katherina Reiss argues that “objective translation criticism is ‘verifiable’ , that is, it is clearly explained and verified with examples” (Reiss, 2000: 4). Reiss also adds the fact that “this process opens an opportunity for examining the background of the passage, of placing it in a broader context, and determining possible causes of error” (Reiss, 2000: 4).

The translation theories underwent a great change after the 1970s. Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury in Israel, Jirí Levy, Anton Popovic and František Miko in Czech Republic, James Holmes, Raymond van den Broeck, André Lefevere and José Lambert from Benelux countries have become the founders of the descriptive understanding which will gain a new perspective to translation studies so that the translation criticism could emerge.

Raymond van den Broeck, whose translation criticism model will shed light on this thesis, has made a great contribution to the translation criticism field by putting it on a scientific ground. Before him, translation criticism used to cross some shallow and not objective expressions such as “the translation reflects the source text” or “much better than the original” people’s minds. Translation studies researchers who were aware of the fact focused on how and to what extent translation criticism should be, and “A. Popovic (1973, 1976), W. Wills (1974, 1977, 1982), K. Reiss (1971), W. Koller (1979) were among these researchers” (Göktürk, 1998: 92) who made great contributions to translation criticism studies like Raymond van den Broeck.

It is easy to conclude that criticism, like translation, is a long and painful process as creating the artifact itself. But why would someone undertake such a hard job? Muharrem Tosun answers this question in the following manner:

The reader may not enjoy and appreciate what the author has done. A critical work can reverse the situation and help the reader better understand and appreciate what the author has been endeavoring for. Moreover, it reveals various points and facts about the artifact (2013: 26).

Folklore within translation studies seems to be an intact field. It was the end of the 1960s when the manuscript and the translations of riddles in *Bilmece: A Corpus of*

Turkish Riddles which is the source book of this thesis. It should be additionally noted that the translators are not professional. That is, they are not actually translators but scholars in Turkish Studies whose aim is to introduce Turkish folklore to the Western world. Turkish folk riddles have not been translated into English since then. With this thesis which is on the translation criticism of Turkish folk riddles, the readers can appreciate what these scholars endeavoured for and it can also reveal various facts for new translations in the future.

2.2. DESCRIPTION OF RAYMOND VAN DEN BROECK'S MODEL OF TRANSLATION CRITICISM

In this thesis, Erzurum riddles and their translations will be analysed according to Raymond van den Broeck's model of translation criticism that he proposed in his paper *Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism: A Model of Analytic Function* published in 1985. Before the analysis, the model will be explained. Broeck's paper has three pillars and these pillars will be illuminated one by one:

4. The need for a systemic model; 2. The comparative analysis of the source and the target texts; 3. From text structures to systems of texts; 4. The critical norm confronted with the translational norm (Broeck, 1985: 54-60).

Objective translation criticism is free of the critic's personal judgements and there are various factors in this process. According to Broeck, "recent developments on translation criticism for making it a more objective and systemic process are due to the contributions of Eastern European scholars, Jiri Levy, Frantisek Miko, Anton Popovic and Dionyz Durisin" (1985: 54).

Unlike Western practices, Eastern European translators' social status is ensured by the translators' organizations, training and publication facilities so translation criticism can develop. However, the situation in the West is different as Broeck states that:

Unlike most Eastern European countries, ... the countries in the West do little or nothing in order to ensure the social status of their translators. As a consequence, translation criticism (so far as it exists) and, more particularly, the reviewing of translations, is left to a random set of publicists, ranging

from philologists and literary critics familiar with the source language and literature to translators from the same or related languages. Nearly all of them are amateurs in the field of translation studies, and hence translation criticism is amateurish (1985: 54-55).

From the above reference, it is clear that translation criticism in the West is in the hands of various people from various jobs who are not professional critics themselves. In Turkey, translation works have been standardized by columnists in newspaper book supplements for a long time. However, there are recent developments in this field in Turkey. For example, Bilkent University initiated interdisciplinary graduate programs under the Department of Turkish Literature where students from different language and literature departments are welcomed. The curriculums include various courses on critical approaches and a number of theses on translation criticism have been published. But translation criticism has not reached to its standardization in Turkey yet.

In Raymond van den Broeck's view, passing clear judgements on a translated work without giving a clear and detailed account of the source and the target texts by taking the author(s) and the translator(s) into account, along with error hunting is amateurish and this is how translation criticism is carried out especially in the Western countries. The contrary cannot be asserted for Turkey. Philologist, translator and also a critic Akşit Göktürk argues that "Turkish critics approach translated texts with some positive judgements such as 'reads well', 'faithful to the source text', 'fluent' or with some negative judgements" (1998: 105).

After evaluating the situation of translation criticism, Broeck himself proposes a model of translation criticism and reviewing. But first of all, he remarks that it is, on the one hand, an optimum model based on the assumption that the critic will keep in view both "the original act of communication and that of metacommunication, on the other hand, it is incomplete as it is based only on the analytic function of translation criticism, which is apart from postulative and operative functions described by Anton Popovic" (Broeck, 1985: 55).

The purpose of this model is the comparative analysis of the source and the target texts in which the structures and the systems of texts are involved. At this point, Broeck suggests that the critic's norms and the translator's norms need to be distinguished, and he states that:

His (the critic's) evaluation should take account not only of the translator's poetic but also of the translational method adopted by the translator in view of the specific target audience envisaged, and of the options and policies followed in order to attain his purpose. The final outcome of this confrontation will be the reviewer's critical account (1985: 56).

In the light of the above reference, it can be understood that judgements without any reasons or any foundations such as "well-translated" or "bad translation because of a lot errors" will be invalid because the purpose of this criticism is to draw attention to the translations of Erzurum riddles.

As for the comparative analysis of source and target texts, Raymond van den Broeck often indicates in his article that "it is a source text based model and its purpose is to establish between the source and the target texts the factual equivalence by which the critic will prove whether the source and the target texts are functionally relatable to each other" (1985: 57). The occurrence of shifts of expression needs to be taken into account. Broeck refers to the two main classifications of shifts of expression such as "optional shifts" and "obligatory shifts". "Optional shifts" and "obligatory shifts" are similar to the distinction which was made by Popovic as "constitutive shifts" and "individual shifts".

According to Popovic, "all that appears as new with respect to the original, or fails to appear where it might have been expected, may be interpreted as a shift" (quoted in Maier, 1998: 228). "Optional shifts stem from the translator's norms which are adopted for creating a more acceptable text for the target text reader while obligatory shifts stem from the target linguistic and cultural limitations, which will not prevent the adequacy of the target text" (Broeck, 1985: 57).

After this preliminary explanation, Raymond van den Broeck explains his three-step model in detail:

1. A textemic analysis of the source text, leading to the formulation of the adequate translation, viz. the specification of the source text in terms of textemes. This analysis comprises every textual level on which linguistic and extra-linguistic elements obtain functional relevance. It includes phonic, lexical and syntactic components, language varieties, figures of rhetoric, narrative and poetic structures, elements of text convention (text sequences, punctuation, italicizing, etc.), thematic elements, and so on. It goes without saying that certain aspects, relating to the hierarchical structuration of the

various textual components and their interrelationships, should be given priority.

2. A comparison of the target text elements corresponding to these textemes, taking into account the various shifts (or deviations) with respect to the source text. The identification of correspondences will, of course, benefit from the methods and insights of contrastive linguistics and stylistics.

3. A generalizing description of the differences between the actual target text / source text equivalence and the adequate translation, on the basis of the comparison of the textemes. This description will state the factual degree or type of equivalence between the TT and ST (1985:58).

In the first step, Broeck touches upon “adequate translation” which was described by Gideon Toury as “a reconstruction of source text textemes and consists of an explicitation of the textual relations and functions of the source text” (quoted in Maier, 1998: 230). “Adequate translation” will not be an actual text but it will consist of the most textual possessions of the source text. In the second step, “deviations” or “shifts of expression” are handled. Distances from the adequacy between the source and the target texts will be “deviations” or “shifts of expression”. In the third step, the factual degree is mentioned. If both the source and the target texts are functionally relatable to each other, it means that the final product reached to the factual equivalence.

Broeck’s model is related to dealing with “hows” and “whys” of translated texts. As various elements ranging from the translator’s options to the constraints under which s/he has to work influence the end product, everything in this process must be described by asking those questions. Thus, error hunting is not a part of this model.

In the final point, Raymond van den Broeck touches upon the functions of translations in accordance with translators initial choices:

Translations can be either intended to function as if they were original texts in the target literary system, and thus acceptable to the prevailing literary taste; or they can be meant as adequate renderings of their sources, irrespective of the aesthetic norms of the target system; or they can occupy a position somewhere in between these two extremes (1985: 61).

Raymond van den Broeck proposes a detailed model. As he himself states, it is an ideal model and it is not possible to include each element of all of these categories. In accordance with this model, there should be information about the author, the translator, the source text and the target text before the analysis. As riddles are anonymous, Erzurum district and its linguistic peculiarities on phonological level were mentioned

instead of a specific author. The riddles which were analysed below were borrowed from the book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* prepared by İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze (1973). The book consists of riddles from various places in Turkey and they were compiled from different authors' works. Erzurum riddles were collected from Lütfullah Sami Akalın's and İlhan Başgöz's works in this book. After giving detailed information about them, the book was mentioned. The translations were done by Andreas Tietze but Akalın's riddles were translated by Pertev Naili Boratav. So, the readers could find information about the lives and the studies of those scholars.

2.3. ERZURUM REGION AND ITS LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES ON PHONOLOGICAL LEVEL

Erzurum which used to be named as "Theodosiopolis" is located both in Eastern Anatolia and in Eastern Black Sea Region and it has important trade and military routes. Moreover, it has rich streams which feed fertile plains that enable agriculture and stock raising. The geographical characteristics of Erzurum have attracted a number of immigrations since ancient times. However, immigrations have also been stimulated by the city's proximity to Eastern countries and by the wars that occurred in this region. As a consequence, a cultural mosaic which has affected its conservative customs and traditions and also the dialect has been shaped.

Studies and collections that have been made on Erzurum dialect date back to 1942. One of these works belongs to Ahmet Caferoğlu with his book entitled *Doğu İllerimiz Ağzlarından Toplamalar* (1942). Selahattin Olcay stated that "these studies have proven that Erzurum dialect is a mixture of Turkmen and Azeri dialects but it also carries the dialectical characteristics of Kilis and Besni"(1995: 13). Olcay has later added that: "It is not possible to find an exact equivalent of Erzurum dialect because Eastern Anatolian dialects have melded and they have various effects on each other by reason of wars and other conflicts" (1995: 18).

The thesis touched on Erzurum dialect and its culture in a more detailed way while analyzing the riddles. However, as an introduction to Erzurum dialect, it could be pointed out that the key feature of Erzurum dialect lies in the phonology. The following

changes could be observed in its phonology such as: kimse – çisme, gitti – cetti, almak – almah.

2.4. LÜTFULLAH SAMİ AKALIN, THE COMPILER OF ERZURUM RIDDLES

Lütfullah Sami Akalın was born on 2 November 1924, in İstanbul. He started working as a teacher at Erzurum High School and then at Istanbul High School after he had graduated from the Department of Turkish Language and Literature at Ankara University. He continued serving as an academician at the Necati Bey Institute of Education. In 1968, he completed his doctorate thesis on *Dede Korkut Kitabı'nın Folklor Bakımından Değerlendirilmesi* (*An Evaluation of Dede Korkut's Book from the Aspect of Folklore*). In 1982, he started working at Boğaziçi University where he became assistant professor of folklore in 1984.

Here is a list of his works: *Halid Ziya* (Halid Ziya, 1953), *Mehmet Rauf* (Mehmet Rauf, 1953), *Erzurum Bilmeceleri* (The Riddle's of Erzurum, 1954), *Japon Şiiri* (Japanese Poetry, 1962), *Çin Şiiri* (Chinese Poetry, 1964), *Edebiyat Terimleri Sözlüğü* (Dictionary of Literature Terms, 1966), *Dede Korkut Kitabı'nın Folklor Bakımından Değerlendirilmesi* (Evaluation of Dede Korkut's Book from the Point of Aspect of Folklore, chapters in his doctorate thesis, 1968), *Türk Manileri* (Turkish Ditties, 2 Volume, 1972), *İnsan Türü* (The Human Species, dramatic poem, 1974), *Hint Şiiri* (Indian Poetry, 1977), *Zenci Şiiri* (Black Poetry, 1979), *Işık'tan Atatürk'e* (From Light to Atatürk, 1981), *İnsan Boyutları* (Dimensions of Man, dramatic poem, 1981), *İnsanın Ne Olduğu Konusunda* (On What the Human Is, 1988).

(<http://www.kultur.gov.tr/EN,37119/akalin-lutfullah-sami.html>) Retrieved on: May 4, 2015

2.5. İLHAN BAŞGÖZ, THE COMPILER OF ERZURUM RIDDLES

Ilhan Başgöz was born in 1921, in Sivas. He graduated from Ankara University, Faculty of Language, History and Geography, Department of Turkish Language and Literature

in 1945. He served as a research assistant under Pertev Naili Boratav. Upon the dischargement of Pertev Naili Boratav, Başgöz was appointed to Tokat High School in 1952. Then, he started giving lessons at Indiana University in the United States of America. He was granted the title of professor in 1975.

His works can be listed as follows: *Doğu Anadolu'da Folklor Denemeleri* (1947), *Türk Halk Edebiyatı* (1952), *İzahlı Türk Edebiyatı Antolojisi* (1956), *Manilerimizden* (1957), *Köroğlu* (1957), *Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Eğitim* (1968), *Turkish Folklore* (1971), *Bilmece: A. Corpus of Turkish Riddles* (A. Tietze ile, 1973), *Karacaoğlan* (1977), *Studies in Turkish in Folklore* (1978), *Çıt Etti Çiçek Açtı* (1979), *Âşık Ali İzzet Özkan-Yaşamı, Sanatı, Şiirleri* (1979), *Folklor Yazıları* (1986), *Yunus Emre: Araştırma ve Şiirlerinden Güldeste* (1990), *Vay Başıma Gelenler* (1993), *Türk Bilmeceleri* (2 cilt, 1993), *Geçmişten Günümüze Nasrettin Hoca* (1999).

(<http://www.kulturelbellek.com/ilhan-basgozun-ozgecmisi-ve-yayinlari/>) Retrieved on May 15, 2015.

2.6. BİLMECE: A CORPUS OF TURKISH RIDDLES, THE SOURCE BOOK

The source book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* was issued on October 30, 1973. Its manuscript was completed in 1968. It consists of nine chapters as preface, introduction, bibliography, the riddles, index of Turkish riddle answers, index of the last word of the riddles, index of the riddle ideas, glossary and page finder.

The authors İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze mention the preparation of the book; the translations and their purpose for such a study. As for the preparation of the book, all of the materials were collected by Pertev Naili Boratav, Wolfram Eberhard, Şükrü Elçin and İlhan Başgöz from independent books of riddles from all regions in Turkey. These materials were also composed of the previous collections of and works on riddles, and also the publications by People's Houses in 1930s and 1940s.

In the book, there are only riddles in Ottoman Turkish. They do not involve the ones in Turkic languages. In addition, it is noted that only folk riddles are included in this book.

Literary riddles are not involved. The arrangement of the riddles was done according to their answers, not to regions.

The translation of the book was started by Eberhard, continued and completed by Andreas Tietze; Akalın's material was translated by Pertev Naili Boratav. Even though there are many translators, all of them have a common translation strategy which is literal translation.

The purpose of the preparation of this book is to introduce Turkish riddles and Turkish folk literature to the West. For this reason, all of the riddles from each region in Turkey are included and there are 12,200 riddles of which Erzurum riddles constitute 831. However, this number diminished to 99 in this thesis as the translations of Erzurum riddles were analysed and criticised according to the challenges in the source text, to the strategies employed by the translator and to the problems arisen in the target text.

2.7. ANDREAS TIETZE, THE TRANSLATOR OF RIDDLES

Andreas Tietze was born in Venice, in 1914. He had his education at the Department of History and Oriental Languages, University of Venice. He carried out some studies in Turkey between 1935 and 1936. He submitted his doctoral dissertation in 1937. He lectured at several universities such as University of Istanbul, of Berkeley, of Venice and of Boğaziçi between 1938 and 1952.

His works are listed as follows: *Yakın Doğuda konuşulan Firenk dilleri* (1958), *Türk Edebiyatı Okuma Kitabı* (1964), *Kuman Bilmeceleri ve Türk Folkloru* (1966), *Tarihî ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugati* (2002).

(http://www.ufukotesi.com/habergoster.asp?haber_no=20040113) Retrieved on: April 28, 2015

2.8. PERTEV NAILI BORATAV, THE TRANSLATOR OF RIDDLES

Pertev Naili Boratav was born on September 2, 1907 in Bulgaria. After he had graduated from İstanbul High School in 1927, he was accepted to İstanbul University. In 1930, he graduated from the Department of Turkish Language and Literature. He served as a research assistant to Fuad Köprülü and worked in Konya High School and in Teaching School from 1932 to 1936. It was also the time when he started compiling various works of folk literature such as folk tales and epics from many regions in Anatolia. Then, he started studying in Germany and when he returned home in 1938, he started his studies at Ankara University. In 1941, he became an associate professor and published the periodical entitled *Yurt ve Dünya* with Behice Boran and Niyazi Berkes in which he penned some reviews and essays on folk culture and in 1946, he became a professor.

In 1983, he received Sedat Simavi Foundation Award for his book entitled *Folklor ve Edebiyat* and in 1998, he received Folklore Award from Truva Folklore Studies Foundation.

When his professorship chair of Folk Literature was abolished, he was discharged from the university. He continued to carry out his studies at Centre Nationale Recherche Scientifique in Paris where he died on March 16, 1998.

His most famous works can be listed as follows: *Köroğlu Destanı* (1931), *Folklor ve Edebiyat* (1939), *Halk Edebiyatı Dersleri - 1* (1942), *İzahlı Halk Şiiri Antolojisi* (1943), *Pir Sultan Abdal* (1943), *Folklor ve Edebiyat - 2* (1945), *Halk Hikâyeleri ve Halk Hikâyeciliği* (1946), *Zaman Zaman İçinde* (1958), *Az Gittik Uz Gittik* (1969), *100 Soruda Türk Halk Edebiyatı* (1969), *100 Soruda Türk Folkloru* (1973).

(<http://www.sozelti.com/pertevnaili.html>) Retrieved on May 15, 2015.

2.9. GIDEON TOURY'S NORMS: "ADEQUACY" AND "ACCEPTABILITY"

In his paper entitled "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation", Gideon Toury mentions norms which direct the translation activity. Toury accepts that translation

activity is constrained by certain socio-cultural facts: Toury remarks that “these extend far beyond the source text; the systemic differences between the languages and textual traditions involved in the act, or even the possibilities and limitations of the cognitive apparatus of the translator” (Toury, 2000: 199). Toury describes these constraints as two poles: “rules” and “idiosyncrasies”. However, there is another constraint which lies between these two poles, and it is called “norms”. While describing the former two poles in terms of norms, Toury states that “rules are more objective but idiosyncrasies are more subjective norms” (Toury, 2000: 199). Norms are opinions, values, and types of behaviors that are generally accepted and shared by a society. They impose some sanctions on individuals in the society and they are regarded as the key concepts of social order. As translation is an activity which is embedded in two cultures, Toury describes translation as “an activity which involves two sets of norm-systems” (Toury, 2000: 200). Involving norm-systems, translation has some values. Toury describes these values in the following manner:

1. Being a text in certain language, and hence occupying a position, or filling in a slot, in the appropriate culture, or in a certain section thereof;
2. Constituting a representation in that language/culture of another, preexisting text in some other language, belonging to some other culture and occupying a definite position within it (2000: 200).

From this statement, it can be concluded that translation contains two different sources which are distant from each other. Thus, a set of choices lies before the translator. On the one hand, the translator may apply a translation strategy by adhering to the source system norms. As Toury suggests:

If this stance is adopted, the translation will tend to subscribe to the norms of the source text, and through them also to the norms of the source language and culture. This tendency; which has often been characterized as the pursuit of adequate translation, may well entail certain incompatibilities with target norms and practices, especially those lying beyond the mere linguistic ones (Toury, 2000: 201).

Thus, if the source text norms are considered preeminent by the translator, s/he provides a translation within the boundaries of source language and culture, which is characterized as “adequate translation”. Some violations of target norms could be noticed in adequate translation.

On the other hand, the translator may apply a translation strategy by adhering to the target system norms. As Toury suggests:

If this stance is adopted, norms systems of the target culture are triggered and set into motion. Shifts from the source text would be an almost inevitable price. Thus, whereas adherence to source norms determines a translation's adequacy as compared to the source text, subscription to norms originating in the target culture determines its acceptability (Toury, 2000: 201).

In Toury's view, the more the norms of target language and culture are reflected in the translation, the more "acceptable" is the end product. However, the occurrence of shifts should not be confused with the adequacy or the acceptability of a text. According to Toury, "the occurrence of shifts has long been acknowledged as a true universal of translation and even the most adequacy-oriented translation involves shifts from the source text" (Toury, 2000: 201).

As this study attempted to find out whether the translator provided an adequate or an acceptable translation, the findings that would enable to draw a conclusion were supported by explanations and examples on four different levels in the following section.

2.10. THE APPLICATION OF RAYMOND VAN DEN BROECK'S MODEL OF TRANSLATION CRITICISM TO ERZURUM RIDDLES

According to Raymond van den Broeck's model, translation criticism is an objective act based on a systematic description. The description process starts from the comparative analysis of the source text and the target text. But this analysis should be based on source text because the target text is derived from the source text. Raymond van den Broeck proposes a three-stage model:

The first stage includes phonic, lexical and syntactic components, language varieties, figures of rhetoric, narrative and poetic structures, elements of text convention (text sequences, punctuation, italicizing, etc.), thematic elements, and so on; the second stage corresponds to the comparison of the source text and the target text regarding the shifts of expression (or the

deviations) in translation; the third stage states the differences between the source text and the target text, and adequate translation (Broeck, 1985: 58).

As this model was detailed, it was not possible to include all these categories while analysing Erzurum riddles. The comparison of the source text and the target text was made on four levels according to the categories set out by Raymond van den Broeck in the first step of his model by taking into consideration the most challenging riddles. Some categories might look new compared to Broeck's model. The four levels could be listed as follows: Language varieties (dialect and register); morphological components (emphatic reduplication, *m*-reduplication, doubling); phonological and lexical components (rhyme, onomatopoeia, neologism -non-sense words); semantic components (figurative language and other cultural elements). Here it should be noted that a new category entitled "semantic components" was opened given the fact that riddles were directly related to their answers and these answers were directly related to the culture. Unless the cultural items are hard to be rendered into the target system, there happen some semantic losses in the target language. Each category was defined and relevant examples from the source text and the target text were given under each category.

In the second stage, the elements in the target text were compared to those in the source text. Various deviations were considered and their names were taken from Geoffrey N. Leech's book entitled *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry* (1969).

In the third and the final stage, differences between the actual source text and target text equivalences were described that "stated the factual degree or type of equivalence between the target text and the source text" (Broeck, 1985: 58).

2.10.1. Language Varieties

"Language" is a general phenomenon but its varieties reflect its different manifestations. English, for instance, is a language originated from England which is spoken in many countries around the world and is used for global communication. But London English refers to a variety of English used only by the members of London. "What makes one variety of language different from another is the linguistic items that it includes, so a

variety of language may be defined as ‘a set of linguistic items with similar social distribution’” (Hudson, 1980: 24). In addition to London English, examples for varieties can be multiplied as: Swiss French, the English which is used in social media, Turkish spoken in İstanbul and in Erzurum.

What is included in the notion of “variety” can be listed as: languages, dialects and registers. In this thesis, under the category entitled “language varieties”, dialect and register are considered from various aspects with their definitions, their standings in the source text, and their translations in the target text.

2.10.1.1. Dialect

“The term ‘dialect’ was borrowed from Greek in the Renaissance” (Hudson, 1980: 31). Although there was confusion between the terms “language” and “dialect” at first, now there are clear distinctions between those two: First of all, language is wider than a dialect. For instance, one may refer to Turkish as a language because it is widely spoken from Europe to Asia but one may refer to Erzurum Turkish as a dialect because it is used only in this region. Another distinction between “language” and “dialect” is the existence of prestige and standardization in “language”. Linguistics scholar Nalan Büyükkantarcıoğlu in her article entitled “Language Varieties and Translation: A Sociolinguistic Perspective” explained the term “standard variety” elaborated by Dittmar and stated that:

Dittmar explains the *standard variety* as a legitimized and institutionalized supraregional form of communication that has gained superiority over the other dialects as a result of socio-political and power-political circumstances in time. Although no variety can be claimed to be communicatively less or more efficient than others, the standard variety is the one that has been recognised as the most prestigious due to cultural, political, educational, commercial or other social and intellectual reasons in the historical process. Standard varieties are the codified and stabilised varieties. In other words, the “correct” written and spoken forms prescribed in dictionaries or grammar books are identified with the features of the standard variety. It is the *King’s or Queen’s English* in Britain, *le bon français* in France, or the *İstanbul Türkçesi* in Turkey (1999: 69).

Taking this statement into consideration, the terms “Standard English” and “Standard Turkish” along with “Erzurum dialect” are often mentioned in this study. Since this study is about Erzurum riddles, the riddles which were once uttered with Erzurum dialect and their translations into English are analysed.

Here is a table which gives some clues about Erzurum dialect:

Erzurum dialect	Standard Turkish	English
Alma	Elma	Apple
Ağu	1. Tuzlu, 2. Zehir	1. Salty, 2. Poison
Bekmes	Pekmez	Molasses
Eke	Büyük	Big
Eze	Teyze	Aunt
Oğrı/Oğrun	1. Hırsız, 2. Gizlice	1. Thief, 2. Secretly
Yelim	Hafif	Light
Yumak	Yıkamak	To wash

The above examples in the Erzurum dialect column are parallel to the old Turkish as meaning and form. The examples are taken from http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/1326676523_41_AkanBudak%20Dilek_S-629-646.pdf, retrieved on December 27, 2014. As in the examples of “alma” and “bekmes”, there are only sound differences between standard Turkish and Erzurum dialect. However, “eke”, “eze”, “yelim” and “yumak” show that members of Erzurum dialect denote some things in a different way. “Ağu” and “oğrı/oğrun” convey the preservation of words borrowed from old Turkish. Moreover, people have attributed two close meanings to a single word.

Erzurum dialect cannot be limited only to old Turkish. Related to regional immigrations, Erzurum dialect was affected by Azeri Turkish, Armenian and Russian. As mentioned above, those effects could be seen easily because the form and thus the sound, and even the meaning of the words change. Hence, there are striking differences between standard Turkish and Erzurum dialect.

Rephrasing a dialectal expression with another dialect in the same language is difficult or sometimes impossible so grasping the same dialectal expression in another language seems to be difficult for every translator because besides being a notion on word level, dialect is also a historical, cultural and geographical notion. Finding equivalence for each of these points and reflecting them in the target language is not possible. A translator, who wants to create the soul of the source text in the target text, might practice some strategies. The examples will be provided below.

As for the peculiarities of Erzurum dialect, the sounds in some words are pronounced differently than in Standard Turkish. People replace the sounds with other sounds. Sound, something that one can hear in a word, is separated into two as “vowels” and “consonants”. Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary defines “consonants” as: “1. A speech sound made by completely or partly stopping the flow of air being breathed out through the mouth. 2. A letter of the alphabet that represents a consonant sound, for example ‘b’, ‘c’, ‘d’, ‘f’” (Hornby and Wehmeier, 2005: 311). Compared to “consonants”, “vowels” represent “a, e, i, o, u”. In the following lines, the replacements of consonants in Erzurum riddles are separated into three parts and their translations are provided.

Replacement of the first consonant

While the initial consonant of some words is /k/ in Standard Turkish, it undergoes a change and turns into /g/ according to Erzurum dialect. Here are the riddles in which that change can be observed and their translations:

K>G

- Yol üstünde, gara düğüm (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 75).

“Gara” is an example for the tendency of changing consonants in Erzurum dialect. In Standard Turkish, its form is “kara”.

Here is the translation:

On the road, a black knot (Akalin, ans: Ant) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 75).

“Gara” was translated as “black” and there is not a tendency for using a dialect in the target text.

- Guyruhsuz kedi, miyav miyav dedi (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 85).

“Guyruhsuz” is the changed form of “kuyruksuz” according to Erzurum dialect. “Kuyruk” means “tail” and as it can be easily seen, not only the first consonant /k/ changed and became /g/ but also the last consonant /k/ changed and became /h/.

Here is the translation:

The cat without a tail said, “Miaw, miaw” (Akalın, ans: Automobile) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 85).

Turkish is an agglutinative language, which makes use of suffixes. As English is not agglutinative, more words are needed for transmitting the suffixes. As in this example, the translator does not have a choice here and “without” is needed. However, the dialectal characteristic of the source text is not seen in the target text as “guyruhsuz” was translated as “without a tail”.

- O tarafı gaya, bu tarafı gaya; atladım bindim sarı taya (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 207).

“Gaya” is the changed form of “kaya” with Erzurum dialect.

Here is the translation:

On that side rocks, on this side rocks. I mounted the yellow colt (Akalın, ans: Churn) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 207).

“Rocks” which is the translation of “gaya” and which is a Standard English word shows the lack of dialect in the target text.

- Bir gutum var / iki türlü otum var / biri ak, biri gara (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 305).

In Standard Turkish, “gutu” should be “kutu” and “gara” should be “kara”. The source text shows another example of how /k/ turns into /g/ in Erzurum dialect.

Here is the translation:

I have a box, I have two kinds of herb, one is white, one is black (Akalın, ans: Eye) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 305).

With “box” and “black”, the target text excludes the dialect.

- Eğri ağaçda gar durmaz (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 353).

“Gar” is another example for the words in Erzurum dialect. Its standard form is “kar”.

Here is the translation:

No snow remains on a crooked tree (Akalın, ans: Goat’s horn) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 353).

The use of “snow” in the target text without a change shows that dialect was ignored again.

- Garadır, gatan değil; sarıdır, safran değil; ganatlıdır, guş değil; boynuzludur, goç değil (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 366).

This riddle is rich in dialectal words. Although it is “kara” in Standard Turkish, it is “gara” in Erzurum dialect; “katran” turned into “gatan”; “kanat” became “ganat”; “kuş” was expressed as “guş”; and “koç” was transformed into “goç” in line with Erzurum dialect.

Here is the translation:

Black, but not tar; yellow but not saffron; has wings but is no bird; has horns but is no ram (Akalın, ans: Grasshopper) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 366).

“Gara” was translated as “black”; “gatan” was translated as “tar”; “ganat” was translated as “wings”; “guş” was translated as “bird” and “goç” was translated as “ram”. All these examples prove the fact that the target text lacks the dialectal richness of the source text.

- Gildan ince, gılıçtan keskin (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 667).

In the source text, the expressions of “gıl” and “gılıç” are examples for the change of the consonants in Erzurum dialect; in Standard Turkish, they are “kıl” and “kılıç”.

Here is the translation:

Thinner than a hair and sharper than a sword (Akalın, ans: The Sirat Bridge)
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 667).

The translation shows that dialect lost: “gıl” was translated as “hair” and “gılıç” as “sword” into Standard English.

While the initial consonant of some words is /g/ in Standard Turkish, it is altered in /k/ according to Erzurum dialect. Here are the riddles in which this alteration can be seen and the translations:

G>K

- Zer kimidir gömleği/sevindirir çömleği (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 546).

In this riddle, the dialectal word is “kimi”. The example “kimi” lexically seems a bit ambiguous even to the source language speakers. In Turkish, “kim” or “kimi” means “who” but with different suffixes the meaning can change. For example, when one adds the suffix “den” at the end of “kim”, it becomes “kimden” and it means “from who” or “whom”. And when one adds the suffix “leri” at the end of “kimi”, it becomes “kimileri” and it means “some people”. “Kim” always signifies a person. If the one who speaks only Standard Turkish glances at the source text, s/he may get confused by this part of the riddle. Considering the general meaning, s/he can guess that “kimi” doesn’t signify a person here. But it is hard for a Turkish learner to make such a guess. In the source text, “kimi” represents “gibi” which is used as a preposition to describe things. The consonant /g/ becomes /k/ and /b/ becomes /m/ and it is an outstanding example for Erzurum dialect.

Here is the translation:

Its shirt is like goldleaf; it pleases the pot (Akalın, ans: Onion) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 546).

In the translation, it is seen that “kimi” is given as “like” which is the English equivalent of “gibi”.

- Güneş öğünden geçer, kölge bırakmaz (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 808).

In this example, “kölge” represents “gölge” in Standard Turkish.

Here is the translation:

It passes before the sun but it does not cast a shadow (Akalin, ans: Wind) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 808).

“Kölge” was translated as “shadow”. “Gölge” and “shadow” are equivalent as it can be seen in each of the Turkish-English dictionary. If the target reader is already familiar with the substitutions of sounds in Erzurum dialect, s/he can understand what the word “kölge” represents and what it means.

D>T

When the initial consonant of some words is /d/ in Standard Turkish, it changes according to Erzurum dialect and turns into /t/.

- Bir enterim var altmış iki parçadan, onu biçen tiken terziye eyvallahımı demişem (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 162).

Here is the translation:

I have a garment made of sixty-two pieces. I said “Thank you!” to the tailor who cut and sewed it (Akalin, ans: Cabbage) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 162).

Another negligence of dialect occurs in this riddle with the verb “tiken” and its translation into English as “sew”. “To sew” is the Standard English meaning of the verb “dikmek”.

- Benim bir avuç hediğim var, dağdan yuvarladım, daşdan yuvarladım, ne güvecim gırlıdı, ne hediğim töküldü (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 593).

In Erzurum dialect, the first consonant /d/ becomes /t/. While in standard Turkish it is “dökmek”, in Erzurum dialect it is “tökmek”.

Here is the translation:

I have a handful of boiled wheat. I made it roll over mountains and rocks. The pot has not been broken nor has my wheat been scattered (Akalin, ans: Pomegranate) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 593).

The verb “tökülmek” is a passive verb. The English equivalent for this verb is “to scatter”. In its translation, the verb “scatter” was given in its passive form as it was in the source text. Here it could be said that the grammatical equivalence between the source text and the target text was established but dialect was neglected.

Replacement in the inner consonant

In Erzurum dialect, the inner consonants are replaced by other consonants. The below examples were provided to show that when the inner consonant is /ğ/ (/uɣ/) according to Standard Turkish, it is converted to /g/.

Ğ>G

- Direkten galın, degenekten yencilek (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 87).

In this riddle, the dialectal word is “degenek”. Its Standard Turkish form is “değnek”.

Here is the translation:

Thicker than a beam, lighter than a stick (Akalm, ans: Bagpipe) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 87)

In Standard Turkish, the word “değnek” is used for “stick” in English. The example given shows that people using Erzurum dialect say “degenek” for “stick”. Consistent with the general translation method of translators, “degenek” was given as “stick” in a standard form, which lacks dialectal characteristics of the source text. However, “yencilek” is an excellent example for Erzurum dialect. It is not a formal word that can be found in a standard monolingual Turkish dictionary. Lütfullah Sami Akalm gives the Turkish meaning of the word in his work entitled *Erzurum Bilmeceleri*. At the end of the book, Akalm provided a dictionary. According to the dictionary, “‘yencilek’ means ‘hafif’” (Akalm, 1954: 112). With his fruitful study that he carried out with his students in the region, it is understood that in daily life only local people use this word. “Hafif” means “light”. In the source text, the suffix at the end of “degenek”, i.e. “degenekten”, shows that there is a comparative form in this sentence. In the target text this form was given perfectly with “light + er”.

“In their study, Başgöz and Tietze try to introduce the tradition of Turkish folk riddle to the western world although they claim no perfection in the translations” (Yetkiner, 1996: 72). When the target reader who will read the translations of the riddles meets this riddle, s/he will not be able to find the spirit of Erzurum and of its dialect in this translation. Apparently, it is difficult to find equivalence while conserving the same

spirit. But an explanation by the translator could have been provided with a footnote. Or, another meaning from an urban dictionary could have been used.

- Bir eşşeğe yükledim zahrayı, yolladım degirmana. Hepsi girdi, guyruğu girmede (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 708).

In this riddle, “degirman” is the dialectical word, its Standard Turkish form is “değirmen”.

Here is the translation:

I loaded wheat on an ass. I sent it to the mill. Everything entered except the tail (Akalin, ans: Spoon) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 708)

In the source text, “degirman” means “değirmen” which is “mill” in English. As there aren’t any other options for “mill”, the translator doesn’t have a choice here.

As Erzurum dialect is nourished and affected by different roots, the last consonants are pronounced differently than they are in standard Turkish. The examples were provided below.

Replacement in the last consonant

Like the initial and the inner consonants, the last consonants of words also change according to Erzurum dialect. The following riddles were chosen to show that while the last consonants of some words is /k/ in the Standard Turkish, they become /h/ according to Erzurum dialect.

K>H

- Ayılmışdır, bayılmaz. Teli çohtur, sayılmaz. Şavkı aleml büümüş (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 346).

In this riddle, the example for the dialect is “çohtur”. “Çoh” in the source text means “çok”.

Here is the translation:

Has recovered, will faint no more. Has much hair that cannot be counted. Its glamour envelops the world (Akalin, ans: Fur coat) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 346)

“Çok” is a determiner that shows a large amount of something. “Much” that means “çok” in English has the same definition and is used for the same purpose but it does not convey any charges to the target text reader.

- Sabahdan gahdım, aynıya bahdım (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 808).

In this riddle, the dialectal words are “gahdım” and “bahdım”. The source text provides two examples of replacement of the last consonants for the reader. Firstly, the infinitive form of “gahdım” is “gahmak” but it isn’t used officially in daily life. It represents the verb “kalkmak”. Secondly, the infinitive form of “bahdım” is “bahmak” and it signifies the formal verb “bakmak”. As the explanation proves, the common point of these verbs is the change of the consonant /k/ to /h/.

Here is the translation:

I got up in the morning, I looked into the mirror. (Akalm, ans: Window)
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 808)

The literal translation does not prove any replacements of the consonants because “gahdım” was translated as “I got up” and “bahdım” was translated as “I looked into”. The following riddle was chosen to show that while the last consonant of some words is /k/ in the Standard Turkish, it becomes /ğ/ according to Erzurum dialect.

K>Ğ

- Ağ odada sarı gelin (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 419).

The example for the change of consonant in this riddle is “ağ”. Its Standard Turkish form is “ak”.

Here is the translation:

A yellow bride in a white room. (Akalm, ans: Lamp) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 419)

In the source text, the word “ağ” does not seem problematic because in Standard Turkish “ağ” means “net”. Actually, it is a very good example for showing the richness of Turkish language. Here “ağ” is not used for its first meaning. It is another example of

dialecticism: “Ağ” means “ak” and it is the synonym of “white”. As there isn’t a synonym for his color, translator had to use only “white”. But still, the dialectal and phonetic structures of the source text are lost in the target text.

Until here, a set of striking examples have been supplied to show the dialectal differences between the source text and the target text. The number of examples can be increased. But these examples prove that the dialect of the source text deviates in the expressions of the target text.

“Poets use dialecticism for a number of purposes ranging from reflecting a flavor of rustic naivety to depicting a life style through the dialect of a particular society” (Leech, 1969: 49). This issue raises a big question: Can a dialect be translated? Dialect is the person’s identity. It carries some implications of person’s life in it: Where is s/he from?, where does s/he live?, how is her/his educational background?. Some clues can be caught for these questions from a person’s dialect. “Disregarding these implications in translation in general would mean underestimating the functional and social role of language” (Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 1999: 70). What can be understood from the statements of scholar Büyükkantarcıoğlu is that dialect can be translated. However, the basic problem is to decide which dialect in the target language should be chosen. Büyükkantarcıoğlu attracts the reader’s attention to this problem as follows:

The basic problem for the translator is to make a decision on which TL dialect to use. We all know that cultural and linguistic asymmetry between languages makes this decision a hard task. The marked SL dialect may not have an equally marked TL dialect. Catford mentions the possibility of the selection of geographically equivalent dialect; that is, “the selection of a dialect related to the same part of the country in a geographical sense”. If, for example, the SL dialect is of a south-eastern, then, one of the TL south-eastern dialects may be taken as equivalent. This consideration is rather problematic. If the translator tries to give the effect of the Scottish dialect by the accentual or lexical features of the speakers in the Black Sea region in Turkey, the result can hardly be a success. However, a careful consideration of regional human characteristics in the target culture may lead the translator to the selection of another geographical dialect whose speakers display similar, if not identical, characteristics with the speakers in the SL dialect (1999: 71).

However, according to Ivana Tomešová (1998: 3) “it is impossible to transfer local language features into another language because regional dialect is too closely

connected with the region where it is spoken” (http://www.phil.muni.cz/~jirka/children/children1/kipling/tomesova_stalky.rtf) (Retrieved on February 20, 2015). Erzurum is in the heart of Eastern Anatolia where there is a mosaic of cultures and languages. Taking all the characteristics of Erzurum and its dialect, the translator had a difficulty in reflecting the spirit of dialectal expressions in the target text and translated them into Standard English. That is why, dialect deviates in the translations and “dialectal deviation” is one of Geoffrey N. Leech’s “deviation” categories.

Before passing to “register”, it should be reminded that “dialect” and “register” are two terms which are widely confused. The examples were provided after the definition of the term below.

2.10.1.2. Register

“The term ‘register’ is widely used in sociolinguistics to refer to ‘varieties according to use’, in contrast to dialects, defined as ‘varieties according to user’” (Hudson, 1980: 48). Register is determined by the purpose, occasion or the audience. It mirrors many things related to the speaker from the society in which s/he lives to her/his education.

However, “language is never used in a vacuum: it is always used in a certain situation. In different cultures a specific use of language is considered appropriate (or inappropriate) in a specific situation” (Lefevere, 1992: 58). Here is a striking riddle and its translation to convey this inappropriateness:

- Küçük Arap goca gavağa sıçrar (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 335).

According to the source text, in the riddle, a parallel was drawn between “Arap” and “flea” which is the answer of this riddle.

Here is the translation:

The little Negro leaps on the giant poplar (Akalin, ans: Flea) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 335).

This riddle raises an issue. Turkish people call every black living being “Arab”. In this riddle, while expressing flea, the riddler used “Arab”. Some say it grows out of racism but it is not certain whether racism is deeply rooted in Turkish literature or not. However, the usage of the word “negro” in the target text as an equivalent of “Arab” in the source text seems problematic. There are two possible reasons why the translator chose this word: The translator regarded the usage of “Arab” to define flea as racism and wanted to render this understanding into English-speaking culture; or the translator thought that the word “Arab” would seem a bit far from Western culture and chose “Negro”, a more familiar term. What is problematic is that the target culture objects to this word as it has been associated with the history when African Americans have been treated as slaves and discriminated. That’s why the translator’s choice is not favorable here and it caused “deviation of register”. Geoffrey N. Leech (1969) argues that “the deviation of register” is “a new invention that poets have exploited with an unprecedented audacity” (50). So, it can be said that the renderings of register above prove how it deviates in the target text.

In this part of the thesis, the comparison between the source text and the target text was made on the level of “language varieties”. “Language varieties” was elaborated on the basis of two sub-categories as “dialect” and “register”. Under the first sub-category which is entitled “dialect”, literal translation caused “dialectal deviation” as the translator did not apply the replacements of sounds in the target text. Under the second sub-category which is entitled “register”, the translator’s literal translation strategy and word choice caused a “deviation of register”. Under this sub-category, it was proven that no two languages operate the same way so an ordinary expression in one language might be inappropriate in another language.

At times when technology was not at the center of people’s lives, people gathered together to entertain themselves. They asked riddles to each other; if the riddlee couldn’t find the answer, s/he would have been punished but if s/he could, s/he would have been rewarded. The riddler who would be the riddlee next time, would give some clues but s/he would also use some traps to mislead the riddlee. In line with these purposes, the riddler would change the structure of the language completely; that change was sometimes on word level, sometimes on sound level or sometimes on

grammar level. In the next part, under “morphological components”, changes on word level in the source text and the way they were translated in the target text were analyzed.

2.10.2. Morphological Components

“Morphology is the study of morphemes, which are the smallest significant units of grammar” (Todd, 1987: 41). After sounds (vowels and consonants), the smallest unit of a sentence is the “word”. There is not a satisfactory definition for “word”. Loreto Todd isolates four of the most frequently implied meanings of “word”: “the orthographic word”, “the morphological word”, “the lexical word”, and “the semantic word” (1987: 49). An “orthographic word” is a word which has a space on its either side. So, the previous sentence has fourteen orthographic words. A “lexical word” consists of various forms of a word. For example, “give”, “gives”, “gave”, “given” are four different words but one lexical word. A “semantic word” involves different meanings of a word. For example, “can” has two distinctive meanings: one is “be able”; the other is “a metal container in which drink or food is put”. Thus, with these two meanings which are not closely related, “can” signifies two different semantic words. A “morphological word” is a unique form of a word. Taking the previous examples, “give”, “gives”, “gave”, “given” are one lexical word but they are four different morphological words. “Can” means “a metal container” and “cans” mean “more than one metal container”. Here, the meaning is the same so “can” and “cans” signify one semantic word. However, as the morphology considers only the form and not the meaning, “can” and “cans” are two morphological words.

In this part of the thesis, the main focus will be on the “words”. As it is impossible to analyze all of the riddles word-by-word, the reduplications in Erzurum riddles will be studied along with their translations.

2.10.2.1. Reduplications

“Reduplication is the repetition of a word or part of a word” (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 90). Göksel and Kerslake (2005) also mention “three types of reduplicative process in Turkish: 1. Emphatic reduplication; 2. *M*-reduplication; 3. Doubling” (90).

2.10.2.1.1. Emphatic reduplication

Emphatic reduplication is used for emphasizing the quality of an adjective:

temiz “clean” → *tertemiz* “very clean”

yeşil “green” → *yemyeşil* “very green”

yeni “new” → *yepyeni* “brand new”

In Turkish grammar, in emphatic reduplication, a prefix is added to an adjective. However, if the adjective begins with a vowel, the reduplicative consonant “p” is employed to attach the prefix to the adjective:

ak “white” → *a+p+ak* → *apak* “all white”

eski “old” → *e+p+eski* → *epeski* “very old”

If the stem begins with a consonant, the prefix consists of this consonant, the vowel following it and one of the reduplicative consonants “p”, “s”, “r” or “m”:

kuru “dry” → *ku+p+kuru* → *kupkuru* “bone dry”

mavi “blue” → *ma+s+mavi* → *masmavi* “deep blue”

temiz “clean” → *te+r+temiz* → *tertemiz* “clean as a pin”

düz “dümdüz” → *dü+m+düz* → *dümdüz* “absolutely straight”

And here are the examples from the riddles and their translations:

- Çarşıdan aldım kapkara / eve geldim kıpkırmızı (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 186).

“Kara” is an adjective in Turkish and it means “black”. The stem begins with consonant /k/ and the prefix comprises the same consonant and vowel too. And the reduplicative

consonant /p/ is used. The same model is applied on “kıpkırmızı”. “Kırmızı” is another adjective in Turkish and it means “red”.

Here is the translation:

I bought it in the market: quite black. I brought it home: quite red. (Akalın; Başgöz, ans: Charcoal) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 186).

In the target text, “kapkara” and “kıpkırmızı” were translated as “quite black” and “quite red”. In the definition aforementioned, it was mentioned that emphatic reduplication is used for emphasizing the quality of the adjective. So in Turkish, “kapkara” and “kıpkırmızı” have strong structures. But when one looks at the target text, s/he will see that these adjectives were given with the adverb “quite”. “Quite” means “fairly” or “very”. Although it is not wrong to use, it is not strong enough. For instance, rather than saying “quite black”, the expression “pitch black” could have been used. And instead of “quite red”, “bright red” could be used.

Whatever the translator’s choice is, a less or a more native choice, the grammatical differences between the source and the target languages reflect in the translation. While it is enough to use only one consonant to accentuate the quality of an adjective in Turkish, an extra adjective or an adverb for the same process is needed in English. That is, one morphological word in the source text needs to be transferred as two different morphological words to the target text. The translator does not have many options here.

- Yusuvarlah, tostoparlah, dışında bir kömleği, derisi abbah (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 545).

The reduplicated adjectives in this riddle are “yusuvarlah”, “tostoparlah” and “abbah”.

Here is the translation:

Wholly round, wholly roundish, has a shirt on his body, his skin is wholly white (Akalın, ans: Onion) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 545).

Again, another morphological difference between the source and the target text is seen. While it is possible only to use one word “yusuvarlah” (“yusuvarlak” in Standard Turkish) or “tostoparlah” (“tostoparlak” in Standard Turkish) to show something which is circular-shaped, an adverb is needed in English for the same process. “Abbah” is an

example for Erzurum dialect. Actually, it refers to “apak” in Standard Turkish which can be translated also as “snow-white”. The problematic part in this translation is seen in “wholly roundish”. In English, “ish” is added after an adjective to make it less definite. Using “wholly” and “ish” together do not accentuate the quality of the adjective in target language.

2.10.2.1.2. *m*-Reduplication

“The function of *m*-reduplication is to generalize the concept denoted by a particular word or phrase to include other similar objects, events or states of affairs” (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 91). In *m*-reduplication, a word or a phrase is repeated with a slight change. If this word or phrase begins with a vowel, the modifying consonant “m” is added before the repetition of it:

ayakkabı mayakkabı “shoes and the like”

ev mev “house and the like”

If the word or phrase begins with a consonant, this consonant is *replaced* by “m”:

bilgisayar milgisayar “computer(s) and the like”

kitap mitap “book and the like”.

Here are some examples from Erzurum riddles:

- Hilidi milidi/ dış kapının kilidi/ akşam size gelen kim idi? (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 670).

The *m*-reduplication in the source text seems ambiguous. Actually, “hilidi milidi” is not meaningful either in Standard Turkish or in Erzurum dialect: “Hilidi” was created by the riddler to sound like “kilidi” and “milidi” was the *m*-reduplication of “hilidi”.

Here is the translation:

Hilidi milidi, the lock of the outside door. Who was it that visited you last night? (Başgöz, ans: Sleep) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 670).

The translator did not substitute the meaningless expression “hilidi milidi” with a reduplication in English to sound like “door” so the choice of the translator seems more ambiguous than the source text.

- Finişli minişli, elimden uçdu, garşı dağda su içdi (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 221).

As it can be understood from the source text, “finişli minişli” was used to rhyme with “içdi”. “Minişli” is the *m*-reduplication of “finişli” and both of them are meaningless elements.

Here is the translation:

Has finiş and miniş, has slipped out of my hands and has gone to drink water on the mountain opposite (Akalin, ans: Cloud) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 221).

As “finiş” and “miniş” are meaningless, the translator who wished to be faithful to the source text left them as they are in the source text. However, he created a more meaningless expression because “has finiş and miniş” does not convey anything to the target language speaker. As he began with “Has”, it seems that he wanted to translate this part but leaving the reduplication untranslated is a violation of target text grammatical rules.

- Ay este meste, bülbüller gafesde, gece gel, beni sesle, iyi yemeğnen besle (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 313).

Neither “este” nor its *m*-reduplication “meste” is correlated to Ramadan. The rest of the riddle is like “gafesde/sesle/besle”. “Este meste” serves only as a melody to harmonize with the rest of the riddle but this reduplication does not have a meaning.

Here is the translation:

Oh, este, meste, the nightingales in the cage; come at night and call for me, feed me with fine food! (Akalin, ans: Ramadan) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 313).

The use of “este meste” in the target text violates the purpose of its use in the source text. Like the aforementioned translations, the translator preferred to leave them

untranslated in underlined forms and he did not use reduplication in target language. The translator who is a scholar is well-aware of the fact of translation act. Yet, his choice grabs the attention of the target text reader. The reader can exert to search on those underlined expressions but when s/he finds out that they do not make any sense, s/he may get puzzled.

2.10.2.1.3. Doublings

By simple definition, doubling is the repetition of two words. Nouns, adjectives, adverbs and quantifiers can repeat in Turkish. For instance, to say “early in the morning” in Turkish, “sabah sabah” is used. Similarly, “a row of houses” is expressed as “sıra sıra evler”. “Doubling can be used to appeal to our emotions, create mood, and to emphasize important ideas” (http://homepage.smc.edu/meeks_christopher/SOUND%20DEVICES%20USED%20IN%20POETRY.htm) Retrieved on March 23, 2014.

Here are examples:

- Kum kum oynar, guyrüh sallar (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 154).

The doubling “kum kum” in the source text proves the richness of Turkish language. When one looks up at a Standard Turkish dictionary, s/he will see that “kum” means “sand” in English. However, as it can be concluded from Broeck’s model, the critic should move away from his/her reality and review the translations within their own context by taking the time into consideration. The time when this riddle was uttered is not known. It is understood that at that time, butter was considered to move as “kum kum”.

Here is the translation:

Dances kum kum, wags his tail (Akalin, ans: Butter) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 154).

The translator who did not have an idea about how to denominate the movement of butter instead of “kum kum” preferred to leave it untranslated as he did before.

- İki başı kertli / ortası bereketli / ananın önüne gider gelir dertli dertli (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 208).

In the source text, the doubling “dertli dertli” rhymes with “kertli” and “bereketli”. Unlike the aforementioned examples, this doubling is meaningful; “dertli dertli” means “in a sorrowful way”.

Here is the translation:

Its two ends are notched. In its center is its wealth. Groaning it comes and goes before your mother (Başgöz, ans: Churn) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 208).

The translator translated “dertli dertli” as “groaning”. It is obvious that the translator gave the inversion structure in the target text and put “groaning” at the beginning of the sentence. “Groan” means “to make a long deep sound because you are annoyed, upset or in pain” (Hornby and Wehmeier, 2005: 657) (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary). “Groaning” seems to suit as to the meaning. But while giving the same meaning, the translator ignored the grammatical point and did not use a doubling form in the target text.

- Seggir süggür ayağı var, yetmiş iki dayağı var (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 242).

“Seggir süggür” in the source text is a meaningless expression. As the answer of this riddle is “cradle”, this meaningless unit conveys the back-and-forth movement of the cradle.

Here is the translation:

Has seggür süggür feet, has seventy-two supports (Akalin, ans: Cradle) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 242).

The translator did not translate the meaningless unit and it looks like an adjective related to “feet” but the way how the cradle moves is not clear in the target text. The translator’s this strategy yields to an ambiguity for the target text reader.

- Tıpış tıpış yürürsün/samur kürkü sürürsün/sen bir bey oğlusun/niçin yayan yürürsün? (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 504).

In the source text, the doubling “tıpış tıpış” was used. It means “to walk quickly with short light steps”. As the answer is “mouse/rat”, this expression describes the way a mouse walks.

Here is the translation:

You walk scamper, scamper. You drag along a sable fur. You are the son of a prince. Why do you walk on foot [and not ride]? (Başgöz, ans: Mouse or Rat) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 504).

“Tıpış tıpış” was translated as “scamper scamper”. Here it is understood that translator wanted to adapt the target text to the morphological structure of the source text and doubled the word “scamper”. However, such a structure does not exist in English grammar.

- Zerre zerre dökülür, denizlerde çok olur, sanma ki sofralara o olmadan çökülür (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 632).

In riddles, some words do not have special roles but they evoke the answer of the riddle. This riddle is an example for this explanation. “Zerre” is a small quantity of some materials. Generally it shows a small amount of an uncountable granular substance. The answer of this riddle is “salt”. From the beginning of the riddle, the riddlee who is also the source language speaker will start imagining the answer as soon as s/he hears “zerre zerre”. Reaching the answer will be easy for him/her.

Here is the translation:

It is poured drop by drop, there is plenty of it in the seas; don't think you can sit down at table before it comes! (Başgöz, ans: Salt) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 632).

In the target text, the translator translated “zerre zerre” as “drop by drop”. He wished to create the same scene in the target text by using “drop by drop”. But the translator who wants to create the same scene in the target text can find a more suitable equivalence which will evoke “salt” in the riddlee's mind. That is, instead of “drop by drop” “pinch by pinch” might suit better here.

In this part of this thesis, reduplications which are common in Turkish grammar and in Erzurum riddles were examined with their translations into English. By looking at the

overall translation principle here, one can notice some inconsistencies between source texts and target texts by taking the translator's decisions into consideration. While analyzing the examples above, the readers may think that it is pointless to take the meaning into account in the criticism as morphology studies only the form (or the grammar) of the word. It needs to be noted that the translator overshadowed the grammar of the words by centering on the meaning. When the words in question did not make any sense in the source text, the translator left them untranslated in the target text. But when they made a sense, he did not consider the form but the meaning. Hence, he caused some inconsistencies. That's why the meanings were also elaborated.

Riddle is an important element of oral literature. Oral literature is rich in all kinds of clever or humorous uses of language. As these uses are closely related to culture and obviously not written, many difficulties appear in translation. These difficulties are seen in the target text because the source language and the target language do not belong to the same language family. English being a member of Indo-European languages, and Turkish being a member of Ural-Altay language family, differ in this respect and the breaking point is the morphology, the structure of words. Mona Baker pointed out that:

As translators, we are primarily concerned with communicating the overall meaning of a stretch of language. To achieve this, we need to start by decoding the units and structures which carry that meaning. The smallest unit which we would expect to possess individual meaning is the word. Defined loosely, the word is 'the smallest unit of language that can be used by itself'. For our present purposes, we can define the written word with more precision as any sequence of letters with an orthographic space on either side (1992: 10-11).

Given this statement, the readers noticed that words of the source text were re-coded in the target text quite differently or they were left untranslated and so grammatical deviation was created. Grammatical deviation is one of Geoffrey N. Leech's categories. Leech examines this category in detail by emphasizing its two dimensional peculiarity: Grammatical deviation has two dimensions: morphology (a branch of linguistics which studies the grammar/form of the words) and syntax (another branch of linguistics which studies the way how the words are put to make a sentence). As morphology deals with the grammar of words and as there are many violations of grammar of words above, grammar deviates in the target text.

The words of a particular language can be examined from different points of view. Under “morphological components”, reduplications, along with their forms in the source text and in the target text were studied. In order to enlighten the translator’s decisions, their meanings were studied too. It was concluded that the literal translation of riddles under this category caused grammatical deviation. Moreover, some inconsistencies were detected in the translator’s decisions as he focused on the meaning in some riddles and on words in the others.

In the next category entitled “phonological and lexical components”, the rhythmical patterns of words were studied both in the source text and in the target text from the phonological point of view, and words were studied according to their forms, meanings and behaviors both in the source text and in the target text from the lexical point of view.

2.10.3. Phonological and Lexical Components

Phonology is the study of speech sounds of a particular language. As the statement suggests, the sound patterns upon which riddles are built (like poetry) were dealt under this part. From the beginning, it needs to be reminded that the riddle is a kind of folk poetry. That’s why they were handled as poetry in this part of the thesis.

Lexicology is the study of the form, meaning and behavior of words. Under this part, neologisms or invention of new words were examined. Geoffrey N. Leech stated that:

Poets and authors are famous for lexical inventions but ordinary people often refer to neologism when they express their feelings or opinions. Neologism is various: It can be made to increase the vocabulary of a certain language by borrowing new words from other languages. If it’s not the case, new words are made up for a single occasion only, which is called *nonce-formations* (1969: 42).

In riddles, neologisms and especially nonce-formations are abundant and most of them do not have any meanings so they are also called “non-sense words”. “Non-sense words are used to produce rhythm in lines. The aim of their usage is not to create a meaningless line. Such words can also serve as a refrain” (Lefevere, 1992: 76).

Even when translator's method is "the intralingual translation which entails the process of rewording in one and the same language for purposes of clarification" (Anderman, 2007: 48), the losses are inevitable and the new text will never be the same as the source text. If the translation process is realized between two different languages, it will not make sense to wait exactly the same original text. Regarding different sound systems of English and Turkish, it is difficult to find an exact equivalence of non-sense words in the target language with literal translation.

Two different components under a common headline may seem jumbled and crowded. However, as it was mentioned above, lexical patterns of language are re-coded for producing rhythm. Thus, these two components are intertwined and should be studied together.

Since composing the poetic harmony in riddles is given priority, "rhyme" and "onomatopoeia" were studied under "phonological components" both in the source and the target texts. Then, examples for "neologism (invention of new words) – non-sense words" were provided along with their translations as "lexical components". But the engagement of the two main categories were not forgotten.

Sound devices are resources used by poets to convey and reinforce the meaning or experience of poetry through the skillful use of sound. After all, poets are trying to use a concentrated blend of sound and imagery to create an emotional response. The words and their order should evoke images, and the words themselves have sounds, which can reinforce or otherwise clarify those images. The poet is trying to get you, the reader, to sense a particular thing, and the use of sound devices are some of the poet's tool (http://homepage.smc.edu/meeks_christopher/SOUND%20DEVICES%20USED%20IN%20POETRY.htm) Retrieved on: March 23, 2014.

Riddles elaborately make use of those tools. Even though most of them sound meaningless and absurd, all of them have one purpose: Leading the riddlee to the answer. In her article, Yetkiner defines the sound devices used by the poet to reinforce the meaning with a quotation from Perrine:

i) First, the poet can choose whose sound in some degree suggests their meaning. In its narrowest sense this is called onomatopoeia. There is another group of words, sometimes called phonetic intensives, whose sound by a process as yet obscure, to some degree suggests their meaning. An

initial fl- sound, for instance, is often associated with the idea of moving light, as in flame, flare, flash, flicker, flimmer.

ii) The second way that the poet can reinforce meaning through sound is to choose sounds and group them so that the effect is smooth and pleasant sounding (euphonious) or rough and harsh sounding (cacophonous)

iii) A third way in which a poet can reinforce meaning through sound by controlling the speed and movement of the lines by the choice and use of meter.

iv) A fourth way for a poet to fit sound to sense is to control both sound and meter in such a way as to put emphasis on words that is important in meaning. He can do this by marking out such words by alliteration, assonance, consonance or rhyme (quoted in Yetkiner, 1996: 77).

All of those sound devices are employed to suggest or emphasize the meaning that already exists in the riddles. But what are their equivalences in the target texts? It might be difficult to give an exact answer for this question because language is the articulation of the world and each language does it from its own perspective. For example, when a heavy object hits somewhere or something else, a native Turkish speaker hears the sound “pat” or “çat”. But a native English speaker hears the same sound as “thud”. Culler explains it well with academic terms as follows:

If language were simply a nomenclature for a set of universal concepts, it would be easy to translate from one language to another. One would simply replace the French name for a concept with the English name. If language were like this the task of learning a new language would also be much easier than it is. But anyone who has attempted either of these tasks has acquired, alas, a vast amount of direct proof that languages are not nomenclatures, that the concepts ... of one language may differ radically from those of another... Each language articulates or organizes the world differently. Languages do not simply name existing categories, they articulate their own (quoted in Baker, 1992: 10).

Based on the above explanation, it is easy to conclude that there is the problem of non-equivalence between languages at some levels and that these problems set other problems for translators. Thus, the translator needs to resort to some strategies for dealing with these problems. Mona Baker mentions some of these strategies:

1. Translation by a more general word (superordinate)
2. Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word
3. Translation by cultural substitution
4. Translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation
5. Translation by paraphrase using a related word
6. Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words

7. Translation by omission
8. Translation by illustration (Baker, 1992: 26-42)

These problems can be dealt at various strategies. Below the most compelling parts in the source text for the translator on sound level and the translator's decisions can be found.

2.10.3.1. Rhyme

Riddles which are short questions in poetic patterns make use of rhyme. "Rhyme is a repetition of some arrangement of vowels and consonants at the ends of lines, or sometimes in the middle, and is defined by H. W. Fowler in *Modern English Usage* as 'identity of sounds between words or lines extending back from the end to the last fully accented vowel and not farther'" (Boulton, 1953:42). That rhythmic pattern of riddles stems from their poetic quality. "Poetry, as compared to prose, generally places greater emphasis on the *sound of language*, on its music and rhythm, and also employs a greater intensity of verbal colors of all sorts" (Raffel, 1994: 6).

Here are examples:

- Dilberin yanağıdır, temmuz ayı çağıdır, vatanını sorarsan, Amasya'nın bağıdır (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 80).

In the source text, rhyme scheme is like: "yanağıdır – çağıdır – sorarsan – bağıdır". The repetition of vowels and consonants are at the ends of lines.

Here is the translation:

It is the cheek of the fair one, July is its season. If you inquire for its home,
it is the gardens of Amasya (Başgöz, ans: Apple) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973:
80)

Taking the target text into consideration, "one – season – home – Amasya" do not rhyme.

- Kat kat döşek/ bunu bilmeyen eşek (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 132).

In the source language, the ends of lines "döşek – eşek" rhyme.

Here is the translation:

Layers of bedding; whoever does not know this is an ass (Başgöz, ans: Book) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 132)

The target language wasn't obviously made up in rhyming couplets same as the source language because the ends of lines are as: "bedding – ass".

- Âşık der ki andı bir, aşk oduna yandı bir; altmış iki deryanın harkı iki, bendi bir (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 138).

According to the source text, "andı bir – yandı bir – harkı iki – bendi bir" show the rhyme scheme.

Here is the translation:

The minstrel says: he will never break his oath, he has been seized by the fire of love; sixty two seas have two canals but one dyke (Başgöz, ans: Breast) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 138)

The rhyme scheme of the source text is "rubaiyat". This term was borrowed after Omer Khayyam's masterpiece. According to rubaiyat rhyme scheme, all lines rhyme except the third one. The translator's choices do not seem to be in line with this scheme.

- Elemez, melemez / ocak başına gelemez / gelse bile duramaz (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 154).

The rhyme scheme, according to the source text, is as: "elemez – melemez – gelemez" and "duramaz". First three lines repeat the same vowels and consonants. Moreover, "melemez" is the *m*-reduplication of "elemez".

Here is the translation:

Does not shift, does not bleat, cannot come to the fireplace. Even if it does come, it cannot endure staying there (Başgöz, ans: Butter) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 154)

Given the prior translations, the translator seems to have composed the rhyme in the beginning. But the *m*-reduplication was lost within this pattern in the target text.

- Kat kat olur, açılır, bostanlarda biçilir; ekşisi hoştur amma, tuzlusundan kaçılır (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 164).

According to the source language, “açılır” and “kaçılır” rhyme.

Here is the translation:

It is in layers; they can be taken apart. They reap it in kitchen gardens.
Pickled it is good, but run away from the salted one! (Başgöz, ans: Cabbage)
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 164)

In the target text, “taken apart” and “salted one” do not rhyme.

- Dört ayaklı bir ayı / üstünde kabadayı (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 185).

In the source text, “ayı” and “kabadayı” are in rhyme.

Here is the translation:

A four-legged bear, on top of him a tough guy (Başgöz, ans: Chair) (Başgöz
and Tietze, 1973: 185)

According to the target text, “bear” and “guy” do not seem to be in rhyme.

- Yemişi engindedir / güzeller rengindedir / dişlemesi pek hoştur / dudağın
rengindedir (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 192).

Here is another example of rubaiyat scheme according to the source text: “engindedir –
rengindedir – rengindedir” are rhythmical. Moreover, last two rhyming words are the
same.

Here is the translation:

Its fruits are hard to reach, its color is the color of beautiful girls; it is a
pleasure to bite it, its color is the color of lips (Başgöz, ans: Cherry) (Başgöz
and Tietze, 1973: 192)

The rhyme scheme of the source text is not seen in the target text because “reach – girls
– it – lips” do not compose a rhythm.

The translations show that the rhyming patterns cannot be seen in the target language.
“Although the arguments against translating poetry into rhymed and metered verse are
persuasive, rhyme can play an important part in the original poem” (Lefevere, 1992:71).
Rhyme is the marker of the riddles: Riddles has euphonious quality. They have

formulaic openings and endings or rhymed structures. So neglecting the rhyme in the target language looks like a disadvantage.

At this point, a brand new issue arises: Normally, rhyme is difficult to translate but is it really impossible?

The impossibility of translation is in a sense not debatable. If every human language is distinct (as it is) in structure, sound, and vocabulary, and if every language contains unique features, then clearly it is literally impossible to fully render anything written in one language into another...The catch, of course, is the word “fully.” If it is not possible to *fully* render anything written in one language into another tongue, it is certainly possible to *satisfactorily* translate – that is, to translate most things and to translate them well. So-called literal translation, again, is on the face of it literally impossible. Exact linguistic equivalents are by definition nonexistent. But good translation can and frequently has been achieved (Raffel, 1988: 11).

As the riddles were literally translated, rhyme could not be caught in the target texts. Thus, phonologically, a shift of expression is clear in the translations of riddles in rhyme. However, given the examples above, it should be repeated that the translator’s task is difficult enough here as there is not a direct linguistic equivalence between languages.

Rhythm obviously helps a great deal in supporting the meaning of the words of a poem; but sometimes the sound of the words also gives great support to the sense. This tendency in words to echo the meaning by the actual sound is called ‘onomatopoeia’ (Boulton, 1953: 53).

The below examples of onomatopoeia from both the source and the target text prove how differently Turkish and English give sound-pictures of things while describing them.

2.10.3.2. Onomatopoeia

Formerly when there weren’t any radios or televisions, people gathered together and told each other stories; played jokes; or those who had a beautiful voice sang. Spending time together was the only way to entertain themselves. Riddles were a part of this entertainment. They were certainly shaped differently in each riddler’s mouth. The

riddler sometimes gave clues and used some sounds to connote the answer. Onomatopoeic words were among those sounds. Robert Lawrence Trask defined the term as follows:

An onomatopoeic word is one which denotes a sound and which has a linguistic form specifically designed to mimic that sound with some degree of recognizability. English examples include clink, meow, hiss, bang, boom, hum, quack and woof. But even onomatopoeic words exhibit a good deal of arbitrariness: the sound of a gunshot is represented as bang in English, but as pum in Spanish, peng in German, and dzast in Basque (1999: 79).

Here are the examples for these sounds or onomatopoeic word usage in riddles:

- Garşıdan gördüm şırıl şırıl, yanına vardım mırıl mırıl, dedim heyir ola, dedi ahşama gelin! (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 140)

It is not clear on what grounds the riddler uses “şırıl şırıl” to connote bridegroom. “Mırıl mırıl” comes from “mırıldanmak” which means “rumble”. “Mırıl mırıl” can be rendered as “in/with a deep continuous voice”.

Here is the translation:

From afar I saw him şırıl şırıl. I approached; he spoke in a low voice. I said to him, “What’s new?” He said, “Come this evening!” (Akalın, ans: Bridegroom) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 140)

As “şırıl şırıl” is absurd in meaning according to the answer of the riddle, it was not translated. However, the target text proves another inconsistency in translations: While “mırıl mırıl” was translated, “şırıl şırıl” was not translated.

- Pat pat vurur, pat desem durur (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 148).

The answer of this riddle is “besom”. Besom is a kind of brush used for sweeping the floor. It is made of a bundle of twigs. In villages, it is still used. When it hits the floor, the sound is heard like “pat”.

Here is the translation:

It slaps, making the sound pat pat, and when I say, “pat,” it halts (Akalın, ans: Besom) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 148).

In the translation although “pat pat” was not translated, the translator’s other choices (the verb-slap and the expression-making the sound pat pat) reflect the soul of the source text. But underlining “pat pat” looks unnecessary as it is clear in the translation (making the sound pat pat) that it is the name of that sound.

- Saksığan şakırdar / şakı benim elimde / ağaçlar gıyırdar / kökü benim elimde (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 298).

The source text uses an onomatopoeic verb “şakır-“. In Turkish, this verb is used to denote how happily a bird sings.

Here is the translation:

The magpie sings şak şak. “Sing in my hand!” The trees shake. Their roots are in my hands (Akalın, ans: Egg) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 298).

As Turkish and English differ in linguistic and extra linguistic matters, one verb in Turkish can sometimes be translated into English as “verb plus an adverb” like in this riddle. It was noticed that the translator chose to use an adverb but it is not clear in the target text. But his options are not over.

The answer of this riddle is “egg”. As onomatopoeic words are to connote the answer, the translator could have taken the answer into consideration and used an adverb in English. The root “şak” is also the sound of eggs when one hits two of them against each other. But the translator did not use any of these options.

- Burdan atdım vız vıza altmış iki yıldıza (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 367).

In the source text, “vız vıza” was employed as the onomatopoeic expression. “Vız” is the sound of an object which travels fast when it is thrown from somewhere. “Vız vıza” is a lexically new term as it is not used in that form in Standard Turkish. But it can still be understood.

Here is the translation:

I threw it from here vız vıza toward the sixty-two stars (Akalın, ans: Gun) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 367).

The answer of the riddle is “gun”. Apparently, the onomatopoeic doubling was used in the source text to connote the sound of the bullets but it cannot be understood from the target text. The translator could have used an onomatopoeic expression like “whirls” which could also rhyme with “stars”.

- Pıt pıt eder, çıt çıt eder, labiye şeker, pamuk atar (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 374).

The answer of this riddle is “hail”. When it hails, small balls of ice fall from the sky like the rain. “Labiye şeker” is a kind of white sugar indigenous to Erzurum. “Labiye şeker” and the cotton were likened to the small balls of ice. As to the onomatopoeic words, when those balls fall, they make the sound “pıt pıt” and “çıt çıt”. To connote the answer, this sound was employed in the source text.

Here is the translation:

Goes pıt pıt, goes çıt çıt, labiye sugar, cards cotton (Başgöz, ans: Hail)
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 374)

According to the target text, nothing connotes the answer: The onomatopoeic words “pıt pıt” and “çıt çıt”, and the simile “labiye” were left untranslated.

- Gur gur öter, kurbağa değil/kıvrılır yatar, yılan değil/başında sini, helvacı değil (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 527).

The answer of the riddle is “narghile”. The most common usage for this word is “hookah”. Narghile or the hookah is an instrument for smoking in which smoke passes through a glass basin. When the smoke passes through the basin, the sound “gur gur” is made. But it is also the sound that the frogs let out.

Here is the translation:

Croaks gur gur, but is no frog; coils up and lies down, but is no snake;
carries a tray on his head, but is not a seller of halva (Başgöz, ans: Narghile)
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 527)

The translator used the verb “croak”. It is a rough sound especially made by frogs. So, the translator seems to have achieved to render the verb which will connote the answer. Yet, he underlined the onomatopoeic word and it may confuse the target language speaker.

- Pat pat eder, çat çat eder, loby şeker, panbuk atar (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 594).

The answer of the riddle is “popcorn”. When the corn is put into the machine, it makes sound while popping. The Turkish language speaker hears this sound as “pat pat” and “çat çat”.

Here is the translation:

It goes: bang bang! It goes: çat çat! Bean (?) candy. It cards cotton (Başgöz, ans: Popcorn) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 594)

The translation shows inconsistency here: The translator who translated “pat pat” as “bang bang” left “çat çat” in the target text. However, the translator could have made better choices. “Bang bang” connotes the “gunfiring” instead of “popcorn”. The translator could have preferred only “pop” which is already an onomatopoeic expression instead of rendering both of the two expressions. Moreover, using the question mark in brackets in the translation looks strange.

- Çin çin ağaç başında, çin garaguş oturur, eteklerin yelledikçe sürmeleri tökülür (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 695).

“Çin” means both “branch of a tree on which there is much fruit” and “original” (http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_bts&arama=kelime&guid=TDK.GTS.54dba79b0c0e16.83940054) Retrieved on: March 25, 2015.

The answer of the riddle is “sorb” which is “a Eurasian rosaceous tree, *Sorbus domestica*, cultivated for its white flowers and brown edible apple-like fruits” (<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/service+tree>) Retrieved on: March 25, 2015. So, in the source text, “çin” and “garaguş” connote sorb and its fruit.

Here is the translation:

Çin çin, on a tree, çin, a black bird sits; whenever it shakes its skirts collyrium falls off (Akalın, ans: Sorb) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 695).

“Çin” was used in the source text in doubling form to show abundancy. “Çin çin” is mostly used as onomatopoeia to connote the sound of two metal pieces but here “çin

çin” is not employed for that meaning. The translator who (most probably) caught the onomatopoeic meaning left it as he did in the examples before.

- Şip, benim alınma; şip, senin alınma (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 609).

“Şip” is a common word in Turkish which is used as the sound of water when it falls.

Here is the translation:

Splash! on my forehead; splash! on your forehead (Akalın, ans: Rain)
(Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 609).

Unlike the prior riddles, the translator rendered the onomatopoeic word.

The target texts prove that the translator could not reach the aim of the source text. None of these translations connote the answers but they seem “foreign” to the target text reader. Because in English, for instance, frogs do not give the sound “gur gur”. The above answer of this riddle is “narghile”. So, “frog” should connote “narghile”. But here there is another striking point: “Frog” is used as a metaphor. The translations seem problematic but is it because of the lack of onomatopoeic expressions or of literal translation of metaphors? Actually, this question has two answers but under “poetic structures” headline, metaphors and their translations weren’t analyzed. Here the only answer to this question is as: “The translations look problematic because there are not any English onomatopoeic expressions in the target text. Yet, they are not read in English”.

2.10.3.3. Neologism – Non-Sense Words

When an already existing word is used for a special purpose and in a new sense or when a new word or a new expression is introduced, “neologism” occurs. A number of new words are introduced to Erzurum riddles but most of them do not make a sense. That is why neologisms were regarded as non-sense words in this title. Here are Erzurum riddles which employ neologisms, and their translations into English:

- Hop hopi çiçek, top topi çiçek, cennetten çıldı, bir bozi çiçek (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 95).

“Hop hopi” and “top topi” created a riddle in tongue-twister form.

Here is the translation:

Hop hopi flowers, flowers in bouquets, a dark brown flower has come from Paradise (Akalın, ans: Broadbeans) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 95).

While the translator translated “top topi” as “in bouquets”, he did not translate “hop hopi”. He could have created a similar tongue-twister form by playing with the words.

- Hindi, hindi, göyden bir adem indi. Bizden bir icat çıktı, ev sahabı misafire bindi (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 100).

“Hindi hindi” is a melodious statement which was created for having the same sound as the verb “indi”.

Here is the translation:

Now, then, a man came down from the sky. A new custom has appeared among us: the master of the house mounts on the guest (Akalın, ans: Beddings piled up during daytime) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 100).

In the target text, the translator used a different strategy here and translated “hindi hindi” as “now, then” without forming neologism and without following the rhythmical pattern of the source text.

- Hey küçücük, küçücük, gızıl üzüm leblecik, dültürük dört tenecik, dört duvarın başı açıl, geldi gongdu üç serçecik, gucuruh, cucuruh (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 105).

This riddle is in the form of tongue-twister. “Küçücük”, “leblecik”, “dültürük”, “tenecik”, “gucuruh, cucuruh” do not draw a clear picture with their sounds in source text readers’ mind but in Turkish, “cük” and “cik” are diminutive suffixes which indicate the smallness of an object or an animal. The answer is “bee”. Although they are not standard language, their meaning is still clear. They depict the smallness and the sound of “bee”.

Here is the translation:

Hey, tiny little ones, red raisins and roasted chickpeas! Dültürük, only four. Four walls with no roof on top. There came three little sparrows and sat on them. Gucuruh, cucuruh (Akalın, ans: Bee) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 105).

The adjectives depicting “bee” was half-translated. As the meanings of “küçük”, “leblecik” and “tenecik” are known, they were translated but as “dültürük” and “gucuruh cucuruh” are not directly understood, the translator didn’t translate them.

- Hüp hüpe / altın küpe / süt kuyusu / sivri tepe (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 138).

“Hüp hüpe” has the same sound as “küpe”. Although it is different from its common form in this riddle, “hüp” can be said the sound uttered by a person while s/he is drinking something.

Here is the translation:

Hüp hüpe; golden earrings. A milk well, a pointed hill (Başgöz, ans: Breast) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 138).

As the answer of this riddle is “breast”, “hüp hüpe” should remind of “milk”. But its untranslated form in this riddle doesn’t remind of anything.

- Handallı handallı, dış kapının mandalı (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 145).

In this riddle, the nonce-formation is “handallı handallı” which is harmonic with “mandalı”.

Here is the translation:

Handallı, handallı, the latch of the outer door (Akalın, ans: Besom) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 145).

The translator left “handallı handallı” untranslated; he could have changed the lexis of a word that could be phonologically in harmony with “door”.

- Çil tavuk, çileme tavuk, başımı kestim, kanı yok (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 176).

“Çileme” is not a standard word that can be found in any of the monolingual Turkish dictionaries. But it is an example of widely used doublings which have one meaningful unit (“çil”) and one meaningless unit (“çileme”) to create melody.

Here is the translation:

Speckled hen, çileme hen. I have cut off its head, it has no blood. (Akalın; Başgöz, ans: Carpet) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 176).

The target text, with unedited Turkish word “çileme”, doesn’t lead to the creation of the same melody.

- Fet feti fetdan, kömleği otdan, burnu gemikden, gulağı etden (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 201).

This riddle makes use of an opening statement with “fet feti fetdan”.

Here is the translation:

Fet feti, a coquette, her shirt is of grass, her nose is of bone, her ears are of flesh (Akalın, ans: Chicken) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 201).

In the target text, the opening statement “fet feti fetdan” was translated as “fet feti, a coquette” which is incongruous in itself on sound level.

- İliksiz tin tin, gene de tin tin, gene de tin tin (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 217).

As the answer of this riddle is “clock”, “tin tin” reminds the reader of the sound which is made by the hand which shows the seconds on the clock.

Here is the translation:

Has no marrow, tin tin, and again tin tin, and yet again tin tin (Akalın, ans: Clock) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 217).

The translator did not find equivalent term for “tin tin” in the target text. As there is not a word such as “tin tin” in English, the target text does not sound English enough.

- Hey nilince, guş dilince, dimbılıh çalar her gece (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 332).

Here the riddlee encounters a riddle in tongue-twister form. “A tongue twister is defined as a phrase or sentence that is hard to speak rapidly, usually because of alliteration (the repetition of similar or identical sounds) or a sequence of nearly similar sounds” (<http://americanfolklore.net/folklore/tongue-twisters/>) Retrieved on: February 20, 2015. Both of the consonants and the vowels are repeated in “nilince-dilince”.

Moreover, both of them rhyme with “gece”. “Nilince” which does not have a meaning is a nonce-formation, used only for rhyming with “dilince”.

Here is the translation:

Hey, nilince, in bird language, it plays the drum every night (Akalın, ans: Flea) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 332).

In the source text, a new word was formed to compose a rhythm but it is not seen in the target text as the translator didn't translate “nilince”.

- Garşıdan bahdım: hisar; yanına vardım: badisar; uzun uzun ayahları, yere batmış cırnahları (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 430).

As new words along with non-sense words are examined under this headline, the only problematic part of the source text is “badisar” here. “Badisar” was lexically changed for being in rhyme with “hisar”. That's why it looks like a brand new term. Actually, it is a brand new term but normally it means “bâd-ı seher” (Karademir, 2007: 627) and in English it means “dawn wind”.

Here is the translation:

I looked from afar: it was a fortress. I came near: it was a badisar. It has long feet and claws dug into the ground (Akalın, ans: Leek) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 430).

Given the information about source text, there are not any newly formed words of which the lexical peculiarities were changed for the sake of rhyme in the target text. Moreover, the translator left the new word untranslated.

- Fini fini fincan, içi dolu mercan (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 507).

Musicality is the most spectacular characteristic of riddles. In order to organize this tune, some expressions which don't have any meanings are employed. “Fini fini” is an example for that kind of expressions.

Here is the translation:

Fini fini coffee-cup, full of coral (Başgöz, ans: Mouth and teeth) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 507).

“Fin fini” has a harmonic sequence with “fincan” but it doesn’t have a sequence with “coffee-cup”. The translator does not seem to have put the same expression in the target text.

- Pat patan ağacı, çat çatan ağacı, kırmızı leylek, kıraptan ağacı (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 551).

“Pat patan ağacı” and “çat çatan ağacı” were expressed as they apparently contain similar sounds to “kıraptan ağacı”.

Here is the translation:

Pat patan tree, çat çatan tree, a stork, tree of imitation gold thread (Başgöz, ans: Orange) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 551).

“Pat patan tree” and “çat çatan tree” aren’t related to the sound pattern of “tree of imitation gold thread” so phonologically the translation is difficult to understand.

- Dağdan gelir hor hor, ayahları mor mor; sekiz ayağı var, otuziki dayağı var (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 558).

The answer of this riddle is “oxcart”. For connoting the answer, the sound created by the vehicle was likened to “hor hor” in the source text.

Here is the translation:

Comes from the mountain hor hor, has a purple feet, has eight legs and thirty-two supports (Akalın, ans: Oxcart) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 558).

In the target text, in its untranslated form, “hor hor” looks like a name rather than a sound pattern.

- Tap tapı, demir gapı, sam ertesi sambağı (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 560).

“Tap tapı” has the same sound as the end of “gapı”.

Here is the translation:

Tap tapı an iron gate, the erte of the yoke peg, the tie of the yoke peg. (Akalın, ans: Padlock) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 560).

In the target text, “tap tapı” was not rendered into English. In addition, the translator drew attention to the word “erte” by underlining it in the target text. “Erte” means “the following” or “the next” but the translator who preferred literal translation did not apply his strategy here.

- Apırdengi, şengi şengi (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 560).

All the words in the source text were ascribed to connote “packing needle”. They are also onomatopoeic expressions. Every language in their own universe perceives the world in their own way; they picture and describe things within their boundaries. This riddle is an utterance coming behind these boundaries: It is not clear why source language speakers articulate the “packing needle” with these words and it is not clear whether they have a meaning or not but at least, it is obvious that they are onomatopoeic expressions.

Here is the translation:

(Obscure) (Akalin, ans: Packing needle) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 560).

As nothing is clear enough in the source text, the translator preferred not to translate the riddle but instead, he wrote “obscure” in brackets to convey the meaninglessness of the source text to the target text reader.

- Hey hudurmuş hudurmuş/ yüreğine su durmuş/ açın sizin killıyı/ geldi izim kudurmuş (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 616).

“Hudurmuş hudurmuş” is another example for nonce-formations. It was only given in this riddle in line with “durmuş” and “kudurmuş”.

Here is the translation:

Hey, hudurmuş, hudurmuş, water has touched its heart. Uncover your hairy one, our enraged one is coming (Başgöz, ans: Razor) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 616).

Nonce-formations in riddles exist for making pleasing sounds. But “hudurmuş hudurmuş” in the target text doesn’t make this sound as it is unconformable to the sounds of the target language.

- Ozi ozi/ bindim pozi/ bir burnu var/ kırk tane gozi (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 633).

Due to Erzurum dialect, “boz” in Standard Turkish (“gray” in English) became “poz(i)”, and “göz” in Standard Turkish (“eye” in English) became “goz(i)” in the riddle. The non-sense “ozi ozi” is in conformity with “pozi” and “gozi”.

Here is the translation:

Ozi ozi, I mount the gray one; it has one nose but forty eyes (Başgöz, ans: Sandal of raw hide) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 633).

As dialect deviates in the translation, “ozi ozi” is useless in the target text.

- Hay hilidi hilidi, dış gapının kilidi, baba Allahın seversen, gapıdan geçen kim idi? (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 647).

In the source text, “hilidi hilidi” and “kilidi” have a songful unity.

Here is the translation:

Hey, hilidi hilidi the lock of the outer door. Father, by the love of God, tell me who passed in front of the door? (Akalin, ans: Shadow) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 647).

In the target text, “hilidi hilidi” and “door” do not have a songful unity.

- Dam üstünde Zıbbirik kadın (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 698).

In Erzurum dialect, ascriptions are widely used. The answer of the riddle is “spider”. In the riddle, “Zıbbirik” was ascribed to “spider”. “Zıbbirik” which is a new meaningless word comes from the word “zıpır”. “Zıpır” is informal and has the meaning of “not being able to keep still”. The reason for the use of “Zıbbirik” for “spider” comes from the fact that the spider often moves and goes into anywhere. So, “Zıbbirik” was lexicalized.

Here is the translation:

Lady Zıbbirik on the roof (Akalin, ans: Spider) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 698).

In the target text, any lexicalized words are not seen and “Zıbbirik” does not convey anything to the target language speaker.

- Ha halvara halvara, on iki ayın başında herkes ona yalvara (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 727).

In the source text, “halvara halvara” establishes a harmonious relation with the rest of the riddle.

Here is the translation:

- O halvara halvara, at the beginning of the 12 months, all seek [its protection] (Akalin, ans: Stove) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 727).

In the target text, “halvara halvara” does not establish a harmonious relation with any of the elements of the riddle.

- Kılte kılıtsız, kılte gemiksiz, kılte dağ aşar, kılte bağ aşar (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 758).

As the language of the source text is Turkish, even a native Turkish speaker gets puzzled when s/he encounters with this riddle because there is enough vocabulary s/he is even not familiar with. Here, the unfamiliar word is “kılte”. The answer of this riddle is “tick”, a small insect that bites humans and animals and sucks their blood. In Turkish, the “tick” is “kene”. “Kılte” and “kene” have familiar sounds and one connotes the other.

“Kılıtı” is not clear but most probably it comes from “kılıtk” which means both “the head” and “the foot” sections of a bed. So, “kılıtsız” shows that the answer does not have a foot or a head.

Here is the translation:

- Kılte, without kılıtı, kılte, without bones, kılte, crosses mountains, kılte crosses vineyards (Akalin, ans: Tick) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 758).

As the answer of the riddle in English is “tick”, neither “kılte” nor “kılıtı” seems to have linguistic (phonological or lexical) relationship between “tick”.

- Hezerem, hezerem, taş üstünde gezerem; herkes ne derse desin, ben bildiğimi yazaram (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 776).

In the source text, “gezer-e-m” cites another example for Erzurum dialect. In standard Turkish, it is expressed as “gezer-i-m”. In order to be in rhyme with that form, “hezerem” was made up.

Here is the translation:

Hezerem, hezerem, I wander over the Stones. I don't care what people say, I write what I want (Başgöz, ans: Trowel) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 776).

The meaningless rhyming nonce-formation “hezerem hezerem” was not translated and it was left much the same in the target text.

- Aşaktan gelir hor, kuyruğunun ucu mor, sekkiz sükküz ayağı var, demir demir dayağı var (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 781).

In the source text, “mor” means “purple” and for creating a rhyming pattern, “hor” which does not have a meaning was employed in the source text. The most known meaning of “sekkiz” (that is “sekiz” in standard Turkish) is “eight”. “Sekkiz sükküz” is a lexically invented doubling and it does not have a meaning.

Here is the translation:

From down below it comes, hor; the end of its tail is purple. It has sekkiz sükküz feet. It has iron props (Başgöz, ans: Umbrella) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 781).

The translator, who could not find equivalence for that sound play of the source text, did not translate “hor” and “sekkiz sükküz”.

The more rhythmic is the source text, the less meaningful is the target text above. Nonsense words in the source text are used to rhyme with the rest of the riddle. They don't have a different role. They may be echoing in the source language but leaving them untranslated does not create the same effect for the target language reader.

It's my job to translate everything, knowing that there might be some loss, but that there might be also be gain, and never giving in to that counsel of despair telling me that a translation is not the real thing, not the same thing, and definitely never a better thing... Leaving the word untranslated and perhaps adding a footnote is, of course, an option, but here it would, I feel, draw unnecessary attention to the word. It does not really matter what kind

of cakes these are. It does matter that the translation is consistent (Costa, 2007: 111-112).

By taking this statement into consideration, it can be said that the translator drew unnecessary attention to the words by leaving them untranslated. Translator could have omitted these parts or selected some expressions that could fit the rhythm of the target language. Lefevere argued that:

It is also possible to construct a poem around the sounds of words as they rhyme with or echo each other. The semantic meaning is then made secondary to the sound, thus reversing the “normal” situation. The resulting poem is automatically characterised as “nonsense poetry”. Again, translators have to investigate the possibilities of constructing their target language poem around analogous sound sequences. If they decide to do so, they may have to substitute a different semantic meaning for the one conveyed by some, or even most, words in the original (1992: 77).

While analyzing “the phonological and lexical components” it was observed that:

- The translator, for the sake of the source text, left many new lexically non-formed words and expressions untranslated, and
- He couldn't establish the same sound pattern in the target text(s) because he did literal translation. But, it was also observed that some expressions were translated because they were meaningful units. Yet, it conveys the inconsistency in the translator's norms.

All of the examples in this category with their explanations show that the translator caused both phonological and lexical deviations because there were sounds belonging both to the source and the target texts in the translations and the untranslated words/expressions did not convey anything to the target language reader.

In the next category entitled “semantic components”, figurative language under which metaphors and puns were listed and the other elements based on the culture like proper names, historical elements and Islamic motifs were studied comparatively with the source and the target texts.

2.10.4. Semantic Components

In riddles, the uses of metaphors, puns, proper names, historical elements, and religious motifs are common but any of these components are not randomly chosen. They serve a pragmatic purpose that brings the answers to the mind and they are deeply rooted in the culture. However, when an expression or the notion which exist in one culture do not exist in the other, the utterance might sound meaningless. As the riddles are culture specific genres of folk literature, they have such utterances which might seem incomprehensible in the target culture. That is why, in addition to the linguistic and stylistic categories determined by Raymond van den Broeck, a new title was opened as “semantic components”.

2.10.4.1. Figurative Language

Figurative language is different from the literal meaning of words or expressions. In English, for instance, there are idiomatic expressions like “kicked the bucket” or “bought the farm” that mean “died”. In Turkish, “tahtalı köyü boyladı” is used for the same meaning. “Although people do not have an idea of where these phrases are derived from, figurative language involves the same kinds of linguistic and pragmatic operations that are used for ordinary, literal language” (Glucksberg and McGlone, 2001: V). Sam Glucksberg and Matthew S. McGlone shed light on this issue with an example:

Even though we may know that the expression “glued to the TV set” does not use the primary meaning of the verb “to glue” we still feel that this is a perfectly straightforward, literal-like usage (2001: 15).

However, it would be better to say that figurative language requires different linguistic competences that are employed in daily life. Not only creative people such as authors or poets use figurative language. Even though it is employed in literature, it can be found in ordinary speech and writing too because people wish to conceptualize their experiences in the way they think, reason and imagine. But it might be considered that figurative language may entrap people and if it is not used properly, the message cannot reach its audience:

Figurative language is tricky as it is useful. When you intend an abstract meaning, you must make sure that your metaphors stay good and dead. And when you wish to be figurative, see whether you are getting the necessary vividness and consistency. If not, go back to literal statement; it is better to make plain assertion than litter your verbal landscape with those strange hulks (Gibbs, 1994: 3).

Simply put, making use of figurative language in literature or in ordinary speech is something about people's real-world knowledge. As the source text and the target text readers conceive the physical system differently, transmitting figurative language across language barriers is definitely not easy. Under "figurative language", metaphors and puns employed in Erzurum riddles along with their translations into English were examined.

2.10.4.1.1. Metaphor

Metaphor is a symbol which usually represents another thing. "It is a figure of speech in which a name or descriptive word or phrase is transferred to an object or action different from, but analogous to, that to which it is literally applicable; an instance of this [is] a metaphorical expression" (Glucksberg and McGlone, 2001: 4). "In its widest sense, it is the most common tool used by the poet to increase the level of expression on a figurative plane" (Yetkiner, 1996: 78). Thus, there are hidden meanings in metaphors so trying to understand them literally might be a waste of time. For this reason, the translator undertakes a big responsibility:

Translators will find that their reader's sense of propriety tends to act as a check on the translation of metaphor: collocations of concepts or words that do not unduly strain one culture's concept of what is acceptable (logically, emotionally, even morally) may be found beyond the pale of the acceptable by members of another culture (Lefevere, 1992: 37).

Under these circumstances, there are two paths the translator has in front of him/her and s/he needs to choose one of them for the translations of metaphors: Will s/he render the metaphors literally or semantically? "If the metaphors are literally rendered, the target text reader might think that there is a surreal image before him/her. If they are semantically rendered, the content will be missing" (Rifat, 2008: 96).

Here are Erzurum riddles in which metaphors are employed, and their translations into English:

- Penbe yanah, al dudah (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 80).

The answer of this riddle is “apple”. Due to its shape and color, apple can describe a beautiful lady or a kid who have fat, pink cheeks and lips. In this riddle, cheeks and lips were used as metaphors to elicit the answer.

Here is the translation:

Red cheeks and scarlet lips (Akalm, ans: Apple) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 80).

“Penbe yanah” was rendered as “red cheeks”. The translator could have translated it as “pink cheeks” as it was in the source text because “red cheeks” remind of an ill person rather than a healthy one. Thus, it may cause ambiguity in the target text.

- Dilberin yanağıdır, temmuz ayı çağıdır, vatanını sorarsan, Amasya'nın bağıdır (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 80).

Here is another riddle with the answer “apple”. Apple does not grow in Erzurum so it is taken from other regions in Turkey. Amasya is the main place among these regions for taking apples. They ripen in July. The source text used the metaphor of “Amasya'nın bağı” which means “the garden of Amasya” to evoke the answer.

Here is the translation:

It is the cheek of the fair one, July is its season. If you inquire for its home, it is the gardens of Amasya (Başgöz, ans: Apple) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 80).

The translation does not mean anything to the target text reader because it is a geographical knowledge-based riddle.

- Uzun Ali uzandı, yetmiş çocuk kazandı (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 497).

The answer of this riddle is “mop for cleaning the ceiling”. “Uzun Ali” or “Tall Ali” (in English) was associated with the “mop”. “Ali”, one of the most common names, does not have a different role apart from evoking the answer.

Here is the translation:

Long Ali stretched out. He gained seventy children (Başgöz, ans: Mop for cleaning the ceiling) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 497).

The translator wanted to evoke the answer with the name “Ali” in the same way as the source text. However, it does not seem to be a suitable choice as the name “Ali” is not common in the target system.

- Dağdan gelir, daşdan gelir/ bir gaba enişten gelir (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 97).

The answer of this riddle is “bear”. Turks used to live as clans in steppes and they used to be shamanist. Their faith led them to enshrine some animals. They believed that bear would help them travel to sky so it was the symbol of power. “However, in some Turkish epics, bear is considered a ‘stupid’ and ‘bad’ animal, and after the acceptance of Islam, with some changes in its meaning, bear is regarded as the symbol of heavy-handed force and bad people” (Çatalbaş, 2011: 51). Although it had changes for its meaning in time, its physical peculiarity causes “bear” to be regarded as “strong”. Hence, for describing bear, “gaba enişten” is used as a metaphor.

Here is the translation:

Comes from the mountain, comes from the rocks, your puffed-up brother-in-law comes (Akalm, ans: Bear) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 97).

The ties of kinship and neighborhood are not as close in Western culture as in Turkish culture. The proof is that broad vocabulary related to kinship in Turkish does not exist in English. “Enişte” is one’s sister’s husband; one’s aunt’s (mother’s sister or father’s sister) husband and it can also be used instead of the word “damat” which means “one’s daughter’s husband”. In Erzurum, the first usage of “enişte” coming to mind is its usage instead of “damat”, that is, husband. Husband represents power and he is said to be superior due to his appearance. Bear is a physically strong animal. That’s why it was associated with man or husband. “Enişte” was rendered as “brother-in-law” in the target text. The usage of “brother-in-law” instead of “husband” sounds “softer” and it does not make the same impact on the target text as it does on the source text.

Here is another riddle with the answer “bear”:

- Dağ başında tonton baba (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 96).

In Turkish, “tonton” is an adjective used for old people who are fat but charming and warmhearted. In this riddle, “bear” was likened to an old loveable father.

Here is the translation:

Father Tonton on the mountain (Akalın, ans: Bear) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 96).

The target text shows that “tonton” was not translated. By capitalizing “tonton” as ‘Tonton’, the word appears as a proper name and it can cause ambiguity in the target text.

- Altı kül, üsdü kül, içinde sarı gül (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 137).

The answer of this riddle is “bread”. In Turkish culture, bread is sacred and that is why, in the source text, it was likened to “gül” which means “rose”, a beautiful flower with a nice smell. “Altı kül, üsdü kül” means that the bread is covered by ash because in Erzurum, bread is cooked in stone ovens which have ash inside.

Here is the translation:

Its bottom is ashy, its top is ashy, in it a yellow rose (Akalın, ans: Bread) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 137).

The target reader who does not have an idea about how bread is made in an oven will have a difficulty in guessing this riddle. However, it is the cultural dimension of the riddle.

- Nar tanesi, nur tanesi, dört köşenin bir tanesi (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 139).

For its color, taste and the arrangements of its grains, pomegranate has been regarded as a miraculous fruit in many genres of folk literature. But in this riddle, pomegranate was not used as a kind of fruit. “Nar tanesi, nur tanesi” is a phrase which is used for emphasizing the preciousness of something or somebody. In this riddle, particular importance was given to “bride” with that phrase.

Here is the translation:

Berry of pomegranate, grain of light, the only one of the four corners [of the world] (Akalin, ans: Bride) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 139).

A word-for-word rendering of the phrase “nar tanesi, nur tanesi” as “berry of pomegranate, grain of light” does not show the deep meaning of that expression.

- Bir nenem var, üç guşah bağlar (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 147).

The answer of this riddle is “besom”. Besom is a tool which is used for sweeping. People did not use to buy them at shops. Women used to collect some twigs and tie these twigs up. Hence, they made a bundle of twigs which are attached to a handle. Since sweeping is done by women, in this riddle, the besom was associated with “nene” which means “grandmother”.

Here is the translation:

I have a grandmother who girds herself with three belts (Akalin, ans: Besom) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 147).

“Guşah” (“kuşak” in standard Turkish) was translated as “belt” in the target text for connoting the strings around the handle of the besom. However, the first meaning of “kuşak” coming to mind is not “belt” in Erzurum. “Kuşak” is a piece of cloth used to surround oneself for being protected against freezing cold. As it is a minor detail, the translator might have considered it not important.

- Yer altında / babam başı (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 160).

The answer of this riddle is “cabbage”. The riddle mentions the place where the cabbage grows and its physical description.

Here is the translation:

Under the ground is my father’s head (Akalin, ans: Cabbage) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 160).

The metaphors which were used to depict the place and the physical description of cabbage were rendered with their literal target meanings. However, the below riddle depicting “cabbage” again is different from this riddle:

- Alı renksen, alı renk; ne Urumsan, ne Firenk; eli zilli, goltuğu defli (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 161).

The standard Turkish form of “Urum” is as “Rum” and it means “Greek”; “Firenk” is an adjective used for Europeans. Greeks and Europeans have different cultural practices from people who live in Erzurum. Cabbage does not grow in Erzurum so it seems too “foreign” for Erzurum. “Urum” and “Firenk” were used in the source text for emphasizing that foreignness.

Here is the translation:

You have red color. You are neither a Greek nor a Frank (i.e., European). He has castanets in his hands and a tambourine under his arm (Akalın, ans: Cabbage) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 161).

The literal translations of “Urum” and “Firenk” which were used in the source text for emphasizing the foreignness might not make the same impression on the target text reader.

- Kırmızıdır, kan değil; okunur, Kur’an değil (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 354).

The time when this riddle was uttered is not known. Its answer is “gold”. The value of gold was foregrounded with “Kur’an” (Koran) at that time.

Here is the translation:

It is red but no blood; it is read but not the Koran (Başgöz, ans: Gold) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 354).

This riddle was obviously asked a long time ago when the only written source or book for reading was the Koran as it can be understood from the statement “okunur, Kur’an değil” (“it is read but not the Koran”). The literal rendering without an explanation is not clear enough for the target text reader as it is an old riddle which has cultural connotations.

The above examples prove the fact that the translator literally translated the riddles in which there are metaphors, rather than focusing on their meanings. The below examples include Erzurum riddles which have puns along with their translations into English.

2.10.4.1.2. Puns

“Pun” can be roughly described as “word play”. Puns are made in a humorous and clever manner with the words which have multiple meanings. Since any two languages do not have the same semantic patterns, it cannot be expected to render the puns to the full extent. Lefevere stated that:

As in dealing with puns, translators would be wise to try to keep the incidence of register-based illocutionary items roughly identical in source and target texts (1992: 58).

In the following lines, Erzurum riddles in which words were played and their translations into English were provided.

- Bizde bize biz derler, sizde bize ne derler? (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 85)

It is a riddle in which pun was used. “Biz”, in Turkish, has two meanings: Firstly, it means “we” which is a pronoun and secondly, it is a tool which is used for making holes in leather.

Here is the translation:

In our house they call us (or, an awl) “us”*, what do they call us (or, an awl) in your house? (Akalın, ans: Awl)

* Turkish biz means both “we” and “awl” (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 85).

In the target text, both meanings of “biz” were used but in order to overcome this ambiguity stemming from having more than one clear meaning, the translator made use of a footnote to enlighten the target reader.

Until that riddle, footnotes had not been used yet. It is a new strategy that the readers have met.

- Garşıdan gördüm şırıl şırıl, yanına vardım mırıl mırıl, dedim heyir ola, dedi ahşama gelin! (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 140)

The answer of this riddle is “bridegroom” so the riddle must be about marriage ceremony. This riddle makes pun with the word “gelin”. “Gelin” has two meanings in Turkish: It means “bride” and it can also be used as the verb “come” and, literally, it is an order phrase which is given to the second plural personal pronoun.

Here is the translation:

From afar I saw him şırıl şırıl. I approached; he spoke in a low voice. I said to him, “What’s new?” He said, “Come this evening!” (Akalm, ans: Bridegroom) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 140)

In the target text, “gelin” was translated only as a verb and word-play does not exist in the translation.

The two examples from Erzurum riddles show that the translator applied two different strategies. In the first example, he made use of a footnote to convey the word-play in the source text. However, the word-play in the second example seems to have been lost as only the one meaning of the word was reflected on the target language.

2.10.4.2. Other Cultural Elements

2.10.4.2.1. Proper Names

Before carrying out a comparative study of proper names between source texts and the target texts, it might be good to remind the reader of the nature of the riddle again. When the riddle is uttered, the riddlee spins the words round in his/her mind to reach the answer. S/he imagines how to build a bridge between what s/he hears and the answer. Man cannot visualize anything he does not know. If the riddlee hears something s/he doesn’t know, s/he starts asking questions to the riddler. In the light of the clues given by the riddler, the riddlee is back in the saddle.

Under this category, the examples of proper names in riddles and their standings in the target texts were examined. Proper names excite certain feelings based on knowledge and experiences of the person or society. For instance, Verona city where Romeo and Juliet lived, arouses different feelings in many people; that feelings are awaken by proper names such as Atatürk or Çanakkale in Turkish people is beyond dispute; it is inarguably true that the name “Hitler’ leads to various notions in many people’s minds even if these people are directly or indirectly related to the War and that there is a distinction between cognitive-mental reactions shown by millions who were harmed by

the Second World War; and by who adore him” (Aksan, 2013: 105). To put it differently, proper names are culturally and linguistically specific.

The reason for employing proper names in riddles is to make the source text more convincing on behalf of the reader or of the riddlee and to help the riddlee visualize the riddle better by associating the objects with a name. Only people who share the same culture can manage to associate the same name with the same object.

Here are the examples:

- Hasan’ım mehdi / çamura çökdü / çektim, guyruğu gopdu (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 17).

In Erzurum, “Hasan” is one of the most common names. There might not be a direct connection with the answer “carrot” but it constitutes the first example for associating an object with a proper name.

Here is the translation:

My Hasan, Messiah (Mahdi), he sank in the dirt. I pulled him out. His tail broke (Akalın, ans: Carrot) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 17).

In the target text, it can be seen that the riddle was literally rendered as it is not possible to find the cultural equivalence. However, “my Hasan” might seem “meaningless” for the target text reader.

- Dilberin yanağıdır, temmuz ayı çağıdır, vatanını sorarsan, Amasya’nın bağıdır (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 80).

The answer of this riddle is “apple”. Apple does not grow in Erzurum so it is taken from other regions in Turkey. Amasya is the main place among these regions for taking apples. They ripen in July. The source text uses the metaphor of “Amasya’nın bağı” which means “the garden of Amasya” to evoke the answer.

Here is the translation:

It is the cheek of the fair one, July is its season. If you inquire for its home, it is the gardens of Amasya (Başgöz, ans: Apple) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 80).

The translation does not mean anything to the target text reader because it is a geographical knowledge-based riddle and there is not an explanation.

- Pambuhdur, yumuŝahdır, iplikden gevŝekdir, nar gabuğundan ferecesi, makina dikiŝli, Ceneviz nahıŝlı. Tökme, berber oğlu, sabunlu suyu, gelip burden züriyetli hanım geçecek (Baŝgöz and Tietze, 1973: 121).

In this riddle, the answer is “black beetle”, a kind of insect, and the source text used the expression “Ceneviz nakıŝlı” in order to describe the striped back of the insect. Some historical background is needed in order to explain this example. In Ottoman Empire era, Bursa – a city located in Northwestern Anatolia within Marmara Region in Turkey – was an important trade route. Also, many tradesmen from different points around the world such as Venice and Genoese settled in Bursa back then. They set up silk industry there and with this industry needlecraft and drapery developed.

Here is the translation:

Soft like cotton wool, gentler than threads, with a dress made of pomegranate skin, with machine-sewn seams, and Genoese embroidery. Do not throw out sudsy water, son of the barber, the lady with offspring will pass by here (Akalın, ans: Black beetle) (Baŝgöz and Tietze, 1973: 121).

“Ceneviz nakıŝlı” was translated as “Genoese embroidery” which is something only a person who comes from Turkish culture can be familiar with. Others can have a problem in understanding the riddle. And as this riddle was taken from a printed source, the riddlee does not have the option of referring to the riddler. Thus, leaving proper names as they are may sometimes cause some troubles.

- Urumelinde / ağız belinde (Baŝgöz and Tietze, 1973: 207).

The answer of this riddle is ‘churn’. Rumelia is both geographically and culturally far from Erzurum. It is not known when this riddle was uttered but it can be deduced that “churn” which is used to make butter and buttermilk was not widespread in Erzurum at that time. “Rumelia” was used in the source text to emphasize the foreignness of the notion.

Here is the translation:

In Rumelia, having its mouth on its waist (Akalin, ans: Churn) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 207).

As for the translation of this riddle, literally transmitting “Rumelia” to the target text does not foreground the foreignness of the notion as much as it does in the source text.

- İriz iriz giderem, İrizvana giderem; guşun ganadıyamdır, Horuzvana giderem (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 213).

It is an interesting riddle because it is seen that proper names “İrizvan” and “Horuzvan” were accorded with Erzurum dialect. And the doubling was created in this direction. “İrizvan” corresponds to Yerevan (“Erivan” in Turkish); “Horuzvan” corresponds to “Horosan”. Since “Erivan” was expressed as “İrizvan”, the doubling was as “iriz iris”.

Here is the translation:

I go away iriz iriz, I go away toward Irizvan. I am the wing of a bird. I go to Horuzvan (Akalin, ans: Cigarette smoke) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 213).

The answer of this riddle is “cigarette smoke”. “İriz iriz” shows the way the smoke travels slowly. Leaving it untranslated causes ambiguity in the target text.

- Abo'm Yemenden gelir, suyu çimenden gelir (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 229).

Regardless of the rest of the riddle, “My Abo comes from Yemen” part indicates coffee. Turkish people met coffee in Ottoman Empire, Yavuz Sultan Selim era. Coffee was brought by the governor of Yemen and it accessed to the kitchen of the palace. That’s why, in Turkish culture, when someone speaks of “Yemen”, coffee comes to mind. “Abo” is a variant form of proper name, “Abbas”.

Here is the translation:

My Abo comes from Yemen. His water comes from the meadow (Akalin, ans: Coffee) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 229).

Without a clear explanation, “Abo” in the target text does not mean anything to the target text reader.

- Gider, Leyli / gelir, Leyli / ayak üstü / durur, Leyli (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 261).

“Leyli” is used instead of “Leyla”, a woman name, and it also means “night”. It is not obvious which meaning of “Leyli” the “door” was associated with in the source text.

Here is the translation:

It goes, Leyli; it comes, Leyli; it stands on its foot, Leyli (Başgöz, ans: Door) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 261).

The same obscurity exists in the target text. The target text reader might find the translation “meaningless” as they might not know what “Leyli” means.

- Dağdan gelir Hanife hatın, barmahları gınalı hatın, keten köynek giyinmiş, göysü düymeli hatın (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 273).

In Turkish folk literature, everything small, delicate and slim is generally characterized by women, like in the example of “duck” which is the answer of this riddle. “Lady Henife” describes a “duck”.

Here is the translation:

From the mountain comes Lady Henife, the lady with henna-stained fingers; she wears a linen shirt, the lady with buttons in front (Akalın, ans: Duck) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 273).

As it is not possible for the target text reader to know that “Lady Henife” describes a “duck”, the literal rendering of the proper name does not lead the target text reader to the answer.

- Hey Heceli Heceli / bugün bir hekmet gördüm / yüzü et, içi deri (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 349).

“Heceli” is the abbreviation of “Haji Ali” in the spoken language.

Here is the translation:

O Haji Ali, Haji Ali, I saw a marvel today: its outside is of flesh, its interior is of skin (Akalın, ans: Gizzard) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 349).

The translator rendered “Heceli” as “Haji Ali” in the target text. “Heceli” was used as a nickname in the source text but “Haji” refers to an Islamic motif in the target text, which does not exist in the source text.

- İsfahan’da gala yapmış, oturur; giderise galasını götürür; gitmezise sakin olur, oturur (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 386).

Turkish language and culture are closely intertwined with Persian language and culture, which reverberates through literature. That’s why there are a lot of stresses on Iran in Turkish folk literature. For instance, “hedgehog” was described with Isfahan, Iran’s third largest city which is famous for its Islamic architecture from its mosques, palaces to the castles.

Here is the translation:

He has made himself a castle at Isfahan, he lives in it. When he goes away, he carries his castle with him. When he does not go, he stays there, seated quietly (Akalın, ans: Hedgehog) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 386).

As the translator translated the riddle literally, the cultural reverberation in the source text is not noticed in the target text.

- Edirne’den sandıh gelir/ sandıhçılar bilmez onu/ içi dolu mercan gelir/ mercancılar bilmez onu/ arasında kağıt gelir/ kağıtçılar bilmez onu (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 592).

“Pomegranate”, which is the answer of this riddle, does not grow in Erzurum. It is taken from other regions such as “Edirne” (“Adrianople”). That’s why, “Edirne” (“Adrianople”) was employed in the source text.

Here is the translation:

From Adrianople comes a chest such as chest-makers do not know; it is full of pieces of coral such as sellers of coral do not know; there is paper between [the pieces of coral] such as paper-makers (or, paper-dealers) do not know (Akalın, ans: Pomegranate) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 592).

The target text reader, who is not familiar with that fact which was explained above, will not be able to attribute any meanings to the translation.

- Fatma, gaşları çatma! Döner dingil otu, töker burun otu (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 635).

The answer of this riddle is “saw”. The reason why the name “Fatma” was uttered in this riddle is different. There isn’t a direct connection between “Fatma” and “saw” but

taking the source text into consideration, it can be stated that “Fatma” was used just for rhyming with the verb “çatma”.

Here is the translation:

Fatma, don't knit your brows! The axletree turns and scatters snuff (Akalın, ans: Saw) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 635).

“Fatma, gaşları çatma” was translated as “Fatma, don't knit your brows”. So, regarding the course of the sentence in the target text, “Fatma” does not rhyme with the /s/ of “brows”.

Below there are two different riddles the answer of which is “letter”. Both of them ascribed different things to the “letter” and to the distance it covers:

- Burdan vurdum gılcı / Helep'te oynar ucu (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 437).

As folk literature is a product of culture, there are many cultural motifs such as geography. In order to solve the riddles in which geographical names are uttered, the riddlee needs to know the location. In this riddle, distance was described with “Aleppo”.

Here is the translation:

Here I struck a sabre blow, the tip of the sabre came to the fore at Aleppo (Akalın, ans: Letter) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 437).

“Aleppo” which was used to describe the distance through which the “letter” covered was left to the target text reader's interpretation.

- İstanbul'da süt pişer / kokusu buraya düşer (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 435).

“Letter” was associated with the milk and of its smell.

Here is the translation:

In Istanbul milk is boiled. Its smell reaches this place (Başgöz, ans: Letter) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 435).

In this riddle, the target text reader needs to know that there is a great distance between Erzurum and Istanbul as there is not a further explanation in addition to the literal translation.

As this part of the thesis can be confusing, an elaborate explanation is needed here. Given the example of “Istanbul” above, lexically, “Istanbul” is “Istanbul”. No matter who the target reader is or what the target language is, “Istanbul” does not change and it does not take another name because “Istanbul” is a proper name and it refers to a unique entity. There are not any other “Istanbul”s around the world with the same properties. That’s why, the only option for the translator is to leave it as “Istanbul”. However, in this category the proper names, in the source texts, suggest the patterns of the objects, the animals or whatever the answer is. Lack of knowledge on source text language and culture makes it difficult to be able to understand what has been suggested. In this case, the emergent product is a line of meaningless words in tandem so the meaning that is caught by the source text reader cannot be taken by the target text reader, which proves the fact that rendering the riddles in which proper names are employed literally causes a semantic deviation, another category put forward by Geoffrey N. Leech.

2.10.4.2.2. Historical Elements

Riddles have existed for a long time. What was all the rage at the time when a riddle was uttered seems “old” and “historical” later. Below are some examples of riddles which date back to old times and which carry some “historical elements”.

- Ünü gelir, ürküdür, beyi paşayı gorphudur (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 74).

The answer of this riddle is the “angel of death” which is feared in Islam. This fear appears in this riddle as big as to terrify “beys” and “pashas” who are high officials of the Ottoman Empire.

Here is the translation:

His fame, when one hears him mentioned, makes one shiver; he terrifies even beys and pashas (Akalin; ans: Angel of Death) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 74).

The target text reader who does not know who “beys” and “pashas” are may find the translation meaningless.

- Bir ecayip nesne gördüm, canı yohdur, seslenir; ne yerdedir, ne göydedir, set yüzüne yaslanır; girallardan haraç alır, padişaktan taç alır; yetmişiki buçuk millet hep ona möhdaç galır (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 479).

“Yetmiş iki buçuk millet” (“seventy-two and a half nations”) is an expression which was inherited from Ottoman period. It implicates the large area on which the empire has spread.

Here is the translation:

I have seen a strange thing. It has no life, but makes its voice heard. It is neither on earth nor in heaven. It rests against a platform. It takes tribute from kings. It takes away the emperor’s crown. All seventy-two and a half nations¹¹⁰ are dependent on it (Akalın, ans: Mill) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 479).

The translator, who noticed that translating the number literally would cause a doubtful meaning in the target text, made use of a footnote in this translation. On page 1041, the footnote was provided as “generalities”. But the explanation is not clear enough for the target text reader to predict the meaning.

2.10.4.2.3. Islamic Motifs

Erzurum is a conservative place in Turkey. As people in this region are ardently adhered to their religion, this devotedness can be noticed in every aspect of their lives. As riddles are pieces of folk culture, religious motifs are also reflected on the riddles.

- Guyruhsuz kedi, miyav miyav dedi (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 85).

The answer of this riddle is “automobile”. “Guyruhsuz kedi” (“the cat without a tail”) was used in the source text to evoke the answer. An automobile has four wheels as a cat has four legs; the noise emitted by the vehicle is likened to the crying sound of a cat. The cat is an important figure for Turkish people because it is believed that a cat saved the prophet from being bitten by a snake. This riddle shows that automobiles are considered as precious as cats.

Here is the translation:

The cat without a tail said, “Miaw, miaw” (Akalın, ans: Automobile) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 85).

Although cats make sound as “meow” in English, the translator preferred to render the sound as “miaw” which is close to its Turkish equivalent “miyav”. Thus, the target text proves that the translator applied his norms again and chose literal translation. On the other hand, the target text reader might not be able to establish the connection with “cat” and “automobile” as the subject is deeply attached to the religion.

- Hacca giden hacıdır, gitmeyen möhdacıdır. Dal verir, yaprah vermez, o neyin ağacıdır? (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 98)

The answer of this riddle, which has a hidden meaning, is “beard” because “beard” was thought to be connoted by “being a haji” in the source text. When a man becomes a haji, he usually grows beard.

Here is the translation:

Whoever goes to Mecca becomes a haji. Whoever does not go is in need of going. What is the tree that has branches but not leaves? (Akalın, ans: Beard) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 98)

The target text was shaped by literal translation. “Hacca gitmek” was translated as “go to Mecca” but it can also be translated as “go on pilgrimage” which has a more familiar meaning for the target text reader. Moreover, “haji” is a religious term which takes place in Islam. Since the translator wanted to be faithful to the source text preferred “Mecca” and “haji” rather than “pilgrimage” and “pilgrim”. But the target text reader, who might not know where, even “what” “Mecca” is, will find the translation weird. Thus, her/his confusion might take her/him away from the answer.

- Kat kat içinde / kat kitap içinde / ne molla bilir / ne kitap içinde (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 258).

This riddle is rich in religious connotations with some terms such as “kitap” and “molla”. The first meaning of “kitap” in a Turkish to English dictionary is “book”. But this riddle does not mention an ordinary book; it mentions the holy book. “Molla” (“mullah” in English) is a teacher who teaches the law of religion.

Here is the translation:

Layer upon layer, book upon book; neither does a theologian (molla) know it, nor is it written in a book (Başgöz, ans: Destiny) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 258).

“Kitap” was translated into its first meaning as “book” so the religious connotation in the source text was lost in the target text. “Molla” was translated as “theologian” but the translator who wanted to transmit the source culture to the target culture added “molla” in its Turkish form in brackets.

- İşte şurda tepede/ hemen doldur sepete/ en güzeli yetişir/ Eyüpteki türbede (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 584).

The answer of this riddle is “plum”. The word which has the religious connotation is “türbe” which means “shrine”. The shrines are covered in green. In Turkish, there is a color named “türbe yeşili” which means “shrine green”. Given these facts, the common point between the religious element of this riddle and the answer is the color “green”.

Here is the translation:

Right there on the hill, fill the basket wit it at once! The most beautiful ones grow at the mausoleum of Eyüp¹³² (Başgöz, ans: Plum) (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 584).

As can be seen in the target text that the translator made use of a footnote. The explanation is as follows: “Eyüp, quarter of Istanbul, near the far end of the Golden Horn” (Başgöz and Tietze, 1973: 1058). That is, the attention of the reader was caught on “Eyüp”. However, this explanation is not enough for the answer.

In this part entitled “semantic components”, culture-specific items were examined under two sub-categories as “figurative language” and “other cultural elements”. Under “figurative language”, “metaphors” and “puns”, and under “other cultural elements”, “proper names”, “historical elements” and “Islamic motifs” were examined. The facts proved that the translator did not focus on the meanings but on the words. Thus, such a literal rendering was not enough for the culture-specific items to be transmitted to the target culture.

If it was a novel, new cultural items in the target text could have been regarded as “exoticism” or “cultural richness” but the riddle is a special case because its purpose is to make the riddlee or the reader reach the answer. The unknown or foreign items cannot fulfill this function of the riddle. Thus, the emergent product might seem “non-sense” (Leech, 1969: 49). In Leech’s view, “non-sense” leads to semantic deviation so it can be concluded from this part is that the literal renderings of semantic components have led to semantic deviation.

CONCLUSION

This thesis analyzed the English translations of Erzurum folk riddles in the light of Raymond van den Broeck's translation criticism model. Both the Turkish riddles and their translations were taken from the book entitled *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles* (1973) by İlhan Başgöz and Andreas Tietze. The framework that was used for this study was the translation criticism model proposed by Raymond van den Broeck. The aim of this study was to propound whether the translator subjected himself to the norms of source language and culture; thus, provided an adequate translation or he prioritized the norms of target language and culture; thus, provided an acceptable translation.

In order to arrive at more accurate results in criticism, the critic should investigate the source text and the target text before criticism. Thus, this study initially explored the nature of the riddles that could challenge the translator due to its historical, lyrical and cultural peculiarities. Within this framework, as the riddle was regarded as the sub-genre of folk literature, some brief information was provided about folklore, its history, its relationships with literature and its sub-genres in Anglo-American and in Turkish Folk Literatures. This brief information shed light on the fact that the riddle was actually a poem. Hence, this study perceived the translation of riddles as the translation of poetry. The difficulties of translating poetry are inevitable. Thus, the criteria of criticism were determined regarding these difficulties.

This study conducted detailed research into translation criticism. It was observed that there are not necessary standards for translation criticism either in Europe or in Turkey yet. It is this gap which constitutes the model proposed by Raymond van den Broeck. In this model in which the critic's norms are distinguished from the translator's norms, and the questions "how?" and "why?" are foregrounded, Broeck puts forward three steps.

In the first step, the specification of the source text is required as this model points out that the criticism should begin with the analysis of the source text because the target text is born out of the source text. The linguistic and extra-linguistic elements are included in this stage; however, as it is a detailed model, the linguistic description of the source text contained only the most challenging linguistic parts of Erzurum riddles by

regarding the fact that Turkish and English belong to different linguistic families and that as a poem that cannot be disengaged from its cultural context, the riddle offers various difficulties to the translator. The findings under this part could answer the first sub-question that was determined as: “Which parts of the source text were challenging for the translator?” Within this framework, the dialectal peculiarity of the riddles as language varieties was observed to be the most striking challenge for the translator. As only Erzurum riddles were included in this study, Erzurum dialect seemed to be apparent in most of the riddles but as their characteristics in the language existed only in this region, it seemed to be difficult to preserve the same characteristics while rendering a text in which dialect was at the forefront.

The second challenging point under language varieties was observed to be the use of register in riddles. Register is determined by the purpose, occasion or the audience. An expression which is used for a special purpose, occasion or an audience in a culture might not suit another culture so while rendering the register; the translator needs to consider not merely the words but the reason and the aim of usage of the register. Transmitting the register literally from the Oriental culture-based Erzurum riddles to the Western culture by preserving the same purpose seemed to be difficult for the translator because his word choice could yield to misunderstandings.

The other challenging part for the translator appeared to be the morphological components as morphological structures of Turkish and English were determined to be quite different. The first challenging point under this part was “emphatic reduplication” employed to accentuate an adjective by employing a prefix and a consonant in Turkish as in the example of “u-p-uzun”. In this example, the adjective is “uzun”. In order to obtain a stronger meaning “u” is needed but as it is not possible to pronounce “uuzun”, the consonant “p” is added. However, in English the adjectives get stronger by adding more words. In order to give the same meaning, the translator should choose the proper words. However, if the translator is not familiar with either the target language or the target culture, s/he may not be able to make a good choice. For this reason, seeking for the best choice seemed to be challenging for the translator whose first language was different from the target language.

The second challenging point under morphological components was suggested as “*m*-reduplication”. In this reduplicative process in Turkish grammar, “*m*” is added before the noun as in the example of “elma melma” or the initial consonant of a word can be omitted and replaced by “*m*” as in the example of “telefon mefelefon”. However, this structure does not exist in English so finding equivalence for a point that did not directly exist in the target language was assumed to be difficult for the translator.

Another challenging point under morphological components was designated as “*doublings*”. *Doublings* in Turkish grammar are formulated by the repetition of the words; however, this structure does not exist in English grammar. In Erzurum riddles, a plenty of *doublings* were noticed. Nevertheless, the only reason why they are challenging to translate is not their structure but also their meaning. While some *doublings* were meaningful, some were meaningless due to the melodious character of each riddle. Thus, determining a common translation method on the translations of *doublings* seemed to be difficult for the translator.

The third challenging part for the translator in the translations of Erzurum riddles was the phonological and lexical components. It was observed that the demanding points of phonological components were rhyme (a word which has the same sound with another word) and onomatopoeia (the words which are the same as the sounds they describe). This category which was formed by focusing on the sound devices in Erzurum riddles suggested to be demanding for the translator owing to the different sound systems of Turkish and English. For this reason, preserving the same phonological character of the source text in the target text was quite difficult for the translator. Similarly, the other demanding point under this category for the same reason was neologisms (the invention of new words) and non-sense words. In this point under lexical components, it was observed that some new words were invented and in some riddles, these inventions were made in line with the sound pattern of each riddle without forming any meaningful units for creating rhythm in the source text. Owing to the differences of sound patterns of the two languages, the way how riddles are received by the target culture is totally different. The translator who is expected to transmit these differences assumes a hard responsibility.

The fourth challenging part for the translator in the translations of Erzurum riddles was the semantic components in which figurative language such as metaphors and puns; proper names, historical elements and Islamic motifs were given place. As these items are related to Erzurum culture, their renderings are challenging because they may not be present in the target culture. The translator who is expected to be a mediator between two cultures should decide whether to use familiar cultural expressions to make those culture-specific items intelligible for the target text readers or to transmit them to the target culture as they are in order to introduce the source culture.

In the second step, Raymond van den Broeck suggests a comparison of the target text regarding the elements of the source text which are specified in the first step. In addition, some differences between the source text and the target text including the shifts of expression are considered with respect to the source text in this step. This thesis deduced from this respect that the translator's decisions and strategies in order to overcome the challenges of the source text determined the shifts of expression to a great extent. Within this framework, these strategies and some problems along with shifts of expression along with some deviations as a result of these strategies were determined. So that, the answers were be provided for the second sub-question that was determined as "What kind of strategies did the translator apply when he encountered these challenges?" and for the third sub-question that was determined as "As a result of these strategies that the translator needed to use when the translation challenged him, which differences arose between the source text and the target text?"

In the first place, it was observed that as the translator could not find a way to transmit the expressions in Erzurum dialect to English, he regarded these expressions as if they were in their Standard Turkish forms and translated them into Standard English. However, as Erzurum dialect was apparent in the riddles and they could not be transferred to the target language, dialectal deviation occurred in the target text.

As for the rendering of the register, it was observed that in the translator's view, the literal translation of the register might not be understood by the target culture. Thus, he used a different expression instead of the one in the source text. However, his word choice seemed to be quite unsuitable for the target culture. Hence, the deviation of register was observed at this point.

Since the grammar of the words was different in Turkish and English, the translator acted within the grammatical limits of the target language that was observed especially in the translations of emphatic reduplications. In line with the structure of English grammar, it is only possible to create the emphatic reduplications by adding new adjectives in front of adjectives in English but the translator seemed to have not been able to find the suitable words to give the same strength. However, under the translations of *m*-reduplications, it was seen that the reduplications were left untranslated in their Turkish forms in the target language and it caused formation of non-English words in English sentences. It might seem incomprehensible for the target text reader and such a strategy might distract the target text reader. When the translations of doublings were considered, it was seen that while some doublings were left in their source language forms in the target language, some of them were translated but in these translations, the doubling form was spoiled. Moreover, although doublings do not exist in English as the repetition of words, a doubling was observed in the target language in that form so the translator seemed to have changed the target language structure and added a new form to adapt the target text to the source text. Hence, the translator seems to have caused some inconsistencies as he translated some doublings but did not translate the others. In the light of these explanations, it could be concluded that the translator's decisions to be able to find equivalence under morphological components caused grammatical deviation.

When the translations of phonological and lexical components were regarded, it was observed that while translating the rhyming patterns, the translator regarded them as if they were not in rhyme and rendered all rhyming words as plain texts in which the rhyme did not exist. Thus, the rhythmical patterns of the source text seemed to have lost in the target language. The similar strategies were applied to the translations of onomatopoeic expressions. They were left untranslated in their source language forms. These words caused ambiguities in English. However, the ones with clear meanings were translated. This was another evidence for inconsistencies in the translation process. As a general strategy, the translator did not translate newly invented words either. Instead, he left them in their source language forms in the target language. As in an example, a riddle which was formed only by non-sense onomatopoeic words was not translated. The translator wrote "obscure" in brackets. Within this respect, the

translator's strategy did not lead the readers to the answers; the riddles became difficult to be understood and they did not sound English. Owing to the consequences listed, phonological and lexical deviations occurred in the target language.

When the translations of semantic components were considered, it was observed that the translator who encountered a lot of culture-specific items only reworded the riddles in English. That is, he expressed the same riddles anew by substituting English words for Turkish words. It was observed that the translator's strategies caused ambiguities, misunderstandings and the loss of hidden meanings. The translations did not lead the target text readers to the answers. Although the translator made use of footnotes under some riddles, the explanations provided under these footnotes were not clear enough. Thus, semantic deviation seemed to be inevitable given these strategies applied by the translator and their consequences.

In the third step, Broeck notes that the factual degree should be stated regarding the differences between the source text and the target text. These differences were proven above. The purpose of this thesis is not to underestimate either the translator's decisions or the final product. Furthermore, this thesis might explore that these riddles could be translated by another translator so that the scope of the comparative analysis could be extended in order to yield healthier results. However, regarding the above information related to the target text, it is noticed that the translator applied his literal translation method by adhering to the norms of the source system and by rendering the dialect, the register, the phonological and the lexical components and the semantic components as faithfully as possible, which was a highly demanding task that required some strategies to overcome problems related to the lack of equivalence and caused other problems along with shifts of expression in the target language. In the light of these statements, this study attempted to answer the research question as: In Erzurum riddles, dialect and culture-specific items play important roles. Parallel to the idea of literal translation method, it is hard to transfer them to the target system with the preservation of the spirit of the source system. Thus, the translator acted within the linguistic and cultural boundaries of the target system by not respecting its aesthetic norms and made some obligatory shifts. Thus, his decisions did not provide an acceptable translation in the target text but an adequate translation.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, R., & Dundes, A. (1972). "Riddles". In R. Dorson (Ed.), *Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction* (pp. 129-144). The University of Chicago Press.
- Akalın, L. (1954). *Erzurum Bilmeceleri*. Istanbul: [publisher not identified].
- Aksan, D. (2013). *Şiir Dili ve Türk Şiir Dili*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Anderman, G. (2007). "Linguistics and Translation". In P. Kuhiwczak and K. Littau (Ed.), *A Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 45-62). Great Britain: Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Başgöz, İ. & Tietze, A. (1973). *Bilmece: A Corpus of Turkish Riddles*. The United States of America: University of California Press.
- Başgöz, İ. (1972). *Folklore Studies and Nationalism in Turkey* (S. Uğurlu, Trans.). Indiana University Press, *Journal of the Folklore Institute*, Vol. 9, No.2/3, pp. 162-176. Retrieved from: [http:// www.millifolklor.com](http://www.millifolklor.com), on March 25, 2015.
- Başgöz, İ. (1986). *Folklor Yazıları*. Maslak, İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
- Başgöz, İ. (1998). "Protest: The Fifth Function of Folklore". In K. Silay (Ed.), *Turkish Folklore and Oral Literature: Selected Essays of İlhan Başgöz* (pp. 339-356). Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University.
- Başgöz, İ. (2008). *Hikaye: Turkish Folk Romance as Performance Art*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.
- Boulton, M. (1953). *The Anatomy of Poetry*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Broeck, R. (1985). "Second Thoughts of Translation Criticism: A Model of its Analytic Function". In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation* (pp. 54-62). London: Croom Helm.

- Büyükkantarcioglu, N. (1999). "Language Varieties and Translation: A Sociolinguistic Perspective". In *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları Dergisi* (pp. 65-85). Ankara: H.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Mütercim-Tercümanlık Bölümü.
- Connolly, D. (1998). "Poetry Translation". In M. Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 170-174). London and New York: Routledge.
- Costa, M. (2007). "Mind the Gap: Translating the 'Untranslatable'". In G. Anderman (Ed.), *Voices in Translation Bridging Cultural Divides* (p. 111,112). Clevedon [England: Multilingual Matters.
- Çatalbaş, R. (2011). "Türklerde Hayvan Sembolizmi ve Din İlişkisi". In *Turan Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi Dergisi*, Yıl: 2011, Cilt: 3, Sayı: 12. Retrieved from: <http://www.turansam.org>, on April 10, 2015.
- Edmonson, M. (1971). *Lore: An Introduction to the Science of Folklore and Literature*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gibbs, R. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Glucksberg, S., & McGlone, M. (2001). *Understanding Figurative Language from Metaphors to Idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London [u.a.: Routledge.
- Göktürk, A. (1998). *Çeviri: Dillerin Dili : İnceleme*. İstanbul: YKY, Yapı Kredi yayınları.
- Güzel, A., & Torun, A. (2003). *Türk Halk Edebiyatı El Kitabı*. Ankara: Akçağ.
- Hornby, A. S. & Wehmeier, S. (2005). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, R. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge [England: Cambridge University Press.

- Iacob, O. (2010). *Translation Criticism: Poetry in Translation*. Retrieved from: http://www.revista-studii-uvvg.ro/files/iunie_2010/critica-traducerii-poezia-in-traducere.pdf, on May 4, 2015.
- Jackson, G. (1994). *Traditional Epics: A Literary Companion*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO.
- Karademir, F. (2007). *Türk Halk Bilmecelerinin Yapı, Dil ve Üslup Özellikleri* (Doctoral dissertation). Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı, Tez Merkezi. (Accession Order Number 206049)
- Karakaş, A. (2011). *Anonim Türk Halk Edebiyatı Ürünlerinden Bilmecenin Çocuk Edebiyatına Katkıları*. Adana: Çukurova Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Leech, G. (1969). *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. Harlow: Longmans.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Maier, C. (1998). "Reviewing and Criticism". In M. Baker (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 205-210). London and New York: Routledge.
- Olçay, S. (1995). *Erzurum Ağzı*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Philip, N. (1995). *The Penguin Book of Scottish Folktales*. London: Penguin Books.
- Pound, L. (1922). *American Ballads and Songs*. United States of America: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Raffel, B. (1988). *The Art of Translating Poetry*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Raffel, B. (1994). *The Art of Translating Prose*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press.

- Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation Criticism: The Potentials and Limitations*. New York, N.Y.: American Bible Society. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/537632.pdf>, 14.01.2013
- Rifat, O. (2008). “Şiir Çevrilir Mi?” In M. Rifat (Ed.), *Çeviri Seçkisi: Çeviriyi Düşünenler* (pp. 94-96). Çemberlitaş-İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.
- Rosenberg, B. (1991). *Folklore and Literature: Rival Siblings*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Süreya, C. (2008). “Kendini Çevirten Şiir”. In M. Rifat (Ed.), *Çeviri Seçkisi: Çeviriyi Düşünenler* (pp. 97-99). Çemberlitaş-İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.
- Tezel, N. (1969). “Bilmeceler Hakkında”. In *Türk Halk Bilmeceleri*. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.
- Todd, G. (1893). *Scottish Ballad Poetry*. Glasgow: W. Hodge & CO.
- Todd, L. (1987). *An Introduction to Linguistics*. Beirut: York Press.
- Tosun, M. (2013). *Çeviri Eleştirisi Kuramı*. İstanbul: Aylak Adam Yayınları.
- Toury, G. (2000). “The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation”. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 198-221). London and New York: Routledge.
- Trask, R. (1999). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Türkyılmaz, D. (2009). “Ortak Sır Kalıplarımız: Türk Dünyası Bilmeceleri Üzerine”. In *Milli Folklor*, 2009, Yıl 21, Sayı 81. Retrieved from: <http://www.millifolklor.com>, on April 14, 2015.
- Utley, F. (1961). “Folk Literature: An Operational Definition”. In *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 74, No. 293, pp. 193-206.
- Yetkiner, N. (1996). “The Concept of Deviation in Riddle Translation from Turkish into English”. In *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları*. Ankara: H.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Mütercim-Tercümanlık Bölümü.

Zipes, J. (1989). *Fairy Tales and Fables from Weimar Days*. Hanover: University Press of England.

Websites

“Andreas Tietze”. Retrieved from

(http://www.ufukotesi.com/habergoster.asp?haber_no=20040113), on April 28, 2015.

“Çin”. Retrieved from

(http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_bts&arama=kelime&guid=TDK.GTS.54dba79b0c0e16.83940054), on March 25, 2015

“Eledim Eledim-Türkü”. Retrieved from

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=umQTBRerHnM>), on June 15, 2015

“Erzurum Ağzı Söz Varlığında Eski Türkçenin İzleri” by Dilek Akan. Retrieved from

(http://www.turkishstudies.net/Makaleler/1326676523_41_AkanBudakDilek_S-629-646.pdf), on December 27, 2015.

“İlhan Başgöz”. Retrieved from (<http://www.kulturelbellek.com/ilhan-basgozun-ozgecmisi-ve-yayinlari/>) on May 15, 2015.

“Lütfullah Sami Akalın”. Retrieved from (<http://www.kultur.gov.tr/EN,37119/akalin-lutfullah-sami.html>), on May 4, 2015.

“Pertev Naili Boratav”. Retrieved from (<http://www.sozelti.com/pertevnaili.html>), on May 15, 2015.

“Service Tree”. Retrieved from ([http://www.thefreedictionary.com/service tree](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/service+tree)) on March 25, 2015.

“Sound Devices Used in Poetry”. Retrieved from:

http://homepage.smc.edu/meeks_christopher/SOUND%20DEVICES%20USED%20IN%20POETRY.htm, on March 23, 2015.

“Şiir Çevirisi Üzerine”. by Asalet Erten. Retrieved from




(http://www.formatd.net/metafor/yazi/11120s_siir_cevirisi.htm) on May 1, 2015.

“Tongue Twisters”. Retrieved from (<http://americanfolklore.net/folklore/tongue-twisters/>) on February 20, 2015.

“Translation of dialect in Kipling's *Stalky & Co*” by Ivana Tomešová. Retrieved from:

(http://www.phil.muni.cz/~jirka/children/children1/kipling/tomesova_stalky.rtf), on February 20, 2015.

EK 1: ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

 <p>HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ YÜKSEK LİSANS/DOKTORA TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU</p>
<p>HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜTERCİM-TERCÜMANLIK ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Tarih: 06/07/2015</p> <p>Tez Başlığı / Konusu: Raymond van den Broeck'un Çeviri Eleştirisi Modeli Doğrultusunda Erzurum Halk Bilmecelerinin İngilizce Çevirilerinin İncelenmesi</p> <p>Yukarıda başlığı/konusu gösterilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 108 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 06/07/2015 tarihinde tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezin benzerlik oranı % 4'tür.</p> <p>Uygulanan filtrelemeler:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Kabul/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç, 2- Kaynakça hariç 3- Alıntılar hariç 4- 5 kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç <p>Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.</p> <p>Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Tarih ve İmza 06.07.2015 </p> <p>Adı Soyadı: Duygu Dalaslan Öğrenci No: N11126882 Anabilim Dalı: Mütercim Tercümanlık Programı: İngilizce Mütercim Tercümanlık Statüsü: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y.Lisans <input type="checkbox"/> Doktora <input type="checkbox"/> Bütünleşik Dr.</p>
<p><u>DANIŞMAN ONAYI</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">UYGUNDUR.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Prof. Dr. Asalet Ertan (Unvan, Ad Soyad, İmza)</p>



**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
THESIS/DISSERTATION ORIGINALITY REPORT**

**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
TO THE DEPARTMENT PRESIDENCY OF TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING**

Date: 06/07/2015

Thesis Title / Topic: An Analysis of the English Translations of Erzurum Folk Riddles in the light of Raymond van den Broeck's Translation Criticism Model

According to the originality report obtained by my thesis advisor by using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software and by applying the filtering options stated below on 06/07/2015 for the total of 108 pages including the a) Title Page, b) Introduction, c) Main Chapters, and d) Conclusion sections of my thesis entitled as above, the similarity index of my thesis is 4 %.

Filtering options applied:

1. Approval and Declaration sections excluded
2. Bibliography/Works Cited excluded
3. Quotes excluded
4. Match size up to 5 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Date and Signature
06.07.2015

Name Surname: Duygu Dalaslan
Student No: N11126882
Department: Translation and Interpreting in English
Program:
Status: Masters Ph.D. Integrated Ph.D.

ADVISOR APPROVAL

APPROVED.

Prof. Dr. Asalef Erten
(Title, Name Surname, Signature)

EK 2: ETİK KURUL İZİN MUAFİYETİ FORMU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ETİK KURUL İZİN MUAFİYETİ FORMU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MÜTERCİM TERCÜMANLIK ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 06/07/2015

Tez Başlığı / Konusu: Raymond van den Broeck'un Çeviri Eleştirisi Modeli Doğrultusunda Erzurum Halk Bilmecelerinin İngilizce Çevirilerinin İncelenmesi

Yukarıda başlığı/konusu gösterilen tez çalışmam:

1. İnsan ve hayvan üzerinde deney niteliği taşımamaktadır,
2. Biyolojik materyal (kan, idrar vb. biyolojik sıvılar ve numuneler) kullanılmasını gerektirmemektedir.
3. Beden bütünlüğüne müdahale içermemektedir.
4. Gözlemsel ve betimsel araştırma (anket, ölçek/skala çalışmaları, dosya taramaları, veri kaynakları taraması, sistem-model geliştirme çalışmaları) niteliğinde değildir.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Etik Kurullar ve Komisyonlarının Yönergelerini inceledim ve bunlara göre tez çalışmamın yürütülebilmesi için herhangi bir Etik Kuruldan izin alınmasına gerek olmadığını; aksi durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Tarih ve İmza
06.07.2015

Adı Soyadı: Duygu Dalaslan
Öğrenci No: N11126882
Anabilim Dalı: Mütercim Tercümanlık
Programı: İngilizce Mütercim Tercümanlık
Statüsü: Y.Lisans Doktora Bütünleşik Dr.

DANIŞMAN GÖRÜŞÜ VE ONAYI

Uygundur

 Prof. Dr. Asalet Erten

(Unvan, Ad Soyad, İmza)

Telefon: 0-312-2976860

Detaylı Bilgi: <http://www.sosyalbilimler.hacettepe.edu.tr>

Faks: 0-3122992147

E-posta: sosyalbilimler@hacettepe.edu.tr



**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ETHICS BOARD WAIVER FORM FOR THESIS WORK**

**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
THE DEPARTMENT PRESIDENCY OF TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING**

Date: 06/07/2015

Thesis Title / Topic: An Analysis of the English Translations of Erzurum Folk Riddles in the light of Raymond van den Broeck's Translation Criticism Model

My thesis work related to the title/topic above:

1. Does not perform experimentation on animals or people.
2. Does not necessitate the use of biological material (blood, urine, biological fluids and samples, etc.).
3. Does not involve any interference of the body's integrity.
4. Is not based on observational and descriptive research (survey, measures/scales, data scanning, system-model development).

I declare, I have carefully read Hacettepe University's Ethics Regulations and the Commission's Guidelines, and in order to proceed with my thesis according to these regulations I do not have to get permission from the Ethics Board for anything; in any infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility and I declare that all the information I have provided is true.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Date and Signature
06.07.2015

Name Surname: Duygu Dalaslan _____

Student No: N11126882 _____

Department: Translation and Interpreting in English _____

Program: _____

Status: Masters Ph.D. Integrated Ph.D. _____

ADVISER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL

Approved
A.S.
Prof. Dr. Asalet Erten

(Title, Name Surname, Signature)