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ABSTRACT

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien is one of the most outstanding British authors and the creator of an imaginary world called “the Middle Earth”. Tolkien’s novels prominent with a new world and a fictitious language have become quite popular worldwide. However, the fictitious words and expressions in Tolkien’s novels are challenging for the translators since the equivalents of these words may not be found in the target language. Çiğdem Erkal İpek, the translator of The Lord of the Rings, has become one of the most popular novels in Turkey. On the other hand, The Hobbit, Tolkien’s another novel about the Middle Earth, was translated into Turkish by a different translator. Since the above-mentioned two novels narrate the events occurring in the same imaginary world, a consistency may be expected in the translated versions of these books in terms of fictitious words and expressions. In this context, the present study aims to analyze the similarities between the Turkish translations of The Fellowship of the Ring and The Hobbit within the scope of intertextuality in terms of the transfer of fictitious language in Tolkien’s novels. Accordingly, the examples of fictitious words and expressions selected from these novels will be examined from the perspective of intertextual relations among the translated texts. By this way, the study will argue whether a translated text can go beyond the scope of the intertextuality and whether the translation can become a source text for future intertextual references in the target literature.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of individual or unique nature of any literary production has always been a controversial issue, especially beginning from the second part of the 20th century. Although literary products were evaluated as separate work fields that should be analyzed within the scope of linguistics in the past, it has gradually recognized that there is a close relationship between different literary works, which is the result of the social interactions of people. This realization has paved the way for the emergence of a new approach known as “intertextuality”, as defined by Kristeva. This approach has revealed a significant truth in the literature: “nothing is said that has not been said before” (Terence, 2004). As this approach has suggested, the interconnected world of literature has provided a shelter for scholars to analyze the literary texts not with their linguistic structures but with their intertextual relations. By this way, literature started to be defined as a continuous and accumulative production process.

Certain authors, on the other hand, have found a way to preserve their uniqueness by using their creative skills. In this regard, John Ronald Reuel Tolkien became a prominent figure of uniqueness in literature. His unique nature does not derive from his linguistic utilizations, but from his newly created imaginary world named “the Middle Earth” and the language called “Elvish”. His creative mind has opened a door to a new world that is not seen or known before and which hosts extraordinary races speaking a different language not heard in our world. Thus, Tolkien managed to break certain rules of intertextuality. Such uniqueness in terms of the creation of a new world and a new language has given him an unshakable position in the world’s literature. His books on the tales of Middle Earth (The Silmarillion, The Hobbit, The Lord of The Rings etc.) have been appreciated by millions of readers from different countries, and his novels have been translated into numerous languages of “our world”. At that point, a new fact has become visible: if the Middle Earth and the Elvish language are unique and special, this uniqueness and specialty should be preserved in their translations, as well. Tolkien’s invented language and its English translation made by Tolkien’s himself have illustrated the necessity for the emergence of creative minds which are able to shape a similar world and language in the translated texts.

*This article is a part of the PhD dissertation entitled “Sociological Intertextuality” in the Turkish Translations of Tolkien’s Middle Earth Novels that is being carried out at Gazi University.
In Turkey, Çiğdem Erkal İpek, the translator of *The Lord of the Rings* (translated in 1999), has assumed the responsibility of becoming the creator of the Middle Earth in Turkish language. Although *The Lord of the Rings* (1955) is not the first book on the Middle Earth, it is the first novel of Tolkien translated into Turkish. Therefore, Erkal İpek is regarded as a pioneer introducing the Middle Earth to the Turkish people. The Elvish language and the terms specific to the Middle Earth, which were formed by means of Tolkien’s competence in linguistics and English language, have become a challenge for the translator since the terms are mostly developed according to the linguistic structures of English. For this reason, Erkal İpek has benefited from her knowledge on the Ottoman language and the ancient Turkish language in order to create specific terms and expressions similar to the English translation of the Elvish, and she has become a unique translator pushing the limits of intertextuality. Erkal İpek’s “Middle Earth” in Turkish has been appreciated and accepted by the Turkish readers, and her translations have become an inspiration for the upcoming translations of numerous fantastic novels.

Although Erkal İpek’s linguistic inventions have given her a different status in the literature and partly alienated her from intertextual requirements, Erkal İpek has also triggered a new form of intertextuality: the inevitable transfer of fictitious language in translation. Tolkien is the only author of the books on the Middle Earth; therefore, there is an undeniable consistency in the books in terms of the use of the invented language. Turkish translations of the Middle Earth books, on the other hand, were made by different translators, which might be resulted in a “polyphonic” language and divergence in the translations. Nevertheless, since Erkal İpek’s invented world has been already accepted by the Turkish readers, a consistency is required to be provided in other Middle Earth books translated by different translators. This consistency can only be possible through the sharing of the same fictitious language and expressions, which necessitates the establishment of a different intertextual relationship between the translators and the transfer of a translator’s cultural capital to another translator. At this point, an intertextual intervention at “local (intralingual) level” should be made in order to establish a connection among the translated texts in terms of the fictitious language (Farahzad, 2009: 128). This intralingual intertextuality will pave the way for the creation of the consistency in the Turkish translations of the Middle Earth novels, which can be considered as a necessity when the expectations of the target readers are taken into consideration.

In line with this requirement, this study aims to illustrate the role of the translators’ preferences in establishing a consistency in the Turkish translations of Tolkien’s Middle Earth novels. For this purpose, the study will focus on the similar words and expressions in *The Fellowship of the Ring* (the first book of *The Lord of the Rings* published in 1955 and translated by Çiğdem Erkal İpek in 1999) and *The Hobbit* (the first tale on the Middle Earth published in 1937 and translated by Gamze Sari in 2007), and the above-mentioned consistency in translation will be questioned according to the intertextual relations between these books. With this purpose, theoretical background information on the intertextuality will be firstly given so as to provide a solid basis for intertextual analyses of the Middle Earth translations. Then Tolkien’s literary style will be discussed, and brief information will be provided about the Middle Earth and the Elvish language. The last section will elaborate the translators’ styles and the similarities between the afore-said two books.

**INTERTEXTUALITY AND TRANSLATION**

Literature has always been at the center of the social studies since it is supposed to both illustrate the inner world of the authors and offer certain clues about their interactions and social status. The analyses carried out on the literary products, on the other hand, have been influenced by the periodic dominant approaches in the social sciences. For instance, the emergence of a movement known as “the Linguistic Turn” at the beginning of the 20th century resulted in the production of linguistics-based studies in literature. Linguistic structures of the texts and the preferences of the authors were examined within the framework of an individual perspective by alienating them from any kind of interactions or relations. However, in the second half of the 20th century, an increasing awareness was observed among the scholars about the invalidity of the concepts of individuality and uniqueness in literature. Throughout that period, the interrelated nature of literary products started to be questioned, and the authors were asserted to be social creatures influenced by their surroundings, their educational backgrounds, and their daily encounters.

The studies of Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) have played a crucial role in the development of the ideology of interrelatedness in literature. In his studies, Bakhtin asserts that different voices and styles exist together in novels, which can be interpreted as the creation of new characters and personalities speaking in their own styles that are different from the style of the author or the implied author. Bakhtin suggests that this “polyphonic” language in novels is developed “by means of the social diversity of speech types and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions” (1981: 263). According to him, the polyphony results from the inevitable interaction of the author with the outer world and other literary or daily texts. Therefore, the author becomes the producer of a text in combination with pre-existing forms, expressions, utilizations, personalities. Bakhtin positions the author in an endless circle where s/he firstly becomes the reader. Contrary to the other well-known approaches in literature declaring the author as the sole authority and personality, Bakhtin advocates that the author is just the hand and the mind shaping and writing the plot under the influence of external factors and semi-dependent personalities, and that there are two actors in the literary process: the author and the reader. According to Bakhtin, the reader is to be in a striking position because the messages given in a text can only assume their “possible” meanings when they are conveyed to the target population, which is the reader. Through this assertion, he states that the author is not “Biblical Adam, dealing only with virgin and still unnamed ob-
joints, giving them names for the first time” (1986: 93). This interrogative elaboration on the relationship among the author, his/her texts, the reader and the social environment has prepared the ground for the multifaceted approach towards the written works.

Although Bakhtin is considered to be a pioneer in the studies on the interrelated nature of the literary texts, Julia Kristeva (1941-) has become the first scholar giving a name to this field of research, “intertextuality”. She has been mostly influenced by Saussure’s linguistic analyses and Bakhtin’s literary views, and she has developed the idea of a textual “mosaic” in which each text is related to another. She explains this approach as follows:

“… any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double” (1989: 37).

In her study, she also refers to the “carnivalesque structure” of the texts, which is a term used by Bakhtin, and she states that texts are similar to a carnival in which the participants can both present their talents and watch other activities (1989: 49). Similarly, the actors of the literature may take the role of reader or writer, and the interaction between readers and writers leads to the creation of multi-layered and interrelated texts. Kristeva’s approach has triggered the emergence of similar studies on the intertextual relations in different texts. Numerous classifications and explanations have been made to understand the basic structures of the intertextuality. Although it may not be possible to determine the borders separating a type of intertextuality from another, Miola’s seven types of intertextuality has been widely acknowledged by the researchers in the field (2004: 14). These types are listed in Miola’s article under the headings of “Revision, Translation, Quotation, Sources, Conventions and Configurations, Genres, and Paralogues” (2004: 14). As it can be seen in the list, translation has been considered as a type of intertextuality since it has an undeniable relationship with the so-called “original” text(s). Within this framework, translation is an obvious demonstration of intertextuality because it cannot be existed without a source. Desmet defines the translation as the intertextual echo of the source text which can be heard in another culture and in another language (2001: 35). This definition lays emphasis on the well-known intertextual relation between a text and its translation; however, it only provides a general approach towards the intertextual role of translation. In fact, translational practices are much more complex since they deal with numerous references in the source text and the target text within two different social and cultural contexts. This complexity is effectively verbalized by Farahzad as:

“Every specific instance of translation deals with two different languages and linguistic systems, and operates in two different socio-historical contexts. The first thing that happens to an intertext which is translated into another language, is that it gets de-contextualised and detached from its own context, and is placed in a new socio-historical context. This movement from one context to another assigns new intertextual properties to it by relating it to the discursive practices of the society it enters” (2009: 127).

As it can be understood from this statement, translators are required to come up with two different intertextual contexts in order to create acceptable target texts. This situation urges them to interpret the source text effectively, to resolve the intertextual references in it, to decontextualize and recontextualize the source text, to recreate similar intertextual relations in the target text, and to present it to the target reader. This long process inevitably results in certain losses and gains because all intertextual relations in the source text cannot be understood by the translators or sufficiently transferred to the target language. Consequently, the translators trigger a new form of intertextuality in the target language and culture through their own comments, perceptions, knowledge and social interactions. Lawrence Venuti remarks that this kind of intertextuality through translation is a risky action as it may cause a “disjunction between the foreign and translated texts by replacing a relation to a foreign tradition with a relation to a tradition in the translating culture” (2009: 158), and he underlines the necessity for translators to have interpretative skills so as to reform acceptable intertextual relations.

Venuti’s and other scholars’ views on the translational intertextuality discussed here have basically focused on the correlation between the source texts and the target texts. Nevertheless, as a type of literary product, translated texts may also have certain intertextual characteristics independent from or semi-dependent on the source text. Although translations tend to be analyzed within the limits of their source language versions, their positions in the target culture and society play a significant role in the provision of new intertextual materials in the literature of the target language. Just like authors, translators also benefit from their cultural capitals, experiences and knowledge in order to produce their translated texts. These individual features of the translators can lead to new and (un)intended intertextual references in the translated works, which can be used in other works or translations of the same language. Farahzad has analyzed this intertextual impact of translations on the target literature, and he has stated that there is a connection between a translated text and other translations and/or writings in the target language. As Farahzad has indicated in his article, this connection is the result of the intertextual bond among the texts at “local (intralingual) level”. (2009: 128). Accordingly, the local (intralingual) intertextuality illustrates the similarity of a translated text with other texts written in the same language. This type of intertextuality can be considered both as a repetition and a creation since the translated text repeats certain linguistic components used in other texts written in the target language, and it creates a new context for them.

At this point, the Turkish translation of The Lord of the Rings (translated by Çağdem Erkal İpek in 1999) serves as a model for the intralingual intertextuality in translation. As the first Turkish translator of a book on the Middle Earth, Erkal İpek has been obliged to translate the unique terms and expressions that are specific to the Middle Earth for the first time. While doing so, she has followed Tolkien’s
instructions on the translation of Middle Earth languages, and she has created new concepts in Turkish to form suitable Turkish versions of unique expressions. She has attained great success with her linguistic inventions, and the invented Turkish terms and expressions have been accepted by the Turkish readers. As a result of this success, other books on the Middle Earth have been expected to make use of Erkal İpek’s invented words in the translation of same expressions so as to create a consistency in the Middle Earth novels. By this way, the translator’s cultural/linguistic capital and utilizations have been partly transferred to other books on the Middle Earth and resulted in the creation of an indispensable and intralingual intertextuality for the sake of consistency in the Turkish translations of Tolkien’s other novels. Before discussing the intertextual relations between the Turkish translations of the books analyzed in this study and the significance of the consistency in Tolkien’s books, it would be appropriate to give brief information about Tolkien’s Middle Earth so as to understand effectively the role of the fictitious language and specific expressions in the development of the plot.

JOHN RONALD REUEL TOLKIEN’S MIDDLE EARTH

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien (1892-1973) is a famous scholar of the English Language and professor of Anglo-Saxon (Doughan, 2017). Although he published some of the stories that he told his children, his literary career officially began when he wrote the first sentence of The Hobbit on a blank page of a student’s exam paper: “In a hole in the ground there lived a hobbit”. (Doughan, 2017). The Hobbit was published in 1937, and it scored such a great success that Tolkien was asked to continue the story with another book. At that period, Tolkien started to construct his new world called “the Middle Earth” with all possible details including the new races, places, maps and even languages and dialects. After shaping his new imaginary world, he wrote his second novel on the Middle Earth which was entitled The Silmarillion; however, the reactions of the editors and critics were not quite positive. Therefore, he did not publish it immediately, and he began to write another story about the Middle Earth, which became his main literary masterpiece: The Lord of the Rings. Although the book was planned to be written for children, the story started to become more complex, creative and engrossing, which resulted in its publication as a novel in three parts between 1954 and 1955.

The events in The Lord of the Rings take place in the same world where The Hobbit is narrated. As a skilled linguist and qualified researcher, Tolkien planned to create an alternative world and language for his stories. His war experiences and observations about the industrialism made significant impact on the power relations in his new world known as “the Middle Earth”. Tolkien was also inspired by Greek and German mythologies while creating the main characters; the names of the persons and the geographical locations were invented with the impacts of these mythologies (Tolkien Gateway, 2017). Tolkien started to prepare the maps of the Middle Earth; however, he could not complete them in full details before his death. For this reason, his son, Cristopher Tolkien, made certain additions to Tolkien’s original maps according to the information provided both in The Hobbit and in The Lord of the Rings (Middle-earth, 2017). The Middle Earth illustrated in these maps is geographically similar to “our world”, and it consists of a large continent comprising the central regions of Arda and the Westlands. The men, wizards, dwarves, elves, ents and hobbits live in the Westlands, where the history of the Middle Earth is written. There are different languages spoken by the races in these lands; however, a common language has been developed under the influence of local languages. This common language is known as Westron or Common Speech in English, and it is spoken by men, wizards, dwarves, elves, ents and hobbits. However, elves mostly prefer to use their own language which consists of two different versions: the High-elven or Quenya and the Grey-elven or Sindarin (Tolkien, 2012b: 1481). Elvish languages have had an impact on the names of the places in the Middle Earth and the names of the persons from different races. Although Tolkien translated some of them into the Common Speech, their elvish versions were also used in the books. As a result, the novels contain numerous specific words which are the combination of the Westron and the Elvish. As the translator of the Red Book written by Bilbo Baggins and Frodo Baggins, Tolkien explains his interventions in the translation as follows:

“Translation of this kind, of course, usual because inevitable in any narrative dealing with the past. It seldom proceeds any further. But I have gone beyond it. I have also translated all Westron names according to their senses. When English names and titles appear in this book, it is an indication that names in the Common Speech were current at the time, beside, or instead of those in alien (usually Elvish) languages” (2012b: 1490).

As it can be understood from this statement, Tolkien assumed the role of a translator while transferring his invented language into English. Therefore, he personally experienced the difficulties that might be encountered in the translation process of his books. For this reason, he added an appendix to the third book, The Return of the King, and he made explanations on the English translation of specific names in order to help the translators who would translate his books into other languages. Tolkien also prepared a guide for the translation of the names in The Lord of the Rings, and this guide was published by Cristopher Tolkien after being revised. In this material entitled “Guide to the Names in The Lord of the Rings”, J. R. R. Tolkien divides the names specific to the Middle Earth into two categories: Names of Persons and Peoples, and Place-Names. He lists the names which might be challenging for translators, and he explains whether he expects them to be translated or how they can be translated. Accordingly, the following section of this study will focus on the Turkish translations of the specific names included both in The Fellowship of the Ring and The Hobbit within the scope of Tolkien’s instructions, and the similarities between two books will be elaborated within the scope of intralingual intertextuality in translation.
ONE TRANSLATION “TO RULE THE OTHER”: THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING AND THE HOBBIT

J. R. R. Tolkien attached such a great importance to his “new world” and “new language” that he personally accepted the reality of this world and the events occurring in it. This acceptance urged him to explain this world and the languages spoken in it with full details including the names of people, the names of the places, origins of the names, elvish languages, dialects used by different races and communities, etc. After completing the English translation of “the Red Book” in The Lord of the Rings, he published his notes and explanations about the history of the Middle Earth, the translation process that he carried out himself, the characteristics of the races, and the linguistic structures of the languages spoken in the Middle Earth. Since he was the first translator introducing the Middle Earth to our world, his notes and remarks made great contribution to the translation of The Lord of the Rings and the other books on the Middle Earth into various languages. The Appendix F in The Return of the King and his study entitled “the Guide to the Names in The Lord of the Rings” became priceless sources for the translators wishing to form the Middle Earth in their own languages.

Çiğdem Erkal İpek, the translator of The Lord of the Rings, has become the first person striving to invent the Turkish versions of the names and expressions specific to the Middle Earth. In the interviews, she explains the translation process of the afore-said masterpiece, and she remarks that Tolkien’s instructions on translation helped her to re-shape the Middle Earth in Turkish. She states that she analyzed the dialects used by different races, and she realized that Ents used Anglo-Saxon words and expressions while Elves preferred to use Shakespearean English. Accordingly, she translated Ents’ speeches into Turkish by using archaic Ottoman words and expressions, and she chose to use a more recent version of the Ottoman language for the Elves’ dialect and “Middle-Asian” Turkish for the speeches of Rohirrim horse-riders (Göktaş, 2010: 52). Erkal İpek deeply examined the origins and the meanings of Tolkien’s invented words based on Elvish languages, and she created the Turkish versions of those words by referring to Divan-i Lugat-ı-Turk and other Ottoman dictionaries. By this way, she managed to reflect the meaning of the specific expressions as much as possible by inventing new words in Turkish.

The Hobbit, on the other hand, was translated into Turkish in 2007 by Gamze Sarı. Although this book is the first story on the Middle Earth, it was published in Turkish after the publication of The Lord of the Rings. Since Erkal İpek’s translation gained enormous popularity in Turkey, and because the invented words were used even for the movies of the trilogy, the translators of other Middle-Earth novels preferred to use her original expressions in their translations in order to create a consistency among novels. In line with the preferences of the translators, this study elaborates the use of the same translation for the words specific to the Middle Earth in The Lord of the Rings and The Hobbit. In the following part, the specific expressions in two books are compared in the light of Tolkien’s instructions on translation, and the role of the intertextuality is discussed through these analyses. The examples are examined in two categories: the names of persons and the names of places.

Names of Places

Example 1. The fellowship of the ring

ST: “It seemed that the evil power in Mirkwood had been driven out by the White Council only to reappear in greater strength in the old strongholds of Mordor”. (Tolkien, 2012a: 57).


Example 2. The hobbit

ST: “And I know where Mirkwood is, and the Withered Heath where the great dragons bred”.(Tolkien, 1954: 20).


The word “Mirkwood” is one of the most challenging invented words in the Middle Earth novels, since the root “Mirk” does not derive from modern English, but in fact, it comes from Anglo-Saxon. Tolkien mentions its origins in “the Guide to the Names in The Lord of the Rings”, and he makes some suggestions for its translations; however, he does not explain the meaning of the root (1975: 183). Çiğdem Erkal İpek, the translator of The Lord of the Rings, expressed the difficulties that she encountered while translating this word in an interview, and she found the meaning of “mirk” as “evil, dark, murky” in an Anglo-Saxon dictionary (2012). Since Tolkien instructs the translators to “translate it by sense, if possible using elements of poetic or antique tone” (1975: 183), Erkal İpek searched for an ancient word in Turkish having similar meaning with “Mirk”, and she found in Divan-i Lugat-it-Turk the word “Kuyut” which can be translated as “to scare, startle, terrify”. She also realized that the word “Kuyut” was also used in noun form by Tatars; therefore, she translated the “Mirkwood” as “Kuyutorman” in Turkish. Although this word was invented by Erkal İpek, it was used by Gamze Sarı in the Turkish translation of The Hobbit, as well. Consequently, the transfer of this invented word enriched the consistency of the books.

Example 1. The fellowship of the ring


Example 2. The hobbit

ST: “I had not gone very far, however, when I met a couple of friends of mine from Rivendell.”(Tolkien, 2011: 42).

“Rivendell” is the name of a specific location inhabited by the Elves, and this name appears in numerous places of the novels since it is the place where the members of the Fair Folk unite their powers to fight against the Evil. In the Nomenclature, Tolkien compares the Dutch version of the word with the Swedish version, and accordingly he makes suggestions for the translation of the word as follows:

“Rivendell: ‘Cloven-dell’; Common Speech translation of Imladris(t) ‘deep dale of the cleft’. Translate by sense, or retain, as seems best. The Dutch version retains the name as Rivendel; the Swedish version has Vattnadal, which is incorrect and suggests that the translator thought that Riven- was related to river.”

(1975: 184).

Erkal İpek focused on the meaning of the word, and she created a new word in Turkish by taking into consideration Tolkien’s explanations and suggestions. Her translation was used both in the movies and in the Turkish version of The Hobbit in order not to cause confusions about the location.

Example 3. The fellowship of the ring

ST: “But he kept in a drawer at Bag End the old cloak and hood that he had worn on his travels, and the ring secured by a fine chain, remained in his pocket”. (Tolkien, 2012a: 18).

TT: “Fakat Çıkmazı’nda bir çekmecede yolculuklarında giymiş olduğu eski pelerin ile başlığı saklamıştı ve yüzük, oncin bir zeytincil emniyetle alınarak cebinde kalmıştı” (Tolkien, 2016: 30).

Example 3. The hobbit

ST: “He shuddered; and very quickly he was plain Mr. Baggins of Bag-End, Under-hill, again.” (Tolkien, 2011: 27).

TT: “Bu sadece Dumanlı Dağlar’ın başlangıcı; ve ötesindeki ortaklarla saldırıya uğramıştı…” (Tolkien, 2016: 27).

Example 4. The hobbit

ST: “There was a large notice in black and red hung on the gate, stating that on June the Twenty-second Messrs Grubb, Crubb, and Burrowes would sell by auction the effects of the late Bilbo Baggins Esquire, of Bag-End, Underhill, Hobbiton.” (Tolkien, 2011: 274).


“Hobbiton”, as it can be easily understood from the examples above, is the village where Hobbits live. Tolkien clearly states that he does not want the word “Hobbit” to be translated into another language since it will not be possible to convey the real meaning of the term into any word of another language. However, for the translation of “Hobbiton”, Tolkien instructs the translators to add a word having the meaning of a “village” into the word “Hobbit” in order to create a new term that can be the name of a village specific to a race. Accordingly, Erkal İpek combined the word “Hobbit” with the literal translation of the word “village” (köy in Turkish), and she translated the name of the place as “Hobbitköy”. Same utilization is also observed in Sari’s translation.

Example 5. The fellowship of the ring

ST: “The party was assailed by Orcs in a high pass of the Misty Mountains as they went towards Wilderland….” (Tolkien, 2012a: 14).

TT: “Yabaneller’e doğru giderken topluluk yüksek bir geçitte saldırına uğramıştı…” (Tolkien, 2016: 27).

Example 5. The hobbit

ST: “That is only the beginning of the Misty Mountains, and we have got to get through, or over, or under those somehow, before we can come into Wilderland beyond”. (Tolkien, 2011: 43).

TT: “Bu sadece Dumanlı Dağlar’ın başlangıcı; ve ötesindeki Yaban Eller’e gidebilmedik için ne yapip edip o dağların içinde, üzerinden veya altında geçmek zorundayız”. (Tolkien, 2016: 69).

“Wilderland” is an invented word which is not used in English as Tolkien states in the Nomenclature. He also explains the origin of the word and its meaning as follows:

“Wilderland: An invention (not actually found in English), based on wilderness (originally meaning country of wild creatures, not inhabited by Men), but with a side-reference to the verbs wilder ‘wander astray’ and bewilder. It is supposed to be the Common Speech name of Rhovanion (on the map, not in the text), the lands east of the Misty Mountains (including Mirkwood) as far as the River Running. The Dutch version has Wilderland: Dutch has wildernis, but not German or the Scandinavian languages (German Wildnis, Danish vildnis).”

(1975: 201).

The “Bag-End” is the name of Bilbo’s house, and it is supposed to be translated in relation with the meaning of the word “bag”, just like the name “Baggins”. Tolkien wants the translators to translate this word group by sense; therefore, Erkal İpek translated them into Turkish by reflecting their meanings effectively and creating a harmony in the sounds. This creative translation was appreciated by the target reader; for this reason, Sari transferred it into her own target text of The Hobbit.

Example 4. The fellowship of the ring

ST: “Indeed, even in the hilly regions and the older villages, such as Hobbiton or Tuckborough, or in the chief township of the Shire, Michel Delving on the White Downs, there were now many houses of wood, brick or stone.” (Tolkien, 2012a: 8).

TT: “Hatta Çıkın Çıkmazı’nda bir çekmecede yolculuklarında giymiş olduğu eski pelerin ile başlığı saklamıştı ve yüzük, oncin bir zeytincil emniyetle alınarak cebinde kalmıştı” (Tolkien, 2016: 21).
Names of Persons and Peoples

Example 1. The fellowship of the ring

ST: “His sword, Sting, Bilbo hung over his fireplace, and his coat of marvelous mail, the gift of the Dwarves from the Dragon-hoard, he lent to a museum, to the Michel Delving Mathom-house in fact.” (Tolkien, 2012a: 18).

TT: “Kılıcı Sting’i ocağın üzerine asmıştı Bilbo; cücelerin Ejderha hazinesinden ona armağan olarak verdikleri o harika zırhı da müzeye, daha doğrusu Ulığ Kazım’ı daki Belek Evi’ne geçici olarak vermişti” (Tolkien, 2016: 30).

Example 2. The hobbit

ST: “Time wore on, but it seemed to have little effect on Mr. Baggins.” (Tolkien, 2012a: 27).


The translation method applied to the word “Sting” is a good example of the socio-cultural factors influencing the decisions of the translators. “Sting” is in fact a transfixed word, and its meaning also serves the purpose of use in the original text. However, the word was chosen as a nickname by Gordon Sumner, a singer and musician in England, since he was quite interested in the word in its original form by explaining its meaning in a footnote. As a result, she created a similar combination with Turkish words having same meanings. On the other hand, she preferred to translate the word “land” as “eller” (a more ancient version of the word in Turkish) rather than a currently used version such as “arazi”, “bölge” or “alan”. Since this translation was used in the maps of the Middle Earth, it was also transferred to the Turkish translation of The Hobbit.

Example 1. The fellowship of the ring

ST: “I will give you a name,” he said to it, “I shall call you Sting”*.(Tolkien, 2011: 144).


* İğne, (cn).

The translation should contain an element “Baggins”. “Baggins” is one of the most significant names both in The Hobbit and in The Lord of the Rings. In The Hobbit, Bilbo Baggins is the main character shaping the story. He is the one who finds the One Ring, and who triggers the events mentioned in The Lord of the Rings. In The Fellowship of the Ring, Bilbo Baggins gives the ring to his nephew, Frodo Baggins who tries to destroy it for preventing the Dark Lord to rule the Middle Earth. Since Bagginses play significant roles in the novels, Tolkien lays emphasis on its translation into other languages; therefore, he gives instructions for its possible translations as follows:

“Baggins: Intended to recall ‘bag’—compare Bilbo’s conversation with Smaug in The Hobbit -- and meant to be associated by (hobbits) with Bag End (that is, the end of a ‘bag’ or ‘padding bag’ = cul-de-sac), the local name for Bilbo’s house. (It was the local name for my aunt’s farm in Worcestershire, which was at the end of a lane leading to it and no further). Compare also Sackville-Baggins. The translation should contain an element meaning ‘sack, bag’.” (1975: 153).

Tolkien translated the Westron names into English, and he wanted other translators to translate them into their own languages, as well. However, the translators also had the authority to decide how to translate the fictitious names and expressions. In this example, Erkal İpek did not translate the name “Baggins” although she invented equivalent words for most of the names mentioned in The Lord of the Rings. Her decision to transfer the above-mentioned name into the target text in its original form was accepted by the target readers, and same utilization was also observed in the movies of the trilogy. As it can be seen in the table above, this acceptance also influenced Sari’s decision in the translation process, and she kept the original form of the name in her translation of The Hobbit, as well.

Example 3. The fellowship of the ring

ST: “The Big Folk and the Little Folk (as they called one another) were on friendly terms, minding their own affairs in their own ways, but both rightly regarding themselves as necessary parts of Bree-folk.” (Tolkien, 2012a: 196).

TT: “Büyük Ahali ile Küçük Ahali (birbirlerine böyle hitap ediyorlardı) dostluk içinde yaşyor, herkes kendi işine bakıyordu ve her biri haklı olarak kendisini Bree halkının elzem bir parçası olarak göruyordu.” (Tolkien, 2016: 188).

Example 3. The hobbit

ST: “The mother of our particular hobbit – what is a hobbit? I suppose hobbits need some description nowadays, since they have become rare and shy of the Big People, as they call us.” (Tolkien, 2011: 4).

Tolkien, The Hobbit, classified the races according to their heights, and he calls them as the Big Folk (People) and the Little Folk. In his nomenclature, he wants these word groups to be translated by their senses (1975: 153). Erkal İpek preferred to use the first meaning of the adjective “big” while she translated the word “folk” with a more ancient Turkish word having the same meaning, Ahali, rather than using the word, Halk, which is commonly used today in Turkey. Sarı also used the same style, and she transferred Erkal İpek’s translation into her target text.

**Example 4. The fellowship of the ring**

ST: “Am I right in guessing that you are the Gloin, one of the twelve companions of the great Thorin Oakenshield?” (Tolkien, 2012a: 297).


Tolkien does not make any comment on the translation of this name; therefore, the translators are expected to decide how to translate the name into the target language. Erkal İpek translated the surname by using the first meanings of the words in the word group. Sarı also used the same translation in The Hobbit, and by this way, she created the consistency between two books. Although The Lord of the Rings is the sequence of The Hobbit, Erkal İpek’s choice influenced the translation methods applied by the other translator.

**Example 5. The fellowship of the ring**

ST: “This last belonged to Thorin, an enormously important dwarf, in fact no other than the great Thorin Oakenshield himself, who was not at all pleased at falling flat on Bilbo’s mat with Bifur, Bofur, and Bombur on top of him.” (Tolkien, 2011: 11).


As Tolkien remarks, Sackville is a name used in the English society. However, he uses this name together with the name “Baggins” because both names include a reference to “sack/bag”. By this way, he aims to create a “comic effect” on the hobbits that are not quite welcome. For the transfer of the same purpose to another language, Tolkien wants the translators to translate the name by making reference to the word “bag”. In line with this instruction, Erkal İpek translated the name as “Torbaköylü”, and Sarı used the same name in her translation.

**CONCLUSION**

As mentioned in the “Introduction” part, this study has aimed to analyze the similarities between the Turkish translations of The Fellowship of the Ring and The Hobbit within the scope of intertextuality in terms of the transfer of fictitious language in Tolkien’s novels. Accordingly, all fictitious words and expressions have been examined in both books, and common fictitious words have been noted. 10 common words have been found in total, 5 of which are the names of places while the residual words are the names of persons and peoples. For this reason, the examples have been divided into two categories according to their characteristics, and each example selected from the Turkish translation of The Fellowship of the Ring has been compared with its equivalent in the Turkish translation of The Hobbit. Subsequent to the comparison, Tolkien’s instructions on the translation of the word given in the example have been mentioned, and Çiğdem Erkal İpek’s methods have been discussed within the framework of these instructions. Then Gamze Sarı’s preferences on the translation of the fictitious words have been stated.

As a result of these analyses, it has been seen that Gamze Sarı, the translator of The Hobbit, used the fictitious words that Erkal İpek invented under the influence of her cultural background information and her knowledge on the Ottoman language and archaic Turkish language. During the transfer of the fictitious words, Sarı did not make any intervention, and she preferred to take a passive role instead of striving to recreate the fictitious words according to her own experiences and knowledge. Eventually, the utilization of the same words in two books on the Middle Earth has enabled the formation of a consistency in the plots of the novels. By this way, Turkish readers find a way to establish connection between two novels, and they do not encounter any kind of difficulty in imagining the events within the borders of the same geographical regions in the same world. Consequently, it may be stated that the use of the same fictitious words in both of the novels increased the harmony and the consistency of the stories in the eyes of the target readers.

When the fictitious words and expressions in the Turkish translations of two novels are examined from an intertextual perspective, it can be said that Erkal İpek pushed the limits of intertextuality even in the translation by inventing new words that were not used in Turkish before. Of course, she did not create these words by alienating herself from all linguistic components, structures and lexemes in Turkish; instead, she used the pre-existing words, suffixes and
affixes to form new words giving the meanings that Tolkien intended to convey in his novels. Nevertheless, since those combinations were unique word formations specific to the talents of the translator of The Lord of the Rings, her inventions can be regarded as an exception for the intertextual relations in the Turkish literature. At that point, Erkal İpek managed to assume the role of a creative writer in terms of the formation of new concepts, and she has become one of the most original translators partly getting rid of the intertextual bonds although the translation itself is considered as a form of intertextuality. However, she triggered another type of intertextuality, intralingual intertextuality, in the Turkish literature since her invented words were transferred to other novels written on the Middle Earth. As it can be seen in the analyses of this study, a close intertextual relationship was consciously established between The Fellowship of the Rings and The Hobbit so as to meet the social and cultural demands of the target society. Since J. R. R. Tolkien is the author of the books written on the Middle Earth, there is an undeniable consistency in the plots, and the fiction has been illustrated in sequence without needing to make any corrections or alignments. Nevertheless, the Middle Earth novels were translated into Turkish by different translators, which resulted in the emergence of a need for conscious alignments among the novels in order to create consistent flow of events among the stories taking place within the same imaginary world. When the examples analyzed here are taken into consideration, it is clearly seen that such alignments have become a necessity in Tolkien’s interrelated masterpieces. Accordingly, it can be stated that Erkal İpek’s translation played the role of a source text for other translations in terms of the fictitious language, and Sarı’s preference to use the same concepts in her translation paved the way for the establishment of a new intertextual connection which is not commonly seen in the acts of translation. In line with these arguments, it may be said that translations can take the role of unique literary products in the target literature from certain aspects although the act of translation is considered as a form of intertextuality. It may be also concluded that a translated text might influence other original texts or translated texts in the target literature through its intertextual capacities. Of course, social and cultural factors are the key determinants affecting the status of a translated text within the borders of the target literary system. Since the analyses of this study are limited to the comparison of two novels in terms of the transfer of the fictitious linguistic components, further analyses and studies are needed to support the arguments presented here. Nevertheless, it is obvious that translations can assume the responsibility of becoming source texts for other literary productions in terms of intertextual references in the same language.
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