Supplementary Material S1: Corpus and analytical documentation

1. Corpus and provenance

The documentary source is the author's unpublished book manuscript dated 23 August 2026, Edebiyatın Diplomatik Gücü: Edebî Çeviri, Kültürel Diplomasi ve Diplokültürel Etki, Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 and 3.2. Its first sixteen comparison tables preserve literary excerpts and page references. S3 is a verbatim cell-level export of those tables. It excludes the biographical table and other personal information. S2 selects the comparisons supporting the article and adds interpretive categories. Neither register is represented as a new collation against the printed books or as a dataset of reader responses.

Gide A (1956 [1925]) Les Faux-Monnayeurs. Gallimard, Paris

Gide A (1989) Kalpazanlar, trans. Yücel T. Can Yayınları, Istanbul

Tanpınar AH (1961) Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü. Remzi Kitabevi, Istanbul

Tanpınar AH (2007) L'Institut de remise à l'heure des montres et pendules, trans. Muhidine T. Actes Sud, Arles

2. Files and fields

S3_Source_Inventory.csv preserves table identifiers, row indices, table titles and up to three verbatim cells per row. Row indices begin at zero; header rows are retained. S2_Analytical_Register.csv contains 51 selected source–target records. Each records its source table and row, translation direction, cultural category, editions, reported page locators, textual transcriptions, interpretive operation, potential and reception status. Table identifiers B01–B16 follow their order in the book manuscript. All CSV files use UTF-8 with a byte-order mark.

3. Selection and preparation

The analytical register selects the literary, geographical, educational, political, culinary, institutional and ritual examples discussed in the article. The original inventory includes additional third-country comparisons; these remain available in S3 but are not used to imply a broader article sample. Merged cells create duplicate strings in some original tables: S3 preserves them; S2 takes the first and last cells as the two language versions. For Gide, the last cell is French source and the first is Turkish target. For Tanpınar, the last cell is Turkish source and the first is French target. Page locators are extracted from the labels already present in those cells. Multiple locators in a combined row remain in their reported order. No page is inferred from a neighbouring row.

S2 preserves the source and target strings rather than silently correcting their spelling, punctuation, repeated wording or transcription errors. The operation labels and category names are editorial classifications prepared for this revision. No quantitative scores or frequencies are calculated. Document-to-CSV transcription is a packaging step; no numerical formula, statistical procedure or analytical script is used to generate a finding.

4. Analytical categories

Retention: A culture-specific name or form remains identifiable.

Explicitation: Wording or a note supplies information implicit in the source.

Accommodation: A cue is reformulated through a target-language description or established equivalent.

Omission: The specific source cue is absent; a broader action may remain. The loss of the name çiftetelli differs from removal of the entire scene.

Visibility: A cultural referent remains available for recognition.

Intelligibility: Contextual support may make the referent easier to interpret.

Evaluation: The text makes a culturally relevant judgment available; no reader judgment is measured.

Practical salience: A possible connection to action; not evidence that readers travelled or changed behaviour.

Labels may overlap and are not automatic measures of benefit. Intentionality, agency, temporality and valence in Table 2 specify dimensions for further research. They are not populated as measured reception variables in the present registers.

5. Corrections and evidentiary limits

The revised article locates Mihrimah Camii at Tanpınar 1961, 24 / 2007, 34; Süleymaniye at 1961, 146 / 2007, 179; and Ayasofya at 1961, 109 and 216 / 2007, 138 and 256. The earlier article grouped these locations incorrectly. The çiftetelli passage is described as generalisation of the dance name (1961, 355 / 2007, 410), whereas zeybek remains named (1961, 359 / 2007, 413). The La Fontaine discussion is documented at Gide 1956, 195–197 / 1989, 264–266. The isolated earlier claim about a French-language remark at Gide 1956, 42 is removed because the available source inventory does not document its source–target pairing.

The transcriptions remain the author’s documentary record. Errors inherited from that record can only be resolved by consulting the printed editions. The sample is purposive, operations are interpretive, and no exhaustive denominator or intercoder agreement is supplied. The eighteen-language passage is fictional: it illustrates a narrative mechanism, not the reception of Tanpınar’s novel. No measured effects on national image, familiarity, tourism or consumer behaviour are claimed. Full copyrighted editions are not reproduced; the shared comparisons and locators permit examination of the reported textual basis.