From Theory to Practice, From Theory to Analysis in Translation: An Analysis of the Novel *Disgrace*

Çeviride Kuramdan Uygulamaya, Kuramdan İncelemeye: *Disgrace* Romanının Bir İncelemesi

Research/Araştırma

Seyhan BOZKURT JOBANPUTRA

Assist. Prof. Dr., Yeditepe University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies, seyhan.bozkurt@yeditepe.edu.tr, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6897-5830

ABSTRACT

This paper will present an analysis of İlknur Özdemir's translation of J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace* (1999) into Turkish as *Utanç* (2005) in the light of stylistic approaches to translation as expounded by Jean Boase-Beier in her invaluable book *Stylistic Approaches to Translation* (2006, and the revised and expanded version *Translation and Style*, 2019). It aims to demonstrate that translation theory, thanks to the cognitive turn in stylistics and translation studies, has come a long way from expressing shifts in translation with everyday expressions, such as loss of "voice", "rhythm of thought" and "rhythm of speech" that J. M. Coetzee used to criticize the first German translation of his work *Waiting for the Barbarians*. Resorting to Fowler's concept of "mind style" (1977), Boase-Beier regards the translator both as a reader who should attend to the "weakly implied meanings" that make it possible to reflect how people see the world differently and that this is also expressed in linguistic choices that may be revealed in stylistic subtleties such as metaphor, iconicity, ambiguity and foregrounding. In this paper, I will analyze J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace* (2000) and its translation *Utanç,* translated by İlknur Özdemir and published by Can Yayınları in 2005, and demonstrate how foregrounding through repetitions of the word *disgrace* enables the author to depict his way of looking. The paper will also examine how Özdemir strives to preserve this in Turkish.

Keywords: stylistic approaches to translation, translation theory, literary translation

ÖZET

Bu makale, J. M. Coetzee'nin İlknur Özdemir tarafından *Utanç* başlığıyla Türkçeye çevrilen *Disgrace* romanının Jean Boase Beier'in *Stylistic Approaches to Translation* (2006) ve yeni baskısı *Translation and Style* (2019) kitaplarında sunduğu "çeviriye biçemsel yaklaşımlar" tartışması ışığında bir incelemesini sunacak. Yazıda, aynı zamanda çeviri kuramının, hem biçembilim hem de çeviribilimdeki bilişsel dönüşüm sayesinde, çevirideki deyiş kaydırmalarının J. M. Coetzee'nin *Barbarları Beklerken* romanının ilk Almanca çevirisini eleştirmek için kullandığı "ses", "düşüncede ahenk", "konuşmada ahenk" yitimi gibi günlük konuşma ifadeleriyle tartışılmasından çok öteye gittiğini göstermeyi amaçlanmaktadır. Boase-Beier, Fowler'ın "zihin biçemi" kavramından faydalanır ve çevirmeni metnin bir okuru olarak görür. Bu bağlamda çevirmen, "önceleme"lere dikkat kesilmelidir çünkü öncelemeler, çevirmenin, insanların dünyayı farklı şekillerde gördüklerini yansıtmasını mümkün kılar ve metafor, gösterim, belirsizlik, önceleme gibi biçemsel özelliklerde ifade bulur. Bu incelemede, Coetzee'nin *Disgrace* (1999) romanı ve 2005 yılında Can Yayınlar'ından çıkan ve İlknur Özdemir tarafından yapılan çevirisi *Utanç* ele alınacak, yazarın "disgrace" sözcüğünün yinelenmesi aracılığıyla yarattığı zihinsel biçemi ve Özdemir'in bunu koruma çabası betimlenecektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: çeviriye biçemsel yaklaşımlar, çeviri kuramı, edebiyat çevirisi

1. Introduction

At the end of his article "Roads to Translation" in which he discusses the translations of his several novels into different languages, the 2003 Nobel Prize recipient J. M. Coetzee states that

> There is a legitimate branch of aesthetics called the theory of literature. But I doubt very much that there is or can be such a thing as a theory of translation- not one, at any rate, from which practitioners of translation will have much to learn. Translation seems to me a craft in a way that cabinet-making is a craft (Coetzee, 2005a, p. 151).

According to Coetzee, since translation is a craft like cabinet-making, he doubts whether it has a theory like the theory of literature. He expands on his comparison and adds that "there is no substantial theory of cabinet-making, and no philosophy of cabinet-making except the ideal of being a good cabinetmaker, plus a few precepts relating to tools and to types of wood" (2005a, p. 151). As he points out, the rest can only be learned through practice and observation and "the only book on cabinet-making" he can imagine "that might be of use to the practitioner would be a humble handbook" (p. 151). These words I find very upsetting as a researcher of translation studies since there is "such a thing as theory of translation", as well as a robust philosophical tradition behind it. In "Roads to Translation", Coetzee also discusses two different translations of *Waiting for the Barbarians* into German. Since the first translation was considered a failure by common consent, a second translation followed. While explaining why the first one failed, Coetzee states:

> The translator could read my English perfectly competently, word by word and sentence by sentence, and turn it into adequate German prose. Yet as I read the text she produced, I felt more and more disquieted: the world that her pages evoked was, in subtle and not so subtle respects, not the world I had imagined; the narrator whose voice I was hearing was not the narrator I had conceived (2005a, p. 149).

Continuing his discussion, Coetzee explains, as follows, why the world constructed by the translator did not match the one he had imagined and why he was not hearing the voice of the narrator he had conceived:

> In this part this was a matter of word choice: given a choice between two valid options, the translator seemed more often than not to choose the one I would not have chosen. But in the main it was a matter of rhythm- rhythm of speech but also rhythm of thought. The sensibility behind the German text, a sensibility embodied in particular in the speech of the narrator, felt alien to me (p. 149).

The key words that should catch our attention in the above quotes are "voice", "the world", "rhythm of speech", "rhythm of thought" and "sensibility", which find different expressions in the stylistic approaches to translation as I will explore below. There is no doubt that theories of translation do not preach practicing translators what to do but provide them with a "tool kit" (Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 6) that can help them in the process of translation, such as when they have to decide which word to choose when they have different alternatives. As Jean Boase-Beier (2006, p. 6) argues:

> …knowledge of theories and approaches can and should be part of a translator's toolkit… This is not to say that a translation will (or should) be undertaken in accordance with a theoretical view. And it is certainly not to say that theory is under any obligation to offer guidelines for practice. The most we can expect, as Toury (1985: 34-35) says, is that a description of process might allow us to draw tentative conclusions for practice.

However, it is not only practicing translators that theory can assist. Those that analyze these translations can also benefit from this tool kit, one that may help them explain why, for instance, in the German translation of *Waiting for the Barbarians,* "a sensibility embodied in particular in the speech of the narrator" made Coetzee feel alien to his own novel (2005b, p. 149). Below I will analyze *Utanç*, the translation by İlknur Özdemir of J. M. Coetzee's *Disgrace*, in the light of the methodology Jean Boase-Beier outlines in *Stylistic Approaches to Translation* (2006) and its second edition *Translation and Style* (2019). The novel *Disgrace*, by South African born novelist, essayist and translator J.M. Coetzee, was the winner of the Booker Prize for Fiction and may be considered his most famous work. Firstly, I would like to outline the framework of my analysis and explain how I will approach the translated text, and will then proceed with the analysis of the translation.

2. Methodology

Boase-Beier points out that "literary translation is, in a very basic and important sense, the translation of style, because, because style is the expression of mind, and literature is a reflection of mind" (2006, p. 112). This is actually what Coetzee wants to tell us when he is talking about the "rhythm of speech", which he then immediately links to the "rhythm of thought". Indeed, the connection between "rhythm of speech" and "rhythm of thought" explains the relation between language and mind, which together constitute "style" as Jean Boase-Beier sets out to explore in her invaluable work *Stylistic Approaches to Translation* (2006) and *Translation and Style* (2019).

Boase-Beier defines style in language as "those aspects of language assumed by the hearer, reader or translator, and indeed by the speaker, original writer, or writer of translations, to be the result of choice" (2006, p. 53). Following from the definitions provided by Boase-Beier (style is the expression of mind and the result of choice), we can assert that words chosen by Coetzee in *Waiting for the Barbarian* build up a rhythm of thought which is the expression of [his] mind. In other words, we can say that [his] mind finds expression in his linguistic choices, which together constitute his style or the style of the book. Boase-Beier states that style "has always, since the earliest discussions of Aristotle, been seen as a manifestation of mental processes or properties, or mental states. There is no other way to explain that style represents choice" (2006, p. 109).

As Boase-Beier points out, style consists of choices first by the authors in the original and then by the translator, who is considered the writer of translation:

> We can consider style in translation from at least four potential viewpoints: i) the style of the source text as an expression of its author's choices, ii) the style of the source text in its effects on the reader (and on the translator as reader), iii) the style of the target text as an expression of choices made by its author (who is the translator), iv) the style of the target text in its effects on the reader. (2006, p. 5)

Actually the analysis of translation provides us with clues about how the style of the source text is perceived by the translator and how it is conveyed in the translation via the choices of the translator, the writer of the target text. The emphasis in this paper will be on discussing the choices made by a translator, İlknur Özdemir, which then will take us to the choices made by Coetzee. But more importantly, I will focus on how "mind" finds expression in the choices or to put it another way how choices lead us to the analysis of mind as I will explain below.

As Boase-Beier (2006, 2019) points out, there is a cognitive turn in translation studies. And it is possible to associate the development of Cognitive Translation Studies with new findings in other branches of humanities such as cognitive linguistics, cognitive literary studies, cognitive media theory etc. (Base-Beier 2019). "Cognitive" in the context of Translation Studies, according to Boase-Beier, could be interpreted in two ways: firstly

studies using evidence from eye-tracking studies or think aloud protocols or studies such as those which explore translators' thoughts about translation could be called "cognitive", secondly, studies which "incorporate insights from cognitive linguistics, cognitive stylistics or poetics, from cognitive narratology or cognitive literary studies more generally" could be called "cognitive" (Boase-Beier, 2019).

According to Semino and Culpeper, "Cognitive stylistics combines the kind of explicit, rigorous and detailed linguistic analysis of literary texts that is typical of the stylistics tradition with a systematic and theoretically informed consideration of the cognitive structures and processes that underlie the production and reception of language" (2002, p. ix). Here the notion of "mind style" developed by Roger Fowler (1977, 1986, 1996) gains significance. Boase-Beier, based on Fowler's definition of mind style as "the 'distinctive linguistic presentation of an individual mental self" (1977, p. 103) but not satisfied with the use of "mental self" in the definition as it implies a permanent state, redefines the term as "the linguistic style that reflects a cognitive state" (Boaise-Beier, 2003, p. 254) and argues that "it is a linguistic style characterized by distinctive and striking textual patterns" (p. 254). Thus, according Boase-Beier, "reading a literary text is seen as giving access, not just to whatever meaning is attachable to the linguistic structures, but also to a state of mind" (2006, p. 19).

But how does the translator arrive at this state of mind? Before answering this question, it should be noted that "literary translation works not merely as a literary text, but as a special type of literary text, one whose relation to a source text plays a role in its interpretation" (2006, p. 28). It is the 'weakly implied meanings' "which may or may not be intended by the author" and which are "are open-ended, tend to be implied by stylistic nuances of the text, and embody the facility of texts to involve the reader" that takes translators, who are also readers of the source text, to the mind style (2006, p. 36).

What is significant in the cognitive approaches to translation is the fact that the translator is regarded also as a reader. As Boase-Beier points out, the act of reading is "a cognitive process; the translator as reader of the source text plays an active role in constructing a reading, which involves the construction and modification of contexts" (2006, p. 112). Boase-Beier explains that there are two levels of meaning which in turn "splits the task of the translator effectively into two" (2006, p. 37). Firstly, translators should be able to discern "determinate meaning" which is "embedded in the linguistics of the text, which demands background cultural and linguistic knowledge of the source language, probably augmented by the use of a dictionary or other tools" (p. 37). But most importantly, translators should attend to the second order meanings that I referred to above as 'weakly implied meanings' which are found mainly in the style.

As Boase-Beier points out, "perception of these weakly implied meanings, including their effects upon the reader, can hardly be separated from the act of recreation, and it is in the realm of such meanings that much of what stylistics has to say

is of special relevance for translation" (2006, p. 37). As I have already pointed out, style represents choices. Boase-Beier writes, "This is not to say that these choices represent different ways of saying the same thing but different ways of saying which reflect different ways of seeing; what is said also varies according to how it is said" (2006, p. 112). Weakly implied meanings are a way of reflecting such choices in the style, which are the reflection of a state of mind, which in turn is a different way of seeing.

'Weakly implied meanings' are called "weakly implicated meanings" (implicatures) in relevance theory, which "are a way of formalizing the notion of meaning which goes beyond "primary" lexical or syntactic meaning" (2006, p. 45). As Boase-Beier explains:

> If such implicatures, with the openness that their description as "weak" entails, serve to provide clues to a state of mind, then the elements of style and in particular those aspects which are consistent enough to constitute a "mind style" ... will be a starting point for creating a reading which captures something what writers like Pope and Denham must have meant by the "spirit" of the original text (p. 45).

As Boase-Beier points out, the weak implicatures provide communicative clues which are clues "to the communicative intention ... of the speaker, provided by stylistic features" (2006, p. 41). But what are these stylistic features or the elements of style and in particular those aspects which are consistent enough to constitute a "mind style"? Boase-Beier explains that stylistic subtleties or features like metaphor, iconicity, ambiguity, foregrounding and the like are not merely in the text but have cognitive correlates. All these elements in the text together provide communicative clues to a cognitive state. So the translator must pay close attention to these aspects of the text in order to be able to discern the mind in the text which possibly carries an ideology, attitude and feelings (2006, pp. 80-81-113). Below I will try to explain what stylistic subtleties or features draw attention in *Utanç* and then will compare them with those in *Disgrace*.

2.1 Foregrounding- Repetitions

Foregrounding can be defined as a strategy used by the author to "force us to look" (Boase-Beier, 2006, p. 89). There are different strategies of foregrounding, one of which is repetition. Through repetition, the author creates a pattern that draws attention to itself and these repetitions may lead us to "weakly implied meanings" or "implicatures", which in turn lead us to the mind style.

The translator, as the writer of the translated text, is responsible for its style because it is the style of the translated text to which the target readers responds and from which they create meaning (2006, p. 51). Boase-Beier (p. 51) points out that "it is the translator in her or his role as writer who 'triggers discovery in the reader'

(MacKenzie, 2002, p. 24)". There is no doubt that translators trigger discovery in readers through their choices. But how do translators arrive at these choices?

It seems like translators are free to construct weakly implied meanings but it is partly true because "the text while leaving the translator free to construct weakly implied meanings according to her or his own pragmatic context, nevertheless exert some sort of cognitive manipulation" (2006, p. 40) through "communicative clues" provided by stylistic features of the text. Drawing on Relevance Theory, Boase-Beier summarizes this aspect of style as follows: "the gap between the actual utterances in a text and the thought behind it "is filled by the hearer's inferential recognition of a speaker's intention, guided by contextual clues" (2006, p. 41). In implicatures, what is central is the inference by the reader. As relevance theory makes clear, there is a difference between implications and implicatures: "Implication is in the text, but an implicature is attributed to a speaker: it is taken to involve an intention to suggest something. Relevance theory thus takes for granted that we assume there is a speaker who has intentions" (2006, p. 40). This speaker should not necessarily be the author. As Boase-Beier points out, it is more plausible to speak of an inferred author defined as "a figure constructed (rather than reconstructed) by the reader, but with direct reference to the style of the text, especially using such notions as mind style and cognitive state" (2006, p. 38). The translator assumes that "stylistic features in the source text reflect the inferred author's choices" (2006, p. 50). Boase-Beier explains that "the point about a stylistic reading of the source text is that it aims to reach a full and detailed picture of the inferred author's choices, not that it can or wishes to reach facts about an actual author's choices" (2006, pp. 50-51). So the translator is not free to construct "weakly implied meanings" but constrained by the choices of the inferred author which is the reflection of her/his mental state (2006, p. 40). Henceforth, when I speak of an author, I will not refer to J. M. Coetzee but to an inferred author whose mind style I will endeavor to pursue.

In the light of all these information we can come back to the notion of mind style and revise its definition. Boase-Beier explains:

> Fowler pursued the notion of the individual social-cognitive nature of style in his term "mind style", "the world-view of an author, or a narrator, or a character" (1996: 214; see also 1977a: 103), as evidenced in textual structures, especially those which embody the speaker's experience of the socially-embedded phenomena of the real world. In Boase-Beier (2003a) I distinguished between the world-view of the speaker or narrator or inferred author and its linguistic expression. Only the latter was referred to as "mind style." (2006, p. 54)

This is how I will use the term "mind style" in this paper – as the linguistic expression of the speaker's, narrator's, inferred author's or character's world-view. I will focus on the choices of the translator first, what kind of "mind style" it creates. As Boase-Beier points out, "what makes a rendering of a text in another language a translation is

the similarity of cognitive effect it makes possible, as judged by the translator" (2006, p. 63). She explains

> If stylistic effects are seen as "characteristic mental representations and mental processes" (Pilkington 2000: 499), then an attempt to recreate effects would be an attempt to encourage the reader to go through particular cognitive processes. These would, by virtue of being literary, not be fixed and would differ according to the reader's cognitive context, that is her or his beliefs, knowledge and attitudes, but it might be possible to expect similar effects in source text and target text if the readers go through similar processes. (p. 63)

In this paper, I consider myself as a reader of both the target and source text who is trying to explain why the cognitive effects she has gone through in relation to the mind style of the inferred author has not been the same. I will first explain what kind of cognitive effect I have been through while reading the target text and how it has been caused by the repetition of the word *utanç*. I will then move on with its comparison with the source text. Although the analysis seems two-fold, it is not. I will deal with both the target and the source text at the same time.

3. Repetition: *Utanç* – 'Disgrace'

Disgrace begins with the following sentence "For a man of his age, fifty-two, divorced, to his mind, solved the problem of sex rather well" (Coetzee, 2000, p. 1). David Lurie, once a professor of modern languages, now works as an adjunct professor of communications at the Cape Technical University. On Thursday afternoons, he visits a prostitute called Soraya who is the solution to his problem of sex. However, their relationship ends when he discovers that she has another life as a wife and mother. David Lurie, so much under the influence of Eros, searches for other options and that is when he notices Melanie Isaacs, one of his undergraduate students from a rural part of South Africa. The problems begin when Melanie lodges a complaint against Lurie accusing him of abusing her. David loses his job after the inquiry held by the university committee. In order to get away from his troubles, he decides to spend some time with his daughter Lucy and sets off for her farm in the Eastern Cape. However, another trouble awaits him there. Three young African men invade Lucy's house and rape her.

As I have already pointed out, "disgrace", the title of the novel, is translated into Turkish as *utanç*, a word which is repeated several times in the target text. Since it is the title and is repeated throughout the book, it draws attention to itself, which we might consider as foregrounding, a stylistic choice by the translator, a choice weakly implying a meaning.

I would like to start my discussion with comparing the connotations of *utanç* and "disgrace". The word "disgrace" is defined in *Merriam-Webster* (n.d.) online dictionary as "1 a: the condition of one fallen from grace or honor b: loss of grace, favor, or honor

2: a source of shame" and its Turkish equivalents are given in *Redhouse* (Avery, R. et al, 1997, p. 270) dictionary as "1. gözden düşme, itibardan düşme ("to fall from grace", "fall from honour") 2. rezalet, yüz karası ("disgrace(d)", "black sheep") (Redhouse). "Utanmak", the verb form of "utanç" is defined in *Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlüğü* as "onursuz sayılacak, veya gülünç olacak bir duruma düşmekten üzüntü duymak, korkmak, mahçup olmak" ("to feel sorrow, fear or embarrassment at being in a position considered disreputable or demeaning") and the noun form "utanç" is defined as "utanma duygusu, hicap" ("the feeling of shame or embarrassment"). From the definition of *Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlüğü* we can conclude that *utanç* in Turkish is mostly attributed to the feelings experienced by the person herself/himself. We can say that the word "disgrace", which is falling from grace or honor, has more social connotations rather than describing the feelings experienced by the person herself/himself.

David describes his encounter with Melanie as the beginning of a love story under the spell of Eros. During the inquiry, he refuses to say more and admit that he was wrong, and he offers no apology. The committee requires him to show a spirit of repentance, to which he disagrees and says: "Repentance is neither here nor there. Repentance belongs to another world, to another universe of discourse" (2000, p. 58). In his dialogue with Bev Shaw, the owner of the clinic David works at after she moves in with her daughter, he says:

> David susuyor. Sonra, "Kızımın beni sana neden yolladığını biliyor musun?" diyor.
>
> "Başının dertte olduğunu söyledi."
>
> "Yalnızca dertte değil. Bence **utanç** denilecek bir durumdayım." (Coetzee 2005b, p. 109, emphasis mine)
>
> He is silent. Then: 'Do you know why my daughter sent me to you?'
>
> 'She told me you were in trouble.'
>
> 'Not just in trouble. In what I suppose one would call **disgrace**.' (Coetzee 2000, p. 85, emphasis mine)

When we compare "Bence utanç denilecek bir durumdayım" and "In what I suppose one would call disgrace", the feeling we get is different. It is not David who calls the situation he is in as "disgrace" but the others. That's why he says "one would call disgrace". Besides, David never admits his wrongdoing in the case of Melanie, nor he does feel ashamed or guilty of what he did. He finds Melanie beautiful and she excites him. He says, "Because a woman's beauty does not belong to her alone. It is part of the bounty she brings into the world. She has a duty to share it" (Coetzee, 2000, p. 16). So it may be asked here whether it is appropriate to translate "disgrace" into Turkish as *utanç*, especially when it is David Lurie himself who utters the word. As Williams (1999) points out:

> It is with most of the author's words; chosen with deliberate care to create maximum impact and the author certainly mines a rich seam of emotional intensity, embracing lust, brutality, guilt, vengeance and regret. These emotions and images are seared into David Lurie's soul. (p. 42)

It is true that the words are chosen to create maximum impact but it is certainly difficult to find a trace of regret or guilt in David's soul as the meticulous use of the word "disgrace" implies, as I will explore below.

The repetition of *utanç* from the mouth of David Lurie, such as "Bence utanç denilecek bir durumdayım" ("In what I suppose one would call disgrace"), creates confusion in the target text because, as I have already pointed out, he seems not to regret what he has done. Before moving on with the part where David utters the word "disgrace" in his conversation with Melanie's father, I would like to quote how he explains his interest in Melanie with the fire-flame story:

> 'In Melanie's case, however, something unexpected happened. I think of it as a fire. She struck up a fire in me.'

> 'A fire: what is remarkable about that? If a fire goes out, you strike a match and start another one. That is how I used to think. Yet in the olden days people worshipped fire. They thought twice before letting a flame die, a flame-god. It was that kind of flame your daughter kindled in me. Not hot enough to burn me up, but real: real fire.' (Coetzee, 2000, p. 166)

He is reckless enough to explain what happened between him and Melanie in such an erotic manner. After having super with the family, he says to the father:

> "Benim inancıma göre, kızınızla aramda geçenlerden dolayı cezalandırılıyorum. Öyle bir **utanca** bulandım ki, bundan kendimi kurtarmam pek kolay olmayacak. Benim yadsıdığım bir ceza değil bu. Verilmesin diye sızlanmıyorum. Tam tersine, her gün yaşıyorum bunu, **utancı** varoluş konumum olarak kabul etmeye çalışıyorum. Belli bir süreyle sınırlanmadan **utanç** içinde yaşamam Tanrı için yeterli mi sizce?" (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 215)

> In my own terms, I am being punished for what happened between myself and your daughter. I am sunk into a state of **disgrace** from which it will not be easy to lift myself. It is not a punishment I have refused. I do not murmur against it. On the contrary, I am living it out from day to day, trying to accept **disgrace** as my state of being. Is it enough for God, do you think, that I live **in disgrace** without term? (Coetzee, 2000, p. 172).

When his discourse is carefully analysed, "being punished", "a state of disgrace", "accept disgrace as my state of being" all imply that he is going through something that is forced upon him, not something experienced by him. He has lost his reputation and his job and has had to move in with his daughter because of the disgrace and because society has judged that what he experienced with Melanie was wrong. But in the target

text, what I feel as a reader is a trace of regret which comes from within because of the word *utanç*.

There are also other communicative clues, which lead one to think of "disgrace" as more than *utanç* in the case of David Lurie; for instance, the meticulous use of the word "shame", which is usually translated into Turkish as *utanç* and its adjective form "ashamed":

> Yeni yaşamına gömülmüş bir kadın. İyi! Arkasında bırakacağı buysa- bu evlat, bu kadın- o zaman David'in **utanacağı** bir şey yok demektir (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 81).

> A solid woman, embedded in her new life. Good! If this is to be what he leaves behind- this daughter, this woman- then he does not have to be **ashamed** (Coetzee, 2000, p. 62)

There is a third-person narrator in the story, who mostly tells not only what happens but also who recounts David Lurie's feelings. Actually Lucy, David's daughter, makes him feel proud when David arrives and sees how she manages her farm and her life. "If this is to be what he leaves behind" leads one to think of what happened with another woman David has a relationship with, namely Melanie. Two women in his life, two women he will leave behind; one is abused by him, one is raped by three black men. But he seems to think that his daughter, the solid woman embedded in her new life, would make him forget what happened with the other one. If this is what he leaves behind, "then he doesn't have to feel ashamed". So he lives in disgrace but not in shame. The cover of the target text, which is completely different from the source text's, also seems to support my argument about how two different David Lurie exist in the source and target texts. In the cover of the target text we see a picture of an old man with his head down sitting on a coach, one of his hands is on his knee and the other is on the arm of the coach in a dark dusty room with big windows which lets the sun shine in but only the head of the professor is benefitting from it. The man seems isolated, exhausted and contemplative. Most probably it represents David Lurie, although it is compatible with David Lurie presented in the target text, it is far from David Lurie pictured in the source text because he is going on his life feeling no shame, as I will go on to explore below.

The choice of the word "disgrace" and also the use of the adjective "ashamed" and the word "shame" and their meticulous repetition in the text can actually be considered as a stylistic feature, as I will try to analyse in more detail below; a communicative clue which helps the inferred author construct a certain cognitive effect on the reader regarding David's Lurie's character. It may thus be regarded as part of the mind style that the inferred author reflects in the novel. I will now move on to the use of the words "disgrace" and "shame" in the target and source texts.

After three men attack Lucy's house and rape her, we often come across the word *utanç*. When I compared them with the source text, what I noticed was that most of them were the translation of either "shame" or "disgrace". I observed that there is a

distinction in the contexts where the inferred author chooses "disgrace" over "shame". Below are some examples:

> Kızı kullanılırken kendisi banyoya kilitlenmişti. Çocukluğundan kalma bu şarkı parmağını alaylı alaylı sallıyor: *Aman Tanrım, ne olmuştur acaba?* Lucy'nin sırrı; kendisinin **utancı** (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 137).

> Locked in the lavatory while his daughter was used. A chant from his childhood come back to point a jeering finger. *Oh, dear, what can the matter be?* Lucy's secret; his **disgrace** (Coetzee, 2000, p. 109).

In the above quote, the narrator tells us how David feels about the rape and here what attracts attention is the word *utanç*, which is the translation of "disgrace". However, as I will try to demonstrate below; there is no distinction in the target text between the uses of *utanç* when it is the translation of "disgrace" and when it is the translation of "shame".

The state of being ashamed and the feeling of shame are attributed to Lucy. After the rape, Lucy does not report the rape to the police. She merely recounts the event as an attack on her house, as a simple robbery. In the passage below, the narrator tells how the rapists may interpret Lucy's silence about the rape.

> Kadının bedeninin üzerine suskunluğun bir örtü gibi çekildiğini anlayacaklar. ***Çok utanıyor***, diye düşünecekler, ***anlatmaya utanıyor*** ve yaşadıkları serüveni hatırlayıp keyifle gülecekler. Lucy bu zaferi onlara tattırmaya razı mı? (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 139).

> It will dawn on them that over the body of the woman silence is being drawn like a blanket. ***Too ashamed***, they will say to each other, ***too ashamed to tell***, and they will chuckle luxuriously, recollecting their exploit. Is Lucy prepared to concede them that victory? (Coetzee, 2000, p. 110)

This is how they may interpret Lucy's silence; they may think that Lucy is "ashamed". In the passage below, we see how David Lurie interprets his daughter's silence and how he thinks it is wrong.

> Olabildiğince tatlı bir sesle sorusunu yineliyor David: "Lucy, canım, neden anlatmak istemiyorsun? Bu bir suçtu. Bir suça konu olmanın **utanılacak** bir yanı yok ki. Sen suçun nesnesi olmayı kendin seçmedin ki. Sen masun olan tarafsın." (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 140).

> As gently as he can, he offers his question again. 'Lucy, my dearest, why don't you want to tell? It was a crime. There is no **shame** in being the object of a crime. You didn't choose to be the object. You are an innocent party." (Coetzee, 2000, p. 111)

David thinks that there is no reason for Lucy to feel ashamed. She is the object of a crime, the innocent party. This was actually how he felt when he was accused of abusing Melanie Isaacs. The narrator tells us about this in a sarcastic tone as the passage below demonstrates (David Lurie has written a work on William Wordsworth):

> William Wordsworth (1770-1850), doğa şairi. David Lurie (1945-?), William Wordsworth yorumcusu ve onun **utanç verici** durumdaki müridi. Piç bebek kutsansın. Toplumdışı değil. Bebek kutsansın.

> William Wordsworth (1770-1850), nature-poet. David Lurie (1945- ?), commentator upon, and **disgraced disciple** of, William Wordsworth. Blest be the infant babe. No outcast he. Bless be the babe" (Coetzee, 2000, 46).

The narrator tells us in a sarcastic tone how David Lurie regards himself as innocent as a baby, although the translator misses it here, translating "infant babe" as *piç bebek*. "Infant babe" here symbolizes "innocence". (Although in the source text it feels like a crowd of people screaming for the salvation of an innocent person from punishment as in the old times, we do not feel it in the target text.) David Lurie is disgraced but he is innocent. He is not "*utanç verici durumdaki"* ("one in a shameful situation") but "*utanç verici duruma düşürülen"* ("one who has been placed in a shameful situation"). So, according to David Lurie, Lucy does not have to feel ashamed. Like himself, she is innocent. However, Lucy feels both disgraced and ashamed as the below quote demonstrates and this is the part where the difference between "disgrace" and "shame" becomes more apparent.

> Lucy yanıt vermiyor. Elinden gelse yüzünü gizleyecek, bunun nedenini biliyor David. **Rezil olduğu için. Utandığı için**. (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 145)

> She does not reply. She would rather hide her face, and he knows why. **Because of the disgrace. Because of the shame.** (Coetzee, 2000, p. 115)

Lucy is the victim of a crime. The crime does not only cause her disgrace but also shame, as David interprets it. Here the translator prefers to render "disgrace" not as *utanç* but as *rezil olmak*, which is closer in meaning to its source text use and, as before, she prefers the verb form *utanmak* for "shame" instead of *utanç*. It is not a coincidence that in Lucy's case the feeling of shame and disgrace accompany each other. This actually signals implicitly an allusion to history and the post-apartheid era, as I will try to explain below.

The asymmetrical relationship between Melanie and David is not only one based on age but also on race. David Lurie is an educated white man, while Melanie is a black girl from the rural hinterland of South Africa. As Joseph McElroy points out, *Disgrace* is the protagonist David Lurie's story: "*Disgrace* was always David's story, his education and habit of mind the main ground on which Coetzee thinks his way through" (McElroy, 2000, para. 16). However, as Stephen Williams (1999, p. 42) points out, the story does not confine itself only to the story of David Lurie. There is an allusion to the history of the apartheid period and also to post-apartheid politics. Williams states that, "It is a narrative that alludes to the unreconciled dilemmas of both Lurie's life and, by extension, his country's predicament" (p. 42). But the most striking point that Williams mentions is that "this predicament might be neatly summarised by the book's one word title," namely "disgrace". Laura Shapiro (1999) writes:

> The title of this splendid, Booker Prize-winning novel sums it up: no redemption is at hand. Everything David holds valuable is smashed or violated in its turn, most terribly his daughter, who is raped on her remote farm by black strangers she refuses to condemn. David cannot understand her stoicism; she rejects his rage. (p. 56)

Boase-Beier states that ideally a translation allows multiple interpretations rather than restricting itself to one interpretation (2006, p. 116). "Disgrace" as a word is broader in meaning than *utanç* in Turkish, especially in a context where both personal and social issues are at hand. The below extract attracted my attention at first because of the phrase *kötü emellerine alet etmek*, a term filled with cultural connotations, but then I realized there is more to it than domestication as I will try to explain:

> *Kötü emellerine alet etmek*: Bu sözü bekliyordu. Dürüstlükle titreyen bir sesin bu sözü söylemesini. O kadın, David'e baktığında ne görüyor ki sesi bu kadar öfkeyle titriyor? Zavallı minicik balıkların arasında dolaşan bir köpekbalığı mı? Yoksa başka bir şey mi canlanıyor kadının gözlerininin önünde: İri yarı...Eşit değillerdi; nasıl yadsıyabilirdi ki bunu? (2005b, p. 70)

> *Abuse*: he was waiting for the word. Spoken in a voice quivering with righteousness. What does she see, when she looks at him, that keeps her at such a pitch of anger? A shark among the helpless little fishies? Or does she have another vision: of a great thick-boned ....Unequal: how can he deny that? (2000, p. 53).

Here, it seems that the narrator is telling us how unequal Melanie and David are physically. But when one proceeds and Lucy is raped by three men, one of whom is a young black boy Lucy later identifies, the irony becomes clear. The unequal status is not only physical but also racial. *Kötü emellerine alet etmek* ("to be an instrument of bad intentions") could be considered too arabesque and dramatic and it restricts the range of meaning the word carries when Melanie's and David's relationship is assessed in terms of the political turmoil and racial issues South Africa is undergoing, and the fact that the inferred author is making allusions to political issues. Coetzee himself admits: "My English does not happen to be embedded in any particular sociolinguistic landscape, which relieves the translator of one vexatious burden; on the other hand, I do tend to be allusive, and not always to signal the presence of allusion" (Coetzee, 2005a, p. 143). Apart from the word "abuse", the pattern also catches attention here. The paragraph starts with "abuse" followed by a colon and ends with "unequal" followed by another colon. However, it is noticeable that the translator loses this pattern in her translation by putting a colon after the word "unequal". Coetzee uses the same pattern when he wants to emphasize something in the story. However, much of the time, Özdemir does not follow this pattern. She opts for a semi-colon rather than a colon, and her preference does not follow a set pattern.

As I have pointed out above, the use of the words "disgrace" and "shame" in the case of Lucy signal an allusion to the post-apartheid period, whereas in truth they

demonstrate how David and Melanie view the post-apartheid issues from different angles. As the below example illustrates:

> "Petrus'a yardım etmek. Bu hoşuma gitti. Geçmişi gırgıra almak gibi. Çalışmam karşılığında bana ücret verir mi? Ne dersin?" (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 98).

> "Give Petrus a hand. I like that. I like the historical piquancy. Will he pay me a wage for my labour, do you think?" (Coetzee, 2000, p. 77).

Petrus is the black man who helps Lucy on the farm but he also owns part of the farm. When David arrives, Lucy offers him to help Petrus. It seems that David finds it amusing but as events unfold, it is clear that Lurie has a condescending attitude towards blacks. Actually, the word "piquancy" already signals it here which means "1) agreeably pungent or sharp in taste or flavor; pleasantly biting or tart 2) agreeably stimulating, interesting, or attractive 3) of an interestingly provocative or lively character 4) Archaic: sharp or stinging, esp. to the feelings" (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, n.d.). Below is a part from one of the conversations with Petrus that clearly demonstrates David's attitude towards black people:

> 'You will marry Lucy," he says carefully. 'Explain to me what you mean. No, wait, rather don't explain. This is not something I want to hear. This is not how we do things.'

> *We*: he is on the point of saying, *We Westerners*. (Coetzee, 2000, p. 202)

Below is a part of another conversation between David and Petrus where the word "people" signifies two different "people" living in the South Africa who are in conflict.

> "Senin çocuğun mu? Şimdi bu Pollux senin çocuğun mu oluyor?"

> "Evet. O bir çocuk. Benim ailem o, benim yakınım."

> Demek öyle. Artık yalan yok. Benim ailem. Olabildiği kadar açık bir yanıt. Eh, Lucy de onun ailesi. (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 249).

> 'Your child? Now he is your child, this Pollux?'

> 'Yes? He is a child. He is my family, my people.'

> So that is it. No more lies. *My people*. As naked an answer as he could wish. Well, Lucy is *his people*. (Coetzee 2000, p. 201)

Lucy does not report the rape to the police because she thinks it is with this attack she paid the rent to the real owners of the land, to the South Africans. That is why she feels both shame and disgrace. She feels she owns them something. Below is a part of a conversation between David and his daughter that makes this point clear, and the note David leaves for her daughter:

> "O zaman anlamama yardım et. Ortaya koymaya çalıştığın şey, bir tür **özel kurtulma işlemi** mi? Şimdi acı çekerek geçmişteki cürümlere kefaret edebileceğini mi düşünüyorsun?" (Coetzee, 2005b, p. 141)

74

> "Then help me. Is it some form of **private salvation** you are trying to work out? Do you hope you can expiate the crimes of the past by suffering in the present?" (Coetzee, 2000: 112).

> "Sevgili Lucy, içimde büyük bir sevgiyle sana şunu söylemeliyim: Korkunç bir hata yapmak üzeresin. Kendini tarihin önünde **aşağılatmak** istiyorsun. Ama izlediğin yol yanlış. Onurunu yitireceksin. Kendinle yüzleşemeyeceksin. Sana yalvarıyorum, sözümü dinle.

> Baban." (Coetzee, 2005b, pp. 200-201)

> "Dearest Lucy, With all the love in the world, I must say the following. You are on the brink of a dangerous error. You wish to **humble** yourself before history. But the road you are following is the wrong one. It will strip of all honor; you will not be able to live with yourself. I plead with you, listen to me.

> 'Your father.' (Coetzee, 2000, p. 160)

The above examples demonstrate how different attitudes Melanie and David have towards the political issues. The use of the word "disgrace" and "shame" in certain contexts signal this difference.

4. Discussion

Considering myself as a reader of both the target and source texts, I have attempted to expound upon some of the cognitive effects experienced while reading the target text and how they were caused by repetition of the words *utanç* and *disgrace*, used respectively in the target and source texts. Jean Boase-Beier writes, "If style is the result of choice, and choice is the result of cognitive state, then it could be argued that all style is in a sense mind style. However, what is peculiar to the notion of mind style is a consistent stylistic pattern in the text as evidence of a particular cognitive state" (2003, p. 263). And here this consistent stylistic pattern throughout the text, in my reading, was the repetition of these two words and also the replacement of *utanç* in some instances with *rezil olma*.

According to Boase-Beier, "A translator has to consider both the cognitive state embodied by stylistic repetition and cognitive effects on the reader of patterns which draw attention to particular points in the text" (Boase-Beier 2006, p. 94). However, as Anton Popovic (1971, p. 79) explains, translation is the encounter of not only two languages but also the encounter of the literary systems to which the author and the translator belong and it is the differences between these two languages and systems that determine the changes in the translation. Following Popovic, we can argue that the fact that İlknur Özdemir's translation involves shifts in the translation of "disgrace" does not mean that she "underemphasize[s] the semantic appeal of the original" (p. 79). *Utanç* is a word with a very strong resonance in Turkish, a very striking word that catches

the attention, especially as the title of a novel by a Nobel Prize-winning author. As I have tried to demonstrate above, it is difficult to recreate the effect it has on the reader with its use in the same context as 'shame'. Özdemir thus looked to other ways to solve this dilemma.

What I would like to suggest in this reading and analysis of *Utanç* and *Disgrace* is that a stylistic analysis of a literary text is not only a necessary step for translators when reconstructing the state of mind of a character, author or a narrator but also for those analyzing the translation and who would like to bring a more structured discussion of style in terms of the choices made by the translator and, of course, by the author of the source text. This way it is possible to avoid some of the expressions Coetzee used to criticize the translation of his work *Waiting for the Barbarians* into German, such as "voice", "the world", "rhythm of speech", "rhythm of thought" and "sensibility".

5. Conclusion

It should not be forgotten that choices in both the source text and the target text are important since they are part of the cognitive effects on the readers, and translators are considered, first and foremost, readers of texts. The translators thus need to be aware of certain patterns and certain stylistic features that can take them to weakly implied meanings in the text, which can in turn lead them to the mind style of the author.

In this study, I wanted to demonstrate different cognitive processes I went through while reading *Utanç* and *Disgrace* in the light of the framework I constructed around Boase-Beier's discussion of stylistic approaches to translation. As Jean Boase-Beier points out, "If literary texts are indeed 'a product of the mind' (Graham 1992: xiv), then, we expect to find traces of the mind of the originator in the product, that is, in the style of the source text" (2006, p. 75). The concept of mind style developed by Boase-Beier throughout *Stylistic Approaches to Translation* (2006) and *Translation and Style* (2019) would seem to be a savior that helps not only the translators but also those who analyze the translations to integrate the cognitive processes they go through when they are reading the translation into their analysis.

References

Avery, R., Bezmez, S., Edmons, Anna G. and Yaylalı, M. (1997). Disgrace. In *İngilizce-Türkçe Redhouse Dictionary* (26th Edition, p. 270). SEV Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık.

Boase-Beier, J. (2003). Mind style translated. *Style, 37*(3), 253-265. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.37.3.253

Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic approaches to translation*, St. Jerome.

Boase-Beier, J. (2019). *Translation and style* (2nd edition). Taylor and Francis.

Coetzee, J. M. (2000). _Disgrace_. Vintage.

Coetzee, J. M. (2005a), Roads to translation. _Meanjin_, _64_(4), 141-51.

Coetzee, J. M. (2005b). _Utanç_ (İ. Özdemir, Trans.). Can Yayınları.

Dictionary.com. (n.d.). Piquant. In _Dictionary.com._ Retrieved November 10, 2022, from https://www.dictionary.com/browse/piquant.

Fowler, R. (1977). _Linguistics and the novel._ Methuen.

Fowler, R. (1986). Linguistic criticism. Oxford University Press.

Fowler, R. (1996). _Linguistic criticism_ (2nd edition). Oxford University Press.

McElroy, J. (2000, March 6). _Salvation in South Africa_, The Nation.

      https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/salvation-south-africa/

Merriam-Webster (n.d). Disgrace. In _Merriam-Webster Dictionary_. Retrieved November 10, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/disgrace.

Popovic, A. (1971). The concept of shift of expression. In J. Holmes (Ed.), _The nature of translation_ (pp. 78-89). Gruyter Mouton.

Semino, E., & Culpeper, J. (2002). Foreword. In E. Semino & J. Culpeper (Eds.), _Cognitive stylistics: Language and cognition in text analysis_ (pp. ix-xvi). John Benjamins.

Shapiro, L. (1999, Nov 22). African anger: A booker prize winner. _Newsweek_ (Pacific Edition), 134 (21), 56..

Türk Dil Kurumu Genel Türkçe Sözlük. (n.d.). Utanç. In _TDK Genel Türkçe Sözlük_. Retrieved November 10, 2022, from https://sozluk.gov.tr/

Türk Dil Kurumu Genel Türkçe Sözlük. (n.d.). Utanmak. In _TDK Genel Türkçe Sözlük_. Retrieved November 10, 2022, from https://sozluk.gov.tr/

Williams, S. (1999). Book reviews. _African Business, 248_, 42.