

Betrayed by Nihal Yeğınobalı: Examining Manuel Puig in Turkish Through the Lens of Berman

Nihal Yeğınobalı'nın *İhaneti*: Manuel Puig'i Türkçe Çeviride Berman'ın Çerçevesinden İncelemek

Ceyda Elgöl¹ 

¹Dr., Boğaziçi University, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies, İstanbul, Türkiye

Corresponding author/

Sorumlu yazar : Ceyda Elgöl

E-mail / E-posta : ceyda.elgul@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper explores Nihal Yeğınobalı's 1991 translation of Manuel Puig's first novel *La Traición de Rita Hayworth* into Turkish in light of Antoine Berman's model of translation criticism that highlights the social aspect of translation products and asks the critics to examine the translation project within a context that includes the translator's elaboration of the meaning, purpose, mode, and form of their work. This concerns the historical, social, literary, and ideological discourse on translation surrounding the translator; thus the critic also discovers whether the translator internalizes these norms or acts against them. Because Yeğınobalı's work is an indirect translation, the study introduces the medium text that the translator utilized, namely the English translation of the novel by Suzanne Jill Levine, and it discusses the topic of indirect translation in light of the translation norms and market conditions surrounding Yeğınobalı. Lastly, the study employs Berman's stage of confrontation in which the source text is compared with the translation in light of the aforementioned data. The paper concludes with its findings on the examined translation product that covers both the textual and the contextual factors and presents the implications of Berman's critical model on research in literary translation.

Keywords: Antoine Berman, indirect translation, Latin American Literature in Turkish translation, Nihal Yeğınobalı, translation criticism

ÖZ

Bu makale Manuel Puig'in ilk romanı *La Traición de Rita Hayworth*'un, Nihal Yeğınobalı imzalı 1991 tarihli Türkçe çevirisini, Antoine Berman'ın çeviri eleştirisi modeli ışığında incelemektedir. Bu model çeviri ürünlerin toplumsal yönünü öne çıkarmakla birlikte, çeviri eleştirisinde eserin anlam, amaç, yöntem ve formunun çevirmen tarafından nasıl ele alındığının açıklanmasını beklemektedir. Bu, çevirmenin etrafındaki tarihsel, toplumsal, edebi ve ideolojik çeviri söylemiyle ilişkilidir; böylece çeviri eleştirisinde, çevirmenin bu normları içselleştirip içselleştirmediği ya da bunlara aykırı davranıp davranmadığı da keşfedilir. Yeğınobalı'nın çalışması dolaylı bir çeviri olduğu için, makalede çevirmenin kullandığı aracı metin olan Suzanne Jill Levine'in İngilizce çevirisi tanıtılmakta ve dolaylı çeviri konusu Yeğınobalı'yı çevreleyen çeviri normları ve piyasa koşulları ışığında tartışılmaktadır. Son olarak, tüm bu veriler dahilinde kaynak metin ile çevirinin karşılaştırıldığı yüzleşme aşaması uygulanmaktadır. Makale, incelenen çeviri ürününe ilişkin hem metinsel hem de bağlamsal unsurları kapsayan bulgularla ve Berman'ın çeviri eleştirisi modelinin edebiyat çevirisi araştırmalarında kullanımıyla sonuçlanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Antoine Berman, çeviri eleştirisi, dolaylı çeviri, Nihal Yeğınobalı, Türkçe çeviride Latin Amerika Edebiyatı

Submitted/Başvuru : 21.09.2023

**Revizyon Talebi/
Revision Requested :** 05.10.2023

**Son Revizyon/
Last Revision Received :** 16.10.2023

Accepted/Kabul : 26.10.2023

**Published Online /
Online Yayın :** 15.12.2023



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

1. Introduction

Critical statements on translated works generally reflect the critic's thoughts on the concepts of translation, creativity, originality, authorship, and translatorship. These meta-texts on translation provide a panorama of views on the concepts of primary and secondary creation, and they reveal how these concepts have evolved throughout the literary history, which makes them useful data in historical translation research. Although the sociocultural approach to translation that underlines the historicity of the translation phenomenon, as well as the social position of the translation and its translator seems to have an acknowledged popularity within the academy, it might not be at the very center of every translation criticism; error hunting is still observable within the domain. In that respect, the criticism model presented by the French scholar Antoine Berman that blends literary and social theory into the practice of translation criticism gains a highlight.

Antoine Berman is quite a versatile figure in translation studies; he is a translator, philosopher, literary theorist and literary historian. His work reflects on theories from diverging disciplines and is quite popular within the field of translation criticism. His *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne* implements a macro perspective towards translation products that combines close reading with the contextual factors surrounding the translation product. Upon introducing this holistic approach, this paper will discuss Nihal Yeğınobalı's translation of Manuel Puig's first novel *La Traición de Rita Hayworth* into Turkish in light of the translation criticism model that Berman presents.

2. Methods

As a scholar who is critical of unclear value judgements on translation products, the underestimated position of translation, and the marginalization of the translator within literary history, Antoine Berman establishes a dialogue among writers, translators, and thinkers from different periods and regions, and presents a holistic model of translation criticism that encompasses the beyond the text criteria in translation analysis. His view bears theories that arose in different eras, ranging from the Romantic school and modern hermeneutic school, to the post-structuralist and functionalist schools. Berman has been quite influential in modern translation theory, his name being listed next to Jacques Derrida and Walter Benjamin. Firstly, he presents translation as a form of criticism that maintains the survival of the original work; and highlights translations as a "trial/experience of the foreign" as they manifest a relationship between "the Self-same (propre) and the Foreign by aiming to open up the foreign work to us in its utter foreignness," a vision to be seen in works by such pioneers of post-colonial translation theory as Lawrence Venuti, Gayatri Spivak and Tejaswini Niranjana (Berman, 2000, p. 284). Much as translations represent the foreign, they mirror how the home culture approaches the foreign, in which there is always something to be learned:

When its openness is passed through, it leads to the foreign shore, which includes a reflection on what is foreign, what is to be learned, so that with the return home, the appropriation of what is one's own can be accomplished, and the foreign that has been transformed and brought back can be presented. (Heidegger, as cited in Massardier-Kenney, 2009, p. xv)

As the translator of *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne* also denotes in his introduction, the above-noted words by Heidegger on the notion of a work's self-reflection summarize the task Berman adheres to translation and translation criticism. The foreign contributes to one's own self-actualization, thus leads to transformation. Within this context, the act of translation is presented as an experience rather than a practice, while the product of translation becomes an indicative of this transformative experience.

Secondly, in addition to reflecting the scholar's hermeneutics background, Berman's call seems to escape ethnocentrism and it rejects the subsidiary position of the translator in literary creation: They are involved in a supreme task of experiencing the foreign and enable a mutual communication between two distinct cultures. That's why the causes of their choices are worth a deeper analysis. One of the aims of translation criticism is to illuminate the translation's capacity of self-reflection. This would eventually elevate the position of the translation and translator, just as it would open up a comprehensive sphere for translation criticism.

There are two literary traditions inherent within Berman's view of translation and translator. His view of criticism as a way to reveal the potentials of the text is rooted in 19th century Romanticism, which regards the original as an entity full of potentials that are activated through reading. Berman's rhetoric combines this view with the vision by modern hermeneutics school that defines reading as a laborious process of understanding, and thus considers each reading as an interpretation with its own peculiarities. Supporting translators as the utmost readers of the original works who activate their hidden potentials, and in fact recreate them, this view of the reading practice implies a demarginalization of translators and their work. In addition, as Berman discusses in the second part of his book, the portrayal of translations

as peculiar interpretations of their source texts unearths retranslation as a topic of debate; and in fact, his retranslation frame is open to further elaboration in literary translation research that presents comparative analysis of retranlations.¹

While introducing criticism as a self-reflective practice, Berman highlights the positive aspect of the task: Criticism is a mirror through which all works communicate, manifest, accomplish and perpetuate themselves. This might fall at odds with traditional schools of translation that have been trapped by error hunting. Here Berman mentions *engage analyses* by Henri Meschonnic amongst the paths that adhere the critic a “fighting position” (Berman, 2009, p. 35). Underlining the historicity of translation criticism, Berman emphasizes that the fighting position can be limited to the translations that “mistreat works crucial to the Western culture” (such as Bible, or the works by Paul Celan and Franz Kafka) and it reflects the protective attitude of the critic towards the original work (2009, p.35). In fact, Berman cannot help supporting the canonicity of some works himself, and therefore he does not seem to present *engage analyses* as a thoroughly unacceptable method. Discussing the risk-taking involved in translating the canon, he quotes Derrida:

When quoting the existing translation (of Celan), I would first like to express my great debt and to pay homage to those who took the responsibility or the risk to translate [...] In general I have refrained from translating, and especially from retranslating. I did not want to appear to be trying, however slightly, to amend a first attempt. In the proximity of such texts, lessons or polemics have no place. (Derrida, as cited in Berman, 2009, p. 36)

Next to Meschonnic’s approach that implies translation as a subsidiary activity, Berman posits the empirical view by the Tel Aviv School. The neutral and scientific observers of this school aim to develop translation criticism as a socio-critique of existing translations, and they study the ideology and the doxa that affect translation practice and make translations what they are. They posit translation in the same level as the original texts, as they are also worth a deeper socio-cultural analysis, which is appreciated by Berman; however, he also seems to be critical of the over-neutrality recommended by the empirical approach.

The methodology by Berman can be considered as a combination of these two approaches and the hermeneutic view, and it refers to translation as a form of criticism that result from the transfer of a work from one language context to another. To him, translation is essential for the works’ self-expression, fulfillment, survival and circulation, and so is criticism. Besides evoking this postmodern argument centered around translation and survival, Berman’s argumentation suggests each translation as a contributor of a superior composition called ‘translating language’ and ‘translating literature’, which might remind of the ‘pure language’ theory by Walter Benjamin and the ‘repertoire’ theory by Itamar Even-Zohar respectively (Berman, 2009, p. 30).

The methodology Berman offers in translation criticism includes: a reading of the translation; a reading of the source text; familiarization with the secondary material about the source text and the translation; selection of the singularities of the source text; research on the translator’s *position, project* and *horizon*; and comparison of the source and target texts in order to come to the conclusions that concern the socio-historical position of the translation. While presenting this model, Berman mentions that any text is bounded to its own context, and any work of criticism, including the ones pursuing his model, would be historically situated. In the second part of his book, Berman applies this method to the translations of works by the metaphysical poet John Donne. He lists various translation projects that focus on the John Donne corpus, and embarks on a stylistic comparison that highlights the differences among the selected source and target texts. In doing so, he considers the contexts of the translation products. In this section that exemplifies how theory meets with practice, the notions of *failure* and *success* are related to what Berman calls the *translation project*. Here, Berman investigates whether the project fails or succeeds in accomplishing the project’s goals. Consequently, Berman’s model is quite comprehensive: In addition to revealing the interpretation and transmission means of the translator, criticism becomes indicative of how poetics deployed within source and target context. As mentioned in the last chapter of the book, in his context, reception is determined by the literary horizon of the period that inspires literary production. Henceforth, Berman’s project of productive translation criticism presents the critics a multi-stepped model of research and analysis.

I would lastly like to note that while examining the Turkish translation of *La Traición de Rita Hayworth* with Berman’s model, I will discuss the target text as an indirect translation in light of the arguments by Gideon Toury (1995) and Martin Ringmar (2006), and also touch upon remarks by the translator of the work into English, Suzanne Jill Levine, on translating Manuel Puig and Latin American fiction.

¹ Having said that, Berman’s view of retranslation has not been without controversy. His retranslation hypothesis suggests that retranlations of a source text complement each other. This view presents that the latest translation has a potential to be the most complete version, thus it implies a hierarchy amongst different translations of source texts. For reflections on Berman’s view of retranslation please see Tahir-Gürçaçlar 2020.

3. Analysis & Discussion

In this section of the paper, following an overview of Manuel Puig's 1968 novel *La Traición de Rita Hayworth* and its translations into English (*Betrayed by Rita Hayworth*, Trans. Suzanne Jill Levine, 1971) and Turkish (*Rita Hayworth'un İhaneti*, Trans. Nihal Yeğinoğlu, 1991), the novel's Turkish translation will be examined in light of Berman's model of translation criticism.²

La Traición de Rita Hayworth is the first novel of the Argentine author Manuel Puig. This semi-autobiographical work is based on the extraordinary influence of motion pictures and other mediums of Western popular culture on the inhabitants of an ordinary town close to Buenos Aires, called Vallejos. The novel takes place between the years 1933 and 1948, and it focuses on the childhood and adolescence of the main character Toto. This little boy tires to achieve his *Bildung* within a village in which life is distorted by various means of oppression and foreign intrusion. The reader witnesses Toto's *Bildung* mainly through his and other townspeople's internal monologues; therefore, the book includes various tones of voices, manifesting different cases of how the locals have internalized Hollywood and the pop culture. An example of postcolonial writing, the novel elaborates the themes of marginalization, lacking a sense of belonging, hybridity, and suppressed sexuality. The narrative embraces multiple perspectives and continuously refers to code-switching, which situates the work within the literary context of parody and pastiche.

Although written in the same year as Gabriel García Márquez's Nobel Prize winning novel *Cien Años de Soledad*, *La Traición* is not a main participant of the Latin American literary boom. Because rather than magical realism, the novel can be considered as a work of pop-art, which in fact puts the work amongst the pioneers of the post-boom literary movement known as dirty realism. Additionally, because "his pull to an art form comes from the movies rather than literature", Manuel Puig also differs from his Argentine counterpart Jorge Luis Borges (Cheuse, 2009, p. ii). Although they are both 'rewriters' who offer the reader a pastiche of previous references, Puig can be considered closer to the territories of camp instead of the canon; his main source is not the Western heritage but pop culture.

Translation in *La Traición* is manifest at various levels. Firstly, the novel itself bears a translational value due to the high level of intertextuality it bears. While blending the pop culture and the local material, Puig in a way decontextualizes and *translates* these source texts into the language of his critical discourse. This also has its implications on culture translation, as the novel also discusses how Hollywood and pop culture elements intervene in the local territories, and transforms, translates the local people and culture. During the novel, Puig intentionally *mistranslates* his characters and represent them as distorted, incomplete beings that lack autonomy, in order to underline the philistine aspects of the period's Argentine environment. Women are unable to reach the luxurious style of Hollywood stars; young girls fail to encounter the supreme love of their love, unlike the girls in Hollywood movies; kids ask when the miracles in the animated stories would come true. These are grounded by poverty, hatred, rootlessness, and death.

The novel was translated into English in 1971 by the American scholar and translator Suzanne Jill Levine, a recognized representative of Latin American fiction in the US. Levine presented the English translations of works by numerous Latin American authors from different regions of the Spanish-speaking South America, such as Severo Sarduy, Silvina Ocampo, Adolfo Bioy Casares, Jorge Luis Borges, Guillermo Cabrera Infante, José Donoso, and Julio Cortázar. Manuel Puig was a close friend of Levine, and besides from *Betrayed by Rita Hayworth*, she translated *Heartbreak Tango* (1973), *The Buenos Aires Affair* (1976) and *Tropical Night Falling* (1991) by him. Levine is a prolific figure in translation criticism, she wrote numerous articles and books that describe her view of translation and her own translation experience of Latin American fiction. Her award-winning literary biography *Manuel Puig and the Spider Woman* (2000) and her book on the poetics of translation *The Subversive Scribe: Translating Latin American Fiction* (1991) are commonly referred reference sources in postmodern translation research.

The novel's translation into Turkish by Nihal Yeğinoğlu appeared in 1991. The current study acknowledges Jill Levine's English translation as Yeğinoğlu's source text, because in an interview the translator states that she did not use the Spanish original of Puig's work as her source, and used English as a medium language (Bengi Öner 1990). Because Jill Levine's translation was the only published English version of the novel at the time Yeğinoğlu translated it, during the analysis, Yeğinoğlu's translation will be examined in comparison with Levine's English version.

Reading the Translation

Berman's analytical path introduces two consecutive sets of steps: the first set is related to the reading of the target and source texts, and the second concerns the "fundamental moments of the critical act itself as it will appear in written

² Here I should note that Berman presents his offer not as an ultimate model but as a "possible analytical path", which can be "modulated according to the specific objectives of each analyst and adapted to all standardized text types" (Berman, 2009, p. 49). As he himself also acknowledges that a study that would follow this path might "prove to be a book rather than an article", the present study will not include the phase of reception in its scope.

form” (Berman, 2009, p. 49). According to Berman, what differs his model of criticism from those of the Meschonnic’s school and the Tel Aviv School is his emphasis on agency, which comprises the translator and actors participating in the translation project. The translation phase entails “a long, patient activity of reading and rereading the translations while completely setting aside the original text” (2009, p. 49). It enables the critic to observe whether the translated text stands, firstly as a “written text in receptor language, in other words, primarily, not to be outside the written norms of this language”, secondly as a “real text” that possesses a systematic, correlative and organic character with its constituents (2009, p. 50). Here, Berman introduces the terms “immanent consistency” and “immanent life”, which refers to whether the text stands on its own “outside any relation to its original” and whether it is “stiff”, “spirited”, and “lively”. Within this context the translation mirrors its “zones” by itself; the critic sets aside the source text and finds out where/if the translator loses the rhythm, or on the contrary, gets too fluent. Berman seems to support the translation’s interference in the target language sphere and suggests that the parts that the translator has “foreign-written” in the target language are “full of felicity”.

Reading Nihal Yeğınobalı’s translation of Puig’s novel in light of this Bermanian context, one inevitably recognizes the breathless flow in the narrative that is a main consequence of the frequent use of the stream of consciousness method. This flow collaborates with the text’s idiosyncratic nature, which mostly comes out: 1) in the parts that reveal the text’s dirty realism, that is, when the tone of voice gets vulgar, unusual curses are articulated, 2) or when the monologue includes frequent transitions from one subject matter to the other. Yeğınobalı’s translation combines these idiosyncratic stylistic features of the novel with her domesticating strategies:

- Toti’m benim, sen büyüyünce kötü sözler söylemeyeceksin, değil mi nonoşum? Ines’e benzemediğin için çok şanslısın, onun hiç şansı yokmuş, zavallı babasız yavrucuk. Ablam nerelerde acaba? Ölmüş müdür, dersin? Yaşım daha çok küçük, ama teyze oldum bile. Bu gece de Ines’i yatağıma alacağım, benlen Kuzu’nun arasına yatacağım. Ines iki teyzesinin arasında yatsın, sıcaıcık, kuytucuk. Senin de baban eve körkütük gelse de kayışını eline alsın, sen de korkardın bal gibi. Kayışla öyle bir verıştirdi ki bana. Toti, dilerim Tanrıdan sen büyüyünce baban aynı şeyi yapmasın sana. Şapşal Ines, başlıyor zırlamaya, bu kez daha da kötü kayış yiyor, elbet. Keşke büyüdüğünde Ines’le evlensen, gerçi o senden birazcık büyük, ama hiç önemi yok. Ines şimdiden, ana, baba, demesini biliyor. Sen ne zaman öğreneceksin, ana, baba demesini? (Puig, 1991, p. 19)

Reading the quotation above, one could come to the conclusion that such domesticated lexical choices as ‘körkütük’, ‘bal gibi’, ‘verıştirdi’, ‘zırlamak’ contribute to the vulgar setting of the scene. Below is another quotation that exemplifies the breathless flow of the novel enabled through the stream of consciousness method embedded in the monologue. The passage is still comprehensible, but perhaps is a bit more difficult to read than the one above due to the frequent change of topic within the monologue:

Anne bir gün biz yolda yürürken ağladı, ama hangi gündü, unuttum. Ne zamandı? Neden ağlıyorsun, annemim? Söylemiyor, ama küçük kara kızla balıkçık boğulmuşlar, havuzun kara suunun yüzüne çıkmışlar. . . Ne mutlu onlara ki uçak düşüp parçalandıktan sonra Ginger Rogers’le Fred Astaire saydam olarak dans ediyorlar hatıralarında, mademki onları hiç kimse ayıramaz, artık savaş olsa da olmasa da. Anne öyle uykusundan kalkınca söyleyeceğim, gürültü etmedim, cici çocuk oldum diye. Küçük kara kızla balıkçık da öldükten sonra cennette saydamlaşacaklar, ama ben annemin onların resmini boyamasını istemiyorum, öyle pisler ki, saydam olunca da çirkin olurlar. Minik kuşlar daha cici değil mi? Bir kuşçağız mı ölmüş? Bitişikteki çocuğun kanaryası mı ölmüş? (Puig, 1991, p. 40)

The novel comprises various passages written in different literary styles, such as letter, monologue, dialogue; therefore, the varying level of fluency observed in Yeğınobalı’s translation would not make the target text a work that lacks *immanent consistency*. In fact, in Berman’s terms, the translation seems to *stand* as a text on its own firstly because it is not outside the written norms of Turkish language, and is comprehensible enough and reads well. As for the second context of the target text’s autonomy presented by Berman, namely whether it possesses a systematic, correlative and organic character in all its constituent parts, one cannot arrive at a certain conclusion via considering the translation apart from its original. The novel itself is a vivid example of the postmodern trend, therefore it comes against correlations in many aspects. The book tells a number of stories, namely those of the people in the village, there’s not a certain tone of voice, nor an uninterrupted story to follow. The novel is centered around Toto, yet even his story is not depicted fully. The reader needs to guess what happened in his life in the years between his monologues. Therefore, the inconsistencies in translation product can be considered with these in mind.

As Berman states, the translations reveal their own zones where the narrative gets condensed, stiff and spirited. Below is a selected zone in Puig’s novel that manifests an increased level of intertextuality and abrupt change of topic:

Anne beni tokatlıyor, ama pek acımıyor, Hector’u da tokatlıyor, ama o benden büyük, daha hızlı koşuyor, anne onu tutamıyor, bitişikteki çocuk da ‘Baban babaların en iyisi, benim babadan bile daha iyi,’ çünkü babam beni hiç dövmez ne de Hector’u. Bir gün öyle uykusu saatinde anneyi uyandırdım, çünkü sıkıldı babam da, ‘sana şimdiye kadar fiske bile vurmamışım, ama bir elimi kaldırırsam ağzımı burnunu dağıtırım,’ ben de en sevdiğim filmi düşüneceğim, çünkü anne, dedi ki uyku saatinde canım sıkılmasın diye film düşün, dedi. *Romeo ile Juliet*’in konusu aşk, acıklı bitiyor çünkü ölüyorlar, en sevdiğim filmlerden biri. Norma Shearer hiç yaramazlık yapmayan bir artist. Anne beni tokatlar, ama acıtmaz, ama baba tokatlarsa ağzın burnun dağılır. Hector’un Kudas ayını kitabında bir kadın ermiş var, tıpkı Norma Shearer, uzun, beyaz giysili

bir rahibe, elinde bir demet beyaz çiçek. Norma Shearer'in ciddi, gülerken ve profilden çekilmiş resimleri var bende, dergilerden kesilmiş, hiç görmediğim bir sürü film. Ve Felisa 'Anlat bana ne oluyor o müzikalde,' ben de yalan attım ona, ikisi yalnız başlarına dans ettiler, rüzgar esip kadının eteklerini, adamın fragmanın kuyruklarını havalandırdı, değil de, gökten küçük kuşlar geldiler, kadının etekleriyle adamın kuyruklarını yavaş yavaş kaldırdılar dedim (Puig, 1991, p. 31)

In the example above, despite the lively and comprehensive nature of the narrative, the constant shift in the narrator's focus disrupts it. Toto is a rather young and naïve voice who intends to relate different things to one another quite easily. Puig allows him to lose sense more than he does to other characters, thus the reader might find it harder to comprehend Toto. When it comes to the translation by Yeğinoğlu, it is seen that the juvenile nature of the speaker is given via inverted, and on occasion, ungrammatical sentences. There are also gaps in the narrative. For instance, in the section above we cannot comprehend the father's anger towards Toto when the kid wakes his mother up, which will be detailed later in the paper during the confrontation stage.

Reading the Original

According to Berman, reading the original entails setting aside the translation and focusing on the source text. This reading is done to "locate all the stylistic characteristics, whatever they may be, that individuate the writing and the language of the original" (Berman, 2009, p. 51). It requires a focus on sentence types, propositional sequencing, recurring words, keywords, usage of grammar including adjectives, adverbs, tense, prepositions, and so on. The critic is expected to complement this stylistic analysis with parallel readings that include other works of the author, studies about the author, and the period. This holistic source text analysis that combines the investigation of the main text with extra-textual material might be similar to what the translator does during the translation process; yet the critic is particularly involved in "selecting pertinent and significant stylistic examples in the original" that are described as the *signifying zones* that unearth "where the work reaches its own purpose (not necessarily that of the author) and its own center of gravity" (2009, p. 54).

Before embarking on the stylistic features of the novel, the study will first introduce Manuel Puig and his work. Manuel Puig was born in 1932, in Buenos Aires province. After studying architecture for a few years, he started to work as a film archivist and an editor in Buenos Aires. Shortly after, he moved to Italy with a scholarship, and returned home, which he never called home, in the 1960s. Although Puig's dream was to become a screenwriter, and to write TV shows and movies, he never became as successful in the field as he did in literature. Due to the political turbulence in Argentina, he moved to Mexico in 1973 and started his voluntary exile. He has seven novels in total, the most famous of which are *La Traición de Rita Hayworth* (1968), *Boquitas Pintadas* (1969), *The Buenos Aires Affair: Novela Political* (1973) and *El Beso de la Mujer Araña* (1976). His works carry the traces of his film career and remind the style of a screenplay, which took the American producers' attention. His most popular work, *El Beso de la Mujer Araña*, has been adapted into a movie and a Broadway musical and he has several works written in the forms of drama, musical and screenplay. Besides not joining the magical realist literary movement of his time, Puig incorporates various elements of popular culture and especially the motion picture trend in his works; therefore, he can be considered as an author of post-boom, although his novels started to appear during the *El Boom* period.

Among the few novels Puig wrote in Argentina, *La Traición* is composed of sixteen chapters, half of which are written in the form of internal monologue. The other forms included in the novel are: dialogue, journal, diary, essay and letter. As exemplified in the quotation below, the first two chapters are written in dialogue form, the dialogues including freefall of ideas. Much as they can be fun to read, these dialogues do not follow a consistent storyline. There are many people involved, each character talks about a different matter, and the reader does not easily sense who is who, as there are only dashes before each statement. It can be said that these sections prepare the reader to the continuous change of topic and code-switching that are to come in the monologues of the following chapters:

- Grandpa left to take the chicken to Violeta's father. Can I go with him, Mommy?
- He went out with that grey apron on again. If Mita saw him go out with that grey apron on she'd be furious
- Clara, your father's one pleasure in life is to walk around with that apron on.
- Mita wouldn't stand up for Violeta any more if she knew what Violeta was saying about her.
- Mommy, grandpa already crossed the street so I couldn't follow him.
- But Adela couldn't have studied with such poor eyesight. Remember the headaches she'd get.
- Such long hours at that place, and besides which, she has to work with the light on.
- If Mita came to life in La Plata, would she still want to keep on with her career? Sofia's father could get her into the university as somebody's assistant.
- How I'd love to see Mita's baby.
- No, what Berto wants is for Mita not to work anymore, as soon as his affairs get straightened out a bit.

- I am completely worn out.
- Violeta thought you worked from nine to six, and she had to go make supper for her father. She says hello. (Puig, 2009 [1971], p.12)

In the introduction that he writes to the 2009 edition of Jill Levine's translation of *La Traición*, Alan Cheuse mentions that although the novel does not have a narrative voice, therefore no descriptive passages apart from a few short ones, it is no easier to follow than the books that the villagers of Vallejos avoid reading, such as Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain* (Cheuse, 2009, pp. v-vi). Just as the villagers cannot find the sufficient patience to read the classics, as Cheuse states, one would never feel ready to read *Betrayed*, therefore needs to jump right into it. As exemplified above, right from the very beginning, the novel leads the reader from one anonymous and non-sense conversation to the other. Jill Levine states in her translation memoir that, it was also difficult for her to translate these dialogued chapters, as there are a variety of speakers the identities of which the reader is expected to guess:

The dialogued chapters (1,2,4) in Rita Hayworth presented what initially seemed like insurmountable difficulties. In chapter I ("Mita's Parents' Place, La Plata, 1933) and chapter 2 ("At Berto's, Vallejos, 1933") conversations are transcribed without any descriptive or narrative context, and the names of the speakers are omitted. The reader gradually figures out who's who by the casual hints dropped by the speakers, speaking from within their world and not to the author or reader, who both play the role of eavesdropper. And we "hear"- in chapter 4- only Choli's side of the conversation, from which we are forced to induce Mita's possible responses. (Levine, 1991, p. 83)

Consequently, the translator asked for Puig's help for the missing identities and the omitted parts of the dialogue, and confesses that without this external interference, she couldn't have managed to solve the puzzle by herself. As for Yeğınobalı, she must have experienced the ease of adopting the English version as her source text. In fact, when read thoroughly, it is realized that the complicated scene the reader encounters right at the beginning of the book (although Levine says she managed to solve the complexity, it is still partly there) actually fulfills the function of establishing a setting for the rest of the novel. These chapters describe the family's Italian origin, how Toto's parents moved to Vallejos and are about to lose touch with their roots.

As for the monologues that follow the dialogues, we see that only the main character Toto has more than one monologue (he has 2 monologues and a school essay in total). He is the character that makes the novel semi-autobiographical, and perhaps that's the reason as to why these particular sections of the novel mirror the peculiarities of Puig's literary style, more than the parts allocated to other characters. In Toto's monologues, as well as in his school essay based on the movie he liked the best, there is an increased level of intertextuality and irony. Despite that none of the monologues reveal an internal consistency (in that, none are based on a particular theme, rather, they present a pastiche of a variety of seemingly unrelated topics), it seems that this is more of the case when the stage is given to Toto; the narrative becomes an unsolvable puzzle.

Besides the textual distribution into chapters, another stylistic peculiarity of the novel would be the breathless flow within the monologues that tends to offer a twenty-page chapter in a single paragraph. The dialogues, physical expressions (i.e. onomatopoeic reactions), self-questionings all play their role in these one-paragraph monologues, which might frustrate the reader from time to time. The quotation below explains how Toto makes up a plot for the musical he's seen, and he tells it to the nanny Felisa:

... and Felisa "Tell me what happens in the musical" and I told her lies not that the two of them danced alone and the wind lifted up her dress and his coattails, but that some birdies came flying along slowly and lifted her dress and his coattails because Ginger Rogers and Fred Astaire rise in the air to music, and the air carries them high with the birdies who help them twirl faster and faster, what a pretty flower! I think Ginger wants it, a white flower high up in a tree and does she ask a birdie to get in? and the birdie makes believe he doesn't hear her, when I want to give them breadcrumbs they get frightened and I have to go far away. Are they afraid of me? and Mommy too? But there's a birdie who's the kindest of all and when Ginger is not looking. . . he flies over and cuts the flower from the tree and puts it in her blond hair and then Fred Astaire sings to her that she looks pretty with the flower and she looks at herself in the mirror and has the flower that she wanted in the hair. . . (Puig, 2009 [1971], pp. 28-29)

Below is another example for the humorous narrative by one of Puig's naïve characters. This time Tete speaks. She is one of the kids within the neighborhood, her mother is caught by a fatal illness:

... Paqui isn't afraid of the end of the world. I am a little, but during the day not one bit. Toto is. His class partner isn't at all. Mommy no, she says she hopes to God it comes soon. Mita doesn't believe in the end of the world. Daddy does, but he says that me and Mommy will go to heaven and that maybe he'll be saved from going to hell, he'll go to purgatory for a while and then he'll come to us. Mommy prays for Grandpa so that he'll get better. And if Mommy dies I'll keep on praying for her, and who will pray for Grandpa? No, I'll pray for Grandpa because Mommy is going to be in heaven, she doesn't have any sins, but if she went to heaven because she forgot to confess something, how will I know? because then she'll be waiting for nothing in purgatory. It would be better if Grandpa died so then Mommy will pray for herself, because she doesn't have to pray for Grandpa to get better anymore, and I'll pray for myself and I'll see Cataldi and that's it. . . (Puig, 2009 [1971], p. 87)

As seen in the examples, the tone of voice in monologues manifest a variety. Toto has a more sapient voice, whilst

Tete remains too puzzled. However, they bear stylistic similarities as well, such as: the unending sentences connected to one another with ‘and’; the arbitrary use and non-use of a capital letter after the full-stop or question mark; the lack of descriptions and adjectives, and the abundance of action and verbs.

In Search of the Translator

The stage before *confrontation*, Berman’s phase of criticism that focuses on the translator aims for comprehending the stylistic system and the logics of the receiving system. Here, Berman compares the critic’s task to a philologist’s investigation of the author that “concerns the biographical, psychological, existential elements meant to illuminate his work”, and states that the former is a different quest as it does not concern the translator’s life, nor their moods (Berman, 2009, p. 57). Berman expects the critic to center their research on the professional life of the translator and relate the information outside their profession to their translation-related works. Berman lists the questions to be asked as follows:

We need to know whether he is French or foreign, whether he is ‘only’ a translator or if he has another significant professional activity, such as teaching (as is the case of many literary translators in France). In addition, we want to know whether he is also a writer and if he has produced literary works, from what languages he translates, what relationships he has with these works, if he is bilingual and of what kind, what types of works he usually translates and what other works he has translated, if he translates several authors (the most frequent case) or one author (like Claire Cayron). We want to know what his linguistic and literary domains are, and what his major translations are. We want to know if he has written articles, studies, dissertations, monographs about these works he has translated and, finally, if he has written about his own practice as a translator, about the principles that guide it, about his translations and translation in general. (2009, p. 58)

In light of these questions, the paper will examine Nihal Yeğınobalı’s stance as a translator, *Rita Hayworth’in İhaneti* (1991) as a translation project, along with the horizon surrounding them. Although introduced as separate tools, *the position, project and horizon* are closely related, which Berman also acknowledges in his book. The section below will elaborate them together and examine: the translator’s text selection and translation strategies; the indirect nature of the translation; the position of Jill Levine’s translation in the English language literary context; and how her stance corresponds to that of Yeğınobalı.

The Position, Project, and Horizon of the Translator

According to Berman, the position refers to the “self-positioning of the translator *vis-a-vis* translation” (2009, p. 58). It concerns how the translator views and elaborates the meaning, purpose, mode, and form of their translation. These might not be expressed verbally or textually, but are still found in their work. In most cases, the norms of their environment, namely, the historical, social, literary, ideological discourse on translation surrounding the translator, provide data about the stance of the translator as well. Whether they internalize these norms or act against them, and how the translation product manifests this, are all important in this phase of Berman’s setting.

As a translator himself, Antoine Berman includes the translation commission in his setting of translation analysis. The commission, as he believes, shapes the translator’s decisions. Every consistent translation is carried out by a *translation project* that determines how the translation will be realized, the selection of the mode and style of the work to be produced, and where it will be published (i.e. in an anthology, collection, special series etc.). Here, Berman introduces the term *absolute circle* which suggests that the translation might be read on the basis of the project, or vice versa. These two, the part and the whole, do not necessarily mirror each another. In some cases, the translation escapes to fulfill the project’s requirements; in others, it adopts the project as its main initiative and becomes its representative.

The horizon, on the other hand, encompasses both the translator’s position and the translation project. As Berman states, the term comes from modern hermeneutics, referring to the set of linguistic, literary, cultural and historical parameters that determine the ways of feeling, acting, thinking of the translator (Berman, 2009, p. 63). Although it reminds of translation norms at first sight, the term can also be associated with more agency oriented tools introduced into translation research, such as the *explicit ideology* of the translation (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2009), or *field* by Pierre Bourdieu (Gouanvic, 2005).³

Nihal Yeğınobalı can be a rich figure to analyze in light of this particular step of translation criticism that asks for a deep focus on the translator and her surroundings. As an author-translator, a woman professing her literary endeavors within a patriarchal publishing field, and a child of the Republic, Yeğınobalı is a significant name in Turkish literary history who stands out with her distinct decisions as a writer and a translator. Her 1950 novel *Genç Kızlar* is quite a well-known case of pseudotranslation in Turkish translation history. As manifest at the back cover of the novel’s current

³ Please see: Gouanvic, J. M. (2005). A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances. Trans. Jessica Moore. *The Translator* 11:2, 147- 166. Tahir Gürçağlar, S. (2009). Translation, Presumed Innocent: Translation and Ideology in Turkey. *The Translator* 15:1, 37-64.

edition by Can Yayınları (which is published under her own name), due to the sexual elements her novel includes, Yeğinoğlu first published the book under the fake name Vincent Ewing and presented the illusion that the novel is not originally written in Turkish. This can be an indicative of how back then the author felt obliged to obey the literary conventions of the period. She was hesitant that publishing the novel under her name would cause controversy.

Shaping her translations with domestication and omissions, on the one hand, and creative solutions (i.e. her translation of the wordplays in *Alice in Wonderland*, and of the dialects in *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*) on the other, Yeğinoğlu has been a topic of debate in the literary circles of different periods. She introduced many authors to the Turkish literary repertoire and did not abstain from shaping them into acceptable forms; while doing so, she made herself, as well as her work, more visible within the publishing circle. In an interview, she states that she shortened the scenes with sexual elements in her translation of *El Beso de la Mujer Araña* by Manuel Puig, because she thought that the book might be banned otherwise (Bozkır, 2014).

Nihal Yeğinoğlu was into languages and literature since she was a child, and she started her career in the Turkish literary market right after graduating from Arnavutköy American College for Girls. She continued translating while studying literature at New York State University. She published five novels and a memoir that tells the first eighteen years of her life (*Cumhuriyet Çocuğu*, 1999, Can Yayınları). Yeğinoğlu is known as a creative translator who has an author inside; therefore, her creative departures from the source text are praised by some, and criticized by others. She did not have the chance to be in “close collaborations” with the authors she translated, therefore never got the permission for her infidelities as Puig’s English translator Suzanne Jill Levine did; however, we could still describe her with the terms that Levine describes herself: a “subversive scribe” and a “faithfully unfaithful translator” (Levine, 1991). Since her childhood, she has developed a great admiration towards Western literature. Yet this admiration does not attribute the translator a subservient fidelity; she is known with her creative departures from the source text. Perhaps that’s why she chose challenging writers that employ devious literary styles, such as Mark Twain, Lewis Carroll, and Manuel Puig, as their works provided the translator with a sphere in which she could practice her creative endeavors. In many occasions, her creativity can also be related to her market-oriented stance within the publishing sector of her active years.

Besides *Betrayed by Rita Hayworth*, Yeğinoğlu translated into Turkish *The Buenos Aires Affair* (*Hüsrân Tangosu* [Original title: *The Buenos Aires Affair: Novela Political*], 1989, Güneş Yayınları) and *Kiss of a Spider Woman* (*Örümcek Kadının Öpücüğü* [Original title: *El Beso de la Mujer Araña*] 1986, Öykü Yayınları) by Manuel Puig. The other Latin American authors she translated include Julio Cortázar, Carlos Fuentes, Eduardo Galeano and Isabel Allende. Hispanic Literature is not the mere case of indirect translation for Yeğinoğlu, she introduced works by German, Polish and Japanese authors to the Turkish reader adopting the English versions of their works as her source texts. She translated an astounding list of works of the 19th and 20th century English and American literature. The writers she translated include Iris Murdoch, Lewis Carroll, Charles Dickens, Jane Austen, Oscar Wilde, D.H. Lawrence, Pearl Buck, Thomas Hardy, Laurence Sterne, Graham Greene, Charlotte Brontë, William Makepeace Thackeray, and Mark Twain.⁴

The translation of *Betrayed* was published by Can Yayınları in 1991 and was introduced into a rich corpus of Latin American works in Turkish translation. Since the publication, Can Yayınları has published many writers of the Latin American Boom and post-boom period, including Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Mario Vargas Llosa, Carlos Fuentes, Isabel Allende, Luis Sepulveda, Laura Esquivel, and so on. Manuel Puig does not stand out of the publishing policy of the publishing house; especially if we consider that the Turkish literary circle felt the effects of *El Boom* later than North America and Europe, namely in the 1980s. Both the publishing house and the translator were quite remarkable within the publishing field of the 1990s, and it can be assumed that this particular translation project contributed to the symbolic capital of both.

As listed before, a great majority of the translations by Nihal Yeğinoğlu are works from Anglo-American literature. However, in addition to Manuel Puig, although Yeğinoğlu does not know Spanish, she translated such Latin American authors as Julio Cortázar, Eduardo Galeano and Isabel Allende into Turkish. She also translated authors who wrote in languages apart from English and Spanish, such as Erich Maria Remarque, Yasunari Kawabata, and Henryk Sienkiewicz. As in many other cultures, indirect translation which Gideon Toury refers as “second-hand translation” has played quite a significant role in the formation and reformation of the 20th century Turkish literary repertoire (Toury, 1995, p. 130). In his examination of the indirect translations between Finnish and Icelandic, Martin Ringmar suggests that this type of mediated communication occurs between (semi)peripheral languages (Ringmar, 2006, p. 1). Within the context of the indirect translations of Latin American works into Turkish via English, we might consider the languages of the

⁴ For a detailed list of Nihal Yeğinoğlu’s translations and novels, please see Erkul Yağcı 2019.

original text and translation as less dominant languages, and explain the mediation of English language with the power relations of the time of the publication.⁵

Besides the power relations among the mediating languages, and the mediated source and target languages, Ringmar introduces two issues that help us examine the Turkish translation of *Betrayed*. Firstly, he states that “paratextual claims of direct translation cannot always be trusted and bibliographies tend to repeat these claims, whether true or not” (Ringmar, 2006, p. 1). As indirect translations lack the prestige of direct translations in the literary market, many publishing houses do not indicate the source text of the translation, but instead present the title of the indigenous work on its tag. Yet when the translation is not mediated, this is mostly indicated on the cover with a note, such as ‘İspanyolca aslından çeviren (translated from the Spanish original)’. In the case of *Betrayed*, the publishing house follows the procedure, and the translator is presented with the note ‘Türkçesi (The Turkish version)’ on the cover. This is not to say that the publishing house betrays the reader, it simply hides the mediation involved during production. Secondly, Ringmar mentions the “correlation between dominant languages and ‘domesticating’ translations”; therefore, as he suggests, the indirect translations lack adequacy, which comes out when the text is compared with the indigenous work (Ringmar, 2006, p. 1). In fact, the translator of the medium text Suzanne Jill Levine acknowledges that she subverted Manuel Puig’s text to make it appeal to the American reader, therefore the source text of Yeğinoğlu is a translation that lacks adequacy. Still, as Yeğinoğlu is a domesticating translator herself, be it a direct or indirect translation, it would not be safe to relate the fluency in her translation only to this postcolonial aspect of Ringmar’s theory. Lastly, the indirect translation context of *Betrayed* cannot be considered as an exceptional case of its period. Although they are in decrease, indirect translations are still commonly published in Turkey; let alone the fact that during the 1990s it was a more common practice for the Spanish language works.

Confrontation

In Berman’s model, the source-target text comparison has a four-fold mode. Following the comparison of the selected passages in the source and target texts, the critic refers to the *inverse confrontation* and compares the textual zones of the translation and their source text versions. If a retranslation exists, thirdly, the critic looks at how the retranslation(s) render the parts that were examined in the first two steps. As the translation under focus does not have a retranslation, the paper will skip this step. Lastly, the translation is compared with its *project*. As Berman states, the confrontation step reveals not only the translator’s subjectivity and their innermost choices, but also the consequences of the project and what it yields (Berman, 2009, p. 69).

The section below describes how the novel’s main character Toto mixes a Ginger Rogers movie with the cartoon *Snow White* with a ceaseless flow of ideas:

... and Felisa “Tell me what happens in the musical” and I told her lies not that the two of them danced alone and the wind lifted up her dress and his coattails, but that some birdies came flying along slowly and lifted her dress and his coattails because Ginger Rogers and Fred Astaire rise in the air to music, and the air carries them high with the birdies who help them twirl faster and faster, what a pretty flower! I think Ginger wants it, a white flower high up in a tree and does she ask a birdie to get in? and the birdie makes believe he doesn’t hear her, when I want to give them breadcrumbs they get frightened and I have to go far away. Are they afraid of me? and of Mommy too? but there’s a birdie who’s the kindest of all and when Ginger is not looking. . . he flies over and cuts the flower from the tree and puts it in her blond hair and then Fred Astaire sings to her that she looks pretty with the flower and she looks at herself in the mirror and has the flower that she wanted in the hair, like a barrette, and she calls to the good birdie to come to her hand and pets him a lot. (Puig, 2009 [1971], pp. 28-29)

In its transfer of this breathless narrative of the speaker, which is mainly enabled through the frequent use of the connectors ‘and’ and ‘but’, the Turkish translation replaces the connectors with punctuation marks, thus presents a narrative that includes shorter successive statements. In addition, the language in the Turkish text seems to be less ungrammatical and deviated. The parts in which the English version does not resort to capitalization also manifest proper capitalization in the Turkish text. All these attribute the narrative a more controlled tone:

... ve Felisa “Anlat bana ne oluyor o müzikalde,” ben de yalan attım ona, ikisi yalnız başlarına dans ettiler, rüzgar esip kadının eteklerini, adamın frağının kuyruklarını havalandırdı, değil de, gökten küçük kuşlar geldiler, kadının etekleriyle adamın kuyruklarını yavaş yavaş kaldırdılar, dedim. Çünkü filmde Ginger Rogers’le Fred Astaire müziğe uyup havalanıyorlar, rüzgar onları yükseklere uçuruyor, küçük kuşukların yardımıyla daha hızlı dönüyorlar, daha hızlı, ne güzel çiçek bu, galiba Ginger bunu istiyor, ağacın ta tepesinde bir beyaz çiçek, acaba küçük kuştan mı isiyor gidip koparmasını, kuşuk duymazlıktan geliyor oysa, kırıntı verdiğim zaman ürküyorlar, ben de uzaktan veriyorum çaresiz. Benden mi korkuyorlar? Anneden mi? Ama hepsinden iyi kuşuk var, Ginger’ın bakmadığı sırada. . . uçup ağaçtaki çiçeği koparıyor, Ginger’ın

⁵ This is not to state that Ringmar’s theory is valid and applicable to all cases of indirect translation. Turkish translation history also bears evidence of relay translations of Anglo-American literature into Turkish via the French versions. This particular case is not a direct reference to the peripheral nature of English language at the time, but to the involvement of the Turks in French language and culture during the modernization period, thus the majority of the translators having competence in French.

o sarı saçlarına takıyor, derken Fred Ginger'e şarkı söylüyor çiçek çok yakıştı diye, o da aynaya bakıyor, istediği çiçeği saçında görüyor, firkete gibi, iyi yürekli kuşçuğu yanına çağırıp okşayıp öpüyor. (Puig, 1991, pp. 31-32)

The second example is quoted from Tete's monologue, which seems to present a more naïve and less aggressive tone of voice than Toto:

... Paqui isn't afraid of the end of the world. I am a little, but during the day not one bit. Toto is. His class partner isn't at all. Mommy no, she says she hopes to God it comes soon. Mita doesn't believe in the end of the world. Daddy does, but he says that me and Mommy will go to heaven and that maybe he'll be saved from going to hell, he'll go to purgatory for a while and then he'll come to us. Mommy prays for Grandpa so that he'll get better. And if Mommy dies I'll keep on praying for her, and who will pray for Grandpa? No, I'll pray for Grandpa because Mommy is going to be in heaven, she doesn't have any sins, but if she went to heaven because she forgot to confess something, how will I know? because then she'll be waiting for nothing in purgatory. It would be better if Grandpa died so then Mommy will pray for herself, because she doesn't have to pray for Grandpa to get better anymore, and I'll pray for myself and I'll see Cataldi and that's it. . . (Puig, 2009 [1971], p. 87)

Although the translation employs a less deviated grammar and more controlled statements, the reader still gathers the child voice of the narrator, which might be related to the content of the scene:

... Paqui kıyamet gününden korkmuyor. Ben biraz korkuyorum, ama gündüzün değil, gündüzün zerrece korkum yok. Toto korkuyor. Okul eşi hiç korkmuyor. Annem de korkmadığı söylüyor, dilerim Tanrıdan kıyamet çabuk kopar, diyor. Mita kıyamet gününe inanmıyor. Babam inanyor, ama annemle benim cennete gideceğimizi söylüyor, belki ben de cehenneme gitmekten kurtulurum, diyor; belki bir süre için Arafat'a gider, sonra bizim yanımıza gelmiş. Annem büyükbabam için dua ediyor, iyileşsin diye. Annem ölürse ben gene onun için dua edeceğim, peki, büyükbaba için kim dua edecek? Yok, ben büyükbabam için dua ederim, çünkü annem nasılsa cennete gidecek, hiç günahı yok, ama ya herhangi bir günahını papaza itiraf etmeyi unuttuğu için cehenneme giderse ben bunu nereden bileceğim? Çünkü o zaman bir hiç uğruna Arafat'ta bekleyecek. Büyükbaba ölse daha iyi olur, çünkü o zaman annem kendisi için dua eder, çünkü büyükbabanın iyileşmesi için dua etmesine artık gerek kalmaz, ben de kendi kendim için dua edip Cataldi'yi görmeye giderim, tamam, böylece o için nasıl olduğunu öğrenirim, sonra da gider günah çıkarırım, böylece cennete giderim. Biraz da bebek İsa için dua edeceğim. (Puig, 1991, pp. 103-4)

The use of punctuation marks and proper capitalization is more abundant, yet this might also be an editorial intrusion rather than the translator's choice. Besides, the target text replaces the connector 'and' with more explanatory connectors, such as 'çünkü', 'peki'; therefore, it interferes in the simultaneous flow of ideas and presents a more controlled stream of statements. Lastly, the use of 'kıyamet' for the phrase 'the end of the world', as well as the capitalization of 'Arafat' might be regarded as the cultural interferences of the translator.

The passage below exemplifies how the gaps observed in the target text gain clarity during the confrontation step of translation criticism through a comparison with the source text:

... Anne beni tokatlıyor, ama pek acımıyor, Hector'u da tokatlıyor, ama o benden büyük, daha hızlı koşuyor, anne onu tutamıyor, bitişikteki çocuk da 'Baban babaların en iyisi, benim babadan bile daha iyi,' çünkü babam beni hiç dövmez ne de Hector'u. Bir gün öğle uykusu saatinde anneyi uyandırdım, çünkü sıkıldı babam da, 'sana şimdiye kadar fiske bile vurmam, ama bir elimi kaldırırsam ağzımı burnunu dağıtırım,' ben de en sevdiğim filmi düşüneceğim, çünkü anne, dedi ki uyku saatinde canım sıkılmasın diye film düşün, dedi. *Romeo ile Juliet'in* konusu aşk, acıklı bütüyor çünkü ölüyorlar, en sevdiğim filmlerden biri. Norma Shearer hiç yaramazlık yapmayan bir artist. Anne beni tokatlar, ama acıtmaz, ama baba tokatlarsa ağzın burnun dağılır. Hector'un Kudas ayini kitabında bir kadın ermiş var, tıpkı Norma Shearer, uzun, beyaz giysili bir rahibe, elinde bir demet beyaz çiçek. . . (Puig, 1991, p. 31)

... Mommy slaps me but it doesn't hurt much and Hector too but he's bigger than me, he runs faster, Mommy can't catch him and the boy next door 'Your Daddy is the goodest of all, gooder than mine' because he never spansks me, and he never spansks Hector either and once I woke Mommy up during naptime because I'm bored and Daddy 'I never slapped you but the day I put my hands on you I'll break you in two' and I'm going to think about the movie I like the best because Mommy told me to think about a movie so I wouldn't get bored at naptime. *Romeo and Juliet* is about love, it has a sad ending when they die, one of the movies I liked the best. Norma Shearer is an actress who's never naughty. Mommy slaps me but it doesn't hurt much but when Daddy slaps you he breaks you in two. In Hector's communion book there was a saint just like Norma Shearer; a nun with a white costume and some white flowers in her hand. . . (Puig, 2009 [1971], p. 28)

Reading the translation, we see that although the father is bored himself, he gets angry when the kid wakes up the mother. Reading source text, we realize that this inconsistency is a result of Yeğinoğlu's imitation of the ungrammatical language in the source text. The kid speaks about his feelings and thoughts in third person narration, thus reveals his boredom with the sentence 'çünkü sıkıldı', which the source text conveys as 'because I'm bored'. The translation also manifests an incoherence about the kid's attitude against his parents, the 'Mommy' is translated as 'anne', but the 'Daddy' remains as 'babam'. This can be interpreted as a sign of an increased respect or interest towards his father, but as revealed during the confrontation stage, this is not the case in the source text. Yeğinoğlu's translation seems to have preferred to convey the ungrammatical and childish nature of the narrative, and in doing so, her choices might have opened the text to alternative interpretations.

4. Conclusions

The present study set out from Antoine Berman's notion of productive criticism and aimed to portray a constructive analysis of the Turkish translation of Manuel Puig's *Betrayed by Rita Hayworth* by Nihal Yeğınobalı. The paper highlighted Berman's emphasis on the agency of translation products and examined the translation's stylistic features in light of the translator's stance, project and horizon. Yeğınobalı's translation was located into the production context of the 1990's Turkish literary setting, and its historicity and self-reflexivity were discussed in relation to both Yeğınobalı's peculiar translation and literary corpus, and the corpus of the Turkish literary field that highlights indirect translation as a common publishing practice.

The initial analysis of the translation revealed that Yeğınobalı blends her domesticating strategies with the idiosyncratic and fragmented narrative of the source text writer. The translation *stands* as a text on its own; it negotiates the deviated style of Puig with the written norms of Turkish language, and is comprehensible enough. Combined with the analysis of the *translator's horizon* and the comparison of the source and target texts during the *confrontation* stage, the fluency in the narrative is revealed to be related to the translator's own style that incorporates local usages of the home language in her translations. Though it is not completely detached from its source text, that is Suzanne Jill Levine's English translation, Yeğınobalı's fluent style can only partly be related to the fluency in Levine's version. This has peculiar implications on the subject of indirect translation. According to Ringmar's theory, fluency in indirect translation can be considered as an indicative of the asymmetrical power relations among languages, due to the fact that the target text adopts an already domesticated source text- that is the medium text- produced in a dominant language (Ringmar, 2006, p. 1). This does not seem to be the direct case with Yeğınobalı's translation. The translation project by Can Yayınları that commonly introduces Latin American fiction to the Turkish reader via indirect translations (at the time of the publication) might correspond to Ringmar's theory that points at the lack of communication between the language of the original work and that of the target reader in indirect translations between (semi)peripheral languages; however, in the case of Yeğınobalı's translations, domestication does not directly lead to this postcolonial argument, the personal style of the translator plays a role in the construction of this context of fluency.

To conclude, the notion of 'betrayal' in the case of Manuel Puig's novel and its translations into English and Turkish is observable at several levels: The main character of the novel Toto is obsessed with Rita Hayworth's betrayal to Tyrone Power in the movie *Blood and Sand*; Manuel Puig is unhappy with the betrayal of the Hollywood pop culture that transforms the Argentine into mistranslations; Suzanne Jill Levine justifies her betrayal of the Spanish original via regarding her deviations as the indicatives of her fidelity to the text as a whole; similarly, Nihal Yeğınobalı recognizes her departures in her translations as creative solutions that maintain the works' survival in Turkish literary context. Compared to Suzanne Jill Levine's *translation project* that translates into English an Argentine writer's critique of the dominance of North American culture on Latin American reality, which is a challenging task as Levine notes herself (1991, pp. 8-9), Yeğınobalı's *translation project*, despite including the English version as a medium text, might support Puig's deconstructive project at a different, and perhaps observable, level. In a way, we can conclude that, translated into Turkish, Manuel Puig's critique of North American culture's intrusion into other cultural spheres is granted a faithful afterlife.

Peer Review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: Author declared no conflict of interest.

Financial Disclosure: Author declared no financial support.

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış bağımsız.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazar çıkar çatışması beyan etmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Yazar finansal destek beyan etmemiştir.

ORCID IDs of the authors / Yazarların ORCID ID'leri

Ceyda Elgöl 0000-0002-6269-1738

REFERENCES / KAYNAKLAR

Bengi Öner, I. (1990). Çeviriyle Kırk Yıl: Nihal Yeğınobalı İle Bir Söyleşi. *Argos Dergisi*, Ağustos 1990, pp. 55-60. Retrieved from: <https://edebiyatsoylesileri.com/post/619634447196864512/nihal-ye%C4%9Finobal%C4%B1-vincent-ewing-mahlas%C4%B1yla>

- Berman, A. (2009). *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne* (F. Massardier-Kenney, Trans.). Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press. (Original work published in 1995).
- Berman, A. (2000). The Translation and the Trials of the Foreign (L. Venuti, Trans.). In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 284-297). London: Routledge.
- Bozkır, M. (2014). SahneHal'den Örumcek Kadının Öpücüğü. *Mimesis*, 21. Retrieved from: <https://www.mimesis-dergi.org/2014/03/sahnehalden-orumcek-kadinin-opucugu>
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (Invalid Date). Betrayed by Rita Hayworth. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Betrayed-by-Rita-Hayworth>
- Cheuse, A. (2009). Betrayed by Reading Puig. In M. Puig, *Betrayed by Rita Hayworth*, S.J. Levine, Trans. (pp. i-vi). Champaign and London: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Coleman, A. (1971). Betrayed by Rita Hayworth, *New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/books/00/08/13/specials/puig-rita.html>
- Erkul Yağcı, A. S. (2019). Hep Satan Kitapların Çevirmeni Nihal Yeğınobalı. In Ş.T. Gürçağlar (Ed.), *Kelimelerin Kıyısında: Türkiye'de Kadın Çevirmenler* (pp. 216-245). İstanbul: İthaki.
- Hermans, T. (2008). Hermeneutics. In M. Baker and G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies 2nd Edition* (pp. 130-133). London & New York: Routledge.
- Levine, S.J. (2000). *Manuel Puig and the Spider Woman : His Life and Fictions*. New York: fsg.
- Levine, S.J. (1991). *The Subversive Scribe*. Minnesota: Graywolf Press.
- Massardier-Kenney, F. (2009). Translator's Introduction. In A. Berman, *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne*, F. Massardier-Kenney, Trans. (pp. vii- xvii). Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press.
- Puig, M. and S. Sosnowski. (1973). Manuel Puig. *Hispanérica*, Año 1, No. 3 (May, 1973), 69-80.
- Puig, M. (1991). *Rita Hayworth'ın İhaneti* (N. Yeğınobalı, Trans.). İstanbul: Can Yayınları.
- Puig, M. (2009 [1971]). *Betrayed by Rita Hayworth* (S. J. Levine, Trans.). New York: Dalkey.
- Ringmar, M. (2006). Roundabout Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven Centre for Translation Studies. Retrieved from: <https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/ringmar.pdf>
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Ş. (2020). Retranslation. In Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies 3rd Edition* (pp. 484-490). London and New York: Routledge.
- Toury, G. (1995). A Lesson From Indirect Translation. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (pp. 129-146). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Yeğınobalı, N. (1999). *Cumhuriyet Çocuğu*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları.

How cite this article / Atıf biçimi

Elgul, C. (2023). Betrayed by Nihal Yeğınobalı: examining Manuel Puig in Turkish through the lens of Berman. İstanbul Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Dergisi - Istanbul University Journal of Translation Studies, 19, 82-94. <https://doi.org/10.26650/iujts.2023.1364377>