Autonomy of Literary Translator in Terms of Aesthetics and Ethics: Translingualism Example

Sevcan YILMAZ KUTLAY [1]

ABSTRACT

It has taken a long time for Translation Studies to be approved as a legitimate social discipline until descriptive approach. As a reaction to the myths of untranslatability, Translation Studies has been trying to show its dynamic, unique nature peculiar to humanities and also interdisciplinary connections. Literary translation and specifically poetry translation have been generally used as examples/reasons of subjective and challenging nature of translation, which has been taken as an obstacle for being "scientific". When it comes to creativity, the common reaction is that it cannot be measured and explained in any way; so it cannot be positioned in any science. Moreover, it has been believed that one cannot mention any ethical judgement or criticism about literary translation except praising the "original" and announcing the deficiency of translation work. However, descriptive approach declared Translation Studies as a legitimate social science and after the postmodernist and postcolonial approaches, the role of subjective interventions has been evaluated from different perspectives such as power relations, gender and identity. Nowadays, we can without hesitation say that translation is by nature creative whether the text is literary or not. Creativity and the intervention of the creator, namely translator, is not an obstacle for a social science *but a part of it*. Translingualism is an extraordinary case with a hybridized, constructed source language, which obliges literary translators to construct a new language in and from target language with connotations of social and ideological differences. This paper aims to question the autonomy of literary translator in terms of aesthetics and ethics through the example of translingualism.

Key Words: Translation, aesthetics, ethics, creativity and translingualism.

Estetik ve Etik Bağlamında Edebiyat Çevirmeninin Özerkliği: *Translingualism* (Ötedilcilik) Örneği

ÖZET

Betimleyici yaklaşıma değin Çeviribilim'in meşru bir sosyal disiplin olarak onay görmesi uzun bir zaman almıştır. Çevrilemezlik söylencelerine bir tepki olarak, Çeviribilim devingen ve insan bilimlerine has biricik doğasını ve de disiplinlerarası bağlarını göstermeye çalışmıştır. Edebiyat çevirisi ve özellikle şiir çevirisi genelde "bilimselliğe" bir engel olarak görülen Çeviribilim'in öznel ve zorlayıcı doğasına bir örnek/neden olarak gösterilmiştir. Yaratıcılık konusuna gelindiğinde, genel kanı yaratıcılığın ölçülemez ve açıklanamaz olduğu ve bu nedenle bir bilimde yer alamayacağı olmuştur. Buna ek olarak, "özgün"ü övmek ve çeviri işinin yetersizliğini ilan etmek dışında herhangi bir etik değerlendirme veya eleştiri yapılamayacağına inanılmıştır. Ancak, betimleyici yaklaşım Çeviribilim'i meşru bir sosyal bilim olarak ilan etmiş ve postmodernist ve postkolonyal yaklaşımlar öznel müdahalelerin rolünü güç ilişkileri, toplumsal cinsiyet ve kimlik gibi farklı bakış açılarından değerlendirmiştir. Günümüzde hiç tereddüt etmeden çevirinin -edebi olsun olmasın- doğası gereği yaratıcı bir uğraş olduğunu söyleyebiliyoruz. Yaratıcılık ve çevirmenin yaratıcı müdahalesi sosyal bilime bir engel değil onun bir parçasıdır. *Translingualism* (ötedilcilik), edebiyat çevirmenini sosyal ve ideolojik farklılıklarıyla erek dilden ve erek dil içinde yeni bir dil kurgulamaya zorunlu kılan melezleştirilmiş, kurmaca kaynak dillerin olağandışı bir örneğidir. Bu makale, edebiyat çevirisinde etik ve estetiği, özel olarak yaratıcılığı *translingualism* (ötedilcilik) örneğiyle sorgulamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çeviri, estetik, etik, yaratıcılık ve *translingualism*.

[1] Dr.Öğr.Üyesi, Mamara Üniversitesi Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü, sevcanykutlay@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-7841-3513.

1. Introduction

Literary translation occupies a great amount of discussions and theories in Translation Studies due to the high status of literary text compared to others. Translators have always been in a secondary position because authors are attained with a God like power of creation and muse. It is inevitably accepted that literary texts are creative by nature. However, the permission to be creative was not given to translators and they were criticized via the concept of fidelity under the guise of ethics until the declaration of the death of the author. The binary opposition of domestication-foreignization, as the last chain of the binary oppositions of form-content, function-meaning, was the main tool of analyzing literary translation. The voice of translators or their visibility was not generally approved by readers and critics. The discussions on the autonomy of literary translators have experienced a paradigm shift with poststructuralist, postcolonial, feminist translation studies. Currently, translator is accepted as a (divided, hybrid, constructed) subject with her/his own power of action. One of the cases where the role of translator is immense is the example of translating hyrid or translingual source texts. This paper questions the autonomy of translators in literary translation, specifically translingualism, over the concepts of aesthetics and ethics rather than binary oppositions of foreignization-domestication or visibility-invisibility. One should describe the unique context of each translation process because neither visibility nor invisibility necessarily means being ethical in every circumstance.

Our opinions about the autonomy of translators and the role of creativity depend on our notion of translational ethics, which is based on our definition of translation in terms of aesthetical representation. Hulme suggests that translation is closely related to how we approach language and life (2018: 2). In the process of literary translation, translator meets a text "across linguistic and cultural borders", where s/he "*negotiates a series of aesthetic questions* regarding the interaction of form and content, the location of textual meaning, and the challenge of transmitting that meaning interlingually while preserving the artistic shape of the text" (ibid, emphasis is mine). These aesthetic questions are part of literary art ranging from translingualism to constructed fictional languages, from electronic literature to transcreation. Additionally, translators confront "a set of *ethical questions about our interlinguistic, interpersonal and intercultural relations*" (Hulme, 2018: 2, emphasis is mine). Thus, the discussion of literary translators' autonomy is beyond the binary opposition of domestication-foreignization.

About the individuality and subjectivity, Koskinen argues that our translation experience is determined by "*our own (natural) tendencies and predilections, our previous life experiences*, and how our acculturation and socialization have predisposed us towards particular aesthetic solutions" (2012: 13, emphasis is mine). This reminds Bourdieu's (2007) concept of "habitus" in translation sociology which can be defined as an embodied regulation mechanism of an individual determining one's actions, expectations and appreciation and also determined by them. It can be deduced that Tanslators can preserve an emotional distance for ethical reasons but it does not mean a cultural distance (Koskinen, 2012: 13). The reception of domestication and foreignization depends on "the reader's affective stance to these strategies, to the text itself and to the reading context" (ibid). This individuality or partiality does not pose an obstacle for a social science but a rich tableau to describe and interpret. It can be concluded that readers and translators with their whole individuality are agents in a context of literary translation. In this article, the terms of aesthetics and ethics will be discussed in relation with

the limits of creativity and autonomy of literary translators in extreme cases such as translingual source texts.

Aesthetics in Literary Translation

The term aesthetics has its roots in ancient history. Since the discussions of Aristo and Plato, literary criticism has been going between "a dogmatic–didactic school and a formalist–aesthetic school" (Maoz, 2007: 112). The dogmatic-didactic school came from the church seeing literary texts as educational instruments (ibid). Starting with the enlightenment and developed with the theory of aesthetics, the formalist-aesthetic school was against "the inclusion of external interests, including ethics, in the process of reading and evaluation" (Maoz, 2007: 112). Both of them do not fulfill the current needs of Translation Studies. Before discussing the role of aesthetics and ethics in art, literature and translation, we must differentiate the Fine Arts from the useful or mechanical arts because "the aim and end of the productive activity is very different" in these two forms of art (Seth, 1905: 162). Fine arts can be wrongly considered useless because of not responding the primary needs of life. Seth explains that "their aim is pleasure or enjoyment; the productive activity which they exemplify is not an activity constrained by the necessities of human existence, […] and its products are valued not for their utility, but for their beauty, for the aesthetic satisfaction which they give" (1905: 162). This artistic satisfaction can be blended with manipulative power relations in Translation Studies, which will be discussed in the last part of the article.

Whether it is creative or not, both forms of art or literature have "a representation of reality"; however the representation is not "'a mere description in the form', but an interpretation, an 'imitation' of nature, a reproduction of life itself" in the former (Seth, 1905: 163). Literature differentiates from science and history in terms of representation. The former is idealistic and the latter ones are realistic. According to Seth, "science describes the facts as they are; art seizes the truth which the facts only imperfectly suggest, translates the facts into truths, or shows us the facts as they ought to be, and as they have it in them to become" (Seth, 1905: 163). This perspective of art is parallel with Aristotle's view which considers poetry more philosophic than history (in Seth, 1905: 163)". However, it should be remembered that in contrast to Aristotle, Plato believes art is a false discipline which cannot represent "the essence of morality or the absolute Truth" due to "absorbing its audience into a fantasy world" (Hulme, 2018:4).

Although different disciplines define and limit representation in different ways, it can be said that there are three main paradigms on representation. The first is the mimetic school which perceives representation as a copy due to religious determinism (Yılmaz Kutlay, 2020a: 90). The second paradigm is the logocentric school which aims to represent the world completely and the third one is the poststructuralist perspective rejecting the possibility of any representation (ibid). Translation is closely related with the notion of representation because it represents the source text in "a context where source text cannot exist" (ibid). The parallel paradigms of them in Translation Studies are the linguistic approach (which considers "equivalence as the degree of representation"), systemic approach (which recognizes the lingusitic representation as a system) and poststructuralist and postcolonialist approaches (which suggest "the partial and subjective nature of both representation and translation)" (Yılmaz Kutlay, 2020a: 90). The notion of representation determines the conceptualization of aesthetics in a literary work, which affects the norms and expectations about its translation.

Like the discussions on representation, defining literature is also a slippery subject. Katan quotes the definition in Oxford Dictionary: "written works, especially those considered of superior or lasting artistic merit" and adds that "what is considered as artistic merit notoriously changes over time" (2015: 9). It is rather difficult to determine what artistic merit is. (Maybe it has a parallel nature with the subjectivity in Translation Studies.) Despite being a relatively old and recognized discipline, literature is also a controversial discipline. Derrida calls literature a "*strange institution*" because of going beyond its limits and norms (Atridge, 1991: 36; emphasis is mine). Taking it one step further, Culler describes literature as "*a paradoxical institution*" because authors write according to the previous formulas and conventions but they try "flout those conventions, to go beyond them" to be different (Culler, 2000: 46; emphasis is mine). Thus, he stresses that "*literature is an institution that lives by exposing and criticizing its own limits, by testing what will happen if one writes differently*" (ibid, emphasis is mine). It can be claimed that literature is a dynamic discipline and what is considered literature changes from time to time and from context to context such as the changing status of fantastic literature, science fiction, detective novels and electronic literature. Our conceptualization of literature and translation is based on our notion of aesthetic representation in literary art.

The Autonomy (Creativity and Subjectivity) of the Literary Translator

The role of translator in translation process was denied for a long time. Thanks to descriptive approach, the role of agents became visible and as a member of a norm-governed behaviour, translators' decisions started to be described. The term "visibility" gained interest with Venuti (1998) and the reasons of translators' invisibility have been discussed. Venuti matches these two terms (visibility and invisibility) with "domestication" and "foreignization" and announces the latter as the ethical one. This will be discussed in the third part of the paper in detail.

The main question about translator is whether s/he has the right to have autonomy or if yes to what extent. Jones mentions a "constrained autonomy" of the literary translator (2004: 711). Because "all translating acts have ethical and socio-political repercussions", he claims that "partiality informed by awareness […] may often be a more appropriate stance than neutrality" (ibid). Asymmetrical power relations have more things to say than minor translation techniques or strategies about lingusistic representation. In addition to these relations, researchers should give a space for workload and chance factors which may also play a role in translator autonomy (ibid). Defining the literary translator as "a textual and social actor", Jones points out that there are vital social, ideological, ethical and interpersonal factors working in translation (2004: 713). Translator as a subject is at the center of them. Jones asks some questions to construct a framework:

- "To what extent can literary translators be seen as autonomous actors within their social and interpersonal setting?

- What implications does the case-study have for issues such as translator neutrality, translator power and translator ethics?

- What particular socio-ethical and ideological concerns are raised by the case-study, and how might these be resolved?

- How might power-structures of cultural representation condition the literary translator's action?

- Should irresolvable issues such as conflicting loyalties and 'undecidable' decisions be seen as peripheral or central to any model of translator action?" (2004: 713)

These questions draw a framework for a descriptive study of literary translation. It can be deduced that discussions on the autonomy of the translator include two subtopics: creativity and political/ideological stance. When discussing creativity, transcreation is a significant term to remember. It is commonly used for advertisement/marketing translations and literary translations. This term is generally preferred to stress creativity component in a process which is "more creative" (!), "freer" (!) than standard translation falsely recognised with word-by-word transfer (Yılmaz Kutlay, 2020b: 688). Translators can be creative not only in lietarary translation but also in marketing translation where creativity increases sales and brings money to the client/customer. In literary translation, it is widely accepted that creativity is needed; however, there is a void tendency to measure and limit this creativity. Additionally, creativity is not just something artistic but can also be ideological. Vieria claims that "transcreation demystifies the ideology of fidelity" (1994: 71). Calling fidelity an ideology is very effective to show that the myth or doxa of fidelity is not a search for objectiveness or ethics but a biased position.

Currently translators' identity in all levels is a topic of interest. As Jones puts it, there are two mainstreams about the creativity in literary translation: first one focuses on the nature and constraints of translation rights and powers (2004: 713). The second one stems from recent post-colonialist and feminist translation theories and claims that translation "like writing, cannot take place in a socio-ethical void, and translators therefore need to be aware of their role within wider social structures of representation, ideology and power" (Jones, 2004:713). These social structures of power are not just constrained with outher factors but also the translator herself/himself is partial and determined in terms of identity. Accordingly, Davis describes that "the translating subject is constituted in a complex, heterogeneous system economic, social, sexual, racial, cultural" (2001: 58).

In addition to political relations, the identity and habitus of translators as an individual has an impact in translation processes in terms of decisions. Susanne de Lotbiniere Harwood explains the particularity of her translation perspective as below:

> "My translation practice is a *political activity* aimed at making language speak for women. So *my signature* on a translation means: this translation has used every possible translation strategy to *make the feminine visible in language*. Because making the feminine visible in language means making women seen and heard in the real world. Which is what feminism is all about." (De Lotbiniere-Harwood, 1989: 9 in Sagar, 2016: 135, emphasis is mine)

Translators as every individual have complicated loyalties to different people and institutions such as family, friends, state and religion (Jones, 2004: 725). For in-between position of translators, Jones suggests "ambassadorship" analogy coming from social-game model of Goffman (1971), where "ambassadors (like translators) are players whose role is defined by their relationship to other players; though they can only act within the constraints of their brief […] and they have to make constant decisions about how to do so" (Jones, 2004: 722). He underlines that this ambassadorship position is not neutral because neutrality "may not always be the most appropriate ethic for the literary translator" (ibid). In constract, partiality of translators may be more appropriate in some cases. This partiality may even be dectructive such as Haroldo de Campos' concepts of "transluciferation and transfusion (of blood): vampirisation" (in Vieria, 2009: 895).

Before discussing the subjective role of translators, it can be illuminating to remember the notion of subject and subjectivity in western philosophy. The notion of "subject" in philosophy, "ego" in psychology and "actor" in sociology have been considered powerful and prestigious; however, when it comes to subjectivity, it has been labeled an obstacle for scientific objectivity (even "a euphemism for lie") (Dellaoğlu, 2008: 5-6). However, it is for sure that the knowledge and nature of social

sciences/humanities is peculiar to itself. By saying *"humanities is not a problem for philosophy but a problem of phisophy"*, Gadamer calls the knowledge of humanities as "*a totally different knowledge and reality"* (2008: 187-8, emphasis and translation is mine). At this point, it is also significant to note that after Quantum Revolution the difference/distance between the "observer" and the "object" left its place for the "interaction between the observer and object" (2008: 253, translation is mine).Thus, being objective in scientific research is a controversial topic.

Objectivity and the power of subject can be considered ideological because "the 'white western man' who positions himself at the center of the world after the geographical discoveries and Renaissance appeared with a discourse of "discoverer", "ruler" and "determiner" ultimate subject and carried this discourse to every field of life and every discipline (Yılmaz Kutlay, 2019a: 359). As the western man defined himself as creator, all others turned into objects which were obliged to show fidelity/loyalty to him. This situation has projected into literature as "omnipotent author" (ibid). Barthes' declaration of the death of the author has created a paradigm shift; however, the poststructuralist approach which claims to offer a "limitless, fragmented and pluralistic" context can be seen as the intellectual basis of a new political project with implicit power relations. (ibid). Ahmad describes these implicit power relations in literature in details:

> "Literature from other zones of the 'Third World' –African, say, or Arab or Caribbean- comes to us not directly or autonomously but through grids of *accumulation, interpretation and relocation which are governed from metropolitan countries.* By the time a Latin American novel arrives in Delhi, it has been *selected, translated, published, reviewed, explicated and allotted a place* in the burgeoning archive of 'Third World' literature *through a complex set of metropolitan mediations.* That is to say, it arrives here with those *processes of circulation and classification already inscribed in its very texture."* (Ahmad, 1992: 44-5; emphasis is mine)

The agents of literature for above mentioned circulation and classification can be various. For instance, CIA always used literature because books are arms of long term strategical propoganda (Finn& Couvée, 2015: 156). It may not be wrong to say that there is no visible or invisible translator but subjects who becomes visible or invisible depending on the degree of the actions of power relations (Yılmaz Kutlay, 2019b: 109).

Ethics in Translation Studies

The subjectivity and visibility mentioned in previous parts of the article trigger a discussion on the ethics of translation. Pym reminds that "at the beginning of the 1990s, say, the talk was still of describing translations, of moving away from the prescriptive or normative age when one of the aims of Applied Linguistics was to tell translators how to translate" (2001: 129). He suggests that the current popularity of ethics is valid for several sciences and it is "a cross-cultural concern" because of the controversial topics such as cloning, euthanasia, minor nationalism and the internet (Pym, 2001, 129). Visibility is also a term frequently coined with ethics. Pym defines visibility as "an ethics-laden catch-cry for women, sexualities, minorities of all kinds, and hybridity, breaking up the sameness once needed for universal principles" (ibid). Thus, it does not mean necessarily that any kind of visibility or foreignization means ethical and a voice for the powerless.

There are different opinions how to categorize and analyze ethics of translation. Pym reminds that "in the ethics of alterity, the translator would welcome the foreign text *as a person*, giving of themselves and respecting otherness, in a way that goes well beyond generalized deontological rules and calculations" (2001: 135). This framework focuses on the subjectivity and identity of translator as a subject. The hermeunotic interaction between self and the other is the focal point of ethics. Koskinen's view is also similar in terms of dealing with ethics in a meta level. She claims that "a properly

postmodern ethics of translation cannot be based completely on economic relations, on the concerns of a profession, which can only restrict the translator's ethical subjectivity" (Koskinen, 2000:120). Bermann agrees that translation is an ethical task and suggest that we can only translate when "we become most aware of linguistic and cultural differences, of the historical 'hauntings', and of experiential responsibilities that make our languages what they are and that directly affect our attitudes towards the world" (2005: 6). These hauntings are translators' identity, habitus, subjectivity - no matter how one call it- shortly "self" of translator.

On the other hand, Chesterman (1997) differentiates four models of translational ethics to give space for professional, daily ethics of translation business. These models are "the ethics of representation (of the source text, or of the author), an expanding ethics of service (based on fulfilling a brief negotiated with a client), a more philosophical ethics of communication (focused on exchanges with the foreigner as Other), and a norm-based ethics (where ethical behaviour depends on the expectations specific to each cultural location)" (1997 in Pym, 2001: 131). Actually, Chesterman adds the fifth one: "an ethics of 'commitment' as an attempt to define the 'good' ideally attained by translation, embodied in an oath that might work as a code of professional ethics for translators" (ibid). Analyzing the opinions of these theorists, it can be said that there are two levels of translational ethics. One is rather philosophical and includes discussions of power, ideology and identity. The other one is a functionalist, limited way of looking cases of professional ethics.

Tellioğlu has a critical standpoint in ethics of translation especially against this professional ethics. She observes that "each definition of translation, somehow, includes a perspective on how translation should be done and how translators should behave" (Tellioğlu, 2018: 256). So, it can be deduced that ethics of translation starts with defining and limiting the notion of translation. Tellioğlu criticizes the articles in the book titled *The Return to Ethics* (2001) and edited by Anthony Pym of being "normative and universalist" because they try to detect universal professional principles covering all fields of translation for ethics of translation (2015: 91). Tellioğlu reminds that after the late 19th century, linguists aimed to base translation on the laws of linguistics escaping from the slippery scene of literature with subjective (2015: 92). As a reaction to them, the manipulative school and descriptive approach believed that being normative did not help translation and depicting the norms determining translators' decisions could be enough (2015: 93). Thus, ethics of translation became an unpopular topic for a while (ibid). It is highly possible that aiming to make translation studies recognized as a legitimate social science, translation scholars deliberately did not prefer to discuss ethics and judgements but focused on describing the social context of translation.

Tellioğlu points out that today for scholars ethics is a fundamental issue but it is not the same ethics discussed throughout history (2015: 95). It is about power, ideology, colonialism, gender and so on. A new type of source-orientedness emerged from these discussions. Translators with postcolonial and feminist perspective use this strategy for giving voice to ignored identities. Affected by Berman, Venuti offers foreignization as an equalizing tool for the ethics of translation because it gives voice to cultures with asymmetrical power relations (Venuti, 1998: 15-18). Rather than being "a mediator who behaves according to the norms of society", translators can stand with the powerless, voiceless with the help of "methods and strategies making her sometimes visible sometimes invisible" although they are from a colonized culture (Tellioğlu, 2015: 95). Thus, visibility becomes a current theme in the ethic of translation and one cannot say for sure beforehand that which one is ethical to be visible or invisible because it depends on the situation. Tellioğlu highlights that the stress on the subjectivity in translation theories can be interpreted as individual's taking back of her individuality, subjectivity

and uniqueness (2015: 96). This individuality is sometimes criticized of being relativist; however, it questions the codes of ethics to show that the real relativist codes are the ones offered as universal by the powerful figures (Bauman, 1998: 14-15).

Despite accepting the benefits of killing the author for translators, this article agrees with Robinson's criticism that "*death-of-the-subject deconstructions of human agency is just another fictitious construct of liberal bourgeois ideology*" (Robinson, 2013: xii; emphasis is mine). They prevent resistance due to their passivizing and mystifying nature (ibid). Robinson also adds that a subject having the ower of agency is a must for resistance not matter whether it is "a fictitious subject with limited agency" or "a socially constructed virtual 'self '" but a self who can take action (ibid). What translator theorists can do is describing and explaining the functions of these actions between "absolute automatism and absolute autonomy" (Robinson, 2013: xii). The somatic theory Robinson suggests that "that normative orientations or inclinations are circulated through a population as *social feelings*, especially approval and disapproval […] through which any group regulates itself" (ibid). He believes that these regulatory "ideas" position more in "*feelings* or *somatic response" as a "bodybecoming- mind—a homeostatic middle excluded by Cartesian mind-body dualism*" (ibid, emphasis is mine). Thus, translators should be described and analyzed with their whole individuality in different layers from gender and body to religion, education and politics.

Translingualism & Linguistic Miscegenation as a New Narrative Paradigm of Aesthetics and Ethics

Postcolonial literature has given birth to a new narrative paradigm which can be named "translingualism" or "linguistic miscegenation". Translingualism can be defined "as the purposive and artful reproduction within one language of features from another language" (Scott, 1990: 75). There are two outstanding features in this definition: being *purposive* and being an *artful* reproduction. It means that translingualism can approve a deliberate intervention with a specific purpose and it embraces artful, creative side of constructing a language. As an example, Cameroonian author, poet and theorist Peter Wuteh Vakunta both writes in and works on a hybrid language: Camfranglais. In his article named "Translation or Treason: Translating the Third Code", he declares this hyrid, third code as "the distinctive feature of postcolonial francophone literature" (2014). The aim of these authors is transfering culture-specific perspectives and patterns of imagination and sense (ibid). Additionally, they attempt to "*deconstruct* the French language" (or English in some other cases) (ibid). Below is a poem by Vakunta as an example of translingualism:

> IDENTITY CRISIS
> I don't quite know who I am.
> Je ne sais pas au juste qui je suis.
> Some call me Anglo;
> D'autres m'appellent Frog.
> I still don't know who I am
> Je ne sais toujours pas qui je suis.
> My name c'est Le Bamenda;
> My name is L'Ennemi dans la maison;
> My name c'est le Biafrais;
> Mon nom is second-class citizen;
> My name c'est le maladroit.
> Taisez-vous! Shut up!
> Don't bother me!
> Ne m'embêtez pas!
> Don't you know that je suis ici chez moi?
> Vous ignorez que I belong here?

I shall fight to my dernier souffle
To forge a real name pour moi-même.
You shall call me Anglofrog!
Vous m'appelerez Franglo!
Shut up! Taisez-vous!
Don't bother me!
Ne m'embêtez pas!
Vous ignorez que I belong here?
Don't you know that je suis ici chez moi?
I shall fight to my last breath
To forge a real lingo for myself.
I'll speak Français;
Je parlerai English
Together we'll speak camfranglais;
C'est-à-dire qu'ensemble,
We'll speak le Camerounisme,
Because ici nous sommes tous chez nous (10).
A bon entendeur salut!
He who has ears should hear!

As seen in the poem, the source language is not a monolingual one both in terms of vocabulary, syntax and also pragmatics of language. This creative writing of domestication, miscegenation can be considered as a "hybridized, indigenized" constructed language and it inevitably creates challenges for translators. Transfering the overt connotations and significations from this "translated", "constructed" source langauge to another language necessiates creating another constructed language in/from target language. However, context-anchored baggage may not have its parallel projection in target culture, which puts translator in front of dilemmas.

In the book named *Camfranglais: In the making of a new Language in Cameronian Literature*, Vakunta explains that "linguistic manipulation engenders a third code that poses enormous problems for readers and translators not acquainted with Cameroonianisms" due to inventory of words, local expressions and vocabulary of Camfranglophones (2014: ix). Camfranglais, which is spoken in the Republic of Cameroon, includes French, English, Pidgin and some items from local languages. In this area there are nearly 250 indigenous languages apart from English and French (ibid). Vakunta informs that young Cameroonians prefer this language "as a communication code in order to exclude other members of the community" (2010). "Camfranglais first emerged in the mid-1970s after the reunification of Francophone Cameroun and Anglophone Southern Cameroons" (ibid). Some popular musicians such as Lapiro de Mbanga and Petit Pays used it, which increased its popularity in 1990s (ibid). Camfranglais is based on French syntax and replaced English words or words borrowed from indigenous languages such as Pidgin, Ewondo or Duala. It is enriched by techniques like "coinage, elision, affixation, inversion, and reduplication" (Kouega, 2003). Below are examples from daily speech:

"*Tu play le damba tous les jours?* = do you play soccer every day?
Je veux go = I want to go.
Il est come = he has come.
Tout le monde hate me, wey I no know pourquoi = everyone hates me but I don't know why.
J'ai buy l'aff-ci au bateau = I bought this stuff in the market.
Elle est sortie nayo nayo = she went out very slowly.
Tu as sleep où hier? = where did you pass the night yesterday?
Il fia même quoi = what is he really afraid of?" (Ngwa, 2007)

This discourse of translingualism gives its speakers/users a "resistance identity" (Castells, 1997). It additionally paves the way for seeing "the problems and conditions of the widening circles of readers in the language that they really speak" (Kouega, 2003: 11). Another point to be underlined about this language is that speakers constantly transform it by adding new items from European languages and Cameroonian (ibid). Kouega observes that the modern Cameroonian urban youth prefers this hybrid language for showing their identity "in opposition to other groups such as the older generation, the rural population and the elite" (ibid).

As mentioned before, Okara is another well-known name of hybrid language creators. In his novel named *The Voice*, he attempts to "bring the English language under the influence of Yoruba by adapting Ijaw syntax to English" (Vakunta, 2014: 14). With the help of manipulative strategies such as "direct glossing, syntactic fusion, neologism, new lexical forms, untranslated items, transcription of dialects", he reconstructs the source language and culture "through the process of metonymic embodiment" (ibid, 24-25). In his book *Indigenization of Language in the African Francaphone Novel: A New Literary Canon*, Vakunta defines the situation of writers of hybridized languages as "writing in languages they want to deconstruct" […] as a mode of self-expression" (2014). In a complicated process of comparing "self" with the "foreign" and resisting this colonizer foreign, these writers construct a language which demands ethics for their word shaping their vision of the world.

So far, the point of authors writing in hybridized language or speakers of these languages has been discussed. How about the readers and translators? Mehrez claims that these authors "demand of their readers to be like them: 'in between', at once capable of reading and translating, where translation becomes an integral part of reading experience" (2007: 122 in Vakunta, 2011: 5). Thus, it is not just a new, hybrid language but a hyrid reader, hybrid translator and a hybrid target language, all of which demand high levels of tolerance. Both expectations and reactions of readers are crucial for norms of literature. For instance, Scott observes that so far an author/source based aesthetic and a text-based aesthetics have been preferred in the ciriticism of African literature instead of a reader based one, which is "an aesthetics of effect or interaction" (1990: 75).

The case of Camfranglais triggers discussions of literary creativity, translators' autonomy, and ethics of techniques of domestication-foreignization. It is undeniable that there is "an inextricable link between language and ideology in creative fiction, and that it is not a haphazard endeavour, but a deliberate political project" (Anandawansa & Hettiarachchi, 2015: 14). Postcolonialism itself is also criticized for being ideological. Marechera stesses that "it becomes reductionist to assume that postcolonial and postmodernist tenets are indispensable in reading a literary canon as complex as the Black Zimbabwean novel" because "not all Black Zimbabwean novels are postcolonial and postmodernist" (Gwekwerere, 2018: 806). Osundare (2002) criticizes European ideas below:

> "In a rarely eclectic case of archaeology and necromancy, deconstructionists have exhumed the sagacious bones of Plato, Nietzsche, Schlegel, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Heidegger, Marx, Satre, Bakhtin, etc. For critical and analytical terminologies (and methods) they have dug deep into the catacombs of classical and medieval rhetoric […] which they have dusted up and sent on "new" post-structuralist errands. There is, thus, a significant "bending over backwards" in post-structuralism, a rummage through the jungle of primeval epochs. How really self-assuredly new, then, are these terminologies, these methods, even in their new significations and functions? (202: 40 in Gwekwerere, 2018: 807)

He also complains about the "negation of Afrocentric literary-critical theories" (Gwekwerere, 2018: 811). "By claiming exclusive entitlement to "space," "voice," and "authority" for Eurocentric literary-critical theories, Veit-Wild and Primorac reduce Black Zimbabwean novelists to mere apprentices in

the use of borrowed implements while portraying Eurocentric literary-critical criteria as universal, normative, and indispensable" (Gwekwerere, 2018: 816).

After postmodernism, we have encountered with a new paradigm of literature and language: multilingualism. In her book named *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*, Yıldız calls the idea that individuals can "think and feel properly in one language" as monolingual paradigm, which considers multiple languages as a "threat to the cohesion of individuals and communities, institutions and disciplines" (2012: 1). She studies "distinct forms of multilingualism, such as writing in one socially unsanctioned "mother tongue" about another language (Franz Kafka); mobilizing words of foreign derivation as part of a multilingual constellation within one language (Theodor W. Adorno); producing an oeuvre in two separate languages simultaneously (Yoko Tawada); writing by literally translating from the "mother tongue" into another language (Emine Sevgi Özdamar); and mixing different languages, codes, and registers within one text (Feridun Zaimoğlu)" (ibid). She tries to reveal "the dimensions of gender, kinship, and affect encoded in the "mother tongue" are crucial to the persistence of monolingualism and the challenge of multilingualism" (ibid). This pluaral, divided and multi-layered paradigm of multilingualism is inevitably within the scope of Translation Studies.

Conclusion

Much ink has been spelt on the autonomy, namely creativity and subjectivity, of literary translator in Translation Studies. Translators have been mostly accused of being unethical, subjective or visible. Their individuality has been described via binary oppositions and tried to be restricted. The paradigm shift of poststructuralist, postcolonial, feminist translation studies makes translators legitimate actors of translation process. The example of translingualism (hybridized source languages) with its own peculiar case necessitates the previously disapproved creative role of literary translators. Far from binary oppositions, these kinds of cases clarify the wider perspective covering both power relations and also divided subjectivity of translators as an individual and actor. The autonomy of literary translators is based on our notion of translation which shapes our notion of translational norms and ethics. The conceptualization of translation depends on how we perceive the aesthetic representation in literary art and how to represent it. Being partial and subjective does not necessarily means being unethical and being neutral does not necessarily means being ethical. Translingualism, as an example, is waiting for being described and analyzed to recognize the current norms and features of translation. Ranging from hybridized languages to conLangs and electronic literature, innovative ways of literary translation demand up-to-date perspectives and tools.

References

Ahmad, A. (1992). *In theory: classes, nations, literatures*. Londra; New York: Verso.

Anandawansa, K. & Hettiarachchi, R. (2015). Language and ideology in the fiction of Gabriel Okara's the Voice and V.S. Naipaul's a House for Mr. Biswas". *International Conference on the Humanities*, University of Kelaniya.

Atridge, D. (Ed.). (1991). *Jacques Derrida: acts of literature*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Postmodern etik*. (Alev Türker, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Bermann, S. (2005). Introduction. *Nation, language and the ethics of translation*. Oxford & Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1–10.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (2007). *Düşünümsel bir antropoloji için cevaplar*. (Nazlı Ökten, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Publishing.

Castells, M. (1997): *The power of identity*. Malden: Blackwell.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

McDonough Dolmaya, J. (2011). "Moral ambiguity: some shortcomings of professional codes of ethics for translators". *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 19, 28-49.

Culler, J. (2000). *Literary theory – a very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davis, K. (2001): *Deconstruction and translation, translation theories explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

de Lotbinière-Harwood, S. (1989). Preface. *Letters from an Other*. Toronto: The Women's Press.

Dellaoğlu, B. (2008). İnsan bilimleri,özne ve öznellik. *Sosyoloji Dergisi,* 16, 1-10.

Jones, F. R. (2004). Ethics, aesthetics and décision: literary translating in the wars of the Yugoslav succession. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 49, (4), 711-728.

Hulme, H. (2018). *Ethics and aesthetics of translation*. London: UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787352070.

Gadamer, H. G. (2008). *Hakikat ve yöntem 1*. İstanbul: Paradigma Publishing.

Goffman, E. (1971): *The presentation of self in everyday* life. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gwekwerere, T. (2018). Universal, normative, and indispensable: exploring the emphasis on eurocentric literary-critical perspectives in the criticism of the black zimbabwean novel. *Journal of Black Studies*, 49 (8), 801-819.

Katan, D. (2015). Translating the literary in literary translation in practice. *Lingue e Linguaggi Lingue Linguaggi*, 14, 7-29, http://siba-ese.unisalento.it.

Koskinen, K. (2000) *Beyond ambivalence: postmodernity and the ethics of translation*. Tampere: University of Tampere.

Kouega, J.- P. (2003): Camfranglais: a novel slang in Cameroon schools. *English Today*, 19-2, 23-29.

Maoz, A. M. (2007). Ethics and literature: introduction. *Philosophia*, 35, 111–116. DOI 10.1007/s11406-007-9068-6.

Mehrez, S. (2007). Translating Gender. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 3 (1), Special Issue: *Transnational theory, national politics, and gender in the contemporary Middle East / North Africa*, 106-127

Ngwa, F. N. (2007). "New Language for divided Cameroon," http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6376389.stm.

Osundare, N. (2002). *Thread in the loom: essays in African literature and culture*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Pym, A. (2001). The return to ethics in Translation Studies. *The Translator*, (7), 129-138.

Robinson, D. (2013). *Displacement and the somatics of postcolonial culture*. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

Sagar, S. (2016). Towards the aesthetics and ethics of translation. *Indian Scholar*, 2 (13). 133-136. ISSN 2350-109X.

Scoot, P. (1990). Gabriel Okara's The Voice: The non-Ijo reader and the pragmatics of translingualism. *Research in African Literatures*, 21 (3), 75-88, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3819635.

Tellioğlu, B. & Karadağ, A. B. (2015). New universalism in Translation Studies: The rising of professional ethics. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*. 3 (October), 90-100.

Tellioğlu, B. (2018). Bir çeviri etiği dersine doğru. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies* 2018. Special Issue 4 (August), 254-265.

Seth, J. (1905). The relation of the ethical to the aesthetic element in literature. *International Journal of Ethics*, 15 (2) (Jan., 1905), 162- 172 Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Vakunta, P. (2004). Translation or Treason: on Translating the Third Code. *Translation Journal*, October, https://translationjournal.net/October-2014/translation-or-treason-on-translating-the-third-code.html.

Vakunta, P. (2008). On translating Camfranglais and other Camerounismes. *Meta*: *Translators' Journal*, 53 (4), 942–947. Online publication: July 27, 2010. https://www.erudit.org/en/journals/meta/2008-v53-n4-meta2550/019665ar/.

Vakunta, P. (2011). *Indigenization of language in the African Francophone novel: a new literary canon*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Vakunta, P. (2014). *Camfranglais: the making of a new language in Cameroonian literature*. Bamenga: Langaa Research and Publishing.

Vakunta, P. (2016). *Critical perspectives on the theory and practice of translating Camfranglais*. Cameroon: Langaa RPCIG.

Venuti, L. (1998). *Scandals of translation: towards an ethics of difference*. London & New York: Routledge.

Vieira, E. & McGwirk, B. (Eds.)(2009). *Haroldo de Campos in conversation*. London: Zoilus Press.

Yıldız, Y. (2012). *Beyond the mother tongue: the postmonolingual condition*. New York: Fordham UP.

Yılmaz Kutlay, S. (2019a). Beyaz adam'ın yazar söyleminin 'doğumu' ve 'ölümü'nün politiği ve çeviribilimdeki izdüşümleri. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5, 358-366. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.606211.

Yılmaz Kutlay, S. (2019b). *Çeviribilimde bilimsellik-öznellik sorgulamaları*. İstanbul: Hiperyayın.

Yılmaz Kutlay, S. (2020a). Taklitten temsile çeviri kavramı. *Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10 (19), 90-105. DOI: 10.33207/trkede.650127.

Yılmaz Kutlay, S. (2020b). Çeviribilimde çeviriyaratımı (Transcreation) konumlandırmak. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (18), 588-598. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.656912.