



DON KİŞOT'TA ÇEVİRMEN-YAZARIN BİR PORTRESİ

Tahsin ÇULHAOĞLU*

Öz

Bu makalenin amacı, Cervantes'in şaheseri Don Kişot'un yazarlık, özgünlük, çeviri ve metinsellik kavramlarını nasıl sorunsallaştırdığını ortaya koymaktır. Bütün metin üretiminin yazı ve çevirinin melez düzleminde gerçekleştiğini ileri süren yapısökücü bir perspektif kullanan bu makale, Don Kişot'un yazarla çevirmen arasındaki sınırları bulanıklaştıran bir roman olduğunu göz önüne sermektedir. Bu bağlamda, romanda resmedilen kurgulanmış metin üreticisi eş zamanlı olarak hem yazan hem çeviren melez bir figürdür. Yeni türetme translauthor (çevirmen-yazar) sözcüğü, bu melez metin üreticisini ifade etmek için uygun bir terimdir. Makale, Don Kişot'un çevirmen-yazarın görünür bir portresini okura sunan bir roman olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Romanda tek bir anlatıcı ses vardır ve bu ses Don Kişot'un babası, üvey babası, ilk yazarı, ikinci yazarı, yeniden anlatıcısı, yeniden yazarı ve çevirmeni olan çevirmen-yazara aittir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Don Kişot, Cervantes, çevirmen-yazar, yapısökücülük, özgünlük.

A PORTRAIT OF THE TRANSLAUTHOR IN DON QUIXOTE

Abstract

This paper aims to explore how Cervantes' masterpiece Don Quixote problematizes the notions of authorship, originality, translation, and textuality. Using a deconstructionist perspective, which propounds that all text production occurs on the hybrid ground of writing and translation, this paper demonstrates that Don Quixote is a novel that blurs the borders between an author and a translator. In this respect, the fictional text producer portrayed in the novel is a hybrid figure involved in both writing and translating simultaneously. The neologism translauthor, which is a combination of "translator" and "author," seems to be an apt term to describe this hybrid text producer. The paper indicates that Don Quixote is a novel that provides us with a visible portrait of the translauthor. There is just one narrative voice in the novel, and this voice belongs to the translauthor, who is the father, stepfather, first author, second author, reteller, rewriter, and translator of Don Quixote at the same time.

Keywords: Don Quixote, Cervantes, translauthor, deconstruction, originality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Octavio Paz argues that we can make sense of the world only through translation because the world is brought to us through a perpetually proliferating pile of texts,

each slightly different from the one that came before it: translations of translations of translations. Each text is unique, yet at the same time it is the translation of another text. No text can be completely original because language itself, in its very essence, is already a translation—first from the nonverbal world, and then, because each sign and each phrase is a translation of another sign, another phrase (Bassnett and Trivedi, 1999: 3).

Rosemary Arrojo also advocates this view and points out that both authors and translators have a similar function in repressing this "perpetual proliferation of meaning that surrounds and constitutes us in the world as text, in the midst of

which we feel utterly lost unless we find an adequate interpretive thread to give us the illusion of knowing which direction to take and how to (temporarily) master reality” (2002: 65-66). The implication behind such views is that what both authors and translators can only do is to interpret interpretations that were interpreted before them. While attempting to carry out this task of interpretation or translation, they inescapably involve in a perpetual struggle to be the sole possessor of reality and meaning in a text. However, since a text and all the meanings in it are constructed (in a specific socio-cultural context), anyone’s claim to full proprietorship and originality is just an illusion.

Cervantes’ masterpiece *Don Quixote* is a novel that precisely problematizes the issues that Paz and Arrojo discuss above, i.e., the notions of authorship, originality, translation, and textuality. Cervantes seems to be aware that his “text is unique, yet at the same time it is the translation of another text.” He apparently claims to be the sole owner of that uniqueness—as shown below through textual evidence—, but he also makes it clear that he is only rewriting texts that were written before him. In other words, the texture and tenor of *Don Quixote* demonstrates the idea that an author can by no means produce a text without benefitting from other people’s ideas and texts, which he reprocesses through his idiosyncratic style.

Such a perspective emphasizes the fact that all text production occurs on the overlapping and hybrid ground of writing and translation. In a general sense, what an author does is extremely similar to what a translator does. After all, is it not obvious that the person called translator has one assumed or designated source text while the one called author has many anonymous or non-anonymous source texts? In this sense, every author is a translator and every translator is an author concurrently. Perhaps a neologism may be coined and this hybrid text producer may be called a *translauthor*, which is a combination

of “translator” and “author”. In this respect, this paper, as its title also suggests, aims to demonstrate that *Don Quixote* is a novel that provides us with a visible portrait of the *translauthor*.

Most of these arguments are based on the non-essentialist notions of language, meaning and culture that were conceptualized primarily by Jacques Derrida’s deconstruction. Since these arguments and notions constitute the theoretical framework of this paper, the second part below further elaborates on them. Then, the third part explores how the concepts of authorship, originality, and translation have been dealt with in *Don Quixote*. Finally, the last part includes concluding remarks.

2. NON-ESSENTIALIST NOTIONS OF LANGUAGE, MEANING, AND CULTURE

According to Derrida, the biblical story of the Tower of Babel is an indication of the non-essentialist nature of language and meaning. To elaborate, the Shemites tried to build a very tall tower that would reach heaven and allow them “to make a name” for themselves. However, Yahweh does not allow them to reach their goal by destroying the already incomplete tower, confusing their language, and scattering them all over the world. Both building the tower and making a name are attempts to reach a universal language that would secure an ontologically stable and absolute relationship between words and concepts. However, as the story shows, such a thing is never possible. Nothing that enters language can be fixed or absolute.

Thus, according to deconstruction, language is an entity that cannot contain any essential meaning because meaning is not an essence *per se* and does not have an origin or beginning prior to language. It is “an effect of language, not a prior presence merely expressed in language” (Davis, 2001: 14). In other words, there is not an absolute or transcendental relationship between a signifier (word) and

a signified (concept). A word cannot mean anything by itself but signifies only in relation to other words, which means that there are no essences or originals in language but only texts (in the sense of being socio-cultural constructions), or rather intertexts based on some other intertexts that came before. This simply means that there are no writings, creations, and originals but only rewritings, recreations, and translations.

Such a conceptualization of language and meaning is based on Derrida's view that "There is nothing outside context" (Davis, 2001: 9) and his concept of *différance*, which is "the systematic play of differences" that enables "every concept" to refer to "other concepts" in an endless chain of signifiers (Davis, 2001: 13). This, as stated above, suggests that meaning comes out of the difference between signifiers. In other words, signifiers acquire meaning only in relation to other signifiers and signifieds never become essences.

Another significant concept of deconstruction that is relevant to the subject of this paper is *pharmakon*. According to Derrida, "the language we speak is already structured by the conceptual field of oppositions manifested in Western metaphysics" (Davis, 2001: 17). As it is well known, the infamous binary oppositions that have characterized Western philosophy are based on artificial hierarchical demarcations that are considered to be real. One member of the binary is deemed 'real,' 'absolute,' or 'present' and the other is considered 'unreal,' 'supplementary,' or 'absent.' Deconstruction analyzes the relationship between these binary oppositions genealogically, undoes the hierarchical structure, and reveals that binary oppositions are only contextual constructions, and that they do not in any way oppose each other. It demonstrates that they are indeed inseparable from each other and "only exist in relation to each other" (Koskinen, 2000: 93). *Pharmakon* is directly related to this very practice of deconstruction. It "implies the coexistence of the cure and the poison in the

same drug” (Koskinen, 2000: 93). In other words, it suggests that there is no *either/or* but *both/and* in language and in the relationship between words. The neologism *translauthor* is a good example to *pharmakon* because it suggests that a text producer is both a translator and an author at the same time.

Consequently, if no origins or essences exist in language, if words are infinitely translated into each other, if there is heterogeneity and translation at the very origin of language, and if the translator has an “inescapably authorial task” (Arrojo,1997: 28), then the hierarchical distinction between original and translation or author and translator seems to be only a sociocultural construction that can be easily deconstructed. Instead, a hybrid identity like *translauthor* seems more meaningful. In this sense, like all the people called authors, Cervantes is a great *translauthor*, and *Don Quixote* is a fantastic translation of other translations.

A final term that deserves mentioning here is *nazire*, which is an important concept of old Turkish literature. *Nazire* could easily be associated with the non-essentialist notions of language and meaning because of its repetitive and imitative nature. It basically means a response or parallel poem written to other poets’ poems. However, nowadays, it has begun to be used for other genres as well. It is similar to the literary *imitatio* that was once the predominant instrument of literary production utilized by Roman writers and rhetoricians and later by their Renaissance descendants. According to Clifford Endres, “*Imitatio* traces its roots to the Roman rhetoricians, especially Quintilian and Cicero, who pronounced it good training for orators and writers” (2002: 43). *Nazire* has functioned in almost the same way in old Turkish literature, and many great poets have emerged as a result of the training they received via *nazire* writing. Indeed, there were anthologies of *nazires* published and used for educational purposes (Kurnaz, 2003).

Apparently, the concept of *nazire* has a non-essentialist nature and can be conceptualized as a mode of text production that a *translauthor* utilizes. Indeed, as any text producer writes in response to some other texts, it may even be argued that any spoken or written text is a *nazire*, even if people may not be conscious of it. Just look at the title of this paper. Is it not a *nazire* to James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*?

3. AUTHORSHIP, ORIGINALITY, AND TRANSLATION IN *DON QUIXOTE*

In the prologue of part I of *Don Quixote*, Miguel de Cervantes, in the guise of an omniscient narrator, tries to assure his readers that his book is “the child of [his] brain” and “the fairest, gayest, and cleverest that could be imagined” (1991). Then, in the same preface, he states that he is the stepfather of *Don Quixote* although he is accepted as the father. In the opening chapter of the novel, he relates that there was a middle-aged gentleman living in a village in the district of La Mancha and that he went completely mad because he had read so many books of chivalry. Then we are informed that this gentleman decided to be a knight-errant and put into practice whatever he had learned from those romances.

Interestingly, when the narrator remarks about the name of the gentleman, he says that he came across different opinions by authors writing on the same subject. According to some authors, his surname was Quixada, and to others, it was Quesada, but the narrator thinks it was Quexana. The implication is that the narrator has reached this conclusion by researching the archives and annals of La Mancha. The impression one gets is that he is rewriting a history of other histories written in the past about Don Quixote de La Mancha. However, it seems he is not rewriting this history and has not reached this conclusion *alone* because he declares that “this veracious history” has “authors” who “have inferred that his name must have been beyond a doubt Quixada, and not

Quesada as others would have it” (Cervantes, 1991: Part I/Ch.1). Thus, now there is a *group* of authors who presumably wrote *Don Quixote*.

At the end of chapter 8, the narrator relates the beginning of the battle between a noble lady’s Biscayan servant and Don Quixote, but stops abruptly in the middle because he, being “the second author” of this history, cannot continue where the first author could not find anything else written about the history of the renowned knight Don Quixote de La Mancha. As he states:

But it spoils all, that at this point and crisis the author of the history leaves this battle impending, giving as excuse that he could find nothing more written about these achievements of Don Quixote than what has been already set forth. It is true the second author of this work was unwilling to believe that a history so curious could have been allowed to fall under the sentence of oblivion, or that the wits of La Mancha could have been so undiscerning as not to preserve in their archives or registries some documents referring to this famous knight; and this being his persuasion, he did not despair of finding the conclusion of this pleasant history, which, heaven favouring him, he did find in a way that shall be related in the Second Part. (Cervantes, 1991: P.I/Ch.8)

This is quite telling. The narrator is now declaring that he is the *second author* who is apparently retelling, rewriting, or retranslating what the first author is retelling, rewriting, or retranslating from other authors.

This incident suggests that an author cannot write anything without a source text or source texts. In other words, it is impossible for writers to write from scratch; they are obliged to benefit from some others that lived and produced texts before them. As Jorge Luis Borges rightly points out, “The fact is that every writer creates his own precursors. His work modifies our conception of the past, as it will modify the future” (1983: 201). Likewise, Walter Andrews propounds that “Every work of literature is an imitation of other works” (2002: 36). After

all, *Don Quixote* is a parody of books of chivalry, and a parody is both an imitation and a satire, i.e., a subversive work of art.

Carlos Fuentes also states that although Cervantes was a student of a famous humanist and Erasmist scholar, Juan López de Hoyos, he never mentioned Erasmus and his masterpiece *The Praise of Folly* in his huge book *Don Quixote* because “it was too dangerous” in the Spain of that era where there were inquisitions and strict censorship (2003). On the other hand, as Fuentes rightly asks: “Could not *Don Quixote* accept as its perfect subtitle “The Praise of Folly”?” (Fuentes, 2003). Considering the tenor and texture of *Don Quixote*, such a title would undoubtedly suit it perfectly, and Erasmus could certainly be considered a significant precursor of Cervantes. In this sense, *Don Quixote* may also be seen as a *nazire* to *The Praise of Folly*.

Then at the beginning of chapter 9 of Part I, the narrator states that he found an old manuscript which a boy brought to sell to a secondhand bookstore in Toledo. The manuscript was written in Arabic, and the narrator, being an avid reader, wondered what it was about. However, since he did not know Arabic, he searched for a translator and luckily found a Morisco who translated the manuscript for him. Through the mediation of the translator, the narrator tells us that this manuscript was entitled “History of Don Quixote of La Mancha” and was written by an Arab historian named Cide Hamete Benengeli. In the rest of *Don Quixote*, the narrator frequently reminds the reader that the “original” author of the history he is retelling and rewriting is Benengeli. Interestingly, he does not give the name of the translator whom he begged to translate the manuscript “without omitting or adding anything to [it], offering him whatever payment he pleased” (Cervantes, 1991: P.I/Ch.9). Thus the narrator tells us that the translator translated the manuscript “faithfully,” indeed, “just as it is set down here” (Cervantes, 1991: P.I/Ch.9).

Is it really “just as it is set down here”? Does the narrator or *translauthor* of *Don Quixote* really believe in this? It is not possible to say yes to this question. It seems he uses this expression deliberately because he wants to problematize writing, translation, and originality. Just look at the following quotation from the novel:

If against the present [history] any objection be raised on the score of its truth, it can only be that its author was an Arab, as lying is a very common propensity with those of that nation; though, as they are such enemies of ours, it is conceivable that there were omissions rather than additions made in the course of it. And this is my own opinion; for, where he could and should give freedom to his pen in praise of so worthy a knight, he seems to me deliberately to pass it over in silence; which is ill done and worse contrived, for it is the business and duty of historians to be exact, truthful, and wholly free from passion, and neither interest nor fear, hatred nor love, should make them swerve from the path of truth, whose mother is history, rival of time, storehouse of deeds, witness for the past, example and counsel for the present, and warning for the future. (Cervantes, P.1/Ch.9)

This passage seems to indicate the narrator’s incredulity against the essentialist notions of language and meaning. He makes his ironic tone clear by saying that “history” is “mother of truth” and ostensibly blames the historian or author for omitting the good aspects of the famous knight. This simply evokes the common prejudice against translators and translation, namely, the idea that translation usually causes loss rather than gain. Apparently, the passage also implies that there is no difference between writing and translating for the narrator because what he seems to allude to is translation (or rewriting) in a general sense, even though he does not use the word translation directly. After all, as we mentioned before, he is retelling what a Moorish translator has translated from Arabic into Spanish. Moreover, he seems to be aware of the fact that it is not possible for a translator to convey meaning from one language into another without interpreting and transforming it.

Fuentes points out that Cervantes has combined all the genres known at his time in *Don Quixote* and as such has become a pioneer of modern fiction and then adds: "Out of this meeting, Cervantes proposes a new way of writing and reading whose starting point is uncertainty" (2003). Accordingly, Cervantes' fiction is "a universe where nothing is certain," including authorship (Fuentes 2003). That is why Fuentes asks: "Who wrote *Don Quixote*?" (Fuentes, 2003)

This is a question asked and answered by many people including Jorge Luis Borges, who even wrote a tale entitled "Pierre Menard, the Author of *Quixote*". An answer to this question could be: a *translauthor* named Cervantes wrote *Don Quixote*. This is so because even though Cervantes hides behind the mask of an omniscient narrator and tries to distance himself from the authorship of *Don Quixote*, he seems to be the father, stepfather, first author, translator, and second author at the same time. Indeed he himself declares this in the prologue of Part II of *Don Quixote* when he addresses readers:

...bear in mind that this Second Part of "Don Quixote" which I offer thee is cut by the same craftsman and from the same cloth as the First, and that in it I present thee Don Quixote continued, and at length dead and buried, so that no one may dare to bring forward any further evidence against him, for that already produced is sufficient.

As it is seen, there is something else in this quote that Cervantes is emphasizing. He is declaring to the readers that after this second part, he will not write anything else about Don Quixote and he will not let anyone else write about him. In short, *Don Quixote* will be "dead and buried" after this second part that Cervantes is writing. Delving into the background of this declaration reveals that while Cervantes was still writing his second part of *Don Quixote*, which he published 10 years after the first part (i.e., in 1615), an anonymous author published a fake second part with the same title. Thus Cervantes makes it clear that he is the "original" *translauthor* of *Don Quixote*. However, this does not

mean that Cervantes believes every idea in *Don Quixote* is originally his. Apparently, he is aware that what makes his text singular and unique is the way he has reprocessed and re-enhanced those ideas in his book. He further reinforces his argument for his ownership of *Don Quixote* in the last chapter of part II:

For me alone was Don Quixote born, and I for him; it was his to act, mine to write; we two together make but one, notwithstanding and in spite of that pretended Tordesillesque writer who has ventured or would venture with his great, coarse, ill-trimmed ostrich quill to write the achievements of my valiant knight;- no burden for his shoulders, nor subject for his frozen wit: (Cervantes,1991: P.II/Ch.74).

According to Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, the emergence of the notion of original dates back to the early days of “colonial expansion,” which means it is “a relatively recent phenomenon” because in the Middle Ages “writers and/or translators were not troubled by this phantasm” (1999: 2). It appeared “as a result of the invention of printing and the spread of literacy, linked to the emergence of the idea of an author as ‘owner’ of his or her text” (Bassnett and Trivedi, 1999: 2).

Indeed there is conspicuous textual evidence in *Don Quixote* that proves this view. Interestingly, in part II of *Don Quixote*, the narrator relates that Don Quixote and Sancho Panza have heard that part I has been published and both the book and they, as the main characters of the book, have become very famous all over Europe. On the other hand, they have also heard that a bogus sequel to part I has been printed by an anonymous author who has attributed some unreal behaviors and characteristics to them. In order to refute the bogus sequel, in which the fake Don Quixote and Sancho Panza go to Saragossa, Cervantes makes them go to Barcelona. There they see many hectic printing

offices and Don Quixote enters one of these offices where he asks a workman about what he is doing:

The workman replied, "Senor, this gentleman here" (pointing to a man of prepossessing appearance and a certain gravity of look) "has translated an Italian book into our Spanish tongue, and I am setting it up in type for the press." "What is the title of the book?" asked Don Quixote; to which the author replied, "Senor, in Italian the book is called Le Bagatelle." (Cervantes 1991: P.II/Ch.62).

What attracts attention here is that a translator is called an author. It seems the narrator does not see any difference between an author and a translator. Ostensibly, the portrait of the *translauthor* and the narrative structure in *Don Quixote* also suggest that Cervantes himself may have considered the task of an author and that of a translator inseparable from each other.

In addition to the textual evidence above, the socio-cultural context in which *Don Quixote* was published also corroborates Bassnett and Trivedi's view about the birth of the modern concept of originality. The Spain of the sixteenth century was one of the wealthiest and most powerful colonial empires. However, at the beginning of the seventeenth century when *Don Quixote* was published, the Spanish empire had begun to lose power and territory despite being still an influential colonial power, and the notions of originality and ownership had become even more significant in such a context. This was valid for all colonial powers, and such a perspective caused a paradigm shift in the way people considered writing, originality, and translation. As a result, people began to consider:

Europe...as the great Original, the starting point, and the colonies were therefore copies, or 'translations' of Europe, which they were supposed to duplicate. Moreover, being copies, translations were evaluated as less than originals, and the myth of the translation as something that diminished the greater original established itself (Bassnett and Trivedi, 1999: 4).

4. CONCLUSION

To conclude, *Don Quixote* is a novel that blurs the borders between an author and a translator. This paper, with its reading of *Don Quixote* based on the non-essentialist notions of language, meaning, and culture, reveals that the fictional text producer described in the novel is a hybrid figure involved in both writing and translating simultaneously. The paper has come up with the neologism *translauthor* to describe this figure and showed that *Don Quixote* indeed contains and exhibits a portrait of a *translauthor*. There seems to be just one narrative voice in the novel, and this voice belongs to the *translauthor*, who is the father, stepfather, first author, second author, reteller, rewriter, and translator of *Don Quixote* at the same time.

What is remarkable in *Don Quixote* is, of course, Cervantes' consciousness that people called writers and tellers are indeed rewriters and retellers. As a matter of fact, one may easily observe that what is foregrounded throughout the novel is precisely this theme. Such a perspective is obviously closely linked with the question of originality. As it is seen above, how Cervantes approaches and tackles this question is quite interesting. Apparently, he seems to be aware of the non-essentialist and constructed nature of language and meaning. Otherwise, he would not have problematized the questions of authorship, originality, and translation in such a manner in his novel.

All in all, according to the deconstructionist reading this paper has made on *Don Quixote*, the world we know through our cognition is a text constructed merely from signifiers which are endlessly in need of translation because this is what exists in the very genealogy of language. Therefore, any text is infinitely in need of translation "even if no translator is there" (Derrida 1985: 182). Consequently, if language does not have the capacity to contain essences and is always an incomplete construction, then, because we exist through language, we can

never claim absolute originality or authorship. We are merely *translauthors*. In this regard, like all authors and translators, Cervantes is a *translauthor* who has retold an old tale in a new shape in *Don Quixote*. After all, just as words can only exist in a chain, *translauthors* also live and produce in a particular socio-cultural context, not in a vacuum. As Borges rightly points out, “A book is not an isolated being: it is a relationship, an axis of innumerable relationships” (1983: 214). Similarly, a text producer is “an axis of innumerable relationships.”

REFERENCES

- Andrews, W. G. (2002). “Starting Over Again: Some Suggestions for Rethinking Ottoman Divan Poetry in the Context of Translation and Transmission.” *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. (Ed.) Saliha Paker. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 15-40.
- Arrojo, R. (1997). “The ‘Death’ of the Author and the Limits of the Translator’s Visibility.” *Translation as Intercultural Communication*. (Eds.) M. Snell Hornby, Z. Jettmarova, K. Kaindl. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 21-32.
- Arrojo, R. (2002). “Writing, Interpreting, and the Power Struggle for the Control of Meaning: Scenes from Kafka, Borges, and Kosztolányi.” *Translation and Power*. (Eds.) Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Gentzler. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Bassnett, S. and Trivedi, H. (1999). *Postcolonial translation: Theory & practice*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Borges, J. L. (1983). *Labyrinths: Selected stories & other writings*. New York: Modern Library.
- Cervantes, M. (1991). *Don Quixote*. Trans. John Ormsby. World Library Inc., Barron's Book Notes (Tm) Plus, Classics Edition, Ver. 5.0, CD.
- Davis, K. (2001). *Deconstruction and translation*. Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA: St. Jerome Pub.

- Derrida, J. (1985). "Des Tours de Babel." *Difference in Translation*. (Ed.) Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 165-207.
- Endres, C. (2002). "Old Voices and New Texts: Imitatio, Translation, and the Poetic Mirror." *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. (Ed.) Saliha Paker. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 41-57.
- Fuentes, C. (November 2, 2003). "Tilt." *The New York Times*.
<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9902E1DE1431F931A35752C1A9659C8B63&sec=&pagewanted=all> Accessed: June 16, 2006.
- Koskinen, K. (2000). *Beyond Ambivalence: Postmodernity and the Ethics of Translation*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 774, University of Tampere, Tampere.
<http://acta.uta.fi/pdf/951-44-4941-X.pdf> Accessed: Dec 20, 2005.
- Kurnaz, C. (2003). "Osmanlı Şair Okulu." *Journal of Turkish Studies Kaf Dağının Ötesine Varmak: Günay Kut Armağanı II*, Vol. 27 / II.

GENİŞ ÖZET

Giriş

Octavio Paz her biri daha öncekinden hafifçe farklı olan hiç durmadan katlanarak çoğalan bir metinler yığını vasıtasıyla (yani çevirilerin çevirilerinin çevirileri ile) dünya ile muhatap olduğumuz için dünyayı sadece çeviri yolu ile anlamlandırabildiğimizi ileri sürer:

Her metin eşsizdir, ancak aynı zamanda başka bir metnin çevirisidir. Hiçbir metin tamamen özgün olamaz çünkü dilin kendisi, kendi özünde, zaten bir çeviridir—önce sözel olmayan dünyadan bir çeviridir ve sonra, her bir işaret ve her bir söz başka bir işaret ve başka bir sözün çevirisi olduğu için bir çeviridir. (Bassnett and Trivedi, 1999: 3)

Bu makalenin amacı, Cervantes'in ünlü romanı *Don Kişot*'un Octavio Paz'ın yukarıda irdelediği yazarlık, özgünlük, çeviri ve metinsellik kavramlarını nasıl sorunsallaştırdığını ortaya koymaktır. Bütün metin üretiminin yazı ve çevirinin melez düzleminde gerçekleştiğini ileri süren yapı sökücü bir perspektif kullanan bu makale, *Don Kişot*'un yazarla çevirmen arasındaki sınırları bulanıklaştıran bir roman olduğunu göz önüne sermektedir. Bu bağlamda, romanda betimlenen kurgulanmış metin üreticisi eş zamanlı olarak hem yazan hem çeviren melez bir figürdür. Yeni türetme *translauthor* (çevirmen-yazar) sözcüğü, bu melez metin üreticisini ifade etmek için uygun bir terim gibi görünmektedir. Makale, *Don Kişot*'un çevirmen-yazarın görünür bir portresini okura sunan bir roman olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Romanda tek bir anlatıcı ses vardır ve bu ses *Don Kişot*'un babası, üvey babası, ilk yazarı, ikinci yazarı, yeniden anlatıcısı, yeniden yazarı ve çevirmeni olan çevirmen-yazara aittir.

Yöntem

Bu makalenin edebi bir okuma yöntemi olarak kullandığı yapı-sökücülüğe göre dil, herhangi bir öz anlamı içinde barındıramaz çünkü anlam kendi başına bir öz değildir ve dilden önce bir aslı veya başlangıcı yoktur. Yani, anlam “dil bir sonucudur, önce dilin dışında var olup sonra dilde ifade edilen bir şey değildir” (Davis 2001: 14). Başka bir deyişle, bir sözcük ile anlamı arasında mutlak veya aşkın bir ilişki yoktur. Bir sözcük tek başına değil, sadece başka kelimelerle olan ilişkisi vasıtasıyla bir anlam ifade edebilir. Bu, dilde özlerin veya asılların olmadığı fakat sadece sosyokültürel kurgulamalar olarak metinlerin veya daha doğrusu ara metinlerin olduğu anlamına gelir (ki bunlar da daha önce gelen başka ara metinlere dayanır). Bu basitçe şu demektir: yazılar, yaratımlar ve orijinaler yoktur, sadece yeniden yazmalar, yeniden yaratımlar ve çeviriler vardır.

Dil ve anlam hakkındaki böyle bir kavramlaştırma, Derrida'nın “Kontekst dışında hiçbir şey yoktur” (Davis 2001: 9) görüşüne ve *différance* kavramına dayanmaktadır. *Différance* “her kavramın” sonsuz bir imleyenler zincirinde “başka kavramlara” referans yapmasını sağlayan “farklılıkların sistematik hareketidir” (Davis 2001: 13). Buna göre anlam, imleyenler (sözcükler) arasındaki farklılıklardan türemektedir. Başka bir deyişle, imleyenler sadece başka imleyenlerle olan ilişkileri vasıtasıyla anlam kazanırlar ve anlamlar hiçbir zaman özler haline gelmez.

Bulgular (Sonuçlar)

Eğer dilde asıllar veya özler mevcut değilse, eğer sözcükler sonsuz şekilde birbirlerine tercüme ediliyorlarsa, eğer dilin kaynağında heterojenlik ve çeviri varsa ve eğer çevirmenin “kaçınılması mümkün olmayan bir yazarlık görevi” (Arrojo 1997: 28) varsa, o zaman orijinal metin ile çeviri arasındaki veya yazar ile çevirmen arasındaki hiyerarşik ayırım, yapısökümü kolayca yapılabilecek sosyokültürel bir kurgulama gibi görünmektedir. Bu noktada *translauthor* (çevirmen-yazar) gibi melez bir kimlik daha anlamlı görünmektedir. Bu bağlamda, kendilerine yazar denilen bütün insanlar gibi Cervantes de büyük bir çevirmen-yazardır ve *Don Kişot* romanı da başka çevirilerin fantastik bir çevirisidir.

Romanın 8. Bölümünün sonunda anlatıcı, soylu bir leydinin uşağı ile Don Kişot arasındaki dövüşün başını anlatır, fakat hikâyenin ortasına gelince aniden sözünü bitirir. Çünkü birinci yazar şöhretli şövalye Don Kişot’un hikâyesi hakkında yazılmış başka hiçbir kaynak bulamadığı için hikâyenin “ikinci yazarı” olan anlatıcı da öyküyü anlatmaya devam edemez.

Sonra I. Kısımın 9. Bölümünün başında anlatıcı, bir çocuğun Toledo’daki bir sahafa satmak üzere getirdiği eski bir el yazması kitap bulduğunu anlatır. Bu el yazması kitap Arapça yazılmıştır ve tutkulu bir okur olan anlatıcı onun ne hakkında olduğunu merak eder. Ancak Arapça bilmediği için, bir mütercim arar ve sonunda onun için kitabı Arapçadan İspanyolcaya çeviren bir Morisco (zorla Hristiyanlaştırılmış Endülüslü Arap) bulur. Bu mütercimin çevirisi aracılığıyla anlatıcı okura el yazması metnin başlığının “La Mançalı Don Kişot’un Hikâyesi” olduğunu ve yazarının Cide Hamete Benengeli (Seyid Hamid Bin Engeli) isimli bir tarihçi olduğunu anlatır. *Don Kişot* romanının geri kalanında anlatıcı, yeniden yazmakta olduğu hikâyenin “orijinal” yazarının Bin Engeli olduğunu okura sık sık hatırlatır. Anlatıcının el yazması metni “hiçbir çıkarma veya ekleme yapmadan” (Cervantes 1991: P.I/Ch.9) çevirmesi için yalvardığı çevirmenin adını vermemesi ilginçtir. Ayrıca anlatıcı, çevirmenin metni “sadık bir şekilde” ve “tıpkı burada yazıldığı gibi” çevirdiğini söyler (Cervantes 1991: P.I/Ch.9). Peki, gerçekten de “tıpkı burada yazıldığı gibi” mi tercüme edilmiştir? *Don Kişot*’un anlatıcısı veya çevirmen-yazarı buna gerçekten inanmakta mıdır? Buna evet diye cevap vermek mümkün değildir, çünkü Cervantes çevirinin mekanik bir aktarım işleminden ziyade yorum ve yaratıcılık gerektiren bir eylem olduğunun farkında

görülmektedir. Öyle görünüyor ki burada böyle bir ifadeyi bilerek kullanmaktadır çünkü yazı, çeviri ve özgünlüğü sorunsallaştırmak istemektedir.

Sonuç

Sonuç olarak, bu makalenin *Don Kişot* romanı hakkında yaptığı yapısökücülüğe dayalı okumaya göre, romanda betimlenen kurgusal metin üreticisi çevirmen-yazar diye isimlendirebilecek, eş zamanlı olarak hem yazma hem çeviri işinin içinde olan melez bir kişidir. *Don Kişot*'ta dikkate değer olan şey, Cervantes'in yazar ve anlatıcı denilen insanların aslında daha önce yazılmış ve anlatılmış şeyleri yeniden yazan ve anlatan kişiler olduklarının bilincinde olması ve yazarlık, özgünlük ve çeviri gibi meseleleri mercek altına almasıdır.