BILINGUALISM AND SELF-TRANSLATION IN THE PROSE OF SAMUEL BECKETT AND ELİF ŞAFAK

Submitted by İrem Kasar Harris

to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of

PhD in Modern Languages

February 2024

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that any material that has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University has been acknowledged.

Abstract

This study is concerned with two bilingual authors, Samuel Beckett and Elif Şafak and their respective co/self-translation practices. It focuses on four case studies: Beckett's *Premier Amou*r (1970) / *First Love* (1973) and *Company* (1980) / *Compagnie* (1980), alongside Şafak's *Bit Palas* (2002) / *The Flea Palace* (2004) and *Honour* (2012) / *İskender* (2011). By appointing (1) native language fiction and (2) its self-translation and (3) second language fiction and (4) its native reproduction as case studies, this thesis shows the inner workings of the bilingual *œuvre*. This study employs an interdisciplinary methodology to assess the shifts and ruptures in the literary style, narrative flow and spatio-temporal elements across self-translation, as well as as the domestication and/ or foreignisation of sociocultural motifs in consideration of the integrity of the fictive universe. By comparing two authors-translators with different linguistic and cultural configurations, this study contributes to the growing body of research on bilingualism and self-translation, which lacked a comparatist analysis on an East-West hybrid text alongside a West-West self-translation. However, this research found that despite the different power dynamics imposed on Beckett and Şafak, the major discrepancies were not consequences of such implications but were driven by authorial intervention. Both authors are also shown to modify substantially more in self-translations into their respective native languages, while also employing a heightened level of emotivity. Beckett's bilingual texts do not contradict each other, however Şafak's 'rewriting' at times produces paradoxical narratives. Self-translation is bound by both poetics and politics. Beckett is mostly concerned with the former, whereas the latter has more impact in Şafak's case.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisors Prof David Houston Jones and Prof Natalie Pollard for their guidance, valuable feedback and kindness. A big part of this dissertation was written during the Covid-19 pandemic and its aftermath, impacting life as we knew it. I would also like to thank the PGR Support Team for their assistance throughout my years at Exeter. I am eternally indebted to my parents whose support made it possible for me to pursue my PhD. My heartfelt thanks go to my mother for introducing me to the magic of literature. I would also like to thank Irmak, the best friend one could possibly have, for always being my rock. Finally, I am forever grateful to my husband Rob for his unyielding support and love.

Authors's declaration

An article based on the Chapter 2.3. Comparative Analysis of *Premier Amour* and *First Love* of this dissertation has been published as the following:
Irem Kasar, 'Migration, Bilingualism and Self-Translation: Beckett's Stateless Hero in *Premier Amour/First Love'* in *Translation and Circulation of Migration Literature,* ed. by Stephanie Schwerter and Katrina Brannon (Berlin: Frank & Timme: 2022)*,* pp. 195-212.

A conference paper based on the Chapter 3.4. Comparative Analysis of *Honour* and *İskender* has been presented by Irem Kasar Harris at the colloquium "Lire et écrire entre les langues" at Université Aix-Marseille in June 2023.

This dissertation employs MHRA (Modern Humanities Research Association) Style Guide (Third Edition) as its bibliographical style. MHRA released a Fourth Edition in February 2024.

Introduction

This thesis examines and compares Samuel Beckett's and Elif Şafak's bilingual texts, their practices as author-translators and the different borders they cross in their linguistic and cultural journeys. The aim of this study is to look at bilingual writing and self-translation from a wider point of view, by comparing perhaps an unlikely pair as Beckett and Şafak. They share English as their common language, however for Beckett it is the departure gate, for Şafak English signifies arrival. As will be discussed in more detail later on, there is a considerable amount of existing study on bilingualism in literature, however such studies have historically focused on a singular author-translator, or groups of self-translators from similar cultural backgrounds and languages. The purpose of this research is to compare two very different bilingual authors from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. For this I have chosen Samuel Beckett, the most dedicated and also the most studied self-translator, who lived and wrote in English and French, alongside Elif Şafak, who has a completely different self-translation practice as well as two very different languages, Turkish and English. Unlike Beckett, scholarly studies on Şafak's bilingualism are scarce, despite her status as a renowned author and the rich context her self-translations provide.

In *The Bilingual Text*, Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson explain that only a few scholars have ever studied self-translation in more than two authors and/or languages, and the "theoretical reflection on the bilingual text has been largely scattered and fragmentary" (2007 : 10). In a similar vein,

Rainier Grutman argues that Beckett as a self-translator has had a lot of attention and we shall now move on to expand the self-translation field with different self-translators as subjects from various backgrounds, aiming to theorise self-translation. Grutman states that “Beckett can help us gain many precious insights into self-translation, but only if we allow ourselves to look beyond him, instead of staying in the shadow he casts.” (2013a : 188). A major aim of this study is to contribute to the developing field of self-translation by addressing the gaps in existing research. In order to do so, I work with French, English and Turkish, a trio of languages that have never been studied together in the self-translation field, to the best of my knowledge. Studying Beckett and Şafak together does not only let me work between different linguistic systems, but also across multiple cultures: French, English, Irish and Turkish. The latter widens the discussion, as Turkish brings Eastern complexities into Western publishing practices.

The opening chapter reviews the theories and terms relevant to the present study. First, bilingualism as a field is reviewed, from its theoretical debates on definitions, to examples of literary bilingualism in different linguistic and cultural contexts. Next takes place the literature review on self-translation theory, such as Rainier Grutman’s typology of self-translators, as well as Simona Anselmi’s categorisations. Examples of different attitudes and practices in self-translation are also discussed, all the while aiming to identify and discuss the gaps in existing scholarship. Alongside bilingualism and self-translation, several complementary theories are consulted and reviewed, such as those of Lawrence Venuti’s *Translator’s Invisibility,* domestication and foreignisation, alongside self-orientalism, drawing upon Edward Said’s theory. The chapter concludes with the explanation of the methodology used for this thesis.

Chapter 2 is devoted to Samuel Beckett as a bilingual author and a self-translator. It reviews the existing literature on Beckett's bilingualism, from the works of scholars such as Ruby Cohn in 1960s to Brian Fitch's works in 1980s, to its current state with numerous publications on Beckett's bilingualism. Next, Beckett's textual pairs are studied in chronological order. Beckett's French novella *Premier Amour* (1970) and its English self-translation *First Love* (1973) are analysed and the findings are discussed in accordance with the study's methodology. The second textual pair, *Company* (1980) and *Compagnie* (1980) are then analysed and discussed in the same manner, before concluding the chapter on Beckett.

Elif Şafak, her bilingualism and her self/co-translating position is the focus of chapter 3. In it, existing literature on Şafak's bilingual works, which is severely lacking, other than Arzu Akbatur's research, is scrutinised. Following the review, Şafak's Turkish novel *Bit Palas* (2002) and its translation *The Flea Palace* (2004) are analysed. Next, the second textual pair *Honour* (2012) and *İskender* (2011) are compared and discussed within the same framework, before offering concluding remarks.

In the final, comparative chapter, Beckett and Şafak's bilingualism and self-translating practices are discussed in light of the previous findings of this study, followed by the dissertation's conclusion.

Chapter 1: Theories and Terms

1.1. Bilingualism and Its Many Definitions

Throughout the last century, bilingualism has been studied from various scholarly perspectives such as linguistics, child development, education, neuropsychology, sociology and others. The definition of bilingualism remains a point of debate in bilingual theory. Mostly concerned with the level of control an individual has over a language, several different definitions have been offered. Leonard Bloomfield, while studying bilingual speech-communities, defined bilingualism as the "native like control of two languages" and he claimed that, usually the "bilingual acquires his second language in early childhood."[1] Bloomfield is not necessarily opposed to bilingualism that can take place later in life, due to travel, foreign study or other opportunities, but he maintains that "one cannot define a degree of perfection at which a good foreign speaker becomes a bilingual: the distinction is relative."[2] Haugen, on the other hand, believed that an individual becomes bilingual as soon as they can produce meaningful sentences in another language, without having to reach a native-like level.[3] These definitions were followed by sub-definitions, which are concerned with individuals who have some control over a foreign language, though far from being proficient, 'incipient bilingualism'[4] coined by Diebold, referring to minimal

---

[1] Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (New York: Holt 1933), p. 56.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Einar Haugen, *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behaviour* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953), p. 7.

[4] A. Richald Diebold, Jr., 'Incipient Bilingualism', *Language,* 37.1 (1961), 97-112 (p. 111).

bilingual skill, or similarly Hockett's 'semibilingualism'[5]. In this manner, being able to produce a few meaningful utterances in a second language would make an individual completely bilingual according to Haugen, whereas the same individual would be classified as an 'incipient bilingual' by Diebold, and 'semibilingual' by Hockett.[6]

Critics of bilingual theory not only propose different terms concerning the degree of linguistic proficiency, but also the term bilingualism is understood differently by some. Hamers and Blanc differentiate between the terms 'bilinguality' and 'bilingualism', using the latter to depict a widespread bilingualism in a society and the former to refer to an individual's bilingual abilities. Other scholars, like Weinreich and Romaine, do not make such a distinction and prefer to use the term 'bilingualism' in both contexts, which can signal the ability to speak more than two languages (multilingualism) as well.[7]

Ervin and Osgood distinguished between 'compound' and 'coordinate' bilinguals in 1954, attributing individuals with the terms in accordance to the differences in their cognitive and semantic organisations. They claimed that, for the coordinate bilinguals, the languages are independent in their cognitive state, whereas for compound bilinguals the two languages are interdependent. However, according to Weinreich, a bilingual cannot be categorised only by semantic dependence and an absolute emphasis should be put on the context, of how and where the languages have been learned. Romaine exemplifies Weinreich's claim as the following: if an individual learns two languages in two different environments (i.e. one language at home, the other language at school), separate conceptual systems would be developed and maintained for

---

[5] C. F. Hockett, *A Course in Modern Linguistics* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 16.

[6] Suzanne Romaine, *Bilingualism,* Vol. 2 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), p.12.

[7] Ibid.

the two languages, resulting in coordinate bilingualism. On the contrary, if an individual learns both languages within the same context (i.e. parents speaking different languages at home), there would be cognitive dependence between the two languages, hence resulting in compound bilingualism. [8]

Along with the environment, or context, where the individual learned the language, age of acquisition became an important topic of study. According to Hamers and Blanc, the real compound bilinguality cannot exist if one of the two languages is learned after childhood, regardless of the context of acquisition.[9] Their understanding of the term 'compound' is, if it were to be reduced to a simple meaning, what a non-specialist would likely perceive as a 'native speaker' of both languages. However, they argue that this compound-coordinate spectrum is not related to how fluent a speaker is, but it is instead concerned with the context and timing of the language acquisition. Hamers and Blanc point out that equally fluent coordinate bilinguals who learned the language later in life display different association networks in comparison to the compound bilinguals of early age acquisition. Bilingual theory scholars agree that, one way or another, the type of an individual's bilingualism affects their language processing and recall.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, bilingualism is an extensive field with ample definition and debate. In consideration of the scope of this study, the focus henceforth will be on the effects of bilingualism on writing and self-translation. However, I am convinced that an elemental understanding of the bilingual theory is necessary to conduct my research efficiently. In order to read bilingual literature and to read between its lines, to understand the

---

[8] Ibid, p. 79.

[9] Josiane F. Hamers and Michel H.A. Blanc, *Bilinguality & Bilingualism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 95.

bilingual artist, we must first understand the cognitive and cultural aspect of being bilingual. This is an often overlooked area in the current literature, towards which this present study aims to contribute.

1.1.2. The Bilingual's Dictionary

It is important to understand how bilinguals store and choose their words. According to Weinreich, and to Ervin and Osgood who later redeveloped the theory, coordinate and compound bilinguals access words differently. In coordinate bilingualism, where a person learns two languages in two separate environments, each word has a separate meaning. For instance, for a coordinate bilingual who learned English at home and French at school, the words *book* and *livre* would be attached to different conceptual systems, even if they mean the "same thing" in translation. Indeed, if a compound bilingual learned both the words *book* and *livre* at home because they are used concurrently by their family, the meanings of these two words would become joined and be tied to the same mental representation. Romaine demonstrates this as a singular concept having two different verbal labels.[10] In order to understand this theory, I shall use Yiğit Bener as an example, a Turkish author and translator who lived both in Turkey and France. Bener moved back and forth between Istanbul and Paris many times both as a child and adult. Born to Turkish parents, the language spoken at home was always Turkish. His primary and secondary education was split into multiple phases: a few years in Istanbul, then again in Paris, then back to Istanbul and then back to Paris again. He also

[10] Romaine, pp. 79-80.

lived in Switzerland and Brussels. The first language he spoke was Turkish but he learned how to read and write in French before he did in Turkish. He considers each as his native language and he has written literary works in both. Following is a first-hand account from an interview with Şilan Karadağ Evirgen:

> Örneğin şu sıralar, "Fransa'daki Yiğit'in Fransızca yazdığı mektuplara, Türkiye'deki Yiğit'in ise Türkçe yanıt verdiği" ikidilli bir kitap yazıyorum. Kitapta her ikisi de çocukluklarından beri birlikte yaşadıkları o "öteki ben"le, öteki dille hesaplaşmaktadırlar. Fransızca konuşan Yiğit: "Buranın martıları çok eğlenceli, çok güzel gülüyorlar" diyor, çünkü "mouette" sözcüğü ona Gaston Lagaffe'ın çizgi romanındaki komik "martıyı" hatırlatıyor. […] Dolayısıyla Fransa'daki Yiğit, martıyı çocukken okuduğu o çizgi romandan öğrendi […] Bir de filmlerden öğrendi martıyı: Romantik filmlerde âşıklar plajda yürürken arka planda uçuşan martıları... Yani Fransız Yiğit için […] "mouette" sempatik, sımsıcak bir sözcük. Türkçe konuşan Yiğit ise […] itiraz eder: "Sen öyle diyorsun ama bu martılar benim başımın belası! Heybeliada'da çatımda yuva yaptılar, daha sabahın dördünde yavru martılar annelerini çağırmak için inanılmaz bet sesleriyle "gak gak" diye bağırıyorlar, üstelik çöpleri dışarı bırakamıyoruz, çünkü torbaları eşeliyorlar, nesi sempatik bu hayvanın?" Demek ki benim için "martı" sözcüğü olumsuz bir şey çağrıştırırken "mouette" sözcüğü keyifli bir şeyi çağrıştırıyor. Üstelik bu çelişik duygu aynı insanın kafasında yeşeriyor.[11]

> For instance, nowadays, I am writing a bilingual book in which "Yiğit in France" writes letters in French to "Yiğit in Turkey", to which he replies in Turkish. In the book, they are reckoning with each other, with the "other me" and the other language they have been living with since their childhood. French speaking Yiğit says, "Seagulls here are so funny, they laugh adorably", because the word *mouette* reminds him of the funny seagull in Gaston Lagaffe's comics. […] So, Yiğit in France learned about the seagulls from that comic he used to read as a child. […] And he also learned from the films: The seagulls flying in the background while lovers walk by the beach in romantic films… Therefore for

[11] Şilan Karadağ Evirgen, 'Çeviride İkidillilik Sorunsalı: Özçeviri ve Yazar-Çevirmenler'(Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: Yıldız Teknik University, 2016), p. 190.

> French Yiğit […] *mouette* is a lovely, warm word. Turkish speaking Yiğit contests: "You say that but these seagulls are a pain in the arse! They nested on my roof in Heybeliada, the young ones are screaming with their terrible voices calling their mothers at four in the morning! We can't even take the rubbish out, because they scratch and scrabble the bin bags! What's so lovely about them?" Apparently, for me the (Turkish) word *martı* has negative connotations, whereas *mouette* has a cheery connotation. And this conflicting feeling belongs to the same person.[12]

Bener's account of how two words with supposedly the same meaning can have such different connotations in the bilingual mind is a fine example. It makes sense when the previous theory is applied to his account: having learned Turkish at home and French in the outside world, Bener would be a coordinate bilingual and the words would have different conceptual meanings to him, as it is the case with *mouette* and *martı.* Consider how many words a story or a novel would include; this alone is a challenge in bilingual writing and especially in self-translation. Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour recognises this phenomenon upon studying neuropsychological ramifications of bilingual writers in her notable book *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration* (1989). She agrees that the bilingual writer's brain is organised differently than that of the monolingual's, and attempting self-translation makes this schism even more pronounced: "Self-translation causes the bilingual to be even more aware of the separation of the word, self and objects […] because it makes it frustratingly clear that not even words can pass intact from one verbal system to another."[13]

In a similar vein, Micheal Oustinoff analyses the case of author Claude Esteban, who is fluent in Spanish and French, yet only ever writes in the latter.

---

[12] My translation.

[13] Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour, *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1989), p. 175.

Oustinoff exemplifies Estebans's own account of how phonetics shape different connotations and edits the author's bilingual dictionary:

> « Jaune » subit ainsi l' « attraction phonétique » de « jeune », et devient une couleur qualifiée de juvénile. Réciproquement, comme à la tonalité « au » de « jaune » est associée une impression de fatigue, de pesanteur, « jeune » représente alors « le synonyme sensoriel, l'équivalent chromatique de la notion contradictoire, irrecevable de "jeune vieillard" ». Il fallait donc remplacer « jeune » par « amarillo », c'est-à-dire jaune en espagnol.[14]

Oustinoff argues that this bilingual sensibility to words is even more pronounced for writers, as the nature of their art relies on the constant consideration of words and of detecting the slightest nuances between them. He states that bilingual authors have to learn to operate this sharing of words and that the necessary way of operation is unique to each author's bilingual journey.[15] Studying bilingual texts is often puzzling for this very reason: what seems like an inconspicuous, easily transferrable word occasionally gets replaced with an odd choice; that is, to the researcher. Why does the colour of a flower change in self-translation? Perhaps a memory, a sound or a letter interfered within the bilingual mind, changing the associations of the word. Like the *mouette* and *martı* in Bener's anecdote, at times the seagulls don't cross paths, instead they fly towards different meanings.

The sharing of words in the bilingual mind is further challenged by "untranslatable" words. These are easier to detect in writing, though no less perplexing for the author. More often than not, these are words of culture-

---

[14] Michael Oustinoff, 'Le bilinguisme d'écriture', in *Métamorphoses d'une utopie*, ed. by Fulvio Caccia, Jean-Michel Lacroix (Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1992), pp. 65-76 (p. 66).

[15] Ibid, p. 67.

specific items such as a national or regional food name, custom, object etc. The meaning is usually carried over either by explaining the word or likening it to some other word in the recipient language's culture, or a combination of both. The transference is more difficult when an abstract word needs to be replaced; especially if the meaning is believed to be arising from a certain cultural context. When Vladimir Nabokov translated Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin* from Russian to English, he added the following annotation about the Russian word (тоска) *toska*:

> No single word in English renders all the shades of toska. At its deepest and most painful, it is a sensation of great spiritual anguish, often without any specific cause. At less morbid levels it is a dull ache of the soul, a longing with nothing to long for, a sick pining, a vague restlessness, mental throes, yearning. In particular cases it may be the desire for somebody or something specific, nostalgia, lovesickness. At the lowest level it grades into ennui, boredom, *skuka*.[16]

Apparently, Nabokov is not alone in his frustration caused by not being able to find an equivalent for *toska* in English. The Russian *toska* is famous for being untranslatable to such an extent that social psychology scholars Ogarkova and others treated it as a "culture-specific emotion concept" and investigated the range of the semantical perception of the word and its possible translation(s) via the GRID method.[17] In their article, they state that they chose the Russian emotion concept 'toska' for their case-study as it is "frequently reported to be among 'key' concepts in the Russian culture characterized by both cultural saliency and 'untranslatability' into other languages"[18].

---

[16] Aleksandr Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse: Commentary* (Vol. 2), trans by Vladimir Nabokov, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 141.

[17] A. Ogarkova, J.J.R. Fontaine, I. Prihod'ko, 'What the GRID can reveal about culture-specific emotion concepts: A case study of Russian "toska", in *Components of Emotional Meaning: A Sourcebook,* ed. by J.J.R. Fontaine, K.R. Scherer, C. Soriano (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2013), pp. 353-65.

[18] Ibid, p. 353.

These culture-specific emotion concepts undoubtedly shape the bilingual's dictionary further. Turkish author Orhan Pamuk composed his memoir around the word *hüzün,* which he describes as a kind of end-of-empire melancholy that lingers in the city of Istanbul. Even though his historical and semantic take on the word *hüzün* is not consistent or coherent at times; when the memoir was translated to English, the word *hüzün* was intact, as no English word could signify the meaning of this word.[19]

1.1.3. Literary Bilingualism

Numerous writers are no doubt bilingual. However, creating a work of literature in a second language (and sometimes in more than one language) is arguably not a common practice. From Samuel Beckett to Vladimir Nabokov, Milan Kundera to Rabindranath Tagore, these authors still today occupy a particular place in the history of literature. An author's desire to write in a second language can stem from anything, from their current conditions (i.e. exile) to pure creative curiosity. An author's desire to *not* write in a second language can also have many reasons, from sociopolitical (i.e. post-colonial writings as a form of resistance and reclamation) to purely personal.

The Nobel prize winning Polish-American author Isaac Bashevis Singer, for instance, only wrote his literary works in his native Yiddish, despite being fluent in other languages like Polish, Hebrew and English. His motivations were gathered around the survival and expansion of Yiddish literature. Even more curious, he later 'prepared' his Yiddish texts for English translation (which

[19] Orhan Pamuk, *Istanbul, Memories and the City*, trans. by Maureen Freely (London: Faber and Faber, 2005).

consists of trying to relay the Yiddish content to a professional English translator), but he never directly wrote in English.[20]

The idea of the native language as the superior form of perception and expression is nothing new. Schleiermacher, in his hermeneutics lectures in the early 19th century, remarks that “only the native language is present to us in its naturally grown fullness; utterances in foreign languages inevitably come to us in fragmentary form.” (qtd. in Hermans)[21] For some bilingual authors, paradoxically, this is the very reason they are writing in a second language. Beckett, of course, is one of them. Among his many famous remarks about his reasoning for writing in French, “avec le désir de m’apprauvrir encore davantage” (letter to Cohn, 1968), is notable.[22] Beckett had also previously mentioned that “for him, French represented a form of weakness by comparison with his mother tongue.”[23]

It could be argued that literary endeavours in a second language are rarely concerned by the degree of the author’s proficiency in that language. Needless to say that, a certain level of fluency is integral, however this is not as decisive as the level of the cognitive and sentimental associations that the writer has towards their language(s). Among the accounts of bilingual authors attesting to this is Canadian writer Nancy Huston who moved to Paris and started writing first in French. She explains that her native language of English “was too emotionally fraught at the time” and she preferred something more distant and intellectual, when she believes she was in denial of her roots. Over

---

[20] Saul Noam Zaritt, *Jewish American Writing and World Literature: Maybe to Millions, Maybe to Nobody* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), pp. 99-127.

[21] Theo Hermans, "Schleiermacher and Plato, Hermeneutics and Translation". *Friedrich Schleiermacher and the Question of Translation*, edited by Larisa Cercel and Adriana Serban (Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter, 2015), pp. 77-106 (p. 94).

[22] Ruby Cohn, *Back to Beckett* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 58.

[23] Ibid, p.59.

a decade later, she went back to her mother tongue with her first English novel, *Plainsong*, which coincided with a period of her life where French became the daily language of mundane tasks and when she felt strong enough to accept her emotions.[24]

This pattern of writing in a second language is observed as a means of freedom for many bilingual authors, regardless of how comfortable they feel in their chosen language. Elif Şafak describes writing in English as a challenge that sometimes intimidates her. Yet, she states, the joy and pleasure she derives from writing in English is so much greater than the fear.[25] Another example of an author who avoids their native language is the Polish writer Joseph Conrad, who is regarded as an important author of English literature today. Conrad learned the English language when he joined the English merchant navy in his twenties. He wrote neither in his native Polish, nor in his true second language French. Najder, one of the most prominent Conrad scholars, explains the potential reason why Conrad must have chosen English in his biography:

> […] why writing in English may have seemed to Conrad most appropriate: to work in a medium infinitely rich and refined by masterpieces of poetry, resistant like every object that is strange and newly discovered, and at the same time softly pliable because not hardened in schematic patterns of words and ideas inculcated since childhood. At the same time it was a less binding activity, a little like a game: writing in a foreign language admits a greater temerity in tackling personally sensitive problems, for it leaves uncommitted the most spontaneous, deeper reaches of the psyche, and allows a greater distance in treating matters we would hardly dare approach in the language of her childhood. As a rule it is easier to swear and analyze dispassionately in an acquired language.[26]

---

[24] François Grosjean, *Bilingual* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), p. 141.

[25] Elif Shafak, “Dreaming in English”, *The Flea Palace* (London: Penguin Books, 2015).

[26] Zdzislaw Najder, *Joseph Conrad: A Life* (New York: Camden House, 2007), p. 137.

Najder's commentary on Conrad's choice of written language is as powerful as it is valid. Şafak agrees that, had she written her book *Bastard of Istanbul* in Turkish instead of English, it might have been a different, more cautious, more apprehensive book.[27] Writing the story in English enabled her to be freed from the cultural and psychological constraints she believes she unconsciously internalises in Turkish. In this vein, ultimately, every language is tied to a complex culture that has its own knowledge and value systems that the speakers, more or less, internalise. Therefore it is only natural for the writers to hope that by switching languages they can free themselves from the unseen pressures of the prevalent thought systems of the abandoned language. However, leaving the cultural trail behind is not as straightforward as a language switch; firstly, not every bilingual is also bicultural, and secondly, being bicultural often makes it more complicated. The French-American author Julien Green was born in Paris to American parents. His bilingual and bicultural identity shaped his life and his writing career, even his name was affected: he was called "Julian", by his real birth name at home but he became "Julien" with French spelling in the outside world.[28] He explains this as being two different people caught between two different languages. According to him, one's language influences one's expression, identity and even character.[29] Upon studying entries and articles from Green's bilingual journals, *Le langage et son double* (1987) and *L'homme et son ombre* (1991), Genevieve Waite states:

---

[27] Shafak, "Dreaming".

[28] Julien Green, *Le langage et son double* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1987), p. 127.

[29] Ibid, pp. 223-25.

> Whereas in English, Green exhibits a conspicuous “American Identity” while presenting a meek and unassuming narrative voice, in French, he dramatically modifies his language to forge a distinct “French” sense of identity while appearing to be more assertive, confident, and speculative.[30]

Hamers and Blanc stress that “a bilingual does not develop two parallel identities but integrates his two cultures into a unique identity in which aspects of both his cultures are closely interrelated.”[31] However, as they explain, how balanced this bicultural identity is depends on multiple factors concerning the time and socio-affective background of the enculturation process: Is it a minor community bilingualism or on an individual level? How early or late in life has the person met the second culture and where? Is there a sociopolitical layer that positions one culture higher than the other? A successful biculturalism can only occur when the society around the person allows it to and this is cumbersome to measure accurately. Still, what remains certain is that the cultural identity that the bilingual individual develops is different from that of the monolingual.[32] As Julien Green once said himself: “… sans être étranger nulle part, partout je suis double”.[33]

1.2. Self-Translation: Definitions, Limitations and Debates

The earliest definition of self-translation (autotranslation) is given by Anton Popovič in 1976 as “the translation of an original work into another

---

[30] Genevieve Waite, “Julien Green: *L’écrivain double* in Self-Translation”, *French Forum*, Vol 44. No. 3 (2019), 361-76 (p. 362).

[31] Hamers and Blanc, p. 133.

[32] Ibid, p. 115-33.

[33] Julien Green, *Souvenirs des jours heureux* (Paris: Flammarion, 2007), p. 323.

language by the author himself".[34] Ranier Grutman describes self-translation as "either the process of translating one's own writings into another language or the product of such an undertaking."[35] Hokenson and Munson use the term bilingual text and self-translation together: "Bilingual text is a self-translation, authored by a writer who can compose in different languages and who translates his or her texts from one language to another."[36] The understanding of the term is consistent across the field. However, the reach and application of the term remains a source of debate. Susan Bassnett unequivocally denies the term's necessity, she states:

> The term 'self-translation' is problematic in several respects, but principally because it compels us to consider the problem of the existence of an original. The very definition of translation presupposes an original somewhere else, so when we talk about self-translation, the assumption is that there will be another previously composed text from which the second text can claim its origin. Yet many writers consider themselves as bilinguals and shift between languages, hence the binary notion of original–translation appears simplistic and unhelpful.[37]

In her article titled "The Self-translator as Rewriter", Bassnett argues that trying to define a term for the writers who write in both languages and who self-translate is "a moot point"[38]. According to her, neither the term 'self-translator', nor 'bilingual writer' is conclusive enough. She draws upon several examples from such writers while arguing that it is evident translating one's own work is a

---

[34] Anton Popovič, *Dictionary for the analysis of literary translation* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976), p. 19.

[35] Rainier Grutman, 'Self-Translation', in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, Third Edition*, ed. by Mona Baker, Gabriela Saldana (Oxon: Routledge, 2020), pp. 514-18 (p. 514).

[36] Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson, 'Introduction' in *The Bilingual Text* (Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 2007).

[37] Susan Bassnett, 'The self-translator as rewriter', in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), pp.13-16 (p.13).

[38] Ibid, p. 14.

form of rewriting. Therefore, instead of these terms, she suggests dispensing with the terminology and to consider a writer's work on a more holistic level. It is questionable how helpful Bassnett's refusal of the terminology is, after all the term rewriting is also not privy to self-translators. Both Bassnett and Andre Lefevere, who introduced the impactful cultural turn in translation studies in the 1990s, are advocates of seeing translation as a form of rewriting. Lefevere's book *Translation, Rewriting and Manipulation of Literary Fame* bears the following as its opening sentence:

> This book deals with those in the middle, the men and women who do not write literature, but rewrite it. It does so because they are, at present, responsible for the general reception and survival of works of literature among non-professional readers, who constitute the great majority of readers in our global culture, to at least the same, if not a greater extent than the writers themselves.[39]

Lefereve's definition of rewriting does not just include translation but also historiography, anthologisation, criticism, editing and even film and television adaptations.[40] Interestingly, even though Bassnett's suggestion to eradicate the terminology is not widely agreed upon by the scholars, her views on self-translation being a form of rewriting and reconstruction is extensively agreed upon. It would be impossible to conduct research on self-translation without finding evidence in excerpts of deliberate rewriting, or in regards to liberties a "non-self"-translator could not dare take. Then again some self-translators use this power to its full extent, whereas some remain surprisingly loyal to their original text.

---

[39] André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and Manipulation of Literary Fame* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), p. 1.

[40] Ibid, p.7.

Bassnett does not employ self-translation in the "original versus translation" axis. According to her, it is evident that "self-translation is far more fluid than other kinds of translation, and indeed raises doubts as to whether an original can be said to exist at all."[41] Interestingly, Julio-César Santoyo states that the authorial liberty of self-translation indeed makes the translated text a "second original" as it creates a play of mirrors, a dynamic bounce-back between the original and its image.[42]

Bassnett repeats her question in another article: "How useful is the term 'self-translation' in any case?"[43] She maintains that because all translations are forms of rewriting, "then whether that rewriting is done by the person who produced a first version of a text or by someone else is surely not important."[44] This particular statement by Bassnett is clearly not concerned with the realities of the publishing industry. It is indeed very important whether a text is translated by the authors themselves or external translators. Simply put, as we will see in Beckett and Şafak's respective chapters, most of the changes they make in self-translation would call for intervention from the editors, had these been ordinary translations. As I will explore in the coming section, Venuti emphasises that a self-translator's freedom is outside of the privileges of any ordinary translator.[45] What makes self-translation different than translation proper, if for nothing else, is this privilege that is the authorial licence. Bassnett actually

---

[41] Bassnett, p. 15.

[42] Julio-César Santoyo, 'On mirrors, dynamics and self-translation', in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), pp. 27-28.

[43] Susan Bassnett, "Rejoinder", *Orbis Litterarum*, 68.3 (2013), 282-89 (p. 287)

[44] Ibid.

[45] Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference* (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 12-13.

recognises this privilege, stating that it is because the authors “have the freedom to ignore the original and to take it on board as a draft, to be reshaped for a new readership.”[46] But does this freedom really allow them to *ignore* the original? If a particular self-translation is going as far as to ignore the original and recreate the *draft*, should it really be called “translation” at all, like Bassnett suggests, and should it be marketed as such? Is there a line to be drawn, and if so, where do we draw the line?

As self-translation theory is a relatively new field, the debates on terminology will surely continue on this fertile ground. As Santoyo notes, it is “perhaps because self-translations and their authors frequently operate at the limits of, and sometimes with no regard for, the theoretical presumptions and assumptions of the discipline we know as Translation Studies.”[47] What is certain is that, self-translation is neither a perfected sub-category within Translation Studies, nor it is a coincidental or anecdotal phenomenon. It should be considered from a wider perspective of comparative literature, encompassing an interdisciplinary point of view informed by fields such as cultural studies, history, sociology, neurolinguistics, psychology and possible others.

[46] Bassnett, “Rejoinder”, p. 287.

[47] Santoyo, ‘On mirrors, dynamics and self-translation’, p. 28.

1.2.1. “Wastes and Wilds” of Self-Translation

> I have not even begun the translation. I have until August to finish it and keep putting off the dreaded day… It seems funny to be making plans for a text which does not yet exist and which, when it does, will inevitably be a poor substitute for the original (the loss will be much greater than from the French to English Godot)… […] I have nothing but wastes and wilds of self-translation before me for many miserable months to come.[48]

Samuel Beckett described the anguish of self-translating *Endgame,* in a letter dated April 30, 1957 to his friend Alan Schneider. Beckett, time and time again, expressed how much he disliked translating his own works,[49] yet carried it out more systematically than any other self-translator. Beckett’s tortuous relationship with self-translation is of such infamy that Anthony Cordingley analysed Beckett’s position in accordance with Paul Mann’s study of the masochistic dimension of literary criticism, “masocriticism”.[50] Another self-translator, Vladimir Nabokov, describes self-translation as “sorting through one’s own innards” (qtd in Beaujour).[51] In fact, throughout various accounts of self-translators, we are yet to come across a depiction of a process without its drawbacks. Native reproduction (that is, self-translating a second language text into the author’s first language) especially seems to trigger tumultuous feelings. Yiğit Bener explains how he simply cannot let another translator translate his French text into Turkish, as he believes he has a certain style in Turkish that an

---

[48] Samuel Beckett and Alan Schneider, *No Author Better Served: The Correspondence of Samuel Beckett and Alan Schneider*, ed. by Maurice Harmon (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 14.

[49] See Knowlson, 1996, Cohn, 2001 and *The Letters of Samuel Beckett* editions.

[50] Anthony Cordingley, ‘The passion of self-translation: A masocritical perspective”, in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), pp. 81-94.

[51] Beaujour, p. 90.

external translator cannot employ, and even if they tried it would be nothing more than a replica and would not be fair to his Turkish readers. On the other hand, he states that it is easier to let an external translator join the process when he is self-translating from Turkish to French, as he does not believe he is yet to establish a distinctive style in French.[52]

In his book *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, Lawrence Venuti explores the bilingual author Milan Kundera's journey to self-translation:

> The Czech novelist Milan Kundera seems unique not only in scrutinizing and correcting the foreign language versions of his books, but in asserting his preferred translation practice in wittily pointed essays and prefaces. The most notorious case involves the different English versions of his novel The Joke (1967). The first in 1969 appalled Kundera because it edited, excised, and rearranged chapters; the second in 1982 was "unacceptable" because he judged it "not my text," a "translation-adaptation." […] Kundera's "definitive" English version of *The Joke* actually revises the 1967 Czech text: it omits more than fifty passages, making the novel more intelligible to the Anglo-American reader, removing references to Czech history but also altering characters (Stanger 1997). […] When the author is the translator, apparently, he is not above the domestications that he attacked in the previous English versions.[53]

Venuti's riveting account on Kundera's odyssey, from degrading his novel's translations to becoming a self-translator himself, provides insights on the dynamics of self-translation. When the author becomes their own translator, previous ideals along with certain inhibitions seem to blur. The freedom the self-translator has, thanks to copyright laws as Venuti points out, is incomparable to any other form of translation. It could be argued that this sense of ownership

---

[52] Evirgen, p. 195.

[53] Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation,* p. 13.

can override what was once hoped to be a straight-forward process in translating one's own work. Julien Green recalls how puzzled he was when he embarked on translating his own work to English; despite having a clear intention of using the same words, the book turned into something entirely different than he had envisaged.[54] It could be argued that, for this reason, self-translation is the riskiest, the most cumbersome kind of translation for the author-translator. The self-translator tries to maintain a balance between abiding by the (practically non-existent) boundaries and surrendering to re-inspiration. Thus, it is understandable why self-translators like Beckett kept going despite the arduousness of the process. To them, this sense of continued ownership and the new-found freedom in the translated textual space is potentially worth the trouble. Either way, it is evident that self-translation is not simply a logical task of replacing languages, it demands much more from the author; remnants of their artistic essence.

1.2.2. Self-Translation: History and Theory

Academic studies on singular self-translators have never been scarce, especially concerning the modern authors; Samuel Beckett and Vladimir Nabokov in particular. However, it was not until the mid-2000s that self-translation was seen from a theoretical perspective, rather than being deemed a rare act by a handful of authors. Julio-César Santoyo is the first to show that there had been other notable self-translators throughout history, however less popular. In his article, published in 2005, he traces the many self-translators

[54] Green, p. 174.

active throughout the last millennium while arguing that self-translation is becoming increasingly frequent and that it deserves more scholarly attention.[55] Furthermore, Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson's eminent study, *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (2007), is the first book that extensively covers the history of self-translation practices across the globe. They find that self-translation has been a steady feature in literature from Greco-Roman antiquity through to the European Middle Ages and the Renaissance; however, the practice was widely neglected by scholars until recently. They explain that a consolidation of the nation-states highlighted monolingual literary production, though literary bilingualism and self-translation resurfaced stronger in the postcolonial era. The authors' aim is not to establish a methodology and abstain from positing a new theory, but to propose an introduction to the field. Various cases of self-translators, from Medieval times to modern authors, are investigated and provide much useful knowledge. From the early 2010s on, an overarching call emerged to define and methodise self-translation amongst scholars of bilingual literature.

Simona Anselmi's seminal book *On Self-Translation,* published in 2012, aims to categorise the profiles of self-translators in relation to their motives. Anselmi strongly emphasises the importance of studying self-translations through the socio-cultural factors of the given production and reception period, while paying close attention to the self-translated text's position and function in the target literature.[56] Building on Chesterman's recent suggestion of "translator" studies and Baker's previous research on translators, she carries on

---

[55] Julio-César Santoyo, "Autotraducciones: una perspectiva histórica", *Meta,* 50, no. 3, (2005), pp. 858–67.

[56]Simona Anselmi, *On Self-Translation: An Exploration in Self-Translators' Teloi and Strategies* (Milan: LED Edizioni Universitaire, 2012), p. 8.

the term *telos,* “which denotes the personal and ultimate goal of a translator.”[57] Anselmi then identifies a telos for self-translators. She establishes that the authors self-translate for four main reasons: (1) Editorial reasons: Authors take charge because of disappointment or distrust in other translators. Anselmi includes Kundera, Brodsky and Nabokov as examples. (2) Poetic reasons: Authors who self-translate as a creative necessity, like Beckett. (3) Ideological reasons: Colonial and post-colonial self-translators, like Tagore, and bilingual authors from minor cultures, such as Gaelic or Catalan. (4) Economic or commercial reasons: Anselmi concludes that many self-translators could be prompted by mercantile gain, however the ones that stand out are the authors of lesser-known languages aiming to win international literary prizes. Anselmi also observes the methods and strategies used in self-translation: She finds that many self-translators use foreignisation or domestication techniques, however the techniques are neither necessarily consistent nor mutually exclusive.[58]

In his 2013 article “Beckett and Beyond: Putting Self-Translation into Perspective”*,* Rainier Grutman approaches Beckett as a stepping stone towards a self-translation theory, claiming that Beckett the self-translator as an individual case had received a lot of attention, whereas the field of self-translation itself remained understudied.[59] Grutman recalls that, when asked to write the entry of “Autotranslation” for the first volume of *Encyplopedia of Translation Studies* (Routledge) in 1999, he realised how little interest had been shown in the topic. He then found the lack of research on self-translation, especially in polyglot areas like comparative literature, troublesome. Grutman states that since then

---

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid, pp. 9-16.

[59] Rainier Grutman, ‘Beckett And Beyond’, *Orbis Litterarum*, 68.3 (2013), pp. 188-206.

the scholarship on bilingual authors has evolved, though a typology of self-translators and/or self-translations is still missing. Grutman argues that Beckett's bilingualism is quintessential, however it is "not unlike the proverbial tip of iceberg" and he adds: "Underwater […] dwell entire schools of self-translators who deserve to be studied in their own right and on their own terms."[60] He draws attention to Beckett's symmetrical journey between English and French and urges scholars of the field to look into other self-translators who write between languages of asymmetrical qualities, as the majority of the self-translators are of this origin, despite being overshadowed in academic literature by the likes of Beckett, Nabokov, Huston etc. Grutman categorises the self-translators of asymmetric languages as following: (1) "Writers belonging to long established linguistic minorities."[61] (2) "Colonial and postcolonial writers who alternate between their native tongue(s) and the European language of their (former) overlords."[62] (3) "Immigrant writers who expand on work originally begun in their native country while staking out new ground for themselves of the language of their adoptive country."[63] Grutman's typology is comparable to Anselmi's "ideological" self-translations since they both signal self-translations between asymmetrical languages and cultures, inherently harbouring elements of power dynamics.

The same year, *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture,* the first book with a collection of English articles dedicated to self-translation, is edited by Anthony Cordingley and published by Bloomsbury Academic. Grutman contributes to the book with his article "A sociological glance at self-

---

[60] Ibid, p. 203.

[61] Ibid, p. 201.

[62] Ibid, p. 202.

[63] Ibid.

translation and self-translators" where he further expands his typology of self-translators. He establishes the axis as "exogenous versus endogenous" and "symmetrical versus asymmetrical". In Grutman's understanding, exogenous self-translators describe the individual bilingual, whose bilingualism did not originate from their original speech community, instead triggered by migration or other factors. Endogenous self-translators, on the other hand, come from diglossic communities from where their bilingualism originated.[64] Throughout his article, Grutman echoes what he states in his aforementioned article "Beckett and Beyond", arguing that self-translators of symmetrical linguistic configuration such as Beckett are much rarer than asymmetrical self-translators, and that these variables should be further studied in correlation.

Sara Kippur, in *Writing It Twice: Self-Translation and the Making of a World Literature in French* (2015), studies four self-translators who write in French and either English or Spanish. She explores French literature in self-translation through the cases of Nancy Huston, Raymond Federman, Jorge Semprun and Hector Bianciotti. Although such studies focused on individual self-translators are not necessarily scarce, Kippur's take on different cases of self-translators of French in reference to "*littérature-monde en français"* is noteworthy. Moreover, Kippur dwells on the rhetorics of self-translation rather critically. She contests the scholars who question the "why", who analyse the reason behind self-translator's practice. She states:

> It is indeed curious that self-translation studies would place such emphasis on authorial intention given how notoriously skeptical literary critics have been of biographical readings. We do not tend to ask why a certain novel or poem exists, but what it represents, achieves, or signifies as an object whose existence has already

[64] Rainier Grutman, "A sociological glance at self-translation and self-translators", in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013) pp. 64-68.

> been implicitly accepted. If we similarly reframe questions about self-translation, emphasizing effect over cause, or expression over rationale, we can expand the ways we understand self-translation as a multifaceted literary phenomenon.[65]

Kippur's statement is problematic for two reasons: First, the implied assumption of a unified image of a self-translation is simply not conclusive. As shown previously by scholars like Anselmi and Grutman, not all self-translators stand on the same neutral ground of symmetrical binaries, which would naturally be influenced from a certain "why". Furthermore, even within a symmetrical universe of self-translation as found in the cases of authors Kippur studied, certain particulars like migration or exile would entail questioning in order to have a full understanding of not just the "reason behind", but also the impact of self-translation. Kippur continually criticises Pascale Casanova's treatment of Beckett's self-translations in her earlier book *The World Republic of Letters,* as Casanova explores the potential reasons that turned Beckett towards self-translation. Kippur then echoes what critics such as Grutman said, pointing out the lack of research between minor and major languages, which falls outside the scope of her research.

Although I am equally critical of Casanova's assumption that bilingual writing and/or self-translation can only be explained with the unequal structures of the literary world[66], there still is value in questioning the driving force behind a particular self-translation practice, without already having a prescribed answer to the question at hand. Casanova's much debated, nonetheless thought-provoking book depicts a world republic of letters with its own economy,

---

[65] Sara Kippur, *Writing It Twice: Self-Translation and the Making of a World Literature in French* (Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 2015), p. 18.

[66] Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. By M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2004), p. 281.

hierarchy and history, where a piece of literary work is tied to a “literary capital”. As per Casanova’a understanding, this world republic of letters is ruled from the centre (historically Paris) and the authors from the periphery can only gain literary recognition by *littérisation*, which she describes as “any operation — translation, self-translation, transcription, direct composition in the dominant language”.[67] Casanova is of course critical of the inner workings of this system, but she argues that this has been the case historically. For my research purposes, I find immense value in discussing self-translation not only in a literary universe but also in assessing the current real-life challenges of the actual world as we know it —the economic, cultural and political power dynamics. Fortunately, the research on self-translation is now turning more towards the authors on the “periphery”.

In 2017 Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer and Svetlana Page took the sociological perspective further, editing an anthology of articles devoted to cultural power dynamics surrounding self-translation, titled *Self-Translation and Power: Negotiating Identities in European Multilingual Contexts.* Castro, Mainer and Page argue that the European continent offers “a prolific intercultural and intra-cultural context to examine the power relations in regards to the political, social, cultural and economic implications of self-translation.”[68] The works that Castro and others introduce consist of various parameters of minor-major language pairings in the European self-translation context, ranging from case studies of self-translators in bilingual communities to self-censorship. *Self-Translation and Power* is notable in challenging the outdated idea of a merely poetic discourse surrounding self-translation; instead, it focuses on bilingual

[67] Ibid, p. 136.

[68] Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer and Svetlana Page, *Self Translation and Power* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p. 6.

writers who operate under unbalanced linguistic and cultural power dynamics, who in fact make up an overwhelming portion of self-translators. Grutman denotes patterns in the self-translation of Dutch texts in Belgium, Lagarde reviews the case of contemporary Occitan literature in France; Ozdemir analyses Halide Edib's self-translation of *The Turkish Ordeal*, Akbatur analyses the identity politics in Şafak's *The Bastard of Istanbul;* Hulme studies Atxaga's *Obabakoak,* Rickenbach exemplifies Swiss-German literature and so on. This collection of articles is promising in the way it helps steer the wheel towards an understanding of cultural factors at play in the practice of self-translation, all the while contributing to the understudied cases of self-translations from minor languages.

As of early 2020s, the scholarly interest in self-translation is growing steadily; evidenced by many articles, books and dissertations on the topic. In a great effort to comply an ever-growing corpus on self-translation, Eva Gentes edits a bibliography on the topic (https://self-translation.blogspot.com/), which she regularly updates.

As discussed throughout this chapter, both bilingualism in literature and self-translation are developing fields of study. Existing research on individual bilingual authors, alongside comparative approaches, is helping to formulate a self-translation theory which is still in its infancy. The present study acknowledges the theoretical groundwork built by the aforementioned literature and aims to contribute further.

1.3. Additional Theories

1.3.1. Translator's Invisibility

Lawrence Venuti defines the term in his book *Translator's Invisibility*, first published in 1995, as an undesirable consequence of what has been deemed acceptable within the publishing industry, that is a book that reads fluently and "the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the "original.""[69] Venuti emphasises early on his book that "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator"[70] and his motive in writing his book is "to make the translator more visible so as to resist and change the conditions under which translation is theorized, studied, and practiced today, especially in English-speaking countries."[71]

Venuti draws upon Schleiermacher's 1813 lecture, where he argued two different manners in translation: the translator leaving either the author in peace or the reader. Venuti explains this as the following:

> Schleiermacher allowed the translator to choose between a domesticating practice, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing practice, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.[72]

---

[69] Lawrence Venuti, *Translator's Invisibility: a history of translation,* 2nd edn (New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 1.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid, p. 13.

[72] Ibid, p. 15.

Venuti favours foreignisation over domestication as a translation method. He argues that, in search of a fluent text, the longstanding preference of domestication in the British and American publishing industries compromised the authentic realities and differences of the source text, resulting in “a form of ethnocentric violence”. He deems foreignisation a necessity in order to rebalance the literary industry. In fact, he argues that foreignisation “can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism.”[73]

My interest in Venuti’s arguments lies in the applicability, or the lack thereof, of this (in)visibility to the self-translator. Throughout this research, I will at times refer to domestication and foreignisation in Venuti’s understanding while examining my textual examples.

1.3.2. Self-Orientalism

Before delving into self-orientalism in literature, one must attend to the origin of the term “orientalism”. Edward Said was the first person to use the term as we know it today in his seminal book *Orientalism,* first published in 1978. Said takes the term from “Orientalists" whom he describes as western scholars working on the “Orientals”, by which he meant mainly people of the Middle East, but also of Asia and North Africa. Said explains that, upon studying these pieces, he came to find an inherently political pattern of Eurocentric views; inaccurate and degrading depictions of the “East”, which, one way or another,

[73] Ibid, p. 16.

contributed to a stereotypical image of the Orientals. Thus, according to Said, “Orientalism” stopped being solely a neutral field of research or interest, but became a culturally and politically charged Western thought of domination, founded on clichés and power imbalances. I shall quote Edward Said directly:

> […] Orientalism imposed limits upon thought about the Orient. Even the most imaginative writers of an age, men like Flaubert, Nerval, or Scott, were constrained in what they could either experience or say about the Orient. For Orientalism was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, “us”) and the strange (the Orient, the East, “them”). This vision in a sense created and then served the two worlds thus conceived. Orientals lived in their world, “we” lived in ours. The vision and material reality propped each other up, kept each other going. A certain freedom of intercourse was always the Westerner’s privilege; because his was the stronger culture, he could penetrate, he could wrestle with, he could give shape and meaning to the great Asiatic mystery, as Disraeli once called it.[74]

According to Said, such prevalent thoughts gave way to the conception of orientalism, to an imaginary division between East and West; and before long, a certain discourse (backwardness, despotism, sensuality etc.) around the Orient was established. In short, Orientalism is a culmunitation of the views of non-Orientals on the Orient; and Said argues that, historically, their conclusions have usually been negative, condescending and inaccurate. Said traces orientalism through the centuries, explaining its politics and economics, as well as its use as a cultural apparatus.

Chinese history scholar Arif Dirlik is the first to define what he calls “self-orientalization” in 1996. Dirlik argues that orientalism as a terminology has been the subject matter of Europeans, and he suggest that “the usage needs to be

[74] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism,* rev. edn (London: Penguin, 2003), pp. 43-44.

extended to Asian views of Asia, to account for tendencies to self-orientalization which would become an integral part of the history of orientalism."[75] Dirlik's understanding of self-orientalisation is complex. He states:

> To the extent that orientalism had become a part of "Western" ideas by the early nineteenth century, the "Western" impact included also the impact on Asian societies of European ideas of the orient. How Euro-American images of Asia may have been incorporated into the self-images of Asians in the process may in the end be inseparable from the impact of "Western" ideas per se. One fundamental consequence of recognizing this possibility is to call into question the notion of Asian "traditions" which may turn out, upon closer examination, to be "invented traditions," the products rather than the preconditions of contact between Asians and Europeans, that may owe more to orientalist perceptions of Asia than the self-perceptions of Asians at the point of contact.[76]

I must stress that Dirlik's depiction of such phenomenon is far more detailed to what I will refer to as "self-orientalism" in my research. My understanding of self-orientalism (perhaps simplified) is based on Said's depiction of orientalism, only by Orientals themselves, thus reinforcing and complying with the Eurocentric views and the Western stereotypes of the Orient. However, I will argue that, even though the usual suspects of Orientalism are still visible today, contemporary Orientalist stereotypes and inaccuracies might differ from that of Said's era. Said published his last revised edition of *Orientalism* in 2003, the same year before he passed away. He made efforts to keep *Orientalism* somewhat up to date; perceiving and responding to criticism, negotiating misunderstandings and offering clarifications in afterwords or prefaces. In his preface to the final 2003 edition, he mentions the dynamics

---

[75] Arif Dirlik, 'Chinese History and the Question of Orientalism', *History and Theory,* 35.4 (1996), 96-118 (p. 104).

[76] Ibid.

of ‘Islam vs. the West’, in the wake of 9/11 and its aftermath. Of course, in the last two decades since Said’s passing, a lot had changed in the world, and Orientalism has not been immune to the effects of these political and cultural changes; good or bad.

The ‘imaginative geography’ of Orientalism, in Said’s words, amongst the Orientalist scholars had already caused a bizarre creation of a field: From Islam to China, Southasia to Egypt, Arabs to Japanese, etc, all these could easily fit under the umbrella of Orientalism, which had little to do with each other, apart from being “the Other” to "the West.” As Said emphasises for one last time in his preface, “neither the term Orient nor the concept of the West has any ontological stability; each is made up of human effort, partly affirmation, partly identification of the Other.”[77]

Finally, Said addresses the people who by some chance live the multicultural life as an Oriental in the West: “I have long felt that a special intellectual and moral responsibility attaches to what we do as scholars and intellectuals. Certainly I think it is incumbent upon us to complicate and/or dismantle the reductive formulae […] Our role is to widen the field of discussion, not to set limits in accord with the prevailing authority.”[78] In a way, Said is warning against self-orientalism.

Lisa Lau introduces the term “Re-Orientalism” in 2009 to define the kind of Orientalism reinforced by Orientals, namely diasporic ones. Upon studying diasporic South Asian women writers and their home counterparts, she finds an alarming pattern of Re-Orientalism in the English language books published by diasporic authors. Lau states:

---

[77] Said, p. xii.

[78] Ibid, pp. xvii-xviii.

> The reins of dominant representation may have shifted hands from the foreign, male subject to the diasporic, semi-Oriental female, but the Orient continues to be orientalised. It is exactly as Said explained that "Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority . . . in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand" (Said 1978: 7) Re-Orientalism observes that while this 'him' can be taken on by different parties, the relationship of unequal power relations has not changed.[79]

Lau explains that the visibility and accessibility the diasporic South Asian writers have over those writing from within South Asia creates this position of power over the latter. She argues that she had observed patterns of Re-Orientalism such as "the necessity of being recognisably South Asian"[80], generalisations and totalisations, and truth claims that blur the boundaries between fiction and autobiography. "The constant rehashing of a handful of stereotypes which supposedly accord with the expected representation of Indians," Lau writes, "is part of the damaging workings of Re-Orientalism".[81]

The most famous case of self-orientalism in literature is that of Rabindranath Tagore. The Indian poet, best known for his work *Gitanjali*, was awarded Nobel Prize in literature in 1913, after self-translating his works into English. Perhaps a cautionary tale for self-translators, Tagore's rise and fall in the West is well documented in scholarly publications. In "Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds", Mahasweta Sengupta explains the dynamics brought over by Tagore's self-translation practice. Sengupta argues that Tagore intentionally changed the style, the imagery and the lyricism in his English versions, trying to adapt to Edwardian

---

[79] Lisa Lau, 'Re-Orientalism: The Perpetration and Development of Orientalism by Orientals', *Modern Asian Studies,* 43.2 (2009), 571-90 (pp. 573-74)

[80] Ibid, p. 582.

[81] Ibid, p. 583.

English poetics, which at first brought success.[82] However, Sengupta explains that this appreciation in the West was not due to Tagore's artistic abilities — which was indisputable in his Bengali writings — but because of his "wisdom". Even though Sengupta does not use a term such as "self-orientalism", what follows is a prime example:

> Gitanjali fell so easily into the Western stereotype of Eastern mysticism that other aspects of the work were completely ignored.
> Tagore's reputation and immense popularity in the West in the first three decades of this century were not based on an intellectual appreciation of his works but on the emotional association of the East as an enigma, where saints and prophets brought deliverance to ordinary people. In other words, Tagore was supplying another basis for the already existing superstructure of orientalism; he became a representative of the alluring 'Other' to the Western world.[83]

Tagore's case is not only an example of self-orientalism, but also self-orientalism in self-translation, meaning that Tagore's original work did not have such tendencies, but the self-translation fell a pray to orientalism. Theferore, unlike Lau's examples of diasporic writers, Tagore was authentic in the original language, but complied with the Western gaze in translation.

The reason why I have chosen self-orientalism as a complementary theory to be referred to in my research must be clear by now. Not for Beckett, for he remained under the Western literary tradition throughout his writings, but for Şafak, who went back and forth between Turkish and English. Her Turkish

---

[82] Mahasweta Sengupta, 'Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds' in *Translation, History and Culture*, ed. by Susan Bassnet and André Lefevere (London: Pinter, 1990), pp. 56-63.

[83] Ibid, p. 62.

identity positioned her in the “imaginary East” against her English “Western” writings.

Turkey’s position on the world map is a strange one. East to the West and West of the East at once. Situated in both Europe and Asia, yet referred as part of the Middle East by some, Turkey’s unique geopolitical position can shift depending on the perception and on the contemporary imaginative geographies. Turkey being a predominantly Muslim country, as well as the country’s Ottoman legacy and the current political climate, certainly push Turkey more towards the East side of the world. For Şafak, coming from such background and then writing in English, moving abroad and self-translating, there is a sense of an East-West reckoning in her works, however not consistent. As it will be explained in detail in Chapter 3, Şafak at times employs self-orientalism in her translations, latent or manifest, knowingly or inadvertently.

1.4. Methodology of the Study

The main materials for my research are two textual pairs from each author, eight texts in total. In doing so, I have aimed to investigate both authors’ self-translation practices across two different directions. First, from the native language original to its second language translation, and then the second language original to its native reproduction. For Samuel Beckett, these are *Company* and *Compagnie,* and *Premier Amour* and *First Love.* For Şafak, *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace*, and *Honour* and *İskender* have been chosen.

The methodology used is textual analysis informed by close readings of both the original and the self-translation concurrently, going back and forth. This is in line with Marilyn Gaddis Rose's depiction of "stereoscopic reading" which would in turn allow us to study the "interliminal space of translation for literary criticism".[84] Rose suggests all texts should be read with their translation(s) to enhance the reading experience: This practice would let the reader "get inside literature"[85] and provide them with new internal mental spaces such as the affective and semantic space between the two (or more) texts.[86] My case studies being self-translations naturally required such reading, followed by side-by-side comparisons of the source text (original) and the target text (translation). I have scrutinised both texts, noting the modifications, additions and deletions between the textual pairs. This allowed me to observe, in Gideon Toury's understanding "the operational norms": The decisions made during the translation process which affect the target text's matrix, meaning "the way linguistic material is distributed in it – as well as its textual make-up and verbal formulation."[87] Omissions, additions and the segmentation of the target text guided me through the "matricial norms"[88] of the (self)-translation at hand, proved to be particularly useful in Şafak's case (as her texts are longer and more prone to discrepancies). Nevertheless, several patterns in self-translation become evident in both Beckett and Şafak's respective practices, such as changes in style, discrepancies in time and space, modifications or omissions in a sociocultural context, shifts in the narrator's and/or character's perspectives,

---

[84] Marilyn Gaddis Rose, *Translation and Literary Criticism* (Manchester: St Jerome, 1997), p.90.

[85] Ibid, p. 53.

[86] Ibid, 55.

[87] Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies - and beyond,* rev edn (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012), p. 82.

[88] Ibid, p. 82-83.

as well as their names, etc. These findings paved the way for my categorisation on how to read a self-translation critically. I have not just focused on what was omitted, added or modified, but on the *consequences* of such interventions and the *pattern* they created in self-translation. In order to study Beckett's and Şafak's chosen texts systematically and equally, I have come up with four main categories to understand the effects of self-translation on the author's style, the fictive universe and the readers' perspective. These categories have been informed by studying the overarching patterns within the fictive universe across my eight core texts. These are: (1) Style, flow and wording (2) Setting, time and image (3) Sociocultural notions and references. (4) Names, characters and narrators. My aim with this categorisation is to gather, emphasise and culminate my textual examples in regards to their agency in self-translation. I found that these four categories are where the self-translation's impact is felt the most. To adapt Berman's terms, I consider these categories as the likely *zones textuelles problématiques* (containing a defect, a disharmony, a loss of substance or style etc.) in self-translation; but also as the *zones textuelles miraculeuses* (where the translation rewrites itself with unexpected gain). [89]

Each textual pair is then analysed and discussed under these subheadings with numerous carefully chosen examples, as well as consulting and comparing to relevant previous research. In Beckett's case, I have included nearly all the excerpts, except for those containing minor variations on sentence level. The abundance of examples I had for Şafak had to be slightly reduced in number due to logistics, i.e. after five examples of discrepancy concerning the same type of style change, I have left the sixth example out.

---

[89] Antoine Berman, *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1995), p. 66.
Berman uses these terms to explain textual zones one can observe in translation, I am using the terms for self-translation purposes.

I also consult Venuti's theories on domestication and foreignisation where appropriate, as well as interrogating cultural critiques such as orientalism. This approach allows pinpointing specific discrepancies that skew the fictive universe, as well as the perceptions of the reader in the translation's receiving culture. In doing so I aim to understand the inner-workings of bilingualism and to assess the interdependence between the two texts. Where necessary, I will also consult biographical information related to the authors' bicultural backgrounds which might allow us to consider particular modifications from an informed viewpoint. This approach has been helpful not only in understanding a specific textual pair's dynamic, but also in evaluating Beckett and Şafak as self-translators in general.

Chapter 2: Samuel Beckett

2.1. Beckett's Life and Works

Irish novelist and playwright Samuel Beckett was born in Foxrock, near Dublin, in 1906, to Maria (May) Roe and William (Bill) Beckett. He spent his childhood and teenage years in and around Dublin. Those years in the city, along with his difficult relationship with his mother May, are known to have had a major influence on Beckett's writing. Both his parents came from Protestant families and together they formed a middle-class Anglo-Irish family. Samuel Beckett grew up in his family house named Cooldrinagh. At the age of five Samuel Beckett attended Elsner's school near Foxrock, where he started learning French. Following his initial contact with French at the kindergarten, Beckett was able carry on discovering French at his new school Earlscroft House, thanks to the headmaster who "spoke excellent French and helped Beckett keep up the French that he had started to learn with Miss Elsner."[1] Beckett kept on taking courses in French at his subsequent school Portora Royal, in addition to compulsory Latin.[2] Therefore, by the time Beckett started studying French and Italian at Trinity College, as well as taking more courses in Latin, he already had considerable contact with the French language.[3] Thus, Beckett was already a fluent coordinate bilingual before he moved to France.

Beckett's first residency in France took place between 1928 and 1930, while teaching at École Normale Supérieure. "Paris itself was a revelation to

[1] Knowlson, p. 31.

[2] Ibid, p. 41.

[3] Ibid, p. 54.

Beckett"[4], writes James Knowlson in his authorised biography. Here, he felt liberated from his homeland's oppressive atmosphere and discovered an almost new way of living. He met many important figures there, such as Alfred Péron who would later become a collaborator on *Murphy*'s translation as well as help Beckett translate James Joyce's work. After an eventful two-year stay in Paris, Beckett returned home to Ireland in 1930 to take up a lecturer position at Trinity College. His relationship with his mother worsened during this time, as "his mother's excessive fussing annoyed him"[5]. He kept on visiting Paris during his years in Ireland and remained in contact with his friends and acquaintances there, as well as meeting many more.

After his father's death, Beckett entered a period of intense suffering, for which he sought help from his doctor.[6] Following the doctor's suggestion of psychotherapy, he travelled to London to seek treatment, as psychoanalysis was not legal in Dublin at the time.[7] Thus started his two year stay in London, until 1935. There, his short story collection *More Pricks and Kicks* was published in 1934. The traces of Beckett's time in London reflected itself in his English novel *Murphy*, whose Irish-born protagonist navigates a life in London. Later Beckett returned to Cooldrinagh again, where his mother was waiting for him. However, before long he felt "simply the growing certainty that he must get away again"[8] and embarked on a journey to Germany in late 1936.

He finally moved back to France in 1937 for good. At that time, despite moving to Paris, he was still trying and struggling to get *Murphy* published.[9]

---

[4] Ibid, p. 106.

[5] Ibid, p. 120.

[6] Ibid, pp. 171-172.

[7] Ibid, p. 173.

[8] Ibid, p. 227.

[9] Ibid, p. 291.

Soon he started writing poetry in French, though he still kept English as his preferred language for fiction until after the war, however frustrated he was growing with both the Anglophone publishing scene and the act of writing in English itself. He had close ties within the community, and a genuine sense of belonging was blossoming despite the darkness of war time.

Beckett was forced to move around France during the war for safety reasons, between 1940 and 1945. He travelled from Vichy to Arcachon and back to Paris, where he volunteered to work as a liaison officer for the Resistance movement. In the meantime, he was writing *Watt* in English under extremely difficult circumstances. His longest stay during the period of invasion was in the small village of Roussillon, from 1942 to 1945, until he was finally able to go back to his beloved Paris.[10]

After the war, Beckett entered the era later dubbed the “frenzy of writing”. As it will be explained in detail in the following sections, Beckett produced many of his greatest works during these years. During his lifetime, Beckett was awarded many accolades, one of which was the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1969 — he did not turn down the award but donated the prize money and did not attend the award ceremony.

Beckett died in 1989, in Paris.

[10] Ibid, p. 340.

2.2. Bilingual Beckett and His Critics

In the last sixty years, Bilingual Beckett criticism has come a long way. What started out as a study of a bilingual playwright, later evolved into a sub-field of its own, raising crucial questions along the way. Beckett's works have been analysed linguistically, he has been studied as an author, as a translator and both; the data that has been extracted from his biography, letters and manuscripts studied alongside his works. In this section, I will review the body of Bilingual Beckett criticism from the 1960s to its current state.

"To write on Beckett after all this implies rashness, obstinacy, even naivety" writes Leslie Hill in the preface to his book *Beckett's Fiction: In Different Words* (1990). After briefly summarising the different contexts and parameters within Beckett criticism in the last twenty years, he asks: "What remains to be said?"[11] It is certainly a valid, if not a necessary question to ask for everyone undertaking research on any author as canonical as Beckett. In this case, it is more or less a rhetorical question since the author himself continues on, explaining his dissatisfaction with the existing Beckett criticism by stating that "the critical response to the task of interpreting Beckett's work has been, to a large degree, bland and unconvincing."[12] It should be noted that Hill does not solely focus on the bilingualism of Beckett, but on multiple notions within his writing, thus does not only refer to critics of Bilingual Beckett with his comments.

For the purpose of this research, I will focus on the existing criticism about Beckett's bilingual writing, and it is not surprising to see a broad range of parameters used by critics to analyse Beckett's bilingualism. Beckett's choice of

---

[11] Leslie Hill, *Beckett's Fiction In Different Words* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. ix.

[12] Ibid, p.x

language(s) has been assessed according to multiple variants: from his relationship with his mother to his Irish roots, from his literary aspirations to his country of residence, and even his psychology or mood. The case of Beckett's bilingualism has been the research object of many literary fields: English, Anglo-Irish and French literatures, naturally comparative literature and translation studies, and even neurolinguistics. Beckett scholar Ruby Cohn was the first to study Beckett as a self-translator. In her 1961 article named "Samuel Beckett Self-Translator", Cohn looked into then available self-translations of Beckett, focusing mainly on *Murphy* and *Waiting for Godot*, alongside the trilogy. She later published a slightly expanded version of this article as a chapter in her book *Samuel Beckett: The Comic Gamut* in 1962. Later on, in another one of her books, *Back to Beckett* (1973), Cohn did acknowledge Beckett's bilingualism and self-translations while studying Beckett from a broader perspective, however none of these publications were extensive enough to be read as a guide to Bilingual Beckett.

The end of 1980s saw a heightened interest in Beckett's bilingualism, both as collective and singular publications. While there is no definitive evidence to account for this second wave of interest in Bilingual Beckett, it is possible that the delayed influence of post-structuralism in Anglosaxon literary criticism, as well as developments in bilingual studies, or simply the emergence of bilingual critics, could have been in part responsible for the renewed interest. In 1987, an edited book titled *Beckett Translating / Translating Beckett,* was published. The book consisted of multiple critical essays on Beckett and translation by various scholars, such as Ruby Cohn, Brian Fitch, Lori Chamberlain and others. One author, Raymond Federman, a bilingual writer himself and a personal friend of Beckett, stated that "an urgent need exists for a

solid, thorough, definitive study of Beckett's bilingualism and his activity as a self-translator."[13]

The same year, Ann Beer's doctoral thesis, titled "The Use of Two Languages in Samuel Beckett's Art", and only a year later, in 1988, Brian T. Fitch's book *Beckett and Babel* came as the first in-depth studies to the field. Beer's thesis looks into Beckett's bilingualism throughout his writing career and the creation of his bilingual art, focusing mainly on Beckett's prose. Fitch's work, on the other hand, is very much focused on textual variants between the "original" and the "translation" of various pairs, as well as addressing "problematics" of Beckett's self-translation practice. Like all their contemporaries, both Beer and Fitch point out the absence of a significant study on Beckett's bilingualism. While acknowledging the contributions, Beer claims that almost all of the existing research had only been focusing on textual analysis and "they seem to remain at a distance from the full imaginative implications of Beckett's bilingualism".[14]

On the other hand, Fitch directs his criticism to a larger crowd of Beckett scholars, mainly on account of ignoring Beckett's bilingual existence while focusing on monolingual works, thus betraying the work and deceiving the reader. He states that most of the research in the field had been suited to the critic's own native language, meaning that Anglophone scholars were mainly studying the English versions and Francophone critics were most interested in the French texts, whilst the reader had not been properly informed about Beckett's bilingual case. Fitch argues that "whatever the critical approach and

---

[13] Raymond Federman, 'The Writer as Self-Translator', in *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*, ed. by Alan Warren Friedman, Charles Rossman and Dina Sherzer (Pennsylvania : Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987), pp. 7-16 (p. 7).

[14] Ann Beer, *The Use of Two Languages in Samuel Beckett's Art*, (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: University of Oxford, 1987), p.iv.

procedures that are adopted for the analysis of a particular unilingual work, these cannot in themselves prove adequate for the analysis of Beckett's work."[15] This is not a surprising remark, since Fitch himself believes that once a bilingual version of the text is produced by the author, the first text is incomplete without it, therefore it would be misleading to solely focus on the English or the French versions of a given text because they are interdependent. He states:

> […] One thing has emerged from the preceding chapters as being beyond dispute, and its importance can hardly be over-emphasized. That is the need for *both* versions, *both* texts, of his works to be studied for their own sake. To take only one version of the work is to make a wholly arbitrary decision, for on what possible grounds would one take one rather than the other? To take the first is to fail to recognize that it was followed by another version; and to take the second id to fail to recognize that another version proceeded it. In other words, *both versions are, in themselves, incomplete.* [16]

Fitch also uses the term he coined "intra-intertextuality" to look into Beckettian corpus, explained as "the multiple relationship between texts by the same author rather than that which obtains between a given text and texts by other writers (or intertextuality)."[17] Fitch maintains that his stance in Beckett studies is to study it from this intra-intertextual point of view, and he urges critics to do the same for an accurate and balanced analysis. While studying *Bing* and *Ping,* he claims that the appropriate way to look at Beckett's works is to *"*attribute equal status to both versions, neither confusing the chronological precedence nor confusing the status of the last of a series of versions which characterizes the second version with that of the final, definitive, and hence

---

[15] Brian T. Fitch, *Beckett and Babel* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), p. 26

[16] Ibid, p. 227

[17] Ibid, p.23

authoritative text."[18] Throughout his book, he stresses the importance of the bilingual study on Beckett's works:

> Whatever the truth of matter, if the two original texts are too similar to be considered separate works and yet too different for each to be substitutable for the other, they *have* to be brought together in some way so that they can form a unified and coherent aesthetic experience for their reader and for the critic. This much is certain -and imperative. [19]

Certainly, any Bilingual Beckett critic would agree with the importance of acknowledging both English and French versions of a given text, however Fitch is notable in the way that he does not solely point out the differences between both versions to analyse in a traditional original-translation dynamic but uses the differences to show that Beckett's case is particular in its translational mode, since there is no "one" original text to work with. Not everyone agrees with Fitch's reasoning. In his article "Two Darks: A Solution to the Problem of Beckett's Bilingualism" (1994), Lance St. John Butler states that he would agree with Fitch's conclusion of considering two texts different but not for the reasons Fitch had proposed. He states that the differences between two texts are not because of "Beckett's wilful tampering with his first text when he comes to write his second but by the radically untranslatable nature of all text."[20] Butler uses Fitch's examples to show that the difference between the English and the French texts is not caused by the "Beckettian license" but it is "merely thoughtful translating."[21] He states that it is only natural that sometimes a locution that

---

[18] Ibid, p.133

[19] Ibid, p. 229

[20] Lance St. John Butler, 'Two Darks: A Solution to the Problem of Beckett's Bilingualism', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 3, (1994), 111-135 (p. 124).

[21] Ibid, p.125.

works in French cannot work in English, or vice versa, rejecting the idea of authorial intention or extreme modification.

On the other hand, a considerable number of critics believe that it is certainly personal, and Beckett's modes in languages alter in accordance with his own experiences and emotions. The issue of "mother-tongue" raises an important subject. Leslie Hill argues that Beckett is anonymous in French and the lack of familial intimacy of his mother-tongue provides him with a new position within language, thus "Beckett is rewritten into a language to which he is no longer bound by filial obedience."[22] Linda Collinge agrees, in her book *Beckett traduit Beckett* (2000), stating that Beckett's transition from *Malone Meurt* to *Malone Dies* signifies "returning to the maternal matrix of his native language, [Beckett] becomes more derisive and mocking because English is the locus of old wounds and parental authority."[23]

Butler is confident in his statement that the changes that arise between Beckett's textual pairs are due to external factors. He states:

> Where he appears to make a change or to develop a thought or simply to omit or add gratuitously, it is most likely that he is responding not to an internal imperative to revise earlier work but to the external imperatives of language, culture and self-consistency.[24]

Butler refuses the *reviser* within Beckett, which is very much visible across Beckett's bilingual writings, as pointed out by many Bilingual Beckett scholars mentioned in this chapter. Certainly, Beckett's self-translations are not

---

[22] Hill, p. 38.

[23] Linda Collinge, *Beckett traduit Beckett* (Paris: Libr. Droz, 2000), pp. 70-76.

[24] Butler, p.14.

immune to the "external imperatives" which Butler suggests, but Beckett's authorial licence and his freedom (and also the burden) to be able to revise, is at the heart of any self-translator's practice. As I have discussed in detail in Chapter 1, self-translators are prone to revise and rewrite, therefore the influence of Beckett's internal impetus cannot be disregarded. Pascale Sardin-Damestoy's detailed study on Beckett's bilingualism, *Samuel Beckett autotraducteur ou l'art de l'empêchement* (2002) documents the various factors that affected Beckett's choices in self-translation; from aesthetics to psychology. Sardin-Damestoy states:

> La traduction de soi, passage obligé de l'écriture beckettienne, principe évolutif de l'œuvre, est une activité littéraire qui échappe aux catégories traditionnelles de l'analyse littéraire et traductologique. Apparentée à la traduction, mais souvent incompatible avec elle, comparable à une révision, mais différente de cette dernière, l'auto-traduction ne se laisse pas aisément circonscrire. Hybride, monstrueuse, rhizomatique, cette discipline transtextuelle l'est à plus d'un titre, elle qui évolue au rythme de va-et-vient, retours en arrière, mouvements avortés et autres « soubresauts » qui nient toute progression de nature platonicienne.[25]

Sardin-Damestoy's depiction above shows perhaps how "painfully lively" the act of self-translation is, which is miles away from Butler's almost mechanical view of the same. The "self" in self-translator inevitably communicates with the "translator": sometimes as soft as a whisper, at times louder, or perhaps, just by keeping silent. Sinéad Mooney, in her monograph *A Tongue Not Mine: Beckett and Translation* (2011) emphasises just how vital Beckett's self-translation practice is in his work in general. She states that

[25] Pascale Sardin-Damestoy, *Samuel Beckett autotraducteur ou l'art de l'empêchement* (Artois: Artois Presses Universitaire, 2002), pp. 21-51 (Para 61).

translation “is not simply external to the intimate processes of Beckett’s work; rather, it comes to generate some of the most characteristic effects of an oeuvre traversed with alien voices, splittings, hauntings, and simulacra.”[26] It is this communication between “the self” and “the translator” that allows us to elaborate on the dynamics of a textual pair, to even have the *audacity* to question the status and definition of an “original.”

In his book *Beckett, Literature and Ethics of Alterity* (2006) Shane Weller establishes that Beckett’s self-translations are not ordinary secondaries but neither are they originals. Weller states that Beckett’s self-translation practice is “a murderous dispatching of the original, out of which would emerge another original, in another language, freed from any dependence upon the work from which it none the less derives.”[27] Weller focuses on the ethics of alterity in Beckett’s self-translations and states that whether it is in the form of an impoverishment or enrichment of the second text, they both would be forms of negation. He states that many critics solely focus on the impoverishment of the texts, disregarding the “value that is repeatedly placed on such impoverishment of his works.”[28] He criticises Beckett scholars and particularly Brian Fitch about pointing out losses where, according to Weller, there were none.

An often overlooked area in Bilingual Beckett criticism is the status of Beckett’s languages and their relation to each other. As mentioned before in Chapter 1, Rainier Grutman makes a highly interesting point of the “symmetrical” quality of Beckett’s self translations. By mentioning the symmetrical quality, Grutman actually refers to the fact that Beckett was writing

---

[26] Sinéad Mooney, *A Tongue Not Mine: Beckett and Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 7.

[27] Shane Weller, *Beckett, Literature, And The Ethics Of Alterity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). p. 76.

[28] Ibid, p. 67.

intentionally in the world's two most established, deterritorialised languages, English and French. He states that by writing in these two languages Beckett had the chance to "create the illusion of symmetry in ways that are simply not available to the scores of bilingual writers whose repertoire includes a language of lesser diffusion and/or with less symbolic capital."[29] Grutman's statement is significant, for most of the Bilingual Beckett critics fail to pay attention to this quality in Beckett's self-translations. Beckett had two of the literature's most powerful languages in his arsenal, unlike many other self-translators, such as Şafak.

There is no doubt that the Bilingual Beckett field has expanded wide and beyond. While scholars like Grutman are aiming to look 'beyond' Beckett, others are delving deeper into Beckett's works than ever. The Beckett Digital Manuscript Project, started in 2011 by Dirk Van Hulle and Mark Nixon, currently holds ten genetic editions of Beckett's bilingual works, providing access to Beckett's own manuscripts, both in the first language and the self-translation, allowing us to track Beckett's every step in the process. In 2018, *Samuel Beckett Aujourd'hui/ Samuel Beckett Today*, the bilingual journal for Beckettian studies, published an issue dedicated to Bilingual Beckett. Nadia Louar, one of the scholars who contributed to that issue with her article "Le bilinguisme comme genèse du projet beckettien" (2018) states that the posthumous publication of Beckett's notes and manuscripts questions the notion of the work, challenges the idea of textual ending and elucidates the process for a better understanding.[30] Along with manuscripts, Beckett's letters being made public also gave us a privileged look into Beckett's writing and translating practices. In

[29] Grutman, 'Beckett and Beyond', p. 201.

[30] Nadia Louar, 'Le Bilinguisme Comme Genèse Du Projet Beckettien', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 30.1 (2018), p.114.

her article *Becoming Beckett* (2018), Pascale Sardin looks into Beckett's correspondence, tracing his translation practice within his literary career in light of sociocultural dynamics. Sardin concludes that the letters "encourage us to disengage from a mythicized vision of the great man and of his works, to question the romantic vision of the bilingual writer"[31]. Beckett's letters and life events provide contradictory evidence as to why he started writing in French or why he self-translates even though he despises the act itself. Chiara Montini states that Beckett challenges the idea of a mother tongue, and with self-translation he originates a state of work that is never finished, that can be forever modified.[32] Similarly, Sam Slote argues that Beclett's "translation and composition are cogenetically intertwined" and the work is "unabandoned".[33]

As of 2020s, there is no doubt enough research dedicated to Beckett's bilingualism to perceive it as a proper field within Beckett studies. More recently, an edited book by José Francisco Fernandez and Mar Garre Garcia, titled *Samuel Beckett and Translation* was published by Edinburgh University Press in 2021. A section of the book focuses on Beckett's self-translations and its poetics spanning his career and across literary genres, alongside Beckett's translations of author authors.

Throughout this chapter, I reviewed Bilingual Beckett criticism from its inception to major developments within the field to its current state. The abundance of scholarship recently on the topic no doubt limited my review to key works, and to the literature mainly in English and French. However, there are still gaps within the current scholarship which I aim to contribute to: Certain

---

[31] Pascale Sardin, 'Becoming Beckett', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 30.1 (2018), p.84.

[32] Chiara Montini, 'Bilinguisme Et Autotraduction À L' Œuvre Dans L' Écriture De Samuel Beckett', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 30.1 (2018), pp. 85-96.

[33] Sam Slote, 'Bilingual Beckett: Beyond The Linguistic Turn', in *The New Cambridge Companion To Samuel Beckett* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 114-125.

works of Beckett such as the trilogy and *Murphy* seemingly had a lot of attention, whereas an in-depth study on *Premier Amour* and *First Love* was lacking. Throughout my analysis, I refer to key works mentioned, testing out their conclusions in relation to my findings.

2.3. Comparative Analysis of *Premier Amour* and *First Love*

This section aims to exemplify and analyse Beckett's self-translation practice from French to English.[34] In order to do so, I have chosen Beckett's French novella *Premier Amour* (1970) and its English self-translation *First Love* (1973). Written in 1946*, Premier Amour* is one of Beckett's earliest French prose works, despite not being published until 1970. *First Love,* on the other hand, is a mature work in terms of Beckett's practice as a self-translator. The logic behind choosing this specific pair is to sample multiple notions within Beckett's bilingual literature. First and foremost, this comparative study will allow us to observe his practice of self-translating from French to English. It will also provide us with information on Beckett's early French writing style as well as his practice as an experienced self-translator.

This comparative analysis takes place on multiple sentence levels, focusing on the cultural shifts between two works. At the time of the conception of this research, there was no available in-depth comparative study between *Premier Amour* and *First Love.* Despite the resurgence of publications indicating a collective interest in the bilingual Beckett studies throughout the past decade, such as Beckett Digital Manuscript Project editions and *Samuel Beckett*

[34] An article based on this chapter of my dissertation has been published as the following:
Irem Kasar, 'Migration, Bilingualism and Self-Translation: Beckett's Stateless Hero in *Premier Amour/First Love'* in *Translation and Circulation of Migration Literature,* ed. by Stephanie Schwerter and Katrina Brannon (Berlin: Frank & Timme: 2022)*,* pp. 195-212.

Aujourd'hui/Samuel Beckett Today special Bilingual Beckett issue, the *Premier Amour/First Love* pair has still not been studied in depth. The trilogy of novels,*Molloy*, *Malone Dies* and *The Unnamable* seemingly, still generates the most interest in bilingual Beckett studies, along with *Murphy*. This lack of scholarly interest in *Premier Amour* and *First Love* also encouraged the genesis of the present study.

2.3.1. From Premier Amour to First Love

1946 marks an important milestone in Beckett's writing, for it refers not only to the burst into his most fertile creative period,[35] but also to the turn Beckett had finally taken towards writing and publishing French prose. Within the same year, he was going to write *La Fin*, *Mercier et Camier*, *Premier Amour*, *Le Calmant* and *L'Expulsé*; followed by *Molloy* in 1947, *Malone meurt* in 1948, *L'Innommable* in 1949 and *Textes pour rien* in 1950. Following the pattern of producing a novel each year, in a second language, all the while still writing poetry, criticism and plays, perhaps most significantly *En attendant Godot* (1948), Beckett had his most fruitful period in the late 1940s. He did not come back to prose writing until 1956, with *From an Abandoned Work,* which was his first English work of fiction since *Watt* (1944).

All the aforementioned prose he had written in 1947, with the exception of *Mercier et Camier*, have since been referred to as *Nouvelles*, for they have been published together, in different forms, multiple times. *L'Expulsé*, *Le Calmant* and *La Fin* were first published together, in a different chronological order than their conception, in 1955 by Les Editions de Minuit, accompanied by

[35] Cohn, *A Beckett Canon,* p. 127.

Textes pour rien, titled *Nouvelles et Textes pour rien*. Thus the latter was never a part of *Nouvelles*, soon going its own way, though rejoining them in various complete short prose editions.

The status of *Premier Amour* within *Nouvelles* is different, and confusing at times. It was originally written as a part of them, intended to be published together; but when the time came to publish *Nouvelles*, Beckett withheld *Premier Amour*.[36] The only explanation given for Beckett's decision is offered by Deirdre Bair in her biography in which she claims that *Premier Amour* was "too autobiographical, for he was still struggling to perfect the techniques of disguise and concealment that infuse his later writings."[37] However, eventually *Premier Amour* was published in 1970 by Les Editions de Minuit, a year after Beckett had been awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature. Publishers were pressing Beckett for new texts and the quickest solution he could find was to hand over his old materials to be published.[38] In his authorised biography of Beckett, James Knowlson recalls Beckett regretting that he had ever agreed to its publication[39], however he does not state a specific reason for his regret. Either way, *Premier Amour*'s publication was soon to be followed by its self-translation, *First Love*. Beckett finished the translation in 1973 and the same year Calder & Boyars published it in London; but similar to *Premier Amour*'s tale, *First Love*'s appearance did not come without struggle. There were multiple stages of editing between the manuscript and the end product, as well as the presence of an American edition published a year later in 1974 by Grove Press, which contains minor variants. The novellas, including *First Love*, were first published

---

[36] John Fletcher, *The Novels of Samuel Beckett* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964), p. 91.

[37] Deirdre Bair, *Samuel Beckett: A Biography* (Simon and Schuster, 1990), p. 689.

[38] Knowlson, p. 574.

[39] Ibid, p. 577.

together in English in Britain as *Four Novellas* by John Calder in 1977. Despite the later inclusion, both *Premier Amour* and *First Love* always retained a distance from the other three novellas, though mainly in publishing terms. An ongoing sense of similarity is observed throughout the novellas: they all use a first person narrator, each protagonist one way or another is an outcast and, to quote Cohn, they all "remember their fathers, who are usually associated with hats and with bequests of money."[40] John Fletcher suggests that they indeed share the same narrator, and they could even be Watt.[41] Furthermore, the style throughout the novellas is a static one and, with the exception of *Premier Amour*, there is not much of a plot other than the narrators recalling their memories and wandering around the city. Cohn states that unlike the English fiction, "the stories lack exposition, climax, or resolution" and "The French is at once colloquial and rhythmic, simple in vocabulary but phrasally resonant."[42] Amanda M. Dennis states that "The *nouvelles* suggest a blending of physical and textual space by calling attention to their own shift into French as a language of composition."[43]

Despite the novellas' tendency to suggest they might as well be told by the same narrator, there is no definitive evidence provided by the author. Both the narrators and the "impossibly fragmented landscapes and cityscapes"[44] of *Les Nouvelles* suggest a heterogeneity across the four stories. Furthermore, the paucity of significant names and places permits the reader to arrive at this assumption. However, the lack of certainty also allows us to deliberate on the

---

[40] Ruby Cohn, *Back to Beckett* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1973), p.72.

[41] Fletcher, pp. 92-100.

[42] Cohn, *A Beckett Canon*, p.151.

[43] Amanda M. Dennis, "Poets Of Their Own Acts: Tactics, Style and Occupation in Beckett's 'Nouvelles.'" *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, vol. 27, 2015, p. 50.

[44] Ibid, p. 44.

location of the stories. In Beckett's case the question is usually whether the setting is France or Ireland. José Francisco Férnandez follows the allusions in the stories and states that despite the smokescreen of ambivalence in these narratives, they certainly present traces of an Irish context[45]. In this chapter we will also trail the cultural notions in *Premier Amour/First Love* to understand the setting of the story.

The editions used for the purpose of this research are *Premier Amour* (1970) published by Les Editions de Minuit and *First Love* from *First Love and Other Novellas* (2000), published by Penguin Books, edited by Gerry Dukes.

2.3.2. Summary of the Story

The story begins with the narrator-protagonist recalling a recent visit to his father's grave. He is a rather peculiar character, a quality not unusual for a Beckettian hero. He constantly associates his love with his father death's, recalling memories of getting thrown out the house after his father passed away. The narrator-protagonist thinks and talks about his relationship with his father, not being so sure himself about it either, asking questions along the way: did he merely pity him or would he be proud of him? The relationship seems to have dysfunctional elements, and the narrator-protagonist treats it as a semi-absurd point of reference for his romantic relationship. His object of affection is a woman he meets on a bench one day, and then meets again multiple times on the same bench. He constantly questions this relationship: Did he really love her? He draws the conclusion that he must have indeed loved her, for he carved

[45] José Francisco Férnandez, ""The same blinding void as before": Irish Neutrality in Samuel Beckett's nouvelles " *arcadia*, 52.2 (2017), p. 358

her initials in cow dung. She sings to him, though he is not particularly a fan of her singing. She caresses his ankles on the bench, and then they later share greater intimacy back in her house, but the narrator cannot seem to recall that part. The two of them also embark on a dysfunctional relationship; he moves in the spare bedroom of her house and later finds out she is a prostitute. He does not like hearing her clients' laughs but he remains living in his room. The woman falls pregnant with their child and the narrator-protagonist wants her to have an abortion, which is refused. He abandons the house when she goes into labour, but her cries follow him everywhere. In the closing passage of the novella, the narrator says that they still follow him and he doesn't think that they would ever cease.

2.3.3. Comparative Textual Analysis

The methodology used for the textual analysis consists of two stages: firstly close readings of both versions, *Premier Amour* and *First Love*, respectively, followed by side-by-side comparative study of the French original and English self-translation. Over twenty textual examples will be presented to understand and analyse the shift between *Premier Amour* and *First Love*. In light of these excerpts, the main concern is to point out significant changes that create different readings in their respective languages. The findings then will be discussed in respect to the narrator and the narration, the setting, the cultural background , the characters etc.; all under the umbrella of the fictive universe.

For the textual analysis, solely because of the chronological order, *Premier Amour* will be deemed the source text and *First Love* the target text. However it

should be noted that the aim of this study is different to that of a traditional source text-target text analysis, for Beckett is both the writer and the translator. The excerpts will be discussed under four main sections, as explained previously as the methodology for this study: 1) Style, flow and wording, 2) Setting, time and image, 3) Sociocultural Notions and References, and 4) Names, characters and narrators. References to existing theories and bilingual Beckett criticism will be made where appropriate, and the previous findings of studies on other Beckett pairs will be tested and discussed in the light of my findings.

2.3.3.1. Style, Flow and Wording

In this section, I will observe the changes concerning the literary style and flow, as well as the wording choices between *Premier Amour* and *First Love*. An example is observed at the very beginning of the story:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 7	J'associe, à tort ou à raison, mon mariage avec la mort de mon père, dans le temps. Qu'il existe d'autres liens, sur d'autres plans, entre ces deux affaires, **c'est possible. Il m'est déjà difficile de dire** ce que je crois savoir.	p. 64	I associate, rightly or wrongly, my marriage with the death of my father, in time. That other links exist, on other levels, between these two affairs, **is not impossible. I have enough trouble as it is in trying to say** what I think I knew.

The English wording "is not impossible", is translated into French as "c'est possible". Certainly, Beckett could have opted for a simple "it's possible",

as most translators if not all would do. Even though the two usages are not contradicting each other, they do create slightly different perceptions between the French protagonist's and the English narrators' thinking. A heightened discrepancy is observed with the following pair: The French expression "Il m'est déjà difficile de dire" is not exactly the same as "I have enough trouble as it is in trying to say", where it could have been simply translated as "It is already difficult for me to say". What makes these examples more interesting is the sheer simplicity of a literal translation between the French and the English wordings, if Beckett had wanted to. Despite the fact that no two languages are entirely interchangeable, these excerpts point to cases of an easy dynamic between French and English. However, they also do not challenge each other, and more importantly they do not challenge the fictive universe.

Following is another example of a change at sentence level in translation:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 15	J'espère que je n'oublie rien	p. 68	I can think of nothing else

In the French original, the narrator talks about a list of garments and states that he hopes that he's not forgetting anything. This statement turns into "I can think of nothing else", which contains a different undertone than "I hope I am not forgetting anything." Here, Beckett again renounces the literal translation. Throughout the novella, Beckett makes several minor changes in this vein. For the purpose of this study, however, I will focus on the changes that are more significant. As I will show in this section, there are several stylistic and wording changes between *Premier Amour* and *First Love* that have a

considerable effect on the emotive reading of the narrative, whether it be about adding an emphasis or impoverishing the meaning.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p.8	Personnellement **je n'ai rien contre les cimetières**, je m'y **promène** assez volontiers, plus volontiers qu'ailleurs, je crois, **quand je suis obligé de sortir.**	p.64	Personally **I have no bone to pick with graveyards**, I **take the air** there willingly, perhaps more willingly than elsewhere, **when take the air I must.**

The above excerpt is a good example of Beckett's modifications in this category. The narrator of the French version states that he has nothing against the graveyard, whereas the English narrator has "no bone to pick with graveyards." The wording choice of "no bone to pick" in the context of "graveyards" is certainly a deliberate one. The expression that Beckett used in his self-translation heightens the comic tone in the English version, thus giving the English reader a sense of playful absurdity that the French reader cannot experience, especially considering that this is at the very beginning of the story. It thereby sets a different tone or creates expectations from the English narrator, which the French narrator was not subject to. This is also another example of easy translation between the two languages. Beckett could have simply opted for "I have nothing against graveyards." And he actually did: In the 1974 American Grove Press edition[46], the sentence reads "I have nothing against graveyards", a mot-à-mot translation of the original phrase. Why Beckett had changed it in the later British version is unknown, but presumably to be funnier.

[46] Dukes, "Notes", *First Love*, p. 95.

Lance St. John Butler, in his article “Two Darks: A Solution to the Problem of Beckett’s Bilingualism” (1994) strongly suggests that Beckett’s choices in his self-translations are results of the linguistic differences between the French and the English languages,[47] and he tries out his hypothesis on multiple phrases extracted from *Molloy* within the framework of *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de L’ Anglais* (1958) by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet. The examples he uses are accurate, and also to his advantage. It should be noted that the most extreme cases he looks into are “Heureusement”/ “Fortunately for me”, “Jusqu’à la maison de ma mère”/“To my mother’s door”[48], and generally in this critical zone of safety. If he were to look into the above “no bone to pick” example, for instance, it would be very unlikely to come to the conclusion of all of the differences between Beckett pairs are merely because of the stylistic differences between the French and English languages.

Perhaps a less striking change in translation, “quand je suis obligé de sortir” however is not the same as “when take the air I must” for multiple reasons. Firstly, there is an added emphasis in the English phrase, resulting from the anastrophe. Moreover, “sortir” is not exactly “taking the air”; a more literal translation could have been “to go out”. Even though this modification neither changes the position nor the emotion of the narrator, a second look at the entirety of the passage will let us see that Beckett’s modification was indeed more substantial. He used the verb “to take the air” as a translation of both “promener” and “sortir”, hence putting an overall emphasis on the passage with this doubling. Finally, and the only example from this passage that is applicable with Butler’s hypothesis, is the translation of “je suis obligé” being “I must”.

---

[47] Lance St. John Butler, 'Two Darks: A Solution to the Problem of Beckett's Bilingualism', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 3 (1994), 115-135 (p. 116).

[48] Ibid, p. 121.

The following excerpt shows another change in wording by Beckett the translator:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 9	Mon sandwich, ma banane, **je les mange avec plus d'appétit** assis sur une tombe	p. 65	My sandwich, my banana **taste sweeter** when I am sitting on a tomb

The French wording "je les mange avec plus d'appétit" could have been easily translated as "I eat them with more appetite" and it would have been a literal translation, while containing the same reading. Instead, Beckett opted to use the wording "taste sweeter". The crucial part of the problem with this translation is that the sandwich and the banana in the English version become the subjects, whereas they remain the objects in the French version. Thus, while the French phrase has only the narrator as the subject, the English phrase becomes a complex sentence with two subjects. Furthermore, the word "sweeter" in English adds a sensory image which the French reader cannot experience.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p . 23-24	Du reste cela ne me fait plus rien, à présent, d'être dérangé, ou si peu, qu'est-ce que cela veut dire, être dérangé, **il faut même que je le sois**, j'ai changé de système, je tiens le martingale, c'est la neuvième ou dixième, et puis c'est bientôt fini, les **dérangements, les arrangements**, bientôt on n'en **parlera** plus, ni d'elle ni des autres, **ni de merde ni de ciel.**	p. 71	And it matters nothing to me now, to be disturbed, or so little, what does it mean, disturbed, **and what would I do with myself if I wasn't? Yes,** I've changed my system, it's the winning one at last, for the ninth or tenth time, not to mention not long now, **not long till curtain down**, **on disturbers and disturbed,** no more **tattle** about that, all that, her and the others, **the shitball and heaven's high halls.**

The above excerpts also poins out inconsistencies between the translation and the original. "Les dérangements, les arrangements" becomes "disturbers and disturbed" and while preserving a kind of rhythmic similarity, the meaning changes quite radically. The way the narrator talks to himself is more complex in translation. The wording "il faut même que je le sois" turns into the narrator questioning himself as: "what would I do with myself if I wasn't?" Beckett's English text is getting more lively with additions, "not long till curtain now" as well as the slightly specific wording choice "no more tattle" for "on n'en parlera plus". Moreover, a heightened expressivity is observed in "the shitball and heaven's high halls" in relation to the original French wording "ni de merde ni de ciel".

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 24-25	Je vous les dirai quand même, un jour, si j'y pense, mes étranges douleurs, en détail, et en bien distinguant, pour plus de clarté. Je vous dirai celles de l'entendement, celles du cœur ou affectives, celles de l'âme **(très jolies, celle de l'âme),** et puis celles du corps, les internes ou cachées d'abord, puis celles en surface, en commençant par les cheveux et en descendant méthodiquement et sans me presser jusqu'aux pieds, siège des cors, crampes, oignons, ongle incarnés, engelures, trenchfoot et autre bizarreries.	p. 72	I'll tell them to you some day none the less, if I think of it, if I can, my strange pains, in detail, distinguishing between the different kinds, for the sake of clarity, those of the mind, those of the heart or emotional conative, those of the soul **(none prettier than these)** and finally those of the frame proper, first the inner or latent, then those affecting the surface, beginning with the hair and **scalp** and moving methodically down, without haste, all the way down to the feet beloved of the corn, the cramp, the kibe, the bunion, the hammer toe, the nail ingrown, the fallen arch, the common blain, **the club foot, duck foot, goose foot, pigeon foot, flat foot,** trench foot and other curiosities.

The heightened expressivity in English also continues in the above example. First of all, an added emphasis is observed in "none prettier than these" in relation to "très jolies, celle de l'âme". The detail of "scalp" is added alongside "les cheveux". Furthermore, we observe an addition in the form of narrator's problems with his feet. Not only does he add "the club foot, duck foot, goose foot, pigeon foot, flat foot" to his list of physical pains, but the emotive level of his expression changes dramatically. Thus the French passage remains more neutral and methodical in relation to the heightened expressivity found within the English version.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 12-17	**Mais, pour passer maintenant à un sujet moins triste,** à la mort de mon père je dus quitter la maison. […] **Mais, pour passer maintenant à un sujet plus gai,** le nom de la femme avec qui je m'unis …	p. 66-68	**But to pass on to less melancholy matters,** on my father's death I had to leave the house. […] **But to pass on to less melancholy matters,** the name of the woman with whom I was soon to be united …

Another modification becomes apparent when "But to pass on to less melancholy matters" becomes the translation of both "Mais, pour passer maintenant à un sujet moins triste" and "Mais, pour passer maintenant à un sujet plus gai". A *less saddenin*g subject and a *more cheerful subject* of the original are both retained under the umbrella of "less melancholy matters" in the translation. Furthermore, the fine contrast of the original French pairing disappears from the English version and is replaced with the added emphasis of doubling.

We observe multiple modifications of the original throughout *First Love*, and the last sentence of the novella is no exception:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 56	Il m'aurait fallu d'autres amours, pe être. Mais **l'amour, cela ne se commande pas.**	p. 84	I could have done with other lov perhaps. But there it is, **either y love or you don't.**

Perhaps “l’amour, cela ne se commande pas” would not translate well into English language. Still, “either you love or you don’t” is not nearly the most accurate translation. The original French phrase seems to refer to a neutral and universal conclusion, whereas the English phrase implies an increased emotivity with a different meaning.

Next example points out not only a change in style but a literal change of language:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 31	À arracher à pleines mains les orties?	p. 75	To divellicate urtica ***plenis manibus*****?**

All of a sudden, the English narrator starts making remarks in Latin. In both versions the narrator is talking about his love for Lulu, asking would he grab nettles with bare hands if he wasn’t in love? The content is intact, however there is no logical reason for the narrator to utter the sentence in Latin rather than in English. Upon looking closer, it is very possible that there is a hidden reference to a verse in Virgil’s epic poem *Aeneid* “Manibus date Lilia plenis”, which is also been referred in Dante’s “Purgatory”. Considering Beckett’s deep interest in Dante, as I will explain further in this chapter, it is almost certain that this change adds an intertextual layer to the narrative, as well as disrupting the elements of the fictive universe once again.

2.3.3.2. Setting, Time and Image

In this section, I will analyse the changes in translation which concern the setting and time of the story, as well as the images presented within the fictive universe.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 21	les femmes flairent un phallus en l'air à **plus de dix kilomètres**	p. 70	women smell a rigid phallus **ten miles away**

Above we observe the conversion of the metric "dix kilomètres" to imperial "ten miles" in self-translation. However, ten kilometres is not ten miles. It is understandable why Beckett didn't choose to say "six miles" in the translation, as the real converted unit would be, because it simply does not flow the way "ten miles" does. However, if we look at the bigger picture, does this mean that the women in the French version have a superior talent of detecting the smell from almost twice as much distance than the women in the English version? Moreover, why is Beckett changing the units in the first place? The story is set in an unknown city, in an unknown country, but Beckett's tampering with the units does alter the fictive universe. Kilometres hint at mainland Europe, whereas miles to Ireland.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 17	N'étant pas française elle disait Loulou. Moi aussi, n'étant pas français non plus, je disais Loulou comme elle. Tous les deux, nous disions Loulou.	p.	-

In the above passage from *Premier Amour*, the narrator explains how neither the woman nor himself is French, therefore they both used to say "Loulou" instead of Lulu. This passage is completely missing from *First Love*, creating a crucial discrepancy between the two versions. This is not because Beckett omitted three sentences in a row, but because the nature of the passage is vital. No reader, French or English, knows the nationality or the native language of the narrator-protagonist, or the exact location of the story. However, the French reader is privy to important facts that the English reader is deprived of:

1. The narrator-protagonist is not French.
2. Therefore his native language is not the French language.
3. The narrator-protagonist is bilingual.
4. Lulu is also not French.
5. Therefore Lulu's native language is not the French language either.
6. Lulu is also bilingual.
7. They both say Loulou instead of Lulu.

Above are facts that the French reader is made very well aware of, without requiring any additional mental effort. However, this knowledge also brings questions to the mind and provides additional implied facts: If neither Lulu nor the narrator is French, why are they speaking French between them?

Why is it incorrect to pronounce Lulu's name as Loulou? Is it because all the other people around are French, therefore their pronunciation style outweighs that of Lulu's and the narrator's? Are they then in France?

The casual French reader might or might not deliberate on these matters, but they are provided with enough leads if they want to. It is also possible that a French reader with a French copy of *Premier Amour* in a French bistro would not give a second thought to all this information, because they may already assume the location of the story is France anyway.

What is certain is that the English reader is not even provided with the opportunity to deliberate. Moreover, Gerry Dukes in his notes at the end of *First Love and Other Novellas* (2000), mentions that the above passage was actually included in Beckett's self-translation manuscript:

> Ms reads Not being French she pronounced [cancelled] said Loulou. I too, not being French either, said Loulou. We both said Loulou.[49]

However, it is omitted from the published English translations. Beckett's deliberate withholding of this information from the English reader indicates that he didn't want *First Love* to imply France. In the same vein as the aforementioned position of the French reader, the casual English reader of *First Love* will most probably assume that the novella is set in an English-speaking region. Beckett clearly avoids infusing the senses of the English reader with allusions to the foreign.

The cultural background of the reader of the French editions and that of the English editions stands as an understudied area in criticism on Beckett's

[49] Dukes, p. 97.

self-translations. Beckett's modifications to the fictive universe are often mentioned but rarely from the reader's point of view. Ann Beer states:

> Each reader of Beckett comes to his words with a personal set of cultural and linguistic co-ordinates that may be alerted and exposed. There can be no neutral reading, nor any reading in any country or literary tradition that can claim primacy. Reader-response theory, now familiar from the work of Iser, Fish and others, shows why Beckett's work has the effect of a Rorschach test, reflecting back preoccupations and identity as each act of reading, unique and unrepeatable, takes place.[50]

She mentions the reception of the text by the reader, but from a point of view of individuality. Certainly each reader will have a unique interpretation of Beckett's texts, but there are also cultural and linguistic notions that put different readers in different sociocultural groups. A likely inference that can be drawn from Beckett's practice as a self-translator is that he is not so concerned about the reader's perception of cultural and material elements in his narrative. Rather, he is primarily concerned about its intellectual and emotional reception. Certainly this is a privilege stemming from being both the author and the translator.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 27-28	C'était une maison énorme.	p. 73	-

Perhaps a less significant omission, the narrator's remark on his father's house being an enormous one is entirely omitted in the English translation. Even so, it is still notable omission there seems to be no cultural or linguistic

[50] Beer, p. 218.

challenge for Beckett to keep this sentence. Apparently Beckett changed his mind about the necessity of this sentence and again used his authorial license on the self-translation. It also remarks another instant in which Beckett tampers with the fictive universe of *First Love* and deprives the English reader from a mental image that the French reader was granted.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 48	Je le regardais tous les jours, ma jacinthe. **Elle était rose. J'aurais préféré une bleue.**	p. 82	Not a day passed without my looking at it.

The narrator talks about the hyacinth he has in his room and how he looks at the flower every single day, lovingly. In the French original, the narrator tells the reader that the the flower is pink, but he would have actually preferred a blue one. These colour references are entirely omitted in the English translation, therefore the English reader is again deprived of a mental image related to the fictive universe.

2.3.3.3. Sociocultural Notions and References

This section focuses on the status of sociocultural notions and references in self-translation and the manner in which they are carried over to the target language, if at all. Consider the following:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 44	Donnez un vase de nuit, dis-je. **J'ai beaucoup aimé, enfin assez aimé, pendant assez longtemps, les mots vase de nuit, ils me faisaient penser à Racine, ou à Baudelaire, je ne sais plus lequel, aux deux peut-être, oui, je regrette, j'avais de la lecture, et par eux j'arrivais là où le verbe s'arrête, on dirait du Dante.** Mais elle n'avait pas de vase de nuit.	p. 80	Give me a chamber-pot, I said. But she did not possess one.

In the French original the narrator is reminded of Racine, or Baudelaire, before arriving at Dante, solely by the phrase "vase de nuit", the chamber-pot. The entire section of literary references and therefore this particular stream of consciousness are omitted from the English translation. Christopher Ricks, in his article "Racine's "Phèdre": Lowell's "Phaedra"", remarks upon this omission:

Beckett later found himself unable or unwilling to give the English something he was not sure that they wanted anyway, the name and example of Racine: one difference between Premier Amour (1945) and Beckett's translation of it as First Love (1973) is that the following flight was omitted in the English, perhaps because Racine could neither be carried over nor replaced by an English counterpart.[51]

Certainly the name Racine wouldn't be as familiar to an English reader as it is to a French reader, but here Beckett again deprives the English reader of the option. According to Ricks, this assumption on Beckett's inability or unwillingness to carry over Racine indeed stems from a tradition in Anglo Saxon

[51] Christopher Ricks, 'Racine's Phedre: Lowell's Phaedra', *Arion*, 1.2 (1991), p. 47.

literature, “as if not only the art but the very name of Racine cannot be brought over into English.”[52] Beckett’s decision to omit Racine from the English version is especially thought-provoking since we observe multiple other philosophical or cultural references, like Reinhold[53] and Hagenbeck,[54] which should not be less alienating than Racine, if that is indeed the reason behind Beckett’s omission. Furthermore, considering Beckett’s admiration for Racine, it could not have been a light-hearted decision for Beckett to delete his name in his self-translation. Shane Weller points out how Beckett was rereading Racine at a time when he was struggling to write *Endgame,* stating that *“*Beckett’s love for the plays of the great seventeenth-century French dramatist Jean Racine was an abiding one, as evidenced not least by his rereading of Racine in the mid 1950s.”[55] Baudelaire and Dante also disappear from the English translation. Baudelaire most probably fell victim for the same reasons as Racine, being an overtly French literary reference. What about Dante? This is potentially the most striking omission in terms of references, since Beckett’s association with Dante is the most well-known. For an author whose character was named Belacqua and who penned a story titled *Dante and the Lobster,* his omission of Dante is a strange one since he did not have any hesitations while referring to Dante in his English fiction in the past.

As mentioned previously, Beckett already inserted a hidden reference to Dante (and Virgil) in self-translation with his Latin wording. Considering all these points, it is very likely that the reason Beckett omitted this whole section was due to him (thus the narrator) not being reminded of any of these references by

---

[52] Ibid, p. 46.

[53] Beckett, *First Love and Other Novellas*, p. 72.

[54] Ibid, p. 66.

[55] Shane Weller, 'For a migrant art: Samuel Beckett and cultural nationalism', *Journal of European Studies*, 48.2 (2018), p. 176.

the English word chamber-pot. Perhaps the emotive connotation of *vase de nuit* does not exist with chamber-pot. Therefore, it is possible that to Beckett, while self-translating his original almost thirty years later, the English word chamber-pot did not signify any of those names and he omitted the entire section. As mentioned before in this dissertation, in section 1.1.2. “The Bilingual’s Dictionary", I explained that bilinguals can have different associations with the same “word” in different languages. The example of author-translator Yiğit Bener having contrasting connotations for the French word *mouette* and the Turkish word *martı* comes to mind yet again. A self-translator’s relationship with their languages and the infinite number of associations they might have with the words within those languages are purely personal and intimate, therefore there is no way to know for certain why they might change or omit things in translation. From a translation proper point of view, however, Beckett’s omission is beyond the capability of any ordinary translator. Therefore it should be remarked that this is another occurence where Beckett uses his authorial license in the self-translation.

Consider also the following example:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 51	Que des panais! s’écria-t-elle.	p.	-

In *Premier Amour*, the protagonist asks Lulu if he can have parsnip and only parsnip for his meals, and Lulu finds his demand very strange. This section is preserved in both editions, but only in the French version Lulu repeats her bewilderment towards this demand. This seemingly minor deletion might actually have a sociocultural effect. Marina Warner, in her article “Who Can

Shave an Egg?": Beckett, Mallarmé and Foreign Tongues" remarks a conversation she had with a French friend of hers, after he read *Premier Amour:*

> "The protagonist does some kind of business with a "panais," he said, and then he asked, "Qu'est-ce que c'est qu'un panais?" "It's a parsnip," I replied. "Yes, so the dictionary says. But what is a parsnip? The French don't eat parsnips. They feed them to animals."[56]

This is where the differences between French and British cultures come to play. Apparently the parsnip is not a common vegetable for French people to eat, whereas in United Kingdom and Ireland it is readily available and consumed somewhat regularly. Therefore, English Lulu could not have been as shocked as French Lulu, simply because the English reader would not be as surprised as the French reader before this demand.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 23-24	Alors vous ne voulez plus que je vienne ? dit-elle. C'est incroyable comme les gens répètent ce qu'on vient de leur dire, **comme s'ils risquaient le bûcher** en croyant leurs oreilles.	p. 71	So you don't want me to come anymore, she said. It's incredible the way they repeat what you've just said to them, as if they **risked faggot and fire** in believing their ears

Finally, the relationship between "comme s'ils risquaient le bûcher" and "as if they risked faggot and fire" is somewhat unbalanced. While both expressions refer to a punishment by being burned at the stake, only the English expression refers to a particular punishment reserved exclusively for

[56] Marina Warner, '"Who can shave an egg?": Beckett, Mallarmé, and Foreign Tongues', *Raritan*, 27.4 (2008), 62-89 (p. 62).

acts of heresy. This additional level in the meaning is likely to go unnoticed by the casual reader, since the expression “faggot and fire” is quite a rare one. Nonetheless, it does alter the fictive universe of the French original for it also refers to a historical fact:

> A Parliament held in Leicester in 1414 passed the Suppression of Heresy Act (2 Hen. V St. 1, c.7) which called for the hanging and burning at the stake of heretics, esp. Lollards. It was nicknamed the ‘Fire and Faggot Parliament’[57]

Thus, what seems like a playful word choice at the first instance does actually refer to a British historical fact. Hence, it is again putting the setting of the English version in a country different to what is assumed in the French version.

[57] ‘Faggot’, in *Oxford English Dictionary* < https://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/67623 > [accessed 1 January 2024]

2.3.3.4. Names, Characters and Narrators

The final section of my analysis is concerned with the names and traits of characters and narrators in the story. The first example contains multiple changes in translation:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 9-10	Mes autres écrits, ils n'ont pas le temps de sécher qu'ils me dégoutent déjà, mais **mon épitaphe me plait** toujours. **Elle illustre un point de grammaire.** Il y a malheureusement peu de chances qu'elle s'élève jamais au-dessus du crâne qui la conçut, à moins que **l'État** ne s'en charge. Mais pour pouvoir m'exhumer il faudra d'abord me trouver, et j'ai bien peur que **l'État** n'ait autant de mal à me trouver mort que vivant. C'est pour cela que je me dépêche de la consigner à cette place, avant qu'il ne soit trop tard : Ci-gît qui y échappa tant Qu'il n'en échappe que maintenant **Il y a une syllabe de trop** dans le second et dernier vers, mais cela n'a pas d'importance, à mon avis. On me pardonnera plus que cela, **quand je ne serai plus**.	p. 65	My other writings are no sooner dry than they revolt me, but my epitaph still **meets with my approval**. There is little chance unfortunately of its ever being reared above the skull that conceived it, unless the **State** takes up the matter. But to be unearthed I must first be found, and I greatly fear **those gentlemen** will have as much trouble finding me dead as alive. So I hasten to record it here and now, while there is yet time: Hereunder lies the above who up below So hourly died that he lived on till now **The second and last or rather latter line limps** a little perhaps, but that is no great matter, I'll be forgiven more than that **when I'm forgotten.**

Firstly, "Mon épitaphe me plait toujours" is barely on the same level as "my epitaph still meets with my approval." The English version attributes a kind of authority to the narrator that the French version doesn't. Moreover, the sentence "Elle illustre un point de grammaire" is completely missing from *First Love*. The discrepancy between "Il y'a une syllabe de trop" and "The second

and last or rather latter line limps" is far greater, as it not only changes the meaning but also the expressive level. Beckett cannot have translated this section exactly, for there is no "excess syllable" in the English verse as there is in the French version. At this point, we can only speculate that the narrator was referring to the "en" in the "Qu'il n'en échappe que maintenant" when he says there is an excess syllable. The narrator must have wanted for his epitaph to rhyme, therefore adding an extra syllable to the second verse. If that is the case, it would also be grammatically incorrect, thus explaining why the narrator is saying that "Elle illustre un point de grammaire". Furthermore, the future epitaph of the narrator is changed strangely in translation. Both writings have somewhat of a comical tone, but there is an added absurdity in the English version.

Brian Fitch, while analysing Beckett's self-translation practice, states that there are discrepancies between the two versions as a result of Beckett's self-translation, and that we observe shifts in the narrative, such as: "Sometimes it is an emotion or state of mind that is added to the character(s)"[58] An example of this shift could be seen in the extracted passage, between "quand je ne serai plus" and "when I'm forgotten". The English sentence adds a certain emotion to the narrator giving an impression of resentment, for he believes that he will be "forgotten". However, in the original French it is more neutral. The narrator refers to a time when he simply won't exist anymore and is not concerned about whether he will be forgotten or not. Another example from the same passage is Beckett's usage of the words "L' État" and "State". In the original French version, the word "L' État" is used twice, whereas in the English version both "State" and "those gentlemen" are used as translations of the same word. This is certainly

[58] Ibid, p. 115.

not a conventional form of translating. By opting for “those gentlemen”, Beckett adds a fresh state of mind or possibly a political stance to the narrator of the English version. Another emphasis is observed in the example below:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 20	Le jour suivant il pleuvait et je me croyais tranquille, **mais je me trompais.**	p. 70	The next day it was raining and felt in security. **Wrong again.**

By adding the emphasis “again” in the English version, Beckett creates an extra dimension for the English narrator, as if he was “wrong” before, or often. The French original does not imply such meaning, therefore creating a discrepancy between the two narratives. Even though the English narrator does not add lengthy passages to his speech, even the smallest addition like “again” can greatly impact the way the narrator is perceived. Brian T. Fitch observes a similar difference between *Le Dépeupleur* (1970) and *The Lost Ones* (1972):

> […] the more colourful language of the English not only tends to endow the fictive characters of the cylinder with certain emotions and mental attitudes absent from the original, making them somehow more human, but it also creates a more distinctive narrative of voice, one which, if by no manner or means obtrusive, none the less is less likely to go unremarked by the reader.[59]

[59] Fitch, pp. 115-116.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 22	Ce qu'on appelle l'amour c'est **l'exil**, avec de temps en temps une carte postale du pays, voilà **mon sentiment** ce soir.	p. 70	What goes by the name of love is **banishment**, with now and then a postcard from the homeland, such is **my considered opinion**, this evening.

Another noteworthy example from Beckett is how "l'exil" becomes "banishment" in self-translation, whereas it could have simply been translated as "exile". Fletcher, for instance, states that "The principal theme in all these stories is the theme of exile"[60], referring to *Nouvelles*. However, it is doubtful that their emotional readings are on the same level. Beckett's own background makes this choice even more interesting, especially considering that *Premier Amour* was written in France, after almost a decade long residency through thick and thin in the country. To quote Beer, "He preferred to stay in Paris at the outbreak of war even when, as an Irish neutral, he could have gone 'home' to safety."[61] Can this be interpreted as when writing in French, Beckett's feelings are about France and around the theme of exile, whereas in English it becomes about Ireland and banishment? The fact that there is no definite setting in the stories reinforces the validity of this question.

The second example from the above passage, "mon sentiment" becoming "my considered opinion", is also worth mentioning. The English translation heightens the logical activity and stance of the narrator with the addition of "considered", which is not on the same level as the French original.

[60] John Fletcher, *The Novels of Samuel Beckett* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964), p. 106.

[61] Ann Beer, 'Beckett's Bilingualism ', in *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*, ed. by John Pilling(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 213.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 27-28	Je n'avais pas de données là-dessus, n'ayant jamais aimé auparavant, mais j'avais entendu parler de la chose, naturellement, à la maison, à l'école, au bordel, à l'église, et j'avais lu des romans, en prose et en vers, sous la direction de mon tuteur, **en anglais, en français, en italien, en allemand**, où il en était fortement question.	p.73	I had nothing to go by, having never loved before, but of course had heard of the thing, at home, in school, in brothel and at church, and read romances, in prose and verse, under the guidance of my tutor, **in six or seven languages, both dead and living,** in which it was handled at length.

The above excerpt indicates another noteworthy modification. The French narrator who studied the notion of love "en anglais, en français, en italien, en allemand", is modified into an English narrator who studied it "in six or seven languages, both dead and living". The English reader does not know exactly which languages the narrator is referring to, whereas the French reader most certainly knows that the narrator can read in English, French, Italian and German. The language competencies of the narrator abruptly increase in translation, "six or seven" in contrast to four languages in the original version. The English translation also adds "both dead and living" languages to the narrator's skillset. These additions, along with the blurring of the exact languages mentioned in the original version, undoubtedly tamper with the fictive universe of *Premier Amour.*

In the excerpt below, the narrator recalls the day he met the women he loves:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 19	Elle avait seulement chanté comme pour elle, et sans les paroles heureusement, quelques vieilles chansons du pays, d'une façon curieusement fragmentaire, en sautant de l'une à l'autre, et en revenant à celle qu'elle venait d'interrompre avant d'avoir achevé celle qu'elle lui avait préférée.	p. 69	All she had done was sing, beneath her breath, as to herself, and without the words fortunately, some old folk songs, and so disjointedly, skipping from one to another and finishing none, **that even I found it strange.**

In the English translation, there is an added emphasis with the phrase "that even I found it strange" at the end of the passage. This certainly is an emotive expression that does not exist in the French original, which can be read as the narrator not finding things strange that easily, or doing strange things himself, or the woman doing stranger things than the narrator. Granted, the reader can tell that the narrator is indeed a strange man in both versions, but only in the English version the added expression reveals that he is also aware of his strangeness.

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 46	Je l'entendis traverser la cuisine et **refermer sur elle** la porte de sa chambre. J'étais seul enfin, dans l'obscurité enfin.	p. 81	I heard her steps in the kitchen and then the door of her room close **behind her**. **Why behind her?** I was alone at last, in the dark at last.

In the English translation, the narrator passes an additional comment, by asking "Why behind her?". The object of this question is not definitive either: Is

the narrator actually wondering why the woman closed the door behind her or is this a reference to that usage in the English language in general? Either way, we observe once again a heightened narrative presence. Fitch states that the English narrator "does not refrain at times from actually passing judgment on the world he is describing"[56] whereas the French narrator remains neutral. The examples discussed in this section are in accordance with Fitch's statement.

For a final example, consider the following:

	Premier Amour		*First Love*
p. 29	D'ailleurs j'en ai marre de ce nom Lulu, et je m'en vais lui en donner un autre, **d'une syllabe cette fois, Anne, par exemple, ce n'est pas une syllabe** mais cela ne fait rien.	p. 74	Anyhow I'm sick and tired of this name Lulu, I'll give her another, **more like her, Anna for example, it's not more like her** but no matter.

When the narrator gets sick of the name Lulu, he gives her another name. The problem is her name becomes Anne in the French version, and Anna in the English translation. Why? In light of the previous excerpts and discussions, we understand that Beckett does not want to imply a French setting, a foreignness, anything that could spark an alienation with the English reader; but why is the name Anne unacceptable? Surprisingly, Anne is one the names which exist in multiple cultures. Is Anna more English than Anne? Furthermore, the narrator's logic behind appointing Lulu her new name(s) is entirely different between the two versions. In the French original, he says "one syllable this time, Anne, for example, it is not one syllable but no matter", whereas in the English version he tries to give her another name "more like her" and admits that actually it is not more like her, coming to the conclusion that it

does not matter anyway. Therefore we observe an entirely different logical route, however they both end in not having any importance, in a very Beckettian pay off. The renaming of the woman does not come full circle, in fact this inconclusiveness generates even greater uncertainty: the bilingual reader ends up with two sets of names for one character. Who is to say which is the definitive one? The imbalance between the two texts at once reinforces and impoverishes the fictive universe for the bilingual reader.

2.3.3.5. Concluding Remarks

Despite being a work of short fiction, *Premier Amour/First Love* proved to be a fruitful example for the purpose of this research. In this chapter I analysed the changes between *Premier Amour* and *First Love*, while paying particular attention to style and wording, space and time, sociocultural references, characters and narrators, alongside their influence on the fictive universe while considering the bilingual reader's perceptions.

As a point of reference, I will test Brian Fitch's concluding remarks on Beckett's self-translation between *Le Dépeupleur* and *The Lost Ones.* Fitch states that "The English text is often distinctively more evocative" and "The characters thus tend to become more humanized, less impersonal than their French-language counterparts."[62] We observe a similar occurrence between *Premier Amour* and *First Love*. The English narrator is definitely more evocative with utterances like "the shitball and heavens high halls", "Why behind her?", "club foot, duck foot…", and has a narrative stance that the French narrator

[62] Fitch, p. 115.

does not inhabit. The English reader has more of an idea about the narrator's personality, witnessing his mid-sentence interferences and comical exaggerations. Fitch also states that "*The Lost Ones* often presents us with more precise and particular images compared with the more general, abstract evocations of *Le Dépeupleur."*[63] This is applicable with our findings in terms of the narrator's style but not valid regarding the physical or referential descriptions.

Beckett indeed creates a more humanised narrator but he also impoverishes important elements within the fictive universe, such as the remarks about the narrator's and Lulu's native languages, the possible setting of the story, the references to literary figures, the colour of the flower, the size of the house etc. In general, the English translation has more of a comically absurd style, more word play and a more distinctive narrative persona, whereas the French original features a more neutral narrator with a greater physical and referential presence. Leslie Hill, while studying the translation of the trilogy from French to English, states that "Beckett does not embroider his text in translation",[77] however in this particular pairing he indeed embroiders the English version, mainly the narrator's way of talking and his personality traits, as well as some material gains such as him being able to speak more languages.

The greatest differences between the two texts are the ones resulting from Beckett's tampering with the cultural background of the story and the characters. Following is a statement by Fitch about the self-translator's position :

> From the point of view of the *production* of the target-text, however, the author is confronted by the same two options: he can either seek to create for his reader an impression of cultural and linguistic familiarity or, on the contrary, he can set out to place him

[63] Ibid.

> in an alien climate by cultivating a certain cultural exoticism and linguistic strangeness which will make his text 'read like a translation."[64]

I find that Fitch's statement is entirely applicable with the cultural consequences in *First Love.* By ripping the French connotations off of the translation, Beckett avoids alienating the English reader but obscures the cultural background of the story. Fitch states that "this has often been the fate of the second versions of Beckett's texts."[65] Granted, unlike some of his other novels such as *Murphy* or *Malone Dies*, Beckett does not indicate specific places or establishments, therefore the modification of such nouns remains less striking, and open to discussion. Linda Collinge-Germain, in her article "Cultural In-Betweenness in *L'Expulsé/The expelled* by Samuel Beckett" states that despite the ambiguity regarding the setting of the story, the French reader probably would assume that the story is set in France, "because the story was originally written in French and begins on "le perron", a typically French construction leading up to a house, and here the house in which the expelled was born."[66] *L'Expulsé* is part of *Les Nouvelles* along with *Premier Amour*, and the setting of *Premier Amour* also reminds us of France, not because of physical properties but due to the narrator's pronunciation and reference choices. However, Collinge-Germain also points out that Gerry Dukes, in his introduction to the English version, states that the reader would easily recognise references to Ireland, with the landscapes, the odd Irish name and the displays of public piety.[67] Dukes states that "The inevitable conclusion is that events, in

---

[64]Ibid, p. 25.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Linda Collinge-Germain, 'Cultural In-Betweenness in "L'expulsé"/"The Expelled" by Samuel Beckett', *Journal of the Short Story in English*, 52 (2009), 105-111 (p.

[67] Ibid.

general, are set in Dublin and environs."[68] However he also states that in *First Love*, Beckett performs "a kind of double exposure or montage in which he superimpose Paris and the river Seine on Dublin and the river Liffey"[69]. The setting of *Les Nouvelles* is seemingly open to interpretation, but what happens when Beckett omits the necessary clues about the location from his self-translation? Umberto Eco, in his book *Mouse or Rat?,* states:

> A novel describes a world (a possible one, even though not necessarily a fictitious one, as in historical novels). Translators are not allowed to change the true references to that world and no translator could say, in his version, that David Copperfield lived in Madrid or Don Quixote in Devonshire.[70]

If, according to Eco's statement, it is not appropriate to put David Copperfield in Madrid; is it allowed to make him stateless? In a way, this is what Beckett does with his characters in *First Love.* Certainly the strong sense of France disappears in the translation, putting the characters in a more vague setting than the original. Ann Beer, while observing how the modification of the Louis family into Lamberts in translation in *Malone meurt/Malone Dies* also create an added reference to a Balzac character, states that *"*Such cross-lingual connections add a special dimension to readings of Beckett; they also raise important questions about the nature and authority of a single text."[71] At this point it is evident that Beckett carefully picks his modifications, deletions or additions, they are not products of mere chance, and certainly not due to

---

[68] Dukes, p. 3.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Umberto Eco, *Mouse Or Rat?: Translation as Negotiation* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003), p. 63.

[71] Beer, p. 218.

inconsistencies between the French and the English language like Butler states. On the other hand, Beer states that Beckett's "bilingualism is never static"[72] and warns about generalisation on his self-translation practices as it can change from one period to another, thus can be misleading. What is certain, however, is in 1972 during the conception of *First Love*, Beckett was not necessarily following the rules of translation proper, and creating multiple fictive universes.

Throughout this chapter, I pointed out the differences between the readings of *Premier Amour* and *First Love*. I also observed the cultural shifts and the discrepancies between the mental images of a French reader and of an English reader. However there is also the bilingual reader who is possibly the most confused one. The combination of the two works generates a greater level of inconclusiveness for the bilingual reader. How will the bilingual readers interpret the different personality traits of the narrator between the two texts? What will they do with the surplus of information that doesn't conform with their first reading? Or the sudden omissions that could potentially rob them of the sensations they had at first? Which one will they consider as the translation, or will they consider them both originals, or dependents? Will they be amused or resent Beckett for his tampering? The bilingual reader is pushed into a stateless textual landscape where characters have multiple names, fluid personalities and fleeing utterances; a bilingual zone with lots of variants but without the solution.
In this section, I exemplified Beckett's self-translation practice from French to English. The following section will be focusing on his journey from English to French.

[72] Ibid, p. 214.

2.4. Comparative Analysis of *Company* and *Compagnie*

This section observes and analyses Beckett's English prose *Company* and its French self-translation *Compagnie* in a comparative manner, following the same principles adopted in the previous section. First, I will introduce the context in which the bilingual work was produced and published, alongside the received scholarly attention. Next, I will move on to my textual analysis in order to assess the relationship between the English and the French versions, concerning its impact on the fictive universe.

Beckett wrote the English text *Company* between 1977 and 1979. At the time, he had mainly been busy with theatre, attending rehearsals and even directing again. *Company* is remarkable in Beckett's career for a few reasons, one of which is the timing of the text. It had been nearly two decades since he had written a lengthy piece of prose and even longer in English. Beckett writes to Ruby Cohn in a letter dated May 1977: "Tried to get going again in English to see me through, say for company, but broke down. But must somehow, …"[73]. Not only was Beckett writing prose in English again, the content itself was remarkable, for it was weaved with visible personal memories of Beckett, as will be explained in detail later on. Knowlson states that "*Company* comes closer to autobiography than anything Beckett had written since *Dream of Fair to Middling Women* in 1931-2."[74]

Beckett worked on and off on *Company* during the late 1970s, and subsequently started working on the translation based on the English draft, and completed the French text in just over three weeks.[75] This was followed by a

[73] Knowlson, p. 651.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Georgina Nugent-Folan, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Company/Compagnie* (London : Bloomsbury, 2021), p. 21.

practice that had never taken place in Beckett's career before: The French translation, *Compagnie* had been published before the original English *Company*, albeit in the same year.

In the recent ninth volume of the Beckett Digital Manuscript Project, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Company / Compagnie,* Georgina Nugent-Folan traces the genesis of the English and French texts, respectively. She argues that this textual pair is "particularly deserving of scholarly attention because of their unusual chronological overlap."[76] She explains that this reversal in practice was neither intended nor expected by Beckett or the publishers; but even after Beckett had already sent *Compagnie* to his French publisher Minuit, it took him another two months to part with the English original.[77] Nugent-Folan, in a remarkably detailed genetic study, follows Beckett's steps towards the making of *Company,* then *Compagnie,* all the while observing the influence of *Compagnie* on *Company*. In other words, this intertextual dynamic points to a notable moment in Beckett's bilingual career, that is, in terms of a self-translation directly influencing the original work. Nugent-Folan explains Beckett's attitude on this as the following:

> Beckett always maintained that the English *Company* was the 'original'; on 10 January 1980 when he finally sends a typescript of *Company* to Barnet Rosset, he writes that 'The delay is due to the effect of the French translation (which appears this month) on the English which of course none the less remains the original'.[78]

Beckett's emphasis on *Company* remaining 'none the less the original' is important, considering this textual pair deepened the scholars' questioning of

---

[76] Ibid, p. 33.

[77] Ibid, p. 357.

[78] Ibid, p. 354.

"original" vs. "translation" in Beckett's works even further. Nugent-Folan argues that *Company* as a 'base text' would be a better term than 'the original', if it needed one, since Beckett started translating into French from not the final English text, but the second of five typescripts. Similarly, Brian Fitch interprets the relationship between *Company* and *Compagnie* as the following:

> [W]ith the coming into being of *Compagnie*, *Company* has somehow become subject to modification: what was initially complete in itself and autonomous (*Company*) is now rendered retroactively incomplete. In this sense the first version is paradoxically dependent upon the second, and the classic situation of the translation's relationship to its original has been turned upside-down.[79]

Had Beckett not been vocal about the influence of *Compagnie* on *Company*, or had he managed to let go of the English text earlier, the scholars would not possibly have known about this unusual dynamic until the manuscripts were released. However, as early as the late 1980s, this unique dynamic between *Company* and *Compagnie* was widely acknowledged between scholars, such as Brian Fitch and Ann Beer, who were catapulting Beckett's bilingualism into a sub-field of its own within Beckett Studies. Fitch, in particular, dedicated a section on this pair in his book *Beckett and Babel,* analysing it from the perspective of the texts' reception. In the same book, Fitch also tried out various samples of putting together a bilingual text, using the *Company/Compagnie* pair as one of his examples, in what he calls "explorations" by putting two texts side by side, merging the two texts together and alternating sentences etc. In doing so, Fitch evaluates the "hypothetical" ways of how and if a bilingual text might work. In 1993, an actual bilingual

[79] Fitch, pp. 106-107.

edition, a genetic study on *Company* and *Compagnie* was published as the first volume in S*eries of Variorum Editions of Samuel Beckett*, edited by Charles Krance.[80]

With scholars being well aware of this dynamic, combined with the autobiographical sense of the story, they started looking for answers as to why this might have happened. Ann Beer believes that "*Company* is notable for the emotional openness, even sentimental nostalgia"[81] and she argues that working bilingually on this text allowed Beckett to merge English language childhood memories with a detached position thanks to French, "to ensure that 'heart' and 'mind' are balanced".[82] Nugent-Folan agrees with the distance that the French text might have provided Beckett in face of autobiographical elements, thus potentially making it easier to let go. Furthermore, she also argues that it might have been tied to Beckett's insecurity about the English version. She states:

> With the French only days away from being published, the English version was still in his possession in early January 1980. This decision to hold on to the English was undoubtedly exacerbated by the uncertainty Beckett felt towards the English text — *Company* was, after all, his first major prose text in English since *From an Abandoned Work* in 1956. He made numerous references to the insecurity he felt towards the piece, and this uncertainty seems to have been tied to the English language version, as opposed to French. It is entirely possible that Beckett felt less confident of his compositional voice in English than in French, having composed in French for so long.[83]

---

[80] See Samuel Beckett, *Company/Compagnie and A Piece of Monologue/Solo: A Bilingual Variorum Edition*, ed. by Charles Krance (New York: Garland Publishing, 1993).
The series was the first to publish Beckett's bilingual texts together for textual scholarship, however it only lasted three volumes. The recent on-going *Beckett Digital Manuscript Project* develops on Krance's initiative significantly. See https://www.beckettarchive.org/.

[81] Beer, 1987, p. 392.

[82] Ibid, p. 393.

[83] Nugent-Folan, p. 358.

I find Nugent-Folan's reasoning convincing, for even though Beckett never abandoned English as a writing language, the native language's resurgence might have brought its own challenges. Cohn argues that "a new gentleness suffuses *Company*, not unlike Shakespeare's late romances after the tragedies."[84] *Company* has an emotional, intimate quality that exudes from the lines, even to the uninitiated reader.

Either way, in the end, Beckett let both his companions, *Compagnie* and *Company* go. In 1980, following the unintentional precedence of Les Éditions de Minuit's *Compagnie*, the English *Company* was published in the US by Grove House, and by John Calder in UK. The last resetting of *Company* in Beckett's lifetime is the 1989 John Calder edition, collected with *Ill Seen Ill Said* and *Worstward Ho* under the title *Nohow On,* which is also the English edition I refer to in my study.

Up until now, I have shown the conditions and constraints experienced by Beckett during writing and self-translating *Company*, in order to have a well-rounded understanding of the making of this textual pair.[85] Next, I will offer a brief summary of the story, followed by my textual comparative analysis of *Company* and *Compagnie*.

2.4.1. Summary of the Story

Company tells the story of a man lying in the dark on his back, who hears a voice. Unsure of the voice's origin or its intended audience, the man lying in

---

[84] Cohn, *A Beckett Canon*, p. 354.

[85] I should note that, while I obviously acknowledge the influence of *Compagnie* on *Company*, and deeply appreciative of Nugent-Folan's study on their respective genesis, I aim to refrain from referring to genetic material in my analysis unless absolutely necessary to keep within the scope of my research. For detailed information on textual variants in manuscripts see *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Company/Compagnie.*

the dark begins to wonder about the voice, all the while reminiscing about his memories. During his existentially charged recollections, he wonders whether there is an other with him in the dark, or is it merely him imagining the voice? The narrator or narrators are ambiguous during the novella, changing voices. In the end, he comes to the conclusion that he devised the voice just to keep himself company.

2.4.2. Comparative Textual Analysis

2.4.2.1. Style, Flow and Wording

An immediate modification is observed between the opening passages of *Company* and *Compagnie*:

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 5	**A voice comes to one** in the dark. Imagine. **To one** on his back in the dark. **This he can tell by the pressure on his hind parts** and by how the dark changes when he shuts his eyes and again when he opens them again.	p. 7	**Une voix parvient** à quelqu'un dans le noir. Imaginer. **Une voix parvient** à quelqu'un sur le dos dans le noir. **Le dos pour ne nommer que lui le lui dit** et la façon dont change le noir quand il rouvre les yeux et encore quand il les referme.

The doubling effect the French text creates with the repetition of "Une voix parvient" does not correspond to the original English, creating a different musicality in between, as well as an inconsistent degree of emphasis on the voice itself in the introductory part of the novella. Furthermore, the discrepancy

between the two phrasings, “This he can tell by the pressure on his hind parts” and “Le dos pour ne nommer que lui le lui dit” is rather conspicuous. Not only does the “pressure” disappear in translation, but both the syntactic and the stylistic form in French is different. Also, Beckett once more chooses repetition in French, unlike English: Two different usages ,“his back / hind parts” are both translated as “le dos / le dos”.

Throughout the narration, repetition and rhyme are evident in both texts, albeit often in different forms. Reiterations of certain phrases are essential to the narrative. Following is an example of such quality:

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 5	As for example when he hears, **You first saw the light on such and such a day.** Sometimes the two are combined as for example, **You first saw the light on such and such a day** and now you are on your back in the dark. […]	p. 8	Comme par exemple lorsqu’il entend, **Tu vis le jour tel et tel jour**. Il arrive que les deux se combinent comme par exemple, **Tu vis le jour tel et tel jour** et maintenant tu es sur le dos dans le noir. […]
p.6	Why does it never say for example, **You saw the light on such and such a day** and now you are alone on your back in the dark? […]	p. 10	Pourquoi ne dit-elle jamais par exemple, **Tu vis le jour tel et tel jour** et maintenant tu es seul sur le dos dans le noir? […]
p.7	**You saw the light on such and such a day** and your mind never active at any time is now even less than ever so.		**Tu es né tel et tel jour** et ton esprit de tout temps peu actif l’est maintenant moins que jamais.

The phrase, “You saw the light on such and such a day” repeats throughout the story, signalling the “voice”. Without the French translation, it is ambiguous what the voice means in the English original. “Seeing the light” being open to interpretation, the English reader cannot be certain of its meaning. In French, however, Beckett first adopts the reiteration of “Tu vis le jour tel et tel jour” and this remains the wording within the most part of *Compagnie*. The French reader might in this case, reason that Beckett refers to “being born”, however a certain ambiguity remains. Only later, when Beckett then translates the same exact English version as “Tu es né tel et tel jour”, we understand what the voice means. This reading not only changes the fictive universe substantially, but marks a point where the translation “explains” the original. It is not clear as to why Beckett might have opted to translate this way. The scene of the protagonist’s birth is eventually described, introduced by “You were born on… ”[86] and “Tu naquis…”[87], and not by the readily established reiteration.

Similarly, the following example also points to discrepancies between reiterations:

[86] p. 28.

[87] p. 47.

	Company		*Compagnie*
p.5-6	And in another dark or in the same another devising it all for company. **Quick leave him.** […]	p.8	Et dans un autre noir ou dans le même un autre. Imaginant le tout pour se tenir compagnie. **Vite motus.** […]
p. 19	Last person. I. **Quick leave him**. […]	p.31	Toute dernière personne. Je. **Vite motus.** […]
p. 37	Yet another then. Of whom nothing. Devising figments to temper his nothingness. **Quick leave him.** Pause and again in panic to himself, **Quick leave him.** […]	p.63	Donc un autre encore. De qui rien. Se créant des chimères pour tempérer son néant. **Vite motus.** Un temps et derechef affolé à part soi, **Vite vite motus**. […]
p. 49	Yet another still devising it all for company. **Quick leave him.**	p.83	Encore un autre encore imaginant le tout pour se tenir compagnie. **Vite vite motus.**

At first, Beckett translates “Quick leave him” as “Vite motus” in French, which is in itself worth attention. The first part of the sentence, “quick”, finds its appropriate counterpart, “vite”, in translation. The rest of the sentence, however, metamorphoses. Not only does Beckett employ Latin with “motus”, he also changes the reading of the reiteration. *Motus* is neutral, indicating to move, or some sort of a movement. The push to “leave” and the emphasis on “him” vanish in translation. Furthermore, Beckett once again tampers with the reiteration. “Quick leave him” is modified into both “Vite motus” and “Vite vite motus”. Both the English and the French hold their own power and rhythm within the text, but they do not correspond to each other. I have previously showed Beckett’s tendency to add Latin to the protagonist’s dictionary in

translation, as in the case of *First Love*. Based on this, it could be argued that Beckett has a tendency to insert Latin in self-translation, no matter the directionality between the languages. Curious though, as seen later in the text, “Quick imagine.”[88] is translated as “Vite imaginer.”[89], no sign of Latin.

One of the most quoted passages in *Company*’s autobiographical readings by the scholars is the scene where the father is teaching the boy to swim, encouraging him to jump from the high board into the water, a real event that had taken place in Forty-Foot during Beckett’s childhood years.[90] The passage in English is partially modified in French: The father’s “loved trusted face”[91] becomes “le cher visage ami”[92], paring down the sentimentality of the original expression. Moreover, father’s call, repeated twice in both texts, “Be a brave boy” is translated as “Courage !”. This wording choice again contributes to an image of a neutralised interaction between the father and the child. Furthermore, the end of the passage where the child notices everyone is looking at him is described differently in translation. The English “From the water and from the bathing place.”, is split in two sentences in translation, reading “Depuis l’eau lointaine. Depuis la terre ferme.”

In general, *Company* contains an elevated level of emotivity in comparison to *Compagnie.* Sometimes this discrepancy occurs as a result of Beckett’s omission of an adjective, or of an expression in self-translation. For instance, *Compagnie* reads: “L’emploi de la deuxième personne est le fait de la voix. Celui de la troisième celui de l’autre.”[93] The majority of the content is

[88] p. 27.

[89] p. 45.

[90] Knowlson, p. 652.

[91] p. 14.

[92] p. 23.

[93] *Compagnie*, p. 9.

intact, however the original English describes the third voice as “that *cankerous* other”[94], which is missing in the French version. Following is another example where the French text becomes more muted:

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 45	Why not just lie in the dark with closed eyes and give up? **Give up all.** Have done with it all.	p. 76	Pourquoi ne pas simplement gésir les yeux fermés dans le noir et renoncer à tout. En finir avec tout.

As the protagonist’s stream of consciousness continues, he briefly considers giving up. As seen above, the English text again expresses a heightened sense of emotivity. As a result of the omission of “Give up all” in translation, this emphasis on the emotionally driven thought is missing in French, making the passage somewhat more concise. Beckett also omits some longer parts of the protagonist’s thoughts, as well as applying modifications. Following is an example of both:

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 36	**Vague distress at the vague thought of his perhaps overhearing a confidence when he hears for example, You are on your back in the dark.** Doubts gradually dashed as voice from questing far and wide closes upon him. When it ceases no other sound than his breath. When it ceases long enough vague hope it may have said its last. Mental activity of a low order. Rare flickers of reasoning **of no avail**. Hope and despair **and suchlike** barely felt.	p. 61	Doutes peu à peu déçus à mesure que la voix au lieu de s’éparpiller aux quatre coins se referme sur lui. Lorsqu’elle cesse seul son son souffle à lui. Lorsqu’elle cesse longuement faible espoir que pour de bon. Activité mentale des plus quelconques. Rares lueurs de raisonnement **aussitôt éteintes**. Espoir et désespoir **pour ne nommer que ce vieux tandem** à peine ressentis.

[94] p. 6.

The first, lengthy sentence is entirely omitted in the French text, which points to the “vague distress” the protagonist might be having, alongside other details of his thought process. The French text skips this sentence and therefore lacks this information related to the protagonist’s emotions. Furthermore, we observe some modifications towards the end of the passage. Rare flickers of reasoning “of no avail” becomes “aussitôt éteintes”, not just hinting at more of an effort from the English protagonist’s side, but a sense of a blunter loss. Curiously, the latter part of the French passage has a more descriptive style in comparison to the English writing. A stranger translation occurs when the simple expression of “and suchlike” of the original turns into “pour ne nommer que ce vieux tandem” in French. This modification also alters both the meaning and the style between the two texts.

There are a few more instances where the French text gives different, or additional information on the protagonist’s perception. “Better hope deferred than none”[95] being modified into “Mieux vaut l’espoir charlatan qu’aucun”[96] is an example in this vein. The perception changes when “Hope deferred” turns into “l’espoir charlatan”, clearly creating different readings. The former is more neutral in this case, whereas the latter, French, creates a sense of being deceived. Another instance where the French text creates a decisive effect on the fictive universe is observed where the voice’s “constant faintness”[97] becomes “sa faiblesse finale”[98] in French. All the aforementioned examples in *Compagnie* were modifications, however there is also one noteworthy addition:

[95] p. 20.

[96] p. 33.

[97] p. 38.

[98] p. 64.

“Withershins on account of the heart.”[99] translated as “Sénestrorsum à cause du coeur.”[100] is followed by the addition of “Comme aux enfers.” Beckett repeats this addition twice in the French text, which lacks its origin in English. Nugent-Folan reasons that this must be a reference to Dante’s *Purgatorio*. Interestingly, both texts later mention Dante by name, “So sat waiting to be purged the old lutist cause of Dante’s first quarter-smile and now perhaps singing praises with some section of the blest at last”[101], kept fully intact in translation. It is all the while more curious, knowing that Beckett handed in *Compagnie* before *Company,* meaning he had the opportunity to go back to the “original” to insert the “addition” formed in the French text.

In some instances the rhythmic quality of an expression is lost in self-translation without Beckett’s interference, due to the language systems themselves, such as in the example of “Sunless cloudless brightness”[102] becoming “Clarté sans nuage ni soleil”.[103] Beckett, opting to carry over the meaning as it is, loses the rhyme. In other instances, the languages are more accommodating: “to yesterday’s. To yesteryear’s. To yesteryears’.”[104] is translated as “de la journée d’avant. De l’année d’avant. Des années d’avant.”[105] Here, Beckett can maintain a sense of rhyme, not the same, yet not completely lost.

Finally, the following passage which marks the end of the story:

---

[99] p. 40.

[100] p. 68.

[101] p. 49.

[102] p. 19.

[103] p. 32.

[104] p. 11.

[105] p. 18.

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 52	And how better in the end labour lo and **silence.** And you as you alway were. Alone.	p. 88	Et comme quoi mieux vaut tout compte fait peine perdue et toi t que toujours. Seul.

As the protagonist realises the voice was not someone or something else and he had been alone the entire time, the “silence” that follows in English is missing in French. “Silence” here is noteworthy, as it signifies the voice finally has stopped talking. This seemingly small omission in fact creates an important discrepancy in the fictive universe.

2.4.2.2. Setting, Time and Image

There are several location references throughout *Company.* Early into the story, the protagonist recalls a childhood memory: “A small boy you come out of Connolly’s Stores holding your mother by the hand.”[106] Beckett opts to keep the name of the store while also aiming to contextualise for the French reader, translating it as the “Boucherie-charcuterie Connolly”[107].

In *Company,* Beckett refers to several real place names that are closely tied to his personal life. Following is a passage demonstrating as such:

[106] p. 8.

[107] p. 12.

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 18-19	Somewhere on the **Ballyogan Road** in lieu of nowhere in particular. **Where no truck any more.** Somewhere on the Ballyogan Road on the way from A to Z. Head sunk totting up the tally on the verge of the ditch. Foothills to left. **Crocker's Acres** ahead. Father's shade to right and a little to the rear. So many times already round the earth. […] As if bound for **Stepaside**.	p. 30	Quelque part sur **le chemin de Ballyogan** au lieu de nulle part en particulier. Quelque part entre A et Z sur **le chemin de Ballyogan**. Tête baissée dans tes additions au bord du fossé. À gauche les premières pentes. **Devant les pâturages.** À droite et un peu en retrait l'ombre de ton père. Tant de fois déjà le tour de la terre. […] Tout droit sur **Stepaside**.

Beckett opts to keep the road's name, Ballyogan in translation, however "where no truck any more" is omitted in French. Stepaside also preserves its name in *Compagnie*. However, he omits Crocker's Acres in translation and instead replaces it with "les pâturages**".** Curious, as it is clear that Beckett does not refrain from carrying the Irish place names over to the French text but for Crocker's Acres. Eoin O'Brien, in his book *The Beckett Country*, explains that Crocker's Acres refer to the area where the wealthy horse-trainer Richard Webster Crocker ("Boss Crocker") used to train his horses. O'Brien points out that Crocker's Acres had been mentioned in a few other Beckett works, directly or indirectly, such as "Boss Crocker's Gallops" in *More Pricks than Kicks*, as "Crocker's Acres" in *Not I* and as a reference to bookmakers that situated close to the Gallops in *Texts For Nothing*.[108] O'Brien explains that Beckett as a young boy frequented the area:

[108] Eoin O'Brien, *The Beckett Country* (Dublin: Black Cat Press, 1986), p. 45.

> Beckett often trod the Ballyogan Road to the Gallops, situated some fifteen minutes walk from Cooldrinagh. If he continued climbing the Ballyogan Road, he came to the hamlet of Stepaside on the foothills of the Dublin mountains.[109]

It is all the more curious as to why Beckett skips Crocker's Acres names in translation. O'Brien's description of young Beckett's trajectory confirms *Company'*s autobiographical setting once more. However, O'Brien does not mention the omission in Beckett's French text *Compagnie,* or its situation within other translated texts.

Nugent-Folan recognises the same omission in her study, points out the potential answer in *Pas Moi*, the translation of *Not I,* offered by Pim Verhulst, as Crocker's Acres perhaps being "too foreign of a name to use in the target language."[110] (qtd in Nugen-Folan). She then argues, if Verhulst's reasoning is correct, then perhaps it would also apply to *Compagnie*. It is interesting to see Beckett is consistent with not keeping the name Crocker's Acres in translation in both French texts which contain the reference.[111] However, I will argue that Crocker's Acres omission in *Pas Moi* is not comparable to that of in *Compagnie*, for two reasons: First, the simple fact that *Not I/Pas Moi* is a play and not a piece of prose. I refrain from comparing Beckett's attitudes in self-translation across genres, and especially plays, for theatre itself already goes through an adaptation from a text to stage/scene and has different internal and external dynamics of production, acting, audience etc.

Second, and more striking in this case, is the fact that Crocker's Acres is the only overt reference as a proper location name in *Not I*. Therefore, Beckett not carrying over the name into *Pas Moi* is an example of him omitting the

---

[109] Ibid.

[110] Nugent-Folan, p. 374.

[111] Beckett did not translate *More Pricks than Kicks* into French.

entirety of Irish name references, even though there is only one. In *Compagnie*, however, Beckett does keep the place names Ballyogan and Stepaside, and even Connolly's. Crocker's Acres is the only one that does not survive the translinguistic journey, and it is doubtful if this name is any more Irish than Ballyogan. It could be argued that it is because it is not a "proper" place name like Balloygan, but then how come Connolly's make it to the other side? Is this omission in some way tied to the omission of "Where no truck any more" in the same passage? Is it possible that, Beckett in French, remembers less, or the more likely option, does he simply want to share less? Any further than this would be speculation, thus this remains as one of the many mysteries in self-translation.

Other modifications in *Compagnie* are more self-explanatory: Throughout the translation, imperial units of *Company* are modified into metric units in *Compagnie;* "Hundred yards"[112] change into "cent mètres"[113], "Seven cubic yards"[114] into "sept mètres cubes"[115] and so on. Beckett is consistent in his approach, not only in this particular self-translation but across all his works. Ruby Cohn notes that Beckett employs the same approach between English and French *Murphy,* "to clarify its surface meaning for the French reader"[116]*.* The directionality of the translation, in this case, does not matter as Beckett keeps the same approach from French to English as well, as I have exemplified in the previous section on *Premier Amour* and *First Love*. And like my previous examples, alteration of the original units creates discrepancies in the fictive

[112] p. 30.

[113] p. 51.

[114] p. 32.

[115] p. 55.

[116] Cohn, *Samuel Beckett: The Comic Gamut*, p. 266.

universe. The protagonist recalls counting his steps in a memory as an old man, “two steps per yard”[117] in *Company*, “deux pas par mètre”[118] in French. Houses get bigger or smaller, distance gets longer or shorter, people get faster or slower. Such modifications also have an impact on the fictive universe.

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 34	So you sit face to face in the little summer-house. **With eyes closed and your hands on your pubes.** In that rainbow light. **That dead still**.	p. 58	Vous voilà ainsi assis dans le petit pavillon. Dans cette lumière irisée. **Ce silence.**

In the excerpt above, the details of narrator’s sitting position is omitted in the French text, therefore creating a discrepancy between the mental images available to the English and the French reader. Similarly, within the same passage, “A single leg appears. Seen from above” referring to woman’s leg, loses the latter part and only states “Une jambe unique apparait.” The French image is incomplete according to the that of English. Furthermore, there is yet again a partially neutralised translation as “Ce silence” in comparison to “That dead still.”

Another modification of an image within the fictive universe is of a big bow window looking “west to the mountains”[119] in English, but “sur l’ouest et la montagne”[120] in French, thus changing the scenery. Several auditory images are also modified: The sentence “The odd sound.”[121] is replaced with “Un bruit

[117] p. 11.

[118] p. 19.

[119] p. 10.

[120] p. 15.

[121] p. 14.

de loin en loin."[122] Furthermore, "Sole sound in the silence your footfalls"[123] is translated as "Seul bruit dans le silence celui de tes pas"[124], but the immediate following sentence "Rather sole sounds for they vary from one to the next**.**" is omitted in French. Therefore, this auditory variation is missing in *Compagnie*.

The French text seldom offers additional imagery to that of the English text within the fictive universe. A rare example occurs in the memory of protagonist's birth, concerning his father's whereabouts. The English text reads "When he returned at nightfall he learned to his dismay from the maid at the back door that labour was still in swing."[125] Only in French do we learn that the father specifically prefers to enter the house the way he did: "préférant y pénétrer par la porte de service."[126] In another scene, the sentence "Lies in the dark with closed eyes resting from his crawl"[127] is translated as "Souffle les yeux fermés dans le noir."[128] In this instance, Beckett adds "souffle" but at the same time removes the "resting from his crawl*",* resulting in another imbalanced image in translation.

In one instance, the protagonist's temporal memory is also modified. "Cloudless May Day"[129] in the summerhouse becomes "Journée d'avril sans nuage."[130] This puzzling temporal shift in the memory is addressed by two scholars, Fitch and Butler, from different perspectives. While Fitch contests the

---

[122] p. 23.

[123] p. 11.

[124] p. 18.

[125] p. 10.

[126] p. 16.

[127] p. 44.

[128] p. 75.

[129] p. 31.

[130] p. 30.

compatibility of the two within the fictive universe, Butler insists that this is, in fact, a suitable modification. Butler states:

> In French this becomes "Journée d'avril sans nuage" prompting Fitch to remark that "by no stretch of the imagination can 'avril' [...] be translated as "May". Translation is indeed a matter of stretching the imagination but we must be as elastic as possible: "May", from Chaucer onwards, is the sunny spring month par excellence and here Beckett needs a month that will be, as he says, "cloudless"; any time spent in England or Ireland in the month of April will not lead to memories of cloudlessness - as we know, the "glory of an April day" is "uncertain" and it is April that brings the sweet spring showers. Now in France "avril" is just that bit sunnier and drier than in England and thus a suitable candidate for the description "sans nuage" in a way that English Aprils cannot be. Altogether "May" is a better translation of "avril" than "April" would be. This is not Beckettian licence stemming from his authorial authority, it is merely thoughtful translating.[131]

Even if Butler's reasoning were true, and Beckett modified the months thinking of the weather conditions, this would still create a discrepancy within the fictive universe as the story is clearly set in Ireland, evidenced by many location references. The meteorology of May or April in France is irrelevant, as even though the text is in French, the story is not set in France. I agree with Fitch in terms of the incompatibility of the translation, however, having observed Beckett's attitude in self-translation, I also acknowledge he rarely modifies by coincidence. A curious thing neither of the scholars noticed is that, Beckett indeed employs this April/May duality before in another text. *L'Image* reads *"nous somme au mois d'avril ou de mai"*[132] and its English version *The Image*

---

[131] Butler, pp. 125-126.

[132] Samuel Beckett, *L'Image* (Paris: Minuit, 1956), p. 12.

bearing the same phrase *"*we are in April or May*"*[133]*.* Therefore, I am inclined to offer another, perhaps farfetched, reason for this discrepancy, related to Beckett's own life. I shall first quote Knowlson's explanation on Beckett's month of birth:

> There has been a lot of debate as to whether this was or was not true date of his birth. His birth certificate records the date as 13 May, not April. So it has been claimed that Beckett deliberately created the myth that he was born on Friday the thirteenth - and a Good Friday at that. […] The truth is much less dramatic. A mistake was clearly made […] Beckett himself could throw no light on the reasons of discrepancy, except to say that he could remember his mother telling him about it as an error when he was a child and to repeat that his birthday had always been celebrated on 13 April.[134]

I find this discrepancy between April and May both in Beckett's life and *Company/Compagnie* painfully similar to be a coincidence. Given the autobiographic nature of *Company*, would it be too unthinkable for Beckett to insert an amusing detail in translation? On the other hand, the protagonist's birth scene in *Company* indeed mentions the date as the "Easter Friday"[135] (as per Beckett's mother's suggestion in real life), and it is kept intact in French. The May/April discrepancy within the fictive universe occurs later in the text. Perhaps Beckett, after translating the memory of his own birth, felt compelled to insert "Avril" when faced with "May", recreating the discrepancy of a lifetime. Would it not be a very Beckettian thing to do? It is not any less plausible than Butler's reasoning.

---

[133] Samuel Beckett, "The Image" in T*he Complete Short Prose* (New York: Grove Press, 1995), pp. 165-168 (p. 166).

[134] Knowlson, p. 1.

[135] p. 28.

2.4.2.3. Sociocultural Notions and References

There are a couple of obvious sociocultural references in the textual universe of *Company/Compagnie*. Following is an example of modification in this category:

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 19-20	East beyond the sea the faint shape of high **mountain**. Seventy miles away according to your **Longman.**	p. 32	À l'est au-delà de la mer le contour à peine de hautes **montagnes**. Une distance de soixante-dix milles à en croire **ton manuel de géographie.**

Here, the narrator climbs into his hiding place on the hillside and casually mentions its position in relation to the mountain(s), plural in French. Longman he refers to in English, *Longman's Geography* by the British publisher*,* loses its name and affiliations and becomes a generic "manuel de géographie**".** Here, Beckett, as he often does in translation, omits an obvious reference to potentially avoid alienating the French reader. Interestingly, he keeps the "miles" intact in self-translation, in contrast with his previous consistent modification of units as shown in the previous section; though perhaps the narrator is referring to nautical miles in this instance, which is widely used all around the world.

In contrast to the *Longman* modication, Beckett chooses to keep the following sociocultural reference: "There on summer Sundays after his midday meal your father loved to retreat with *Punch* and a cushion."[136] The British magazine is carried over intact as *Punch* in translation, thus showing an

[136] *Nohow On*, p. 32.

instance where Beckett chose to foreignise in self-translation. Knowlson writes that Beckett himself told him that this memory of him reading *Punch* with his father is real, though it did not take place at the summerhouse like *Company* suggests.[137]

It is curious as to why Beckett the self-translator chose to omit, or say domesticate, the reference to *Longman* when he kept *Punch* intact in the French text. Is the name *Punch* any more relatable to the French reader than *Longman'*s name? I do use the terms domestication and foreignisation tentatively here, and my explanation will follow.

In the latest edition of *Translator's Invisibility,* printed as a volume in the series *Routledge Translation Classics*, in 2018, Lawrence Venuti offers a new introduction to his book. In the introduction, Venuti criticises certain scholars for "grossly oversimplifying" the use of domestication and foreignisation, as well as interpreting it as a simple dichotomy. Venuti emphasises once again that neither refer to specific verbal choices in translation, but to their intercultural ethical effect in the translated text.[138] In other words, neither domestication nor foreignisation is as simple as textual discrepancy or accuracy, but it depends on the value they hold (or create, or destroy) in the target text. In this manner, it is highly important what Beckett chooses to carry over. While I refer to Venuti's theories throughout my research, I am also aware that Beckett is not an ordinary (that means, external) translator but he is the author-translator. As I have already explained in detail in Chapter 1, the dynamics of self-translation are very different to those of translation proper. What might be useful to emphasise here is, though, by being the translator of a text that has been

---

[137] Knowlson, p. 652.

[138] Lawrence Venuti, 'Introduction' in *Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (New York: Routledge, 2018).

produced by himself, Beckett is free of a potential challenge in ordinary translation, that is misinterpretation. Venuti recognises that translator's work is a work of interpretation. The history of literature witnessed a good deal of mistakes due to misunderstanding or misinterpretation by translators in the target text. The self-translator does face many challenges of his own, but he is immune to the challenges which may stem from a lack of knowledge of the source text, which could subsequently result in misinterpretation. This privilege is the clearest indicator that no choice in self-translation is an accident. Surely, self-translators also have their own motivations that might alter the text in translation; but it is clear that no attitude in self-translation can be due to misinterpretation. By removing the initial burden on the translator and also on the critic, this "impossibility of misinterpretation" enables us to know that, if nothing else, what stays behind and what gets carried over in self-translation is well-informed.

Coming back to Beckett's *Company/Compagnie* from this point of view, Beckett surely knew exactly what both *Longman* and *Punch* meant and stood for. I will argue that, even though I have noted the omission of Longman in French for my textual analysis, this deletion is not necessarily a form of domestication, as the reference's significance does not point out to a complex cultural or political notion, nor is the reference replaced with a French "counterpart", such as the case in *Murphy*, where the Pulitzer Prize became La Prix Femina in the French text.

Yet, Beckett does employ foreignisation in the example of *Punch*. Before I explain this further, I shall quote the rest of the passage, which is also kept intact in translation:

> There on summer Sundays after his midday meal your father loved to retreat with *Punch* and a cushion. The waist of his trousers unbuttoned he sat on the one ledge turning the pages. You on the other with your feet dangling. When he chuckled you tried to chuckle too. When his chuckle died yours too. That you should try to imitate his chuckle pleased and tickled him greatly and sometimes he would chuckle for no other reason than to hear you try to chuckle too.[139]

The above passage reads as a loving memory between the father and the child. Beckett's personal reminiscence, as told to Knowlson, is such an emotive passage that one might overlook the value *Punch* holds here, which has been the case in scholarly attention. The way in which the protagonist's and his father's chuckles ebbs and flows, I suspect, might signify more than an intimate memory. Joseph P. Finnan, in his article in *Irish Historical Studies,* explains the attitude of the Punch magazine and its cartoons, towards the Irish and their politics:

> Between 1910 and 1918 Punch displayed a grudging acceptance of the principle of home rule, along with an equal concern for the desires of Irish unionists opposed to Irish self-government, and a residual condescending attitude towards the Irish in general, themes which combined to project an ambivalent British attitude towards the Irish question.[140]

The memory of the young boy Beckett reading Punch with his father should approximately refer to this era of the magazine, given that Beckett was born in 1906. Whether Beckett the boy was capable of understanding the content of the magazine in this narrative is irrelevant, as is the apolitical attitude Beckett the author supposedly had, prescribed by many of his critics. The

---

[139] pp. 31-32.

[140] Joseph P. Finnan, 'Punch's Portrayal of Redmond, Carson and the Irish Question, 1910-18', *Irish Historical Studies,* 33 (2013*),* 424-451 (p. 425).

importance of Punch and its existence in French *Compagnie* results in foreignisation, and whether Beckett kept the reference to the magazine with this attitude in mind or not is not the deciding factor.

The value that this reference to *Punch* holds in translation stems from its problematic connotations in the Irish context. Finnan states that “Many of the magazine's portrayals of the Irish in the 1910s reflected persistent stereotypes of rowdy, unsophisticated peasants, symbolised by frequent representations of 'Paddy and his pig.’” [141] By allowing *Punch* to be *Punch* in translation, Beckett is not just transferring a word, but the sociopolitical connotations it is attached to.

2.4.2.4. Names, Characters and Narrators

A few names are mentioned throughout the text(s). Mrs. Coote in “Your mother is in the kitchen making ready for afternoon tea with Mrs. Coote”[142] is carried over intact, albeit as “Madame Coote”[143]. James Knowlson confirms that Mrs. Coote was a real-life character from Beckett’s childhood[144].

Similarly, when the protagonist is thinking about his own birth, he mentions that “The midwife was none other than a Dr. Hadden or Haddon.”[145] Beckett translates the sentence as “L’accoucheur n’était autre que le généraliste Haddon ou Hadden.”[146] Beckett also keeps the name(s) intact in this instance, however the order in which the protagonist is remembering the names

[141] Ibid, p. 427.

[142] Ibid, p. 17.

[143] *Compagnie*, p. 27.

[144] Knowlson, p. 652.

[145] *Nohow On*, p. 10.

[146] *Compagnie*, p. 15

are reversed. According to Knowlson, Haddon is “a real-life doctor who practised during his childhood in the Stillorgan area.”[147] It is clear that Beckett consistently preserves the autobiographic characters of *Company* in his translation.

Following is an example concerning a made-up name between *Compagnie* and *Compagnie*:

	Company		*Compagnie*
p. 25	Let the hearer be named H. Aspirate. Haitch. You **Haitch** are on your back in the dark.	p. 42	Que l’entendeur s’appelle H. Aspiré. Hache. Toi **Hache** tu es sur le dos dans le noir.

The protagonist decides to name the “hearer”, H, subsequently renouncing it; followed by the name M (and W for “himself”) later, and then altogether giving up naming the hearer/himself in a very Beckettian manner, reasoning “His unnamability.”[148] All of these letter-names are kept as they are in self-translation. However, the protagonist is very specific about how to pronounce the letter-name H*, aspiré*, thus becoming “Haitch” in English and “Hache” in French. Therefore, even though the name does not technically change, the phonetics alter the name’s pronunciation, creating rather short-lived nicknames.

When it comes to the impact of self-translation on the narrator(s), any and all discrepancies regarding the usage of language in *Compagnie* alter the reception of *Company*’s narrator(s). This is not due to the natural consequences of self-translation, but due to the textual pair’s specific complexity around the

[147] Knowlson, p. 615.

[148] *Nohow On*, p. 37.

speaking voices. One omission concerning the narrator of *Company* and *Compagnie* occurs early in the story when he first begins to wonder about the voice. Only in English, though, the narrator asks: “May not be there another with him in the dark to and of whom the voice is speaking?[149] This question is omitted in the French translation, and the French narrator does not wonder about the possibility of “another in the dark” until later in the narrative.

2.4.3. Concluding Remarks

As I have shown in this chapter, there are various changes in self-translation from English *Company,* to French *Compagnie.* Some notable changes alter the level of emotivity between the texts, as argued by Beer and Nugent-Folan, such as the French version having more of a distance in the face of the autobiographical content in comparison to the English original. However, there are also notable instances where the French text expands on the original with unexpected modifications, which is a rare occurrence in Beckett’s self-translation practice. Other notable changes relate to the discursive style, therefore creating shifts in the narrator’s perception.

Regarding the textual pair, Fitch evaluates that “certain mental images experienced by the reader of *Company* — visual, auditory and so on — never enter the imagination of the reader of *Compagnie*.”[150] This is true as Beckett’s self-translations do have repercussions on the images within the fictive universe, as I have observed the same between *Premier Amour* and *First Love*. However, Fitch concludes that these particular differences between *Company*

[149] p. 6.

[150] Fitch, p. 99.

and *Compagnie* do not “contradict” but rather “complement” each other.[151] I agree with Fitch in this matter. Despite the modifications in the self-translated text, the relationship between *Company* and *Compagnie* is less distant than that of *Premier Amour* and *First Love.* For instance, unlike *First Love*, *Compagnie* does not obscure the location of the story. I suspect this is due to the clearly autobiographical nature of the text as well as it being written in Beckett’s native language instead of French. As I will argue in Chapter 4, I have observed a similar attitude in Şafak’s practice of interfering less when the self-translation is being made into the second language. Arguably, the native language fiction conserves its integrity across self-translation more than the second language original.

[151] Ibid, p. 101.

Chapter 3: Elif Şafak

3.1. Şafak's Life and Works

Elif Şafak is a best-selling writer who is arguably the most well-known female Turkish author worldwide. She was born in Strasbourg in 1971, the only daughter of a diplomat mother and father, a respected academic. Soon after she was born, her parents got separated and she came to Turkey with her mother. She lived in Turkey until the age of eleven, before leaving for Spain due to the nature of her mother's job. During her adolescent years, she also lived in Jordan and Germany. Several years later she returned to Ankara in Turkey, where she earned her undergraduate degree (International Relations), master's (Women's Studies) and doctoral degree (Political Science). Her first book *Kem Gözlere Anadolu,* which consists of short stories, was published in 1994. This was followed by her first novel *Pinhan* in 1998, *Şehrin Aynaları* in 1999*, Mahrem (The Gaze)* in 2000, *Bit Palas (The Flea Palace)* in 2002 and her first novel written in English, *The Saint of Incipient Insanities (Araf)* in 2004. She also published several non-fiction books that consisted of her newspaper articles published in Turkey, however neither these nor the books *Kem Gözlere Anadolu* (1994), *Pinhan* (1998) and *Şehrin Aynaları* (1999) were ever translated into English.

A peculiar turning point came with the publication of *The Bastard of Istanbul (Baba ve Piç)* in 2006. One might assume the turning point to be *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* (2004), since this was her first book written in a non-native language, when in fact it was because of *The Bastard of Istanbul* (2006)

and the chaos the book brought upon the author. The novel tells the story of two families - a Turkish and an Armenian family - who were tied privately by a cruel secret and publicly by their historical backgrounds. One of the characters in the book refers to the events that took place in the late Ottoman Empire period, in 1915, resulting in hundreds of thousands of Armenians losing their lives, as "the Armenian Genocide" which is still an unresolved and highly problematic issue in Turkish history and politics. Because of the remarks in *The Bastard of Istanbul*, charges of "insulting Turkishness" were brought against Şafak according to Article 301 of the Turkish Penal Code, which had been passed into law just a year before. Orhan Pamuk, another Turkish author and the country's only Nobel Prize winner in Literature, had also been charged under the same law, however both cases were later dropped and they were each acquitted. To put it in context: Turkey had been the country that "jailed the most journalists" for three years in a row, coming second after China in 2019.[1] Amnesty International's 2019 report on Turkey mentions the academics, activists, and politicians imprisoned in Turkey and how freedom of expression is often challenged by restrictive laws.[2]

Returning to Şafak, the timing of *The Bastard of Istanbul* was, in a way, perfect. It was published just before Orhan Pamuk won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2006 and it was public knowledge that he was a very strong candidate for the award. The notorious Article 301 incident, along with Şafak and Pamuk being the two most popular Turkish novelists, linked them more than ever, despite having two very different literary styles. Elif Şafak could be seen as Orhan Pamuk's female counterpart.

---

[1] 'The Countries Imprisoning the Most Journalists in 2019', *Forbes*, 2019 <https://www.forbes.com/sites/niallmccarthy/2019/12/12/the-countries-imprisoning-the-most-journalists-in-2019-infographic/#37665e1213d6> [accessed 1 January 2024]

[2] 'Turkey 2019', *Amnesty International*, 2019 <https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/europe-and-central-asia/turkey/report-turkey/> [accessed 1 January 2024.

"After *The Bastard of Istanbul*", writes Arzu Akbatur, "the way Şafak is identified changes and becomes invested with political meaning."[3] I agree with Akbatur's statement. In the period that followed *The Bastard of Istanbul* becoming an international sensation in 2006*,* what I call the post-*Bastard* period, Şafak's fiction as well as her persona became sensationalised and politicised, both by Şafak herself and the media. An article in American magazine *Publisher's Weekly* shares an insider story from the industry: "With the uproar *The Bastard of Istanbul* precipitated in Turkey, and the coverage in the international press thrusting Shafak into the limelight, Penguin has moved up publication here from March 2007 to January."[4] This politicised expectation from *The Bastard of Istanbul*, and every other subsequent novel Şafak wrote, overshadowed and constrained the literary value of the works in the UK and US markets. The formation of this understanding is created and reinforced by epitextual elements. It is virtually impossible to come across a book review in English on *Bastard* that does not form its review around the novel's perceived political stance. Even worse, some reviews, such as one in *The Guardian* by Geraldine Bedell, simply provide false information like stating that "Elif Shafak, was accused by the Turkish government of 'insulting Turkishness'".[5] In reality, Şafak was not accused by the government[6] but by an individual; a lawyer with ultra-nationalist affiliations made a complaint to the public prosecutor's office — the right of complaint any and every citizen holds according to Turkish law. The

---

[3] Arzu Akbatur, 'Writing/Translating In/to English: The 'Ambivalent' Case of Elif Şafak' (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: Boğaziçi University, 2010), p. 74.

[4] Louisa Ermelino, 'East Meets West', *Publisher's Weekly*, 253:48 (2006), 28-29 (p. 29).

[5] Geraldine Bedell, 'This Turkey's been overstuffed', *The Guardian*, 2007 <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2007/jul/29/fiction.features1> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[6] In fact, at the time, the then prime minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, current President of Turkish Republic himself had told journalists that he was pleased with the news of Şafak's acquittal. See: https://www.haberturk.com/gundem/haber/772-erdogan-safakin-beraati-memnuniyet-verici > [accessed 1 January 2024]

court ruled that there was no ground for prosecution and the charges were dropped. Nevertheless, this politicised persona attached to Şafak's literature remained in the aforementioned markets. Within time, after Şafak moved to the UK, her political articles in British newspapers reinforced this attachment. Meanwhile, back in Turkey, Şafak had become even more of a sensationalised figure. She had been accused of betraying Turkey yet again by certain ultra-nationalist journalists when they accidentally discovered that Şafak had been writing in English. On the other hand, book reviews in prominent Turkish newspapers during the *Bastard* era did not even acknowledge the fact that Şafak was writing in English, and that the Turkish book they were reviewing was in fact a self-translation.[7]

All of her novels that followed *The Bastard of Istanbul* are written in English: *The Forty Rules of Love* (2009), *Honour* (2012), *The Architect's Apprentice* (2014), *Three Daughter's of Eve* (2016), *10 Minutes 38 Seconds in This Strange World* (2019) and *The Island of Missing Trees* (2021). It is noteworthy that all of the novels[8] she had first written in English were published after their Turkish translations.

---

[7] "Eleştiriler Görüşler", *Metis Kitap*, 2006 <https://www.metiskitap.com/catalog/book/4913#Reviews> [accessed 1 January 2024]

[8] Except for the latest novel *The Island of Missing Trees* published in 2021 in English, the Turkish translation *Kayıp Ağaçlar Adası* arriving later in the second half of 2023. Currently we do not know why Şafak's established "Turkish-first" approach to publishing changed. This could be due to the novel's sensitive content around Cyprus (unlikely, as Şafak published more controversial books this way before), or perhaps this time Şafak followed a more traditional translation process. When I was interviewing Şafak's translator Omca A. Korugan, *The Island of Missing Trees* had just been announced in the UK. I asked Korugan whether she will be the professional translator for the upcoming book as well, considering Şafak worked exclusively with Korugan since *Honour*. Korugan did not address that part of the question. Şafak's Turkish publisher Doğan Kitap did not announce the book for two years, which was opposite to what they had been doing since Şafak had started working with them. The recent Turkish translation, *Kayıp Ağaçlar Adası* reads "Çeviren ("Translated by"): Omca A. Korugan" on its title page. This is the first time Şafak is not acknowledged as a co-translator in a Turkish version. Şafak also did not give any interviews in Turkish promoting her book, which is extremely different from her previous marketing strategy. On a very recent podcast in Turkish (*Anlatsam Roman Olur,* episode aired 22 January 2023), the interviewer asks Şafak why the Turkish translation took such a long time. Şafak responds by saying she values translation very much, gives manifold gratitudes to Korugan and states that they worked on it a lot, so it took a long time. What Şafak explained does not sound any different to her previous attitude in self-translation, but she refrains from talking in detail about the particular translation of *The Island of Missing Trees.*

Elif Şafak is vocal about her choice to write in English. Her article "Dreaming in English" is attached to the end of her novels published by Penguin Random House UK, even in the editions which are translations from Turkish. In that article she states her reasoning for writing in English:

> I did not exactly decide to write in English. Rather than a logical resolution, it was an animal instinct that brought me to the shores of the English language. Perhaps I escaped into this new continent. I sent myself into perpetual exile, carving an additional zone of existence, building a new home, brick by brick, in this other land.

She states that writing in English creates a cognitive distance between her and the Turkish culture and, paradoxically, this enables her to take a closer look at her country. In terms of literary style, Şafak's English novels are quite different to her previous Turkish works. Her use of language changes drastically across borders. One reason for this is that, to put it simply, her original literary style is not compatible with English. As will be made clear in the next section, Şafak's Turkish style is much too wordy and her love for commas and semicolons are not as appreciated in Anglophone literature as they are in Turkish literature. Subsequently, by discarding the spices that are the old, mystic words she adds abundantly, she loses the flavour. Şafak can still be an engaging writer in English, but to a reader who first encountered her Turkish works, the loss of this essence is visible. One of her trademarks - listing tens of phrases under one long sentence - is mostly modified in her English novels; instead she uses actual numbered entries in list form. According to some Anglophone book critics, Şafak's "linguistic acrobatics distract rather than

enlighten"[9], her "writing in English is shaky" and "the language can feel stilted in places".[10]

In terms of content, all of her subsequent novels appear to be based on a very similar structure to that of *The Bastard of Istanbul*. There is always some sort of vicious secret or an element to be discovered towards the end of the book, which gets more predictable after every new novel. The novels turn more and more towards politics, violence and the mistreatment of Turkish women. A review of Şafak's novel *10 Minutes 38 Seconds in this Strange World*, nominated for the 2019 Booker Prize, reads: "Sexual abuse, political corruption, and religious fundamentalists' intolerance have been the tropes in so many Shafak novels that her outrage here, however heartfelt, feels shopworn. And her plotting can be overwrought."[11] Şafak's previously delightfully unorthodox characters, such as eccentric bisexual chocolate-maker Gail in *The Saint of Incipient Insanities*, the heartbreaking relationship between an obese woman and a midget in *The Gaze*, or various, interesting residents of *The Flea Palace*, are long gone. The latest characters are usually oppressed Turkish women who have become victims of incestuous rapes and murders. There are no strong-willed female characters and all of them seem to be confused about something, often related to religion. Another book review of her latest novel points out that Şafak is an ardent feminist, therefore "It is ironic, then, that almost all of the episodes in the life she recounts have one or another form of women's

---

[9] 'The Saint of Incipient Insanities', *Publisher's Weekly*, 2004, <https://www.publishersweekly.com/9780374253578> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[10] 'After Her Heart Stops Beating, a Woman Continues to Think', *New York Times*, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/16/books/review/10-minutes-38-seconds-in-this-strange-world-elif-shafak.html> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[11] '18 Minutes and 38 Seconds in This Strange World', *Kirkus Reviews*, 2019, <https://www.kirkusreviews.com/book-reviews/elif-shafak/10-minutes-38-seconds-in-this-strange-world/> [accessed 1 January 2024].

powerlessness at their heart."[12] Themes get repetitive and characters become inconsistent; such as the plausibility of the character Zeliha in *Bastard of Istanbul* — a stubborn, rebel, atheist woman — who decides to keep the baby that has been conceived as a result of being raped by her own brother.

In an interview in 2003, while she was writing her first English novel in Arizona, Elif Şafak states:

> I am worried because the artist is restricted by two forces. On the one hand, the progressive groups here in the United States constantly encourage minorities or people from the non-Western world to tell their own stories. This is very important and optimistic but at the same time dangerous because if you are, let's say, an Algerian woman writer, you are expected to tell your own story, the suppression of women in Algeria. Your identity starts to precede your work. The artist is pushed and encouraged to remain in her identity. As a novelist, I find this highly damaging. Since I came to the United States, I have begun to ask myself more often than ever how was I supposed to define and identify myself ? What is the category I should be located in? What kind of a novelist am I? I believe that only my work, only my writing can tell that. However, for my work to be translated without delay, I have to be defined beforehand.[13]

Her statement is striking, for she is very critical of the expectations from non-Western woman writers, yet a couple of years later she complies with the same expectations. By writing desirable stories, being defined beforehand and also writing in English thus skipping the translation process for Anglophone markets, Elif Şafak secures her place in literary circles. *Şehrin Aynaları* (Mirrors of the City), arguably her best work, is one of her two untranslated novels despite her success in the Western markets. The novel, full of magical

---

[12] '10 Minutes 38 Seconds in This Strange World by Elif Shafak', *Financial Times*, 2019, <https://www.ft.com/content/10be5b18-7ae4-11e9-8b5c-33d0560f039c> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[13] Myriam J. A. Chancy, 'A Meridians Interview with Elif Shafak', *Meridians*, 4:1 (2003), 55-85 (pp. 77)

elements, is about a Jewish man who is running away from the Spanish Inquisition in the 16th century, following his journey to Istanbul. Why was it not picked up by Western publishers? Or *Pinhan*, the story of a mystic hermaphrodite who is trying to find answers in Sufism. Why is it that these remain unavailable in English? The answer could possibly be found here in Müge Gürsoy Sökmen's (a well-known editor and co-founder of Metis Publishing House, Şafak's former publisher) address during a roundtable in Stockholm in 2002 organised by Swedish PEN:

> When I brought my authors to their attention, some "European" publishers seemed interested enough in publishing "something" from Turkey. Did I have Turkish women writers with good stories to tell? This, I understood soon, meant good literary documentaries of family violence, wife-beating, harassment from the violent Orient.
>
> Or something with local color? Well, maybe Murathan Mungan, poet, playwright and short story writer; his Mesopotamian Trilogy covers the Middle East history of dilemmas; between different races and cultures, between reality and dreams, between men and magic... Such a poetic and stimulating trilogy of plays, shattering down the concept of linear time and... No, no, they do not want plays; plays do not sell, and do not even mention poetry. I can not even dare offer Bilge Karasu, who is called the sage of Turkish literature and has a very sophisticated style.
>
> […]
>
> If you get through this prejudice barrier, you meet the "quota". It is no coincidence that after receiving very good reviews from publishers' readers and hopeful notes from their editors, I received from one big publishing house in Germany and another in France the same words of rejection for Latife Tekin: "We have already published one/two Turkish authors this year," naming me authors whose works have no resemblance whatsoever to those of Tekin. I was tempted to say, "Oh, yes, you are right. Who wants two oriental dishes in one dinner party!"[14]

[14] Müge Gürsoy Sökmen, 'Being a Woman Publisher in Islamist Country', *Bianet*, 2002, <http://bianet.org/english/people/14841-being-a-woman-publisher-in-islamist-country> [accessed 1 January 2024].

I found Sökmen's statement extremely valuable in understanding the attitudes of Anglophone markets towards non-Western books. The imposition of being *Oriental enough,* without scaring away the Western reader, further reinforces orientalist stereotypes in the receiving culture. As per Said's views, such practices constantly promote the difference between "the West" and "the East", giving way to alienating the Eastern, "the strange", even further in Eurocentric audiences.

If one happens to walk into a bookshop in Istanbul they can find the majority of books sold in London, everything from crime thrillers to literary canons, romantic comedies to memoirs, translated immediately after the original work's publication. This, of course, is a result of a literary hierarchy between languages. The major imbalance between the availability of Turkish-to-English translations and English-to-Turkish ones is also very much in line with Venuti's depiction of trade imbalance causing "ethnocentric violence" in literary markets.

Akbatur states that Şafak's position cannot be considered exempt from power relations; her self-translation "is not merely a text production but rather it is closely related to political, social, cultural and ideological factors governing, in particular, the representation and contextualisation of minor literatures."[15] She maintains:

> Writing in English, Shafak seems to benefit from the hegemony of this global language as she writes/translates (and thus represents) her culture, identity and perspective. However, this act of self-translation is not free from contradictions. Shafak is critical about the representative function, *the burden of self-translation*, attributed to minority writers and their texts. Yet, thanks to this *burden*, her work has been received, represented

[15] Arzu Akbatur, 'The Power and Burden of Self-Translation: Representation of "Turkish Identity" in Elif Shafak's *The Bastard of Istanbul*', in *Self Translation and Power*, ed. by Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 119-141 (p. 138)

> and reviewed in ways that contributed to its promotion mainly in the Anglo-American context. *The power of self-translation*, on the other hand, is evident in Shafak's agency as a visible and interventionist author when addressing two separate readerships, tailoring her text in view of their preoccupations and expectations. In fact, this agency becomes more prominent in Shafak's mediating role in interpreting Turkish culture and identity for a western audience. However, her writing/translating strategy paradoxically revolves around a particular discourse that relies much on the existing preoccupations of the target readership, while intending to question the established representations of Turkish identity.[16]

I maintain that in order to read Şafak properly one must be informed about her literary journey from a broader sociopolitical and cultural perspective. In this research I will observe and analyse how Şafak' s authorial intention becomes at times an accomplice to the "Western Gaze", resulting in a case of self-orientalisation.

3.1.1. Şafak vs Shafak

Şafak's real surname is actually Bilgin (Sağlık after marriage), but because of her relationship with her father, she opted to use Şafak as her last name instead, which is in fact her mother's first name. All of her literary works have always been published under her chosen surname. In Turkey, she is Şafak. All her books are published with this name on their covers. In the Western market, she is Shafak.

To put it in context, the Turkish language uses the Latin alphabet with some modifications. Prior to the 1928 Alphabet Reform, the official alphabet

[16] Ibid

was the Ottoman Turkish alphabet, which was a mix of Persian and Arabic script. The language itself was the same, however with more words adopted from Arabic and Persian. The Latin alphabet was suited better to Turkish. As part of multiple reforms, including abolishing the sultanat and caliphate, establishing democracy, giving women the right to vote etc., the Turkish Rebuplic's founder Mustafa Kemal Atatürk also established the New Turkish Alphabet. It has 29 letters and several of them also have dotted versions suited to the phonetic necessities: C-Ç, S-Ş, G-Ğ, I-İ, O-Ö, U-Ü. The three missing letters from the Latin alphabet are Q, W and X.

Şafak's choice for adopting Shafak appears to be to make it easier to pronounciate her name in the West. She discards the dot underneath the letter S, and adds an H to create a similar phonetic effect. This is more than an innocent modification. Before moving forward, I shall quote a passage from her novel *The Saint of Incipient Insanities,* which tells the story of a Turkish PhD student in America:

> When you leave your homeland behind, they say, you have to renounce at least one part of you. If that was the case, Ömer knew exactly what he had left behind: his dots!
> Back in Turkey, he used to be ÖMER ÖZSİPAHİOĞLU.
> Here in America, he had become an OMAR OZSIPAHIOGLU.
> His dots were excluded for him to be better included. After all, Americans, just like everyone else, relished familiarity -in names they could pronounce, sounds they could resonate, even if they didn't make much sense one way or the other. Yet, few nations could perhaps be as self-assured as the Americans in reprocessing the names and surnames of foreigners. When a Turk, for instance, realizes he has just mispronounced the name of an American in Turkey, he will be embarrassed and in all likelihood consider this his own mistake, or in any case, as something to do with himself. When an American realizes he has just mispronounced the name of a Turk in the United States,

> however in all likelihood, it won't be him but rather the name itself that will be held responsible for that mistake.
> […]
> The primary requirement of accommodation in a strange land is the estrangement of the hitherto most familiar: your name.
> Playing around with pronunciation, curbing letters, modifying sounds, looking for the best substitute, and if you happen to have more than one name, altogether abandoning the one less presentable to native speakers… Foreigners are people with either one or more parts of their names in the dark. Likewise, in his case, too, Ömer had replaced his name with the less arduous and more presentable Omar or Omer, depending on the speaker's choice.[17]

The above passage would be painfully familiar to anyone in a foreign country, especially Turks. Noting that Şafak was living in the U.S.A at the time she was writing the novel, it is almost impossible not to read the passage as a genuine testimony. It is certainly relatable, however it should be pointed out that nothing actually forces someone to lose their name. Other than some online forms which would not accept characters that are not available in the English alphabet, nothing officially dictates one must discard a name's dots or accents. Isn't it the same with e-mail handles, or websites? It should also be emphasised that the above passage is found at the very beginning of the novel, the first thing readers peruse after turning the book cover, which bears the name Shafak. It is too much of a coincidence not to read it autobiographically; the reader, then, might assume Shafak's own decision is motivated by the desire to appear more presentable. This is problematic, especially because of Şafak's position as a representative of Turkey and specifically Turkish women, not just through her novels, but also with articles she regularly publishes in British and international newspapers. It is a very contradictory message coming from a

[17] Elif Shafak, *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2004), pp. 4-5.

writer who prides herself on being the voice of suppressed Turkish women. Isn't this modification another mode of self-suppression? Is it not okay to be suppressed by the East but acceptable to be suppressed by the West? On the cover of the Turkish translation of *The Handmaid's Tale*, Margaret At**w**ood does not become At**v**ood. Woolf is still Woolf and Márquez is still Márquez.

In an interview in 2003, Elif Şafak recalls her memories as a student attending an international school in Spain:

> It is there that I learned about the hierarchy of nationalities, about an unwritten hierarchy even children knew about and were perhaps more cruel in expressing. Being Dutch or English, for instance, was most prestigious. An Indian girl and I in the class were in the lowest ranks.[18]

Şafak's resentment in the face of this "hierarchy of nationalities" is visible, with an undertone of acceptance. Şafak maintains her position as a "stranger in a strange land",[19] stating that she does not feel connected to any national identity. This is apparent in peritextual and epitextual materials in the West: Her English novels' author page refrains from mentioning her Turkish nationality, though it's pointed out that she was born in France and lives in London, while media articles always emphasise her European background. This was the case until her novel *10 Minutes 38 Seconds in This Strange World,* published in 2019, which bears an interesting opening to the author's biography. It reads: "Elif Shafak is an award-winning British-Turkish novelist…". Elif Şafak had been living in London for over a decade, therefore it's not surprising for her to obtain British citizenship. What is surprising is that the first ever mention of

[18] *Meridians.*

[19] Ibid.

her Turkish nationality in the peritext appears only after the arrival of her hyphenated British identity.

Now bearing the name *Shafak*, the cover images are also altered somewhat suspiciously. Nearly the entirety of Şafak's novels published in the Anglophone countries feature mosques as cover art, framed with oriental designs. Turkish covers, however, are based on design elements tied to the story, i.e. a bowl of chocolates for *Araf* (*The Saint of Incipient Insanities*), or a leaf in the shape of a heart for *Aşk* (*Forty Rules of Love*). For *İskender* (*Honour*), for instance, Şafak had posed herself on the Turkish cover wearing a suit and short hair, whereas on the British cover there is a woman in a headscarf overlooking the London skyline. Since that story is based in London, this should be the logic of the publishers: If they can't insert a mosque, a headscarf will do.

Certain transitions between the book titles further develop this perspective; The *Bastard of Istanbul* is *Baba ve Piç* in Turkish (translation: The Father and the Bastard) and *Honour* (referring to the honour killing in the novel) is *İskende*r (the character's name). These publishing strategies certainly root themselves in being more exotic, more oriental to the Western reader, contemplating financial gain. Perhaps understandable from a business point of view, yet these strategies restrain Şafak as she becomes more and more of what she had criticised in the past; the woman from the East who tells, and who only tells, the tales of the religious, oppressed East.

3.1.2. Co-Translating Position

Certainly one of the aspects that makes Şafak an interesting case is her approach to the translations of her novels. Explaining the translation process, she says that she writes in English, then a professional translator translates the text into Turkish. She continues: “I then take the new Turkish version and rewrite it with my rhythm, my energy, my vocabulary.”[20] Şafak herself uses the verb “rewriting” for her co-translation practice; a highly interesting point for the present study which will be discussed in depth in the following textual analysis chapter.

Elif Şafak’s co-translation practice is a two-way system: Both the earlier novels she’s written in Turkish and the novels in English are translated to the target language in the same manner. There is a translator who produces the first draft and Şafak subsequently rewrites it. One of those translators, Müge Göçek, who translated *Bit Palas* from Turkish to English, *The Flea Palace*, states that she was never in contact with Şafak during the first translation process. Afterwards, they sat down together and the editing process went on for months. Göçek states that Şafak didn’t like the long sentences in English, therefore cut the phrases, deleted some sections. Despite the mutual effort, the English translation of *The Flea Palace* bears the inscription *“Translated from the Turkish by Müge Göçek”*, who, apparently, could keep her dots.

On the other hand, Aslı Biçen, the translator of *The Bastard of Istanbul* from English to Turkish *Baba ve Piç*, states that she never had contact with Şafak and because the author is Turkish and can write in Turkish, she left the final decisions to her. This, however, made it no longer possible for her to feel

[20] Shafak, “Dreaming in English”.

fully responsible for the translation and for this reason she did not want her name to be on the book cover as the translator. It should be noted that in the Turkish publishing industry, the translator's name is traditionally put on the book cover alongside the author's, therefore Biçen's renouncement is important. However, it is stated on the copyright page as a mutual effort by the translator and the author.

At present, I intend to refer to Şafak's translation process as co-translation. Since the present study is a comparative research that also acknowledges Beckett's self-translation process, it is neither suitable nor consistent to perceive their practices under the same term. Furthermore, I believe that had Şafak self-translated from a blank page instead of editing a proper translation, the end result would not be the twin of the co-translated text.

3.2. Review of Şafak criticism

Şafak has been active on the literary front since the late 1990s, and she has been receiving scholarly attention since around 2005. However, considering her established status as a multiple-prize-winning author, as well as the rich material her novels contain and certainly enough controversy, it is surprising to see a lack of academic publication on Şafak. Current literature on Şafak criticism revolves around notions such as mysticism, feminism, identity, the city and multiculturalism. Most of the research comes from Turkish scholars, which is understandable in the case of her untranslated novels. However, even after switching to English she did not get much attention from international academia, despite her fame in media outlets. In the last decade, after the publication of

The Forty Rules of Love, there has been a wave of interest from international scholars on the topic of Rumi and Sufism portrayal in her novel.

Since the present study's interest is bilingualism and co-translation in Şafak's novels, the literature review is focused accordingly. Currently, the only in-depth study available on this topic is a PhD thesis in Translation Studies by Arzu Akbatur, submitted in 2010 in Istanbul. In her doctoral dissertation, she studies Elif Şafak's novels *The Flea Palace* and *The Bastard of Istanbul*, observing the modifications in translations from a re/decontextualisation point of view, as well as focusing on Western publishers' strategies. She confirms her preliminary hypothesis which is the existence of Şafak's interventionist position and her adoption of different values for different target cultures. Her findings are noteworthy: *The Flea Palace* as a translation does not alter the textual integrity of *Bit Palas* drastically, whereas the relationship between *The Bastard of Istanbul* and *Baba ve Piç* is problematic. She finds that there are more additions to the Turkish translation than omissions from English. Additionally, she confirms that these alterations have affected the ways in which the two texts were presented and perceived. Akbatur also published an article in the edited book *Self-Translation and Power* (2017), which focuses on Şafak's translation practice from the point of view of representation of Turkish identity.

Alev Adil, a Turkish scholar in England who has also reviewed some of Şafak's books in British newspapers, mentions Şafak alongside other authors in an article from 2006. Adil observes the contemporary Turkish literature in a British context, but does not explore Şafak's co-translation process, or detail the effects of her bilingualism. Elif Oztabek-Avcı, in her 2007 article, analyses *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* as an "international" novel, however it is not a

bilingual study as she mostly focuses on Şafak's English writing and its perceptions in Turkey, since it was Şafak's first English novel.

Research mentioned above represents the entire corpus on Şafak's bilingualism, to the best of my knowledge. Lack of research on Şafak's bilingualism from an international point of view is perhaps explained by Turkish being a minor language. Additional international research from cross-cultural perceptions, however few, exists. Petya Tsenova studies *Honour* as a cross-cultural negotiation in her 2018 article, while Susan Friedman mentions Şafak from a world literature and migration studies point of view. Elena Furlanetto studies *The Forty Rules of Love* in depth with substantial findings:

> The Forty Rules of Love, though, domesticates Sufism for an American readership and Shafak's contribution to the American Rumi discourse is a case of self-Orientalisation, as she has internalised a Western perspective in her account of one of the most significant figures of the Islamic heterodox tradition.
> In accordance with her employment of Barks's 'aggressively unacademic' translations (Tompkins, 2002), she re-presents the Rumi narrative in a manner that accords with that of the Rumi phenomenon, privileging the aesthetics and the interests of the American reader over conveying a more complete image of Sufism and unveiling the ambiguous quality of its American appropriations.[21]

Şafak's position before her target audience and the differences in representations of cultural elements is closely tied to her co-translating process, thus research similar to above study can be seen as an extension of Şafak's bilingualism. It is indeed a very fruitful yet an highly understudied area of research to which the present study aims to contribute.

---

[21] Elena Furlanetto, "The 'Rumi Phenomenon' Between Orientalism and Cosmopolitanism: The Case of Elif Shafak's *The Forty Rules of Love*", *European Journal of English Studies,* 17:2 (2013), 201-213 (p. 204).

3.3. Comparative Analysis of *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace*

This section aims to exemplify, analyse and discuss Elif Şafak's co-translation practice from Turkish to English. First, I will introduce the novel and the genesis of the co-translation. Next, I will repeat and employ the methodology I previously used for the comparative analysis of Beckett's works. Afterwards, I will analyse my findings with the examples I have gathered from the source and the target text. Finally, following the discussion, I will present my concluding remarks for this section.

Published in 2002 by Metis, *Bit Palas* is Elif Şafak's fourth and latest novel she has written in Turkish. Şafak kept employing her native language for her non-fiction works even after *Bit Palas*, however she never wrote fiction in Turkish again. *Bit Palas* not only signifies the last step before Şafak plunged into the virgin territory of English writing, but it is also the first work of Şafak's to ever be translated into English. The translation, *The Flea Palace*, was first published in Great Britain and in the United States of America by Marion Boyars Publishers in 2004. As mentioned before, even though both the author and the translator worked on the translation together, *The Flea Palace* still today only bears the inscription "Translated from the Turkish by Müge Göçek", disregarding Şafak's involvement in the process. In an interview with Akbatur in 2010, Müge Göçek, who was at the time an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Michigan, stated that she was the one who initiated the translation process. After describing the co-translation period of working together on the manuscript for months, Göçek describes the feeling as the following: "I said 'I swear Elif, I'll write down a note.' I would say, 'Dear

reader, I had translated [the book] as it was but the author attempted to change it all at the last moment.'"[22]

The comparative analysis between *Bit Palas* and its co-translation *The Flea Palace* is built upon the close side-by-side reading of both texts, noting the modifications, additions and deletions. Furthermore, the notable findings are categorised into four sub-sections, in accordance with their value for the present study.

3.3.1. Summary of the story

The story is set at Bonbon Palace, an apartment building in Istanbul, whose residents are severely concerned with the ever growing garbage-hill outside. Trying to find a solution to this rubbish problem and to the accompanying smell in the building, the residents of Bonbon Palace interact with each other more than ever. The story follows each resident in their respective chapters: Extremely superstitious, pregnant Meryem lives with her husband Musa and her son Muhammet in flat number 1. In flat number 2 lives Sidar, a twenty-something who just moved back to his homeland from Switzerland and is utterly confused about almost everything. Flat number 3 is the local hairdresser's salon owned by the incompatible twins Cemal and Celal, and flat number 4 is the home of the dysfunctional Ateşmizaçoğulları (Firenaturedsons in translation) family. Hacı Hacı, the religious grandfather of three, lives in flat number 5 with his son, daughter-in-law and the children; flat number 6 is home to the not-very-happily married couple Metin and Nadya. Flat

[22] Akbatur, p. 162.

number 7 is written as “Me”, and is supposed to be the narrator of the story, a recently divorced academic. The Blue Mistress lives in flat number 8, rented by her lover. In flat number 9 Hygiene Tijen, who is obsessed with cleaning, lives with her daughter Su; and Flat number 10 is the mysterious Madam Auntie’s. There is also a theme of ‘circularity’ applied to the novel, as Şafak’s interest in sufi mysticism often emerges in her storytelling. The residents of Bonbon Palace eventually solve the mystery of the rubbish and the smell: Madam Auntie was hoarding the rubbish in her flat. However, then the narrator of the novel confesses that he made up the whole story because he was bored in his cell, where he had been kept after being arrested at the Labour Day political protest.

3.3.2. Comparative Textual Analysis

3.3.2.1. Style, Flow and Wording

This section focuses on the changes which concern the literary style and flow, as well as the word choices between *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace*. Considering the fact that *Bit Palas* was Şafak’s fourth novel, it can be said that she had established a distinctive literary style at that point in her career. As mentioned before, Şafak’s use of purposefully long, overly descriptive sentences linking many phrases, is one of the distinctive features of her writing. Thus, it could be assumed that carrying over her artistic style in co-translation should have been a priority. However, it should also be noted that the Turkish language is inherently different to the English language. The differences in the two languages’ syntactical structures, as well as the fundamental function of suffixes in Turkish, make it considerably difficult to translate while retaining the same style between Turkish and English. With that in mind, as we shall see, it

cannot be said that all stylistic differences between *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace* are due to the innate linguistic differences between these languages. The following excerpt exemplifies both the inevitable and the intentional discrepancies:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 49	Tek istediği Tanrı'yı görmekti. **Bebeğini sevmediği, sevmeyi bilmediği için elinden alan, onu seçip sınayan, sınayıp ortada bırakan Tanrı'nın rengini**, rengiyle beraber niyetini dosdoğru görene kadar, **zaten bir yanılsamalar ve yansımalar küresi olan** dünyanın renklerini görüp görmemek umurunda bile değildi.	p. 54	Her only true desire was to see God, to see what colour the God was, if any. Until she saw that straight out — and along with it, God's intention in taking her baby away — she did not care at all to see the colours of this world of illusions.

Firstly, Şafak's original use of repeating verbs as a way to create a chain-effect is lost in translation. If the first bold section in the above passage were to translated into English word by word, it would read as the following: *"Because she did not love her baby, and because she did not know how to love her baby, took her away from her hands, the God that picked her to test, and upon testing, left her flat, the God's colour, alongside its colour its intentions* (…)*"*. Certainly, translating such excerpts in this manner would create unintelligible, absurd sentences. This example is to illustrate the incompatibility of certain aspects of Turkish language usage within English. Nevertheless, this is not to say that what the author and the translator employed here is the only solution, or even the best one. In fact, it points to a problematic omission within the narrative. While reducing and reframing the literary style, Şafak also omits the critical part

in English translation, in which the reader learns that the character neither loved, nor knew how to love her baby. As it will be explained later, this marks the inception of a trend we will see throughout Şafak's co-translation practice: Turkish versions having more elaborate descriptions, more emotional depth and hidden truths.

Şafak employs several punctuation strategies while co-translating to retain the meaning and/or the effect in English. In the example above, she uses the em dash to break her long sentence up in English. In another example, as shown below, she employs the use of parenthesis:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 65	köşe başında sergi açmış karpuzcunun ve onun, külüstür kamyonetiyle yaklaşık yirmi dakikada bir aynı noktadan geçecek surette durmadan semti turlayan hoparlörlü rakibinin	p. 71	and the yelling of both the watermelon vendor at his stand on the corner and his competitor circling the neighbourhood in the run-down pickup truck **(whose loudspeaker could be heard from the same place every twenty minutes)**

Şafak's use of these strategies are sensible, as it would be difficult to translate her particularly long sentences into English. It is obvious that, in order to translate without these strategies, one would have to use excessive amounts of conjunctions or relative clauses. This would possibly weigh down the English text as it would not read as seamlessly as it does in the Turkish original, simply because of the grammatical and syntactical differences between the two languages.

The next example illustrates what would be a potential employment of similar strategies:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 244	"Yolda yersin", demişti **pancar gibi kızarmış burnunu** çekip, kastettiği yol gökyüzündeymiş gibi, tek koluyla havada bir yerleri işaret ederek. **Ve daha kolunu indirmeye fırsat bulamadan beter mi beter bir ağlama nöbetine kapılıp sesi soluğu aniden kesiliverdiğinden, daldan şeftali koparmaya çalışırken taşlaşmış, sonra da bulunduğu şeftali bahçesinden nasıl olduysa buraya taşınmış** ırıkıyım bir heykel gibi kalakalmıştı kapının eşiğinde.	p. 278	'You'll eat them on the way,' she had snivelled as she sniffed her **red nose** and pointed with one arm to some place in the sky as if the road she referred to was up there somewhere. In that state she had remained stock-still at the threshold, **like a burly statue of a woman turned into stone.**

Şafak, however, this time opted to completely omit the majority of the long sentence above. Both sentences end with the woman depicted as still as a statue, however in the Turkish version this is a fairly long and descriptive process: *"And before she could even find a chance to put her arm down, she got into a terrible, terrible crying fit, and then became completely silent; like a burly statue of a woman who turned into stone while trying to pick a peach from a branch, like a statue that somehow got transported from the peach garden to where she is now.*" This again is a good example of the descriptive, idiosyncratic style of Şafak's Turkish that gets lost in translation. Other than this omitted part, the above passage also contains a minor deletion: The expression "her red nose" in English has, in fact, a heightened descriptive origin in Turkish: *"her nose reddened like a beetroot"*. Şafak indeed applies minor modifications

of this kind throughout the translation, however they seldom if ever create a shift in the fictive universe.

Another stylistic trademark of Şafak, her usage of the slash (/) for listing various things, is also modified in translation. Consider the following:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
pp. 43-44	Cemiyetin öncelikli gündem maddeleri arasında, lepiska saçlı, ak gerdanlı, arsız bakışlı, aristokrat bozması Beyaz Rus kadınların ahlaka mugayir davranışlarını bir bir tespit edip zapta geçirmek/ bu raporlarla erkan-ı umumiyenin kapılarını aşındırıp davalarına destek toplamak/ İstanbul'un üzerine Sodom ve Gomora'nın lanetini çekecek pavyonların ve tekmil batakhanelerin kapatılmasını sağlamak/ Kiev ve Odessa genelevlerinden sökün edip, Galata sokaklarını mesken tutmuş fahişeleri kışkışlamak/ ağızları hala süt kokan, gözleri daha açılmamış Müslüman delikanlıları, kendilerini bekleyen tehlikeye karşı bıkıp usanmadan uyarmak/ (…)	p. 47	Prioritized among the agenda items of the association were the following: 1) To determine and record one by one incidents of immoral behavior performed by White Russians with soft and silky blond hair, fair complexion, shameless looks and aristocratic pretensions 2) To wear out the gates of the upper echelons of state administration in order to gather support for their cause 3) To ensure the closing down of all the dens of thieves and nightclubs capable of drawing the wrath of Sodom and Gomorrah onto Istanbul 4) (…)

The lengthy passage above (shortened here), is kept fully intact in terms of content. However, Şafak trades her use of slash for a numbered list. The reason for this modification is unknown, however it could be argued that transferring the original sectioning would make the English version too crowded

for the reader's liking. Then again, this is exactly what made Şafak's style famous; pushing the boundaries of the sentence length. In terms of structural compatibility between Turkish and English, there is no reason why this particular passage cannot be translated in its original form in the English version, nor would it be any more alienating to the English reader than it is to the Turkish reader.

Moving on to an example where a minor difference in wording becomes important, as follows:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 73	Ama o, hem **namazında niyazında haminneler gibi** laçkalıktan uzak, hem cetvelle çizilmiş gibi pürnizam ve külçe gibi ağır, hem de platin sarısıydı üstüne üstelik.	p. 80	Yet here she was, **as far removed from being 'a slacker'** as a proper granny, as straight as if she had been drawn by a ruler, as heavy as cast metal, and to top it all, platinum blonde.

In the excerpt above, Şafak retains the entire sentence, but modifies "namazında niyazında", an expression used for describing a devout Muslim person, into "as far removed from being 'a slacker'". This surely creates an abrupt shift in translation, as it changes the meaning completely in that part of the sentence. Another odd choice of wording can be observed in the next example:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 66	Ne de olsa, özbeöz kardeşi, tek yumurta ikiziydi günboyu maruz kaldığı ömür törpüsü **tarakanın** tetikleyicisi.	p. 72	After all, the one who triggered this wearisome ***katzenjammer*** he had to suffer all day long, was none other than his twin, born of the very same egg as he had been.

In this sentence, Şafak uses the German word “katzenjammer” as the equivalent of Turkish word “taraka”, which means heavy clatter, a constant loud noise. Merriam-Webster’s definition of the word is: “*Katzenjammer* comes from German *Katze* (meaning "cat") and *Jammer* (meaning "distress" or "misery"). English speakers borrowed the word for their hangovers (and other distressful inner states) in the first half of the 19th century and eventually applied it to outer commotion as well.”[23] Though this choice of wording does not create a difference in meaning, it is however still an interesting choice, considering Şafak could simply use an English equivalent.

Lastly, below are two examples concerned with the wording choices in translation with greater impact:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 239	Bahçe duvarının kenarına çöplerini fırlatan kadını gördüm işaret ettiği yere bakınca.	p. 273	Where she pointed, I spotted a **headscarfed** woman throwing her garbage by the side of the garden wall.

“The woman” in the Turkish original becomes “a headscarfed woman” in translation. This certainly intentional addition does influence the fictive universe; but more importantly gives us an inside look at how Şafak operates with certain notions in translation. Only by comparing the Turkish original and the English version, we see the self-orientalist traces Şafak will henceforth employ in later translations. Before I elaborate further on this issue, also consider the following example:

[23] ‘Katzenjammer’, *Merriam Webster* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/katzenjammer> [accessed 1 January 2024].

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 370	Şüpheli gözlerle her hareketimizi **süzüyordu** kadınlar **pencere diplerinden, kapı önlerinden.**	p. 429	Women suspiciously **spied** on our every move from the **behind the lattice tulle of windows.**

In a similar vein, the women in the Turkish original who *"look (someone) up and down"* from *"the windows and front door porches",* became confined "behind the lattice tulle of windows", "spying" others. These seemingly subtle modifications indeed changes the reading in translation. As explained in the previous chapters, this type of attitude only reinforces the Western stereotypes of Eastern women, reminding us of Edward Said's depiction of 19th century Orientalist travel writers' perception of the veil. Lisa Lau, after studying diasporic South Asian women writers, states:

> […] in terms of how South Asia is constructed in narrative, it continues to be set in opposition to 'The West', thereby locking both into stereotypes, continuing to define the Orient relative to the Occident, in a word, to Re-Orientalise. At its worst, this has resulted in skewed, distorted and dogmatically generalised representations of South Asia, its culture and its women's positionalities in particular.[24]

What Lau defines as "Re-orientalism" is seemingly fitting for Şafak's practice in this instance. However, the real problem lies in the fact that the original novel, *Bit Palas*, is hardly carrying any self-orientalist (or re-orientalist) tendencies. It is a Turkish novel, written in Turkish, by a Turkish author who at

[24] Lau, pp. 589-599.

the time lived in Turkey and only had addressed Turkish readers up until that point in her career. This makes it even more problematic, since the self-orientalism observed here is not a product of some latent, internalised orientalism but a result of a deliberate interference in translation that is addressed to Western readers.

3.3.2.2. Setting, time and image

There are not any notable discrepancies between *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace* which fall under this category. Names of real places in Turkey, such as Galata, Fatih and others are kept intact in translation. A minor omission is observed where Zekeriya got mixed up with parking-lot mafia[25], as in the Turkish original the location is identified as the *Anatolian Side*[26] (meaning the part of İstanbul that is on the Asian continent). Fictitious street names, such as "Jurnal Sokak, 88 Numara"[27], translated literally into "Cabal Street, Number 88"[28] and this strategy is consistent throughout the translation.

3.3.2.3. Sociocultural Notions and References

There is a great amount of sociocultural notions and references in *Bit Palas*, as is in all Şafak novels. For the majority of these references Şafak

[25] Shafak, *The Flea Palace*, p. 112.

[26] Şafak, *Bit Palas*, p. 100.

[27] Ibid, p. 12.

[28] Shafak, *The Flea Palace,* p. 11.

employs a foreignisation strategy, sometimes with minor additions: “Nazım” (the very famous Turkish poet) is translated as “Nazım Hikmet”, “Lale Devri” as “The Tulip Period of Ottoman Empire”, “Karagöz” as “the shadow theather Karagoz” etc. Few references about Islamic notions such as “İsrafil’in suru”, “The Trumpet of İsrafil”, are translated alongside a short footnote explanation.

The treatment of food names are inconsistent throughout the translation. “Rakı”, the Turkish alcoholic drink, stays as it is, whereas the mezze “Çerkes tavuğu” (*Circassian chicken*) is replaced with “Chicken with ground walnut.” Furthermore, “sucuklu tost” (toastie with sucuk, a type of a cured meat) becomes “hot dog” and “kadayıf” (a very sweet dessert like baklava) is replaced with “coffee cake”.

The narrator, “Me in Flat 7”, is surprised when Madam Auntie distributes mushroom pizza, slice by slice, to neighbours. He says that he has seen many who send “aşure”[29] but never a slice of pizza before. The name of the dessert, aşure, gets simplified in translation as a “pudding”. The importance of this particular modification lies in the fact that distributing aşure is a specific event in Turkish culture, stemming from the “Day of Aşure” in Islam, on which people make and deliver aşure to their neighbours. Thus, this sociocultural reference gets lost in translation and is not available to the English reader. It is also noteworthy that, the character KarısıNadya spends a considerable amount of time earlier in the novel trying to make the perfect “aşure”, where the name of the desert is intact. Not being able to make a proper aşure as a foreigner upsets KarısıNadya greatly as she wants to show her Turkish husband that she too can cook it like a Turk. Thus, this modification not only creates domestication, but also erases this in-text reference.

[29] Şafak, *Bit Palas*, p. 138.

Another sociocultural modification is observed when translating the word “gurbetçiler”[30], replacing it with “‘guest-workers’ off to Germany”[31], though a necessary one to retain the meaning for the target reader. The only two omitted references are Hacı Hacı’s book’s name *Yusuf ile Züleyha*[32] and the quotation[33] from the book *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları*.

The excerpt below points out a more complex case of sociocultural referencing. A long time ago, the twins’ father took one of the boys, Cemal, and left for Australia, leaving their mother and Celal back in Turkey. Years later, Celal recounts the aftermath of their departure to his twin Cemal, as the following:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 313	Siz gidince soldu, kahroldu üzüntüden. Meşhur bir **hoca**yı salık verdiler. Beni de aldı yanına. Gittik. […] **Hoca** bana anlattı **büyü**nün nasıl yapılacağını.	p. 361-362	After your departure, she fell ill with sorrow. People urged her to seek help from this famous **spell-caster**. […] The **sorcerer** gave me a corn husk, […]

The Turkish term “Hoca” of the original is translated as both “spell-caster” and “sorcerer” in the target text. “Hoca” normally refers to someone who is an official religious personality with a profound knowledge of Islam. The translations do not evoke the same meaning. Instead, they are reminiscent of something of a fantastic literature. Furthermore, as it is in the original, the

[30] Ibid, p. 31.

[31] Shafak, *The Flea Palace*, p. 33.

[32] Şafak, *Bit Palas*, p. 330.

[33] Ibid, p. 375.

portrayal of “Hoca” as someone who casts "büyü” (spells based on the Qur’an, which are forbidden and considered sin in Islam) in return for money is depicting a highly debated practice in Turkish culture, often associated with fraud. By gliding over these terms, Şafak bypasses the original meaning and the latent reference she initially made in the Turkish original.

A final noteworthy example is the passage below, which depicts the inscription on a Saint’s tomb:

	Bit Palas		*The Flea Palace*
p. 24	“Burada Ebu Hafs-i Haddad ordusunda çarpışarak İslam fütühatı için büyük kahramanlıklar yapan, **lakin İstanbul’un alındığını göremeden** Hakkın rahmetine kavuşan Kalktıgöçeyledi Dede yatmaktadır. Ruhuna **Fatiha**.”	p. 26	‘Here lies Saint “Hewhopackedupandleft” who performed countless heroic deeds for the conquest of Islam while serving in the army of Ebu Hafs-i Haddad and who reached God’s mercy **before witnessing the fall of the infidel city**. **A prayer** to his soul.’

The problem with the translation here is two-fold. First, “lakin İstanbul’un alındığını göremeden” (*before he got to see the conquest of Istanbul*) is translated as “before witnessing the fall of the infidel city.” Considering this fictitious Saint in question fought for Islam, and taking the original Turkish wording in consideration; the translated version changes the point-of-view insensibly. Second, what is called “The Conquest of Istanbul” in Turkey is referred generally as “The Fall of Constantinople” in Western history. Therefore, this translation not only confuses sociocultural reading, but also once again employs a self-orientalising modification, by adopting the Western term “the fall” in this context. Domestications in this vein are problematic, as they appropriate the source text and culture for the Anglophone audience, in line with Venuti’s

understanding. Such domesticating tendencies not only semantically alter the text, but also erase the foreign culture's historical values.

3.3.2.4. Names, Characters and Narrators

The names of the characters for the most part transferred as they are in the original text. The "real" proper names of people, such as Musa, Meryem, Muhammet, Tijen, Su, Celal, Cemal etc. are carried over without any modification. Nicknames such as Mavi Metres (Blue Mistress) and Madam Teyze (Madam Auntie) are translated literally. Plays on names are also somewhat retained in translation: Karısı Nadya becomes HisWifeNadia, Kalktıgöçeyledi Dede is translated as "Hewhopackedupandleft". Two real proper names that Şafak modifies in translation literally are Haksızlık Öztürk (Injustice Pureturk) and Ateşmizaçoğulları (Firednaturedsons). It is clear that Şafak had made the latter two modifications to retain the comedic effect in Turkish in relation to the characters. However, considering the awkward balance of the names in a Turkish setting, it is doubtful if this was the best way forward. To show this with an example, Zeren Ateşmizaçoğulları becomes Zeren Firednaturedsons in translation, which is further away from the foreignisation strategy Şafak mainly employed before.

On the other hand, in terms of characters' traits and attitudes, as well as the narrator's tendencies, there is no substantial difference between *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace.*

3.3.2.5. Concluding Remarks

The comparative analysis of *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace* proved that the biggest difference in translation was on Şafak's literary style; her use of long sentences gets shorter in translation and her stylistic punctuation choices also get altered in accordance to an Anglophone market. A few unfortunate choices in wording raise eyebrows as Şafak scatters elements of self-orientalism.

Şafak generally opts to foreignise the cultural references, with some domesticated exceptions, as shown in this chapter. Selen Tekalp, studying exclusively the intertextual references in *The Flea Palace,* states her finding, even quantifying it: "When all the examined allusions and translation strategies used for the rendering of each case are considered, it can be seen that Shafak uses a foreignizing strategy for 67.5% of the selected instances."[34] The only other scholar who studied the textual pair, Akbatur, states that "Neither the omissions from the source text, nor the additions in the target text alter the textual integrity of *Bit Palas* drastically."[35] The present study's findings are in line with previous research. All in all, it could be said that Şafak employs a very low level interventionist approach in this particular co-translation.

3.4. Comparative Analysis of *Honour* and *İskender*

This chapter aims to exemplify, analyse and discuss Şafak's co-translation practice from English to Turkish. In order to do so, Şafak's English

[34] Selen Tekalp, 'A Study on the Self-Translation of Allusions in Bit Palas by Elif Shafak', *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 22 (2020), pp. 117- 138 (pp. 133- 134).

[35] Akbatur, p. 222.

novel *Honour* (2012) and its Turkish translation *İskender* (2011) have been chosen. It is rather an unorthodox publication process, since the translation was actually published before the original. Upon interviewing *Honour*'s translator Omca A. Korugan, I have tried to understand the mechanics behind this process.[36] She explained that when she started translating, the author was still working on the English text. Korugan would receive the text chapter by chapter, and sometimes there would be subsequent modifications on the English original by the author. In those cases, the translator would check and update the translation accordingly. She maintained that two texts, *Honour* and *İskender*, went through two different editorial processes, with Turkish publishers and the English publishers, and that should be the reason in the reverse timeline.[37] This information certainly sheds light on the publication process, however, considering the English text has definitely been fully written by the time the translation was finished and subsequently extensively edited by Şafak, the translation's publishing process arguably could have taken longer than that of the original. In this case, an assumption would be Elif Şafak's prominency in Turkey: being the best-selling author that she is, it is very likely that the publishing process is fast-tracked by her Turkish publishers.

İskender bears the inscription "Translated by Omca A. Korugan (with the author)" on the title page. However, the valuable information shared by Korugan also evokes rewriting. She confirmed that Şafak edits the initial translation and decides on what will be the final version of every sentence in the Turkish text. This has been confirmed by Şafak herself in various interviews as well,

---

[36] I have initially reached out to Şafak's publisher for an interview with Korugan and potentially Şafak, however I have not gotten a response. I then managed to find Korugan's contact information from another publishing house thanks to a colleague. I contend that not being able to talk to Şafak did not have an impact on my research, in fact I preferred doing the groundwork independently. However I would still like to interview Şafak in the future to discuss my findings.

[37] Omca A. Korugan, 'E-mail interview', 2021.

applicable to all her English-to-Turkish translations. Şafak has an all-encompassing authorial licence over translations into her native language.

Considering *Honour* is Şafak's eighth novel and the fourth one she had written in English; neither writing in English nor the co-translation was a novel practice to Şafak at that point. As mentioned before, the lack of research on Şafak's bilingualism was a driving factor for the present study and understanding that *Honour* and *İskender* have never been studied together was another reason in choosing this pair as my main material for this chapter.

In this chapter, I will first offer a brief summary of the story, followed by my comparative textual analysis. With this I ultimately aim to compare Beckett's and Şafak's translations practices from non-native language to native language.

3.4.1. Summary of the Story

Honour is a story that travels between places, time and memories. Main characters are the members of Turkish-Kurdish Toprak family, Pembe the mother, Adem the father and their three kids İskender, Esma and Yunus.

Adem had initially wanted to marry Pembe's identical twin Jamila (Cemile in Turkish translation), but ends up marrying Pembe instead. While Jamila stays back in Eastern Turkey and becomes a midwife, Pembe and Adem move first to İstanbul, then to London. Here the family disintegrates following Adem's affair with Roxana. After Adem leaves their home, İskender as the eldest son starts to act like the "head of the house" and keeps his mother Pembe and sister Esma on a close leash. Upon learning from his uncle Tariq (Tarık in Turkish translation) that his mother is also seeing someone, the Canadian chef Elias, he

stabs Pembe to “clean the family’s name”. Later it’s told that he in fact did not want to kill his mother, despite stabbing her in the chest, but only aimed to injure and scare her. Little did he know that her mother’s twin Jamila arrived in London and he in fact killed his aunt, whose heart was anatomically on the opposite side.

3.4.2. Comparative Textual Analysis

Despite the timeline of the publishing process, because *Honour* is in fact the original text it will be considered the source text and *İskender* the target text. Upon doing a close reading of both texts, followed by an in-depth comparative study, I have acquired over three hundred excerpts. Since the scope of this research would not allow me to share every single example, they have been reduced in amount in a purposeful manner. The examples will be discussed under four main categories as before: 1. Style, flow and wording, 2. Setting, time and image, 3. Sociocultural notions and references and 4. Names, characters and narrators.

Considering Turkish language’s status, I will be referring to what would be a back-translation of the original text to prove this analysis accessible and effective. All back-translations within the discussion belong to me.

3.4.2.1. Style, Flow and Wording

The first remarkable modification observed is the change in the emotional tone. The story opens with Esma, the daughter, recalling the day she went to pick up İskender, her brother, from prison. Her emotions about İskender's release is narrated from Esma's own viewpoint. This is important, as in the English original Esma is the only character that has the privilege to speak from her own point of view (with the exception of pages from İskender's diary) however she loses that privilege in the translation. Almost all of her chapters in the translation suffers from turning into third-person narrative, thus causing Esma to lose her voice. Those chapters create too big of a difference to be categorised under the current section, therefore they will be discussed in the fourth category towards the end of this chapter. First chapters in both texts, however, are kept intact in translation, in terms of being from Esma's viewpoint. Yet, they contain many modifications that still alter the fictive universe.

	Honour		*İskender*
p.1	I don't think I'll ever become a **real** writer **and that's quite all right now.**	p. 9	Herhalde hiçbir zaman yazar olamayacağım, **hani şöyle meşhur bir romancı**. **Ama bunu dert etmiyorum artık, gam değil.**

The example above shows how Esma's speech becomes more emotive and detailed in translation. "A real writer" is modified into "a writer, *you know, a famous novelist*." The second part of the sentence, which is a new sentence in the translation, reads "*But I don't worry about it anymore, no grief.*" A similar instance can be observed in the following pair:

	Honour		*İskender*
p.1	Not much on the surface, but a growing burning within.	p. 10	Yüzeyde, **görünürde belli belirsiz bir iz** ama **dipte, derinde zonklayan bir yara.**

Esma's original description of her feelings, "Not much on the surface, but a growing burning within" becomes yet again more emotive and detailed: "*A faint scar on the surface, that meets the eye, but a throbbing wound at the bottom, in the deep*." In a similar vein, "that will help to chase the ghosts away, the music"[38] is translated as "Müzik iyi gelir ruhuma, yardım eder endişeleri uzak tutmaya. Bir de hayaletleri."[39] [Back-translation: *Music soothes my soul, helps keeping the worries away. As well as the ghosts.*] A more concise "That will hurt."[40] becomes "Bu masum soruyu duymak canımı yakacak."[41] [Back-translation: *Hearing this innocent question will hurt me.*] As we will observe throughout this chapter, Şafak's English writing tends to be more concise and less emotional than her Turkish writing.

	Honour		*İskender*
p.1	I owed it to **Mum**, this freedom.	p. 9	Hiç olmazsa bu **kadarcık** özgürlüğü borçluydum **beni dünyaya getiren insana.**

[38] Elif Shafak, *Honour* (London: Viking, 2012), p. 2.

[39] Elif Şafak, *İskender* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2011), p. 10.

[40] *Honour*, p. 1.

[41] *İskender*, p. 10.

The example above also reinforces that thesis. “I owed it to Mum, this freedom” becomes *“I at least owed this tiny bit of freedom to the person who brought me into this world.”*

	Honour		*İskender*
p.2	In the end, **I haven’t achieved either.**	p. 10	Sonunda **galiba, varıp varabildiğim bu noktada, ne öldürmeyi başardım İskender’i, ne de affetmeyi.**

In the same vein, “In the end, I haven’t achieved either” is translated as “*Perhaps in the end, at the last point that I was able to reach, I achieved neither killing İskender, nor forgiving him.”* On a different note, it is also worth mentioning that Esma does not mention her brother’s name in this first chapter of *Honour* at all, whereas she refers to him as İskender in the same chapter several times in *İskender,* immediately creating a different reading. For the English reader, it creates more suspense as they are reading about this mystery man who might or might not be related to her, only disclosed by Esma that he is in fact *her brother, a murderer*[42] in the closing of the chapter. The Turkish reader has a different set of information: The translation itself is titled *İskender*, therefore the Turkish reader already has the knowledge that the story revolves around him and that he is a vital character. Esma’s constant use of her brother’s name in the opening chapter and her references to “annemiz”[43] [*our mother*] only reinforces that perception.

Şafak’s English is harsher in tone and it ultimately affects how characters think and speak. For example, when Esma is talking about how her brother

[42] *Honour*, p. 4.

[43] *İskender*, p. 12.

İskender became silent upon hearing their mother being mentioned, it is told as "That will shut him up."[44] whereas the translation reads "Aniden susacak."[45] [*Suddenly he'll stop talking.*] It is almost as Şafak's characters are kinder in Turkish, their thoughts are less harsh and more emotional. Several modifications take this a step further and change not just the description but also the solid elements within the fictive universe. When, for example, Adem's visit to Eastern Turkey — which is known to be an under-developed area — is told through a flashback, the original text mentions "the children with dirt under their fingernails"[46] whereas it is translated as "oyuncaksız büyüyen çocuklar"[47] [*the children who grew up without toys*]. Şafak's matter-of-fact style commentary changes in tone. Almost guilt tripping the reader, it appeals to their emotions. A similar example is observed below:

	Honour		*İskender*
p.124	'My parents are not exploited and we are not unwashed. **My brother is a boxer**.'	p. 116	"Babamı kimse sömürmüyor, hiçbirimizin eli yüzü kirli değil. **Annem hasta olduğunda komşular bize çorba getirdi.**"

The sentences above belong to Yunus, the seven year-old son of the Toprak family, who somehow befriends the punk squatters in his neighbourhood. One of the squatters mentions Yunus' family being exploited by "the system" and not understanding what it really means, the young boy gets offended. His endearing defence of his parents not being exploited ends on the

[44] *Honour*, p. 3.

[45] *İskender*, p. 12.

[46] *Honour*, p. 82.

[47] *İskender*, p. 190.

note that his brother is a boxer, which creates an almost comical instance. However, in the translation it is replaced by *"The neighbours gave us soup when my mum was ill."* With this modification, the level of the sentence changes drastically and Yunus' almost funny, charming expression is replaced by a defence that would play upon readers' heartstrings in a different way.

Şafak also adds more descriptive passages to the translation. A particular addition which depicts the differences between the two types of people "Gececiller" *[Nocturnals]* and "Gündüzcüller"[48] *[Daytimers]* is reminiscent of Şafak's enriched style in her Turkish writing. The Turkish text is consistently embellished. The scene in which Adem is having a conversation with a Moroccan coworker depicts the latter as "sitting by himself on the pavement"[49] whereas he is also *smoking and drinking*[50] in the translation by way of addition. Their interaction takes longer in the Turkish text; more jokes are exchanged and Adem shares more details about himself:

	Honour		*İskender*
p.43	He said flatly, 'My father was a heavy drinker.'	p. 73	"Babam çok içerdi" dedi usulca. "Kusura bakma. Ne oldu peki?" diye sordu Faslı, aniden ciddileşerek. "Babama mı? Ona değil de, ailesine oldu olan, biz oldu."

Adem's curt statement in the English original abruptly ends the dialogue between him and the Moroccan coworker. Şafak occasionally employs abrupt transitions as a narrative technique in her English writing. However, in the Turkish version, the Moroccan apologises and asks what had happened

[48] Ibid, p. 396-397

[49] *Honour*, p. 43.

[50] *İskender*, p. 72.

eventually to his father, to which Adem replies: [*To my father? Nothing happened to him. It all happened to his family, to us.]* Yet again, a snappy interaction in the original text becomes more emotionally heightened in translation.

Furthermore, several chapters are displaced in the translation, subsequently affecting the narrative flow. For instance, the fourth chapter in *Honour* is placed as the twelfth chapter in *İskender,* also suffering from alteration to the dates, despite telling the same story. Chapter seven becomes chapter nine, consequently changing the order of introduction of one of the characters. In one instance, a section concerning Adem and Pembe's relationship in chapter fifteen in *Honour* is brought forward and placed in chapter seven in *İskender*, embedded within a different story. Naturally, displacing chapters creates differences between readings of *Honour* and *İskender*. Since the story is mainly told through flashbacks between different times and settings, the displacement of the chapters does not necessarily impair the storyline, but it certainly interferes with the perceptions of the reader. At times, the English reader has a specific information about a character or a story tens of pages before the Turkish reader does, and vice versa.

The titles of chapters also differ. In *Honour*, chapter titles vary: "A Scrap of Truth", "The Cloak of Calmness", "Racism and Rice Pudding" and so on. Only chapters about Esma are named after her. In İskender, however, all the chapters are named after a character and the original chapter titles are omitted. Another inconsistency is observed in the form of meta-chapters. Five big sections are added to the translation, roughly once in every ten to fifteen chapters: Varış [*Arrival*], Köprüleri Atmak [*Throwing the Bridges],* Bir Erkek, Bir

Kadın [*One Man, One Woman*], O Senin Kardeşin [*They*[51] *Are Your Sibling*], Yüreğindeki Boşluk [*The Void In Your Heart*].

One of the distinctive features of Şafak's literary style is her use of old Ottoman Turkish words in her writing. She is known to masterfully blend the old words in her Turkish writing; it is more or less her trademark. Similar applications can be seen in *İskender:* "dehr"[52], "sarih"[53], "rahiya"[54] and so on. She especially maintains using the Ottoman Turkish words while writing about religion. Akbatur highlights an equal usage in *Bastard of Istanbul*'s translation *Baba ve Piç*:

> Şafak employs Ottoman Turkish words (—tesadüf,—tevafuk, —tevafukatı gaybiye) related to Islam and mysticism and this serves to infuse the Turkish text with a certain discourse and register reflecting Şafak's individual style. Şafak has embellished the language of the Turkish version with additions of many words and phrases in Ottoman Turkish throughout the text.[55]

Even though Şafak throws in a fair amount of Ottoman Turkish words, *İskender* is not on a par with the level of style in her previous novels written in Turkish. Understandably, Şafak's distinctive style is more apparent in her originally Turkish works, whereas the usage of old words in translation seems stiffer. On the other hand, in *Honour*, she does not employ Ottoman Turkish words (or old English words for that matter), therefore such literary style does not exist in her English writing.

---

[51] Turkish language does not contain gender specific pronouns. Third person singular pronoun "O" is used for *he*, *she* and *it.*

[52] *İskender*, p. 102.

[53] Ibid, p. 17.

[54] Ibid, p. 41.

[55] Akbatur, 2010, p. 289.

Another imbalance in translation can be observed in the ways certain characters speak. The reader gets informed that some of the Kurdish characters in the story cannot speak Turkish properly, but in the English original they form perfect sentences (supposedly in Turkish). For instance, “Yes, my children”[56] becomes “He ya”[57] in translation; thus turning a grammatically correct sentence into a localism. Similarly, “Hey, would you like some?”[58] becomes “Yersin?”[59] [*You eat?*]. This is important, because the style of pronunciation of these characters are necessary elements in the fictive universe. In fact, in this case, the phrases in the Turkish translation should arguably be considered as “originals”. Although Şafak had written the English text first, the characters should have *said* the phrases in Turkish first, subsequently translated mentally by Şafak into her English writing. In that case, the English text fails to find proper counterparts to demonstrate the local speech or to indicate the broken Turkish of a young Kurdish girl.

It is a major concern of this study to observe the imbalances in the fictive universe: Şafak employs Cemile’s indifference to learning Turkish at school as a stepping stone to describe the contrast between Cemile and Pembe, her twin. Pembe is described as being fluent in Turkish for she sees it necessary in order to get out of the small town she grew up in. Cemile, on the other hand, is not concerned. Therefore, a simple phrase arguably hinders the character’s integrity and story’s consistency.

---

[56] *Honour*, p. 7.

[57] *İskender*, p.19.

[58] *Honour*, p. 83.

[59] *İskender*, p. 191.

3.4.2.2. Setting, Time and Image

Some narrative elements are further formed (or deformed) in translation: Adem's flashback to his childhood memory of his mother jumping into the gully is described as "Bit by bit, second by second, he watched her fall."[60] Conversely, his memory is changed in the Turkish version: "Başını tekrar çevirdiğinde annesi yoktu."[61] *[When he turned his head again, his mother was gone.]*

There are several modifications throughout the story that alter the attributes of the physical objects. For example, Esma's husband's "classic charcoal"[62] slippers become "kahverengi"[63] [*brown*] in translation, her "burgundy slippers"[64] somehow turn into "erguvan rengi"[65] [*a pink-purple colour*]. In a similar vein, the "violas"[66] in her back garden becomes "begonyalar"[67] [*begonias*] during the process.

A fair amount of deletions can be observed throughout the translation. However, in comparison to modifications and additions, they are much more infrequent. Some of these deletions concern physical or material attributes of people: "… one of the Chinese — a bald, portly man who acted as if he were the boss, and perhaps he was"[68] is omitted from the Turkish text. Similarly,

---

[60] Ibid, p. 40

[61] *İskender*, p. 69.

[62] *Honour*, p.3

[63] *İskender*, p. 12.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

[66] *Honour*, p.3

[67] *İskender*, p. 12.

[68] *Honour*, p. 44.

“She was beautiful — almond eyes, jet-black hair, a shapely nose, slender hands with the thinnest veins”[69] is completely omitted from the translation. Curiously, “She was attired in a crimson dress that reached below her ankles and a black lace shawl.”[70] was nearly kept intact before the shawl detail is omitted.

The atmosphere in Crystal Scissors, the hair salon, is consistently less discussed in the Turkish text: References to pieces of information about the clients[71], Rita’s opinions and her dynamic with Pembe[72] are visibly reduced in the translation. Adem’s dream about Pembe wearing Roxana’s stripper costume[73] is also deleted. The scene in which Esma draws a goatee on her face also gets taken out.[74] Strangely enough, a two-page long side story about Yunus and Mrs Powell is omitted from the translation. Yunus coincidentally and almost accidentally meets Mrs Powell, who happens to be both one of Yunus’ punk friend’s mother and his sister Esma’s former teacher. Mrs Powell goes on to have a long speech about how her son makes her so upset, that she feels helpless and advises Yunus on not to turn out like him when he grows up.[75] This is the only exception to Şafak’s usual practice of adding more side stories to the Turkish text. Naturally, all of these deletions further alter the fictive universe.

There are a couple of omissions in the flashbacks of Pembe and Cemile’s childhood. It’s told that their mother used to occasionally hit them with

---

[69] Ibid, p. 75.

[70] Ibid, p. 22.

[71] Ibid, p. 108.

[72] Ibid, p. 146.

[73] Ibid, p. 276.

[74] Ibid, p. 209.

[75] Ibid, p. 222.

a rolling pin. The following remark, “The girls found it strange that the instrument they so bitterly abhorred also made the fluffy pastries that they cherished.”[76] is omitted from the Turkish version. The excerpt below exemplifies another deletion:

	Honour		*İskender*
p. 20-21	‘You must have been jinxed. Probably by a *djinni.’* ‘A djinni,’ Pembe echoed. **‘Yes sweetheart.** The djinn love to take a nap on chairs and sofas, don’t you know? **Adult djinn can make a dash for it when they see a human coming, but infants are not so fast. And pregnant women are heavy, clumsy.** You must have sat on a baby djinni and crushed it.’ ‘Oh, my God.’ **Jamila twitched her nose as if she had caught a foul smell. ‘My guess is the mother must have come for revenge and put a spell on you.’** **‘But what am I going to do?’** ‘Don’t worry, **there’s always a way to appease a djinni, no matter how enraged’** said Jamila authoritatively.	p. 104	“Seni cin çarpmış olmalı” dedi. “Cin mi?” diye sordu Pembe. “Tabii ya. Koltukta, kanepede kestirmeyi pek sever cin taifesi. Birini, üstüne oturup ezmiş olmalısın. O da seni çarpmış.” “Sahi mi?” “Merak etme, bir yolunu buluruz” dedi Cemile, kendinden emin.

The expressions in bold are highlighted to point out the missing sentences in the translation. Further descriptions on how djinnis operate and that it must have been their mother who has come for revenge in the form of a djinni is omitted in the Turkish text.

[76] Ibid, p. 15.

There is an indisputable discrepancy between the timelines and structures of each text. Firstly, the dates mentioned in *Honour* does not fall in line with the dates in *İskender.* The matching chapters, for example, can be seen dated as 1945 in *Honour* and 1 Aralık [*December*] 1946 in *İskender*. Similarly, 12 September 1992 is changed into 3 Ekim [*October*] 1992; 1969 into 5 Mart [*March*] 1970 and so on. The inconsistency between the timelines affects further elements in the fictive universe: İskender is sixteen years old when he is arrested in *Honour*, but he is fifteen in *İskender*. He writes in his diary: "Yunus is a Leo, Esma is a Virgo, I'm a Scorpio."[77] Remarkably, both his and Yunus' zodiac signs remain the same in the translated text, however Esma instead becomes a Cancer[78]. Moreover, the adult Esma mentions her husband being sixteen years older than her: "Exactly the same age difference that was between Elias and my mother."[79] However, the age difference between Esma and her husband is spelled as fourteen in *İskender:* "Neredeyse Elias'la annemin arasındaki yaş farkı kadar."[80] *[Almost the same age difference that was between Elias and my mother.]*

There is a plethora of location references in *Honour*, however they are seldom, if ever kept intact in translation. The names of places in England are either completely omitted or changed into something else. Bethnal Green[81], for instance, is reduced to "Doğu Londra"[82] [*East London*] and Hackney[83] to "Kuzey

[77] *Honour*, p. 136.

[78] *İskender*, p. 181.

[79] *Honour*, p. 325.

[80] *İskender*, p. 427.

[81] *Honour*, p. 42.

[82] *İskender*, p. 70.

[83] *Honour*, p. 46.

Londra”[84] [*North London*]. References to Birmingham[85], Warwick[86] and Ridley Road Market[87] are omitted altogether. Şafak arguably does not want to alienate the Turkish reader, therefore omits or tames the English references. But who is the implied reader here — someone who would flinch at the first mention of a foreign place? Strangely enough, the sentence “In Victoria Park they stood by the pond, watching the pigeons.”[88] remains as it is in translation, except the park’s name is changed into Abney Park[89], where there is and never was a pond. What does this modification achieve —besides contradicting reality? Is Abney Park somehow more palatable to the Turkish reader than Victoria Park?

Şafak adds a considerable amount of side stories and backstories to the Turkish translation. A remarkable example is the three-page long description of Elias’ relationship with his ex-wife Anabel. The additional information given to the Turkish reader ranges from the depiction of Anabel’s intense character and infidelity to the reveal of Elias’ infertility.[90] Şafak also opts to leave some side stories behind: Elias’ restaurant is called “Cleo’s” in the English original, whereas it is replaced with “Eflatun Lokantası” *[Lilac Restaurant]* in the Turkish version. “Cleo” is the name of Elias’ disabled younger sister whom he loves very much. Elias owes his cooking skills to Cleo for she was a fussy eater but she would eat whatever her brother cooks. The description of his relationship with Cleo is very brief and both the English and Turkish readers are provided with this information. However, due to the omission of Cleo’s name as the

---

[84] *İskender*, p. 75.

[85] *Honour*, p. 2.

[86] Ibid, p. 205.

[87] Ibid, p. 73.

[88] Ibid, p. 128.

[89] *İskender*, p. 168.

[90] Ibid, p. 172-175.

restaurant's name, the Turkish reader misses out on understanding the level of their connection.

3.4.2.3. Sociocultural Notions and References

An example of domestication via modifications can be observed in the below excerpt:

	Honour		*İskender*
p. 203	So are you **Buddhist, Jewish, Muslim, Christian…** what are you?'	p. 300	"Nesin sen? **Sağcı mısın, solcu musun? Kimlere yakınsın?**"

İskender gets a new cellmate, Zeeshan. The mystical and quirky aura of Zeeshan makes İskender confused and annoyed, and he questions Zeeshan about his faith, offering the names of several religions similar to a multiple-choice question. However, in the Turkish translation, the religions completely disappear and the question is concerned with Zeeshan's political beliefs: "*Are you right wing or left wing? Who are you akin to?".* It is difficult to make sense of a need for such modification, as İskender's original question would make as much sense as it does in English if kept intact. However, it should be noted that the disparity between the right-wing and left-wing in the Turkish context is far greater than what it would connote in the contemporary Western context. The coups of 1961 and 1980 in Turkey have historically seen the two political opinions as declared enemies and the bloody events still linger in memories today. Furthermore, in the Turkish context, being right-wing refers to also being

heavily religious, whereas being left-wing means being secular or agnostic. In hindsight, Şafak might have retained the religious undertone of İskender's question in translation, however that would still be on a very different level than his original question. Considering that this chapter of İskender's diary has been dated as 1991, it offers an even heightened context for the Turkish question as it was another turbulent time for the right-left battle where people would know and question each other's place on the political spectrum.

Before discussing Şafak's domesticating tendencies and the term's applicability, it is necessary to offer a few more examples. The Turkish characters' tea preference is mentioned several times as "which I'll serve without milk"[91], "tea in small glasses —never with milk."[92] in *Honour*, whereas it is only referred to being "demli"[93][well-brewed] in the Turkish translation, omitting the emphasis on the anti-milk attitude. This is not surprising at all, considering consuming tea with milk is unheard of in the Turkish culture. A standard Turkish reader would be shocked by the emphasis on even *not having milk* with tea, as even the suggestion of a possibility of having milk would sound bizarre to them. In a similar vein, the "sesame halva"[94] Esma is making in the kitchen is replaced by "irmik helvası"[95] [*semolina halva*]. It is perplexing to see the wording "sesame halva" in English, as it does not refer to an actual dessert in Turkish. The closest thing could potentially be the *tahini halva,* which is made of tahini that is made of sesame paste; however, it is very bizarre for a Turkish woman to make *tahini halva* at home, as it is something that is bought

[91] *Honour*, p. 3.

[92] Ibid, p. 50.

[93] *İskender*, p. 12.

[94] *Honour*, p. 1.

[95] *İskender*, p. 9.

packaged from the shops. Furthermore, even if it is assumed that Şafak is writing about an obscure dessert whatever it may be, it is not at all the same dessert as the *semolina halva* in the Turkish text. There are virtually no similarities between the ingredients and the taste, and more importantly, *semolina halva* indeed refers to a very commonly consumed dessert, easily made by anyone in their kitchen.

What to do with this conflicted information? I shall draw upon Lawrence Venuti's understanding of domestication; that such an act compromises the cultural elements of the source text in order to appeal to the target reader. He rejects all domestication practices in order to conserve the cultural integrity of a source text, as well as not to further benefit the hierarchy of literatures. According to Venuti, resisting to the Anglophone publishing world's disdain towards foreignisation in translations is essential. Şafak's particular self-translation in this case, however, confounds our understanding of domestication. Şafak indeed modifies the likes of sesame halva of the original into semolina halva in Turkish text, "domesticating" the original in favour of the target culture. However, all the aforementioned modifications *already* concern the Turkish culture, the same target culture the translation is written for. The references that have been "domesticated" for the Turkish text; were they not originally Turkish references anyway? In other words, is it the translated text *İskender* that is domesticated, or is it *Honour*? Şafak's decision while writing in English about Turkish characters already results in a form of domestication.

In terms of "classic" domestication, Şafak modifies the likes of "Coronation Street" to "television series". The subsequent passage "Everyone was curious to see what would happen now that Suzie had managed to seduce Steve and Gail had caught them in an intimate situation. Uncle Tariq didn't think

the affair would last long. Aunt Meral agreed, but nobody took her seriously because she always missed the point."[96] is reduced to a mere *occasional remarks on the characters on the screen.*[97]

The posters covering İskender's bedroom walls consist of *Star Wars*, Muhammad Ali, Bruce Lee, Superman, James Dean and a scene from an Arsenal v. Nottingam Forest game. All the posters exist both in the English original and the Turkish version, except for one: The Union Jack. The latter is removed from the Turkish translation. This seemingly minor omission in fact alters the fictive universe considerably: İskender's immigrant status is consistently emphasised in the novel(s), but it is ever so heightened in the Turkish text. Before I argue the importance of the omitted Union Jack, I shall represent the following:

"We Topraks were only passers-by in this city —a half-Turkish, half-Kurdish family in the wrong end of London."[98] This diary excerpt from *Honour* is modified into: "Yabancı geldiysen yabancı giderdin, kaçarı yoktu. İngilizlerin bizi kendi dengi gibi görebileceklerini düşünmek rüzgara karşı işemek gibiydi. Bazıları sevgiden, barıştan, kardeşlikten dem vurmayı adet edinmişti. Ama sonra hayatın gerçekleri, bütün o sevgini, barışın ve kardeşliğin içine ediyordu.[99] *[If you are a foreigner, you will stay as a foreigner, there is no way around that. To think the English can see us as equals is like pissing against the wind. Some make it a habit to talk about love, peace and brotherhood. But then the reality of life louses up all that love, peace and brotherhood.]*

---

[96] *Honour*, p. 209.

[97] *İskender*, p. 267.

[98] Ibid, p. 50.

[99] *İskender*, p. 48.

This heightened narrative positions İskender and his family's immigration status on a different level. In the English original, he is somewhat more connected to the society, he wants to be a part of the nation; he is an immigrant in the 1970s with a Union Jack poster. In the Turkish text, however, he is more expressive about his feelings and experiences about being an immigrant. If the value of Union Jack were to be assessed from a semiotics perspective, what would it signify? Given the The National Front's appropriation of the Union Jack in that era, how can İskender as an immigrant have that poster on his wall to begin with? What does this tell us about his character?

Continuing with the immigrant topic, the following deletion is worth examining:

	Honour		*İskender*
p.213	Then the march began, **the chant was taken up, 'The National Front is a White Man's front**.' Oddly, the police were nowhere to be seen — even when the protesters started to attack the shops of immigrants, **shouting 'Kill the Black Bastards**', smashing windscreens and windows, harming private property.	p. 277	Sonra gövde gösterisi başladı. İşin garip yanı etrafta tek bir polis bile yoktu. Göstericiler bağıra çağıra göçmenlerin dükkanlarına saldırıp camı çerçeveyi kırmaya, özel mülke zarar vermeye başladıklarında bile gelmedi polis.

The racist chants are entirely omitted from the translation, whereas the rest of the passage is intact. However, there is a conspicuous shift on the focus. Why does Şafak omit the racial slurs against people of colour in the Turkish translation? This is another form of ill-domestication. Since Topraks are immigrants but not Black, Şafak arguably does not feel the need to transfer

elements of reality that “would not be of interest” to her implied Turkish reader. Omissions of such manner damages the integrity of the fictive universe, as well as raising cultural and philosophical concerns.

3.4.2.4. Names, Characters and Narrators

Some noteworthy modifications around İskender’s diary excerpts creates shifts in his character. The table below is a prime example:

	Honour		*İskender*
p.48	Then someone mentioned this **twat** in another class who stuttered so badly nobody talked to him.	p.46	Sonra birisi üst sınıftaki bir çocuktan bahsetti. Öyle fena kekelerdi ki **garibim**, kimse konuşmazdı onunla.

İskender in the original, while reminiscing about a stuttering schoolmate calls him a “twat”, certainly a rude expression, whereas İskender in translation refers to him as “garibim” [*“(my) poor thing”*], which is a very compassionate expression in Turkish. Similarly, “There are women who want to marry me, and cure me with their love. Sick in the head, that is.”[100] becomes “Benimle evlenmek isteyen kadınlar bile oldu. Böyle bir kadın türü var herhalde, suçlularla evlenip onları sevgileriyle tedavi etmek isteyen.” [*There were even women who wanted to marry me. I guess there is a type of woman who wants to marry the criminals and cure them with their love.]* The derogatory “sick in the head”

[100] *Honour*, p.135.

remark is replaced by a more neutral observation and that creates ruptures in the integrity of the character. İskender, in general, is gentler in Turkish translation. Some of his "bad habits" and previous ill-doings are subdued in the Turkish text. In *Honour*, he mentions "smoking grass"[101] multiple times as well as making references such as "like a bad trip" [102] whereas their counterparts in the translation are replaced with innocuous wording. Below is a striking example:

	Honour		*İskender*
p. 164	She said these boys, these gangsters, **had forced her son to drink his own pee.**	p. 235	Hastanedeymiş şimdi. Zatürre olmuş.

In the excerpt above, İskender is recalling his memories of his mother Pembe being asked for help by another mother in the neighbourhood, after his son was harassed by other kids. None of the women knew who the culprits were, but the reader understands that İskender is one of them. The fact that culprits had forced the boy to drink his own pee completely vanishes from the translation and instead gets replaced by the boy being *hospitalised with pneumonia*.

	Honour		*İskender*
p.160	I pick it up and start to **chuckle again**. **'You sad bastard.'**	p.230	Nutkum tutuluyor. "Aşkolsun sana, aşkolsun be oğlum."

[101] Ibid, p. 205.

[102] Ibid, p. 48.

A similar shift can be observed between the two utterances above. İskender, upon discovering his cellmate Trippy's body (named *Uçuk* in translation) and his suicide note, chuckles in the original text, whereas he is *completely speechless* in the translation. Calling Trippy *a sad bastard*, however oxymoronic it would be to his actual feelings, is not at all on the same level as "aşkolsun". The Turkish wording, an extremely common expression in daily life, is also considerably difficult to translate. It could be explained as resenting someone deeply, being hurt or offended by their actions in a loving manner. Therefore, İskender's immediate reaction to his friend's suicide changes dramatically in translation, effectively altering İskender's characteristic traits. Considering the main storyline is İskender's accidental "honour killing" of his mother, (at least that is what the reader and İskender assume until it is revealed that it was in fact his mother's twin) İskender's character traits are considerably important to render him credible concerning his intentions and remorse. Would the perception of İskender by the English reader who has been told his many atrocities intersect with the Turkish reader's perception of a "gentler" soul? What is the driving factor between these modifications?

Not just İskender, but almost all of the characters become more sentimental in translation. At certain times this heightened emotivity can even result in a type of "corniness". Even Trippy, in his suicide letter changes his tone. "You were a good mate. When I see your ma I'm gonna tell her that"[103] gets embellished with reinforcements like *abi [my brother], harbi [honestly], her zaman [always].*[104] A final sentence that has been added to Trippy's letter reads "Hem belki affetmiştir seni, etmiştir be usta*." [Besides, maybe she has forgiven*

[103] Ibid, p. 161.

[104] *İskender*, p. 231.

you, bet she has forgiven you "usta"]. In addition to Trippy's anticipation of İskender having his mother's forgiveness, the wording "usta" here is considerably important. Lexicologically it would mean the master, the expert or an experienced repairman. In this context, however, Trippy calling İskender "usta" refers to the respect and love he has for him. A common usage in Turkish daily speaking, the receiver of the name "usta" is always a male and it is also uttered by almost always a male person. It should be stressed that this refers to an even greater capacity than calling someone *brother* — which is also added in translation, the signature at the bottom of the letter "Your friend Trippy" becomes Kardeşin Uçuk *[your brother Trippy]).* The translated version of Trippy's letter suggests an even closer relationship between him and İskender in comparison to the original narrative. As well as the heightened sentimental context, the usage of an extremely Turkish expression by a British "pothead" in Shrewsbury Prison is reminiscent of an ill-fitting domestication.

Several other modifications can be seen in characters' utterances. Hairdresser Rita's original statement reads: "I always say to my customers, ladies, long hair is for women. That's the way the good Lord made it.'"[105] However, her religious reasoning vanishes in translation and is replaced with "Atkuyruklu oğlan görünce kız mı erkek mi anlamıyoruz."[106] *['When we see a boy with a ponytail, we don't understand whether it's a male or a female.']* Similarly, when Adem is told by İskender that his wife is having an affair, he asks: "'Does she love him?'"[107] His concern is modified in translation into "İyi bir adam mıymış bari?"[108] *[Is he a good guy?]*

---

[105] *Honour*, p.147.

[106] *İskender*, p. 213.

[107] *Honour*, p. 259.

[108] Ibid, p. 336ç

There are many additions to the Turkish text. Şafak has a persistent tendency to provide more backstories for the side characters in the Turkish version. For instance, İskender's girlfriend Kate's family history as well as her personality gets much more detailed in the translation.[109] So as the stories about other minor characters, such as the reason behind the disability of the owner of the coffee shop that İskender frequents or the self-medication habit of the rich woman who Pembe used to work for. The most notable additions in this manner concern Elias and Pembe, as well as Roxana and Adem, which I have chosen to argue in the upcoming section.

In line with the previous observation of heightened emotivity in the Turkish text, many additions are employed to further detail and embellish characters' reactions. "I'll show him to his room and close the door, slowly."[110] is emotionally reinforced with the added section "ağabeyimin, geçmişin, bir türlü geçip gitmeyenlerin üzerine."[111] *[(closing the door) on my brother, the past, the things that never pass.]* Similarly, in reference to Jamila's perception on birds and insects, "Sometimes she thought she understood what they said."[112] is enhanced with "Ya da aklını yitiriyordu."[113] *[Or she was losing her mind.]*

Furthermore, "It was a remarkable feeling to be respected by strangers. To be admired and envied."[114] is supplemented with the following "Tam da ihtiyacı olan şeydi bu. İlaç gibi gelmişti. Dışarıda hiçti belki ama şu an burada kraldı."[115] *[This was exactly what he needed. It was like a medicine. He might be*

---

[109] Ibid, pp. 161-164.

[110] *Honour*, p. 3.

[111] *İskender*, p. 13

[112] *Honour*, p. 37.

[113] *İskender*, p. 43.

[114] *Honour*, p. 42.

[115] *İskender*, p. 72.

nothing outside, but in here he was the king.] The characters are generally more reflective (and sometimes opinionated) in the Turkish version: Tobiko's meditation on whether she is a good influence on Yunus or not[116], Adem's observations about the villagers[117], Esma's regret about being born as a woman in a cruel world[118] and Tarık's assumption that the nude models in magazines must be orphans[119] are all additions to the Turkish text.

Many of the additions to male characters' utterances consist of misogynistic and sexist remarks: The village headman suggesting that men should have more than one wife,[120] a Tunusian coworker's argument on why the women in porno movies are always German[121] and Tarık's validation of a husband's infidelity in case of the wife is not *woman enough*[122] are all additions in such manner.

Another addition is observed when İskender suddenly questions *his mother's condition, whether she is in the hospital or not*[123] after having stabbed her. This also conforms with my previous observation of İskender's softened personality in translation.

Some thoughts and traits of İskender yet again is deleted in translation. His mother Pembe, upon almost getting caught with Elias by İskender, reacts: "Iskender, my son' she said. 'You are home.'" This scene is kept intact in translation, however, İskender's reflection on her mother's reaction is missing: "I

---

[116] Ibid, p. 309

[117] Ibid, p. 190

[118] Ibid, p. 142

[119] Ibid, p. 217

[120] Ibid, p. 197

[121] Ibid, p. 219

[122] Ibid, p. 221

[123] Ibid, p. 365

wondered what surprised her more — that I was home almost three hours early or that I was her son."[124] Additionally, the darker details of İskender's imagination is also deleted. İskender and Esma used to play a game when they were younger, looking outside from their basement window and trying to come up with stories that match the shoes they see walking past. In both versions, he imagines a character who is poor, unemployed and is about to rob the bank around the corner, based on his dirty, worn-out shoes. However, only in the English version, the imaginary character "would get shot by the security guard."[125]

Proper names belonging to some characters also change in translation. Jamila in *Honour* becomes Cemile in *İskender;* similarly Aisha becomes Ayşe and Tariq becomes Tarık. This issue begs two questions: First of all, why keep some names intact while altering the others? Pembe (meaning *Pink* in Turkish), for instance, stays as Pembe across the linguistic border. Adem, İskender, Esma and Meral also get to keep their names. Even Yunus, referred in relation to Jonah the Prophet in the story, remains unchanged in translation. The treatment of the proper names are inconsistent.

Secondly, why specifically amend the Turkish names into their Arabic counterparts? Even though *Honour* is the original, thus potentially having the right to claim primacy, the names in question simply would not be given in the Turkish cultural context. It is common knowledge that many names have varying spellings in different cultures, even if they are stemming from the same root. The mutation of names like Cemile, Ayşe and Tarık — all extremely common names in Turkey — into Jamila, Aisha and Tariq (Turkish alphabet does not contain the letter Q) results in a bizarre, unrealistic modification. Şafak's latent

---

[124] Ibid, p. 50

[125] Ibid, p. 74

tendency to infuse the narrative with ever more *eastern* elements does not go unnoticed. Western names such as Kate and Elias, on the other hand, remain intact with the exception of Roxana (a stage name) becoming Roksana in translation.

Pembe & Elias

The relationship between Pembe and Elias, as well as their individual traits and storylines, are considerably modified in translation. First of all, Pembe's approach towards Elias is far more uninhibited in *Honour* than it is in *İskender.* This is how an initial interaction between them is described in *Honour: "*He insisted on carrying her bags, and that, too, seemed all right, though she would have never allowed it had they been in her neighbourhood."[126] However, Pembe changes her attitude in translation: "Bunda bir beis görmediyse de kabul etmedi Pembe."[127] [*Even though Pembe saw no harm in that, she still did not accept it.*] The scene describing how they parted ways that day[128] is also considerably longer in the English text.

Pembe becomes visibly more conservative and timid in the Turkish translation. When Elias comes to the hair salon to get a haircut from her, he jokingly tells Pembe to make him look handsome, upon being asked what kind of hairstyle he had wanted. "'You're nice already,' Pembe muttered in a voice so low it was a miracle he heard her."[129] is replaced with "Pembe'nin gözlerinden

[126] *Honour*, p. 113.

[127] *İskender*, p. 152.

[128] *Honour*, p. 118.

[129] *Honour*, p. 148.

belli belirsiz bir kıvılcım geçti. Zaten yakışıklıydı Elias, bilmiyor muydu?"[130] *[A faint spark passed through Pembe's eyes. Elias was already handsome, didn't he know that?]* Pembe has enough courage to tell Elias he looks nice in the original text, however low her voice is, whereas she cannot say what she has been thinking out loud in the translation. This is a recurring pattern that Şafak is employing in her translation. At some point in the story, Pembe and Elias go to the cinema together, and upon leaving the premises, he asks: "'Next week, same day, same time, will you come?'"[131] Pembe says 'Yes'. Conversely, she replies by saying 'Bilmem'[132] *[I don't know]* in the Turkish text.

The interference with Pembe's manners are bothersome. It not only affects the elements of her relationship with Elias, but also those of her own character's. Elias also changes attitudes in translation, especially towards topics like sex and intimacy: essentially towards whatever is deemed unsuitable by Şafak for the implied Turkish reader. Elias also suddenly develops concerns for Pembe's marital dynamics, which he did not possess in the original text:

[130] *İskender*, p. 215

[131] *Honour*, p. 156.

[132] *İskender*, p. 225.

	Honour		*İskender*
p.148	‘I need to ask you something.’ ‘What is it?’ she replied apprehensively. ‘Look, I… I’d like to get to know you better, and spend more time together. But if you’d rather I stay away from you, tell me.’ Pembe flinched. Her face paled a little, and after what seemed an eternity she mumbled, ‘Don’t stay away.’	p. 214	“Ama sana bir şey sormam lazım. Yanıtın evet ise sonsuza dek uzak dururum, söz. Yok eğer cevap hayır ise bunu da bilmek isterim.” Kaygıyla bekledi Pembe. “Nedir soru?” “Kocandan hiç bahsetmedin. Hayatındaki pek çok şeyden söz ettin ama onu anmadın bile. Merak ediyorum, seviyor musun?” Pembe’nin rengi soldu, yüreği ağır geldi kafesine. Hiç bitmeyecekmiş gibi gelen bir bekleyişin ardından mırıldandı: “Hayır, sevgi hiç olmadı.” *[back translation:* *‘But I need to ask you something. If your answer is yes, I’ll stay away forever, I promise. But if the answer is no, then I’d also like to know that.’* *Pembe waited anxiously. ‘What is the question?’* *‘You never talked about your husband. You talked about many things in your life but you never once mentioned him. I am curious, do you love him?’* *Pembe turned pale, her heart became heavy for its cage. She mumbled, after a wait that felt like it was never going to end: ‘No, there never was love.’]*

The modification presented above points to further inconsistencies in the fictive universe. The alterations change the end product: Every time Şafak employs rewriting, it is as if she is using a silk thread in a different colour. The fabric might remain the same but the needlework becomes visible. Different colours of thread and different patterns for alternative readerships.

There are various references to sex (or lack thereof) from Elias' perspective in *Honour: "*Since the day they had held hands at the cinema, watching *The Kid* together for the first time, he had craved to make love to her."[133] However, his desires are mitigated to "onu öpmek istiyor"[134] [*he had been wanting to kiss her*] in the translation. Similarly, the following passage is completely omitted in the Turkish text:

	Honour	*İskender*
p. 292-293	All too suddenly, sex resembled a dessert kept to the end of a long meal. Delightful and exquisite, no doubt, but not the main course, and not at all impossible to skip when it came to it. They were only at the starters now. Elias didn't know how long they could go on like this, and he was in no rush to find out. There was something oddly sexy about refraining from sex. He laughed at himself for making such a discovery at his age, precisely when he thought he was too old to discover anything new. 'God is testing us,' she said to him once. 'You think we pass?' 'I'm not interested in God's tests. I want to face my own challenges.' She didn't like to hear him speak like that. She wanted them both to be hopeful and faithful — traits he had lost long ago, if he had ever possessed them. Ever since he was a young man he had managed without pleading for anything from a higher force, consistently sinful, if sin it was. Still, Elias decided not to talk about his reasons for agnosticism. He didn't want to break Pembe's heart — or her God's.	-

This omission above results in yet another imbalance between the perceptions of the readers of different languages. Elias' desire and his reflections on sex vanishes from the translation, so as Pembe's resistance to

[133] *Honour*, p. 201.

[134] *İskender*, p. 375.

temptation and her relationship with God. Paradoxically, in comparison to the translated text, Pembe is represented as being more religious and more liberal at the same time. She asks in her letter to Jamila, after writing extensively about Elias: “When one has tasted the elixir of love, how can she not thirst for it?”[135] The suggestive parts of the letter are considerably subdued in translation, where Pembe refers to Elias more like *a dear friend in a foreign land*[136]. Furthermore, in *Honou*r, upon realising that her son İskender has learned about her affair, she decides to take action: “Now she had to find Elias and tell him that from now on it would be more difficult for her to meet him.”[137] However, the topic of the conversation changes dramatically in translation: “imkansız olacağını söylemek, veda etmekti.”[138] [*to tell him that it would be impossible to meet, to say farewell.*] Both phrases, the English original and the Turkish translation, are the last sentences in their respective chapters, therefore heightening the effects on the reader ever more. The English reader would naturally assume that, even though Pembe is concerned about their future arrangements, she intends to keep seeing Elias. The Turkish reader, however, is told that Pembe is saying goodbye forever. This discrepancy naturally creates further inconsistencies within the fictive universe.

What is interesting is that the heart of the modifications that have been applied to Pembe, Elias and their relationship, are consistent throughout the Turkish translation. That it is to say, for instance, once Pembe is modified into a more conservative, more inhibited, more “innocent” woman; she remains as such throughout *İskender.* This consistency also proves that Şafak’s choices in

---

[135] *Honour*, p. 195.

[136] *İskender*, p. 269.

[137] *Honour*, p. 285.

[138] *İskender*, p. 370.

this case are not at random; her persistent rewriting of particular elements indicates a deliberate act. It should also be noted that, in addition to being a novelist, Şafak is also an academic whose main research field is *Gender and Women Studies*. Her doctoral dissertation is on the perceptions of women in Turkey, and she also taught on the subject. Besides, as mentioned before, she is an ardent feminist who is very much concerned about women in Turkey and elsewhere, writing extensively on the subject for media outlets all around the world. In a *New York Times* interview in 2019, she states:

> If you happen to be an author from a wounded democracy — like Turkey, Venezuela, Pakistan, Egypt, Brazil: The list is so long and it's getting longer — you do not have the luxury of being apolitical. You cannot say, I am not going to talk about what's happening outside the window, when so much is happening out there. *Even writing about gender and sexuality can be a political act of resistance in these countries.*[139] [emphasis added]

Şafak's poignant remark here is of importance. If, writing about gender and sexuality can be an act of resistance in countries like Turkey, and it indeed is the case, why does Şafak put aside her cause in the Turkish text? Why does she tamper with Pembe's actions, remove references to sex from the narrative, turn Pembe into a more modest, more hesitant character? The only female characters who are allowed to keep their sexuality in the Turkish translation are Kate and Roxana — both are not Turkish. This is not to defend or question whether the author is responsible for moral guidance in literary fiction; but to ask, and ask again, why would Şafak curtail Pembe's liberties — the very same Turkish woman have been fighting against for years?

---

[139] Elif Shafak, *New York Times*, 2009.

Another discrepancy in Pembe and Elias' story is caused by the addition of Pembe's birthday and the surrounding narrative to the translation. The day Elias finds out about Pembe's murder also happens to be her birthday and Elias has bought a gift, a necklace for Pembe.[140] This detail is further employed later in the story, when Elias sends *the silver chain with a heart shaped jade stone*[141] to Pembe's daughter Esma.

Roxana & Adem

The most extensive addition between *Honour* and *İskender* is the addition of Roxana's backstory to the translated text. Roxana's chapter is more than tripled in volume in the Turkish version. This includes brand new information, such as: her father being an abusive alcoholic; her mother being permanently bedridden; her real name being Elena; her sexual relationship with a philosopher; her being the mistress of an English man; relocating to London with him; her almost dying in an IRA attack. Furthermore, alongside these drastic additions as narrative facts, Roxana also shares much more of what she thinks about Adem and their relationship. The English reader does not have any of this information about Roxana's background; Roxana really is a minor character in the original text. She eventually leaves Adem and moves to Abu Dhabi. Adem follows suit, partly because he wants to find Roxana, partly because he has to leave England due to gambling debts. He works as a construction worker in Abu Dhabi and never gets to see Roxana again. The

[140] *İskender*, p. 375.

[141] Ibid, p. 383.

story ends. At least that is the extent of the story that is available in the English original.

In the Turkish version, however, Adem and Roxana's story ends with an extremely dramatic addition to the narrative. Over the additional eight pages, the Turkish reader is updated on the whereabouts and the state of mind of Roxana with a plethora of information on how she is now living in a hotel room as a mistress of another businessman. In her last scene in the novel, she steps out on the balcony in the middle of the night and observes her surroundings with the help of a telescope. She then sees a man sitting at the top of a building in construction, only to realise that the man was Adem and subsequently witnesses his suicide.

3.4.2.5. Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have categorised, analysed and discussed the differences between *Honour* and *İskender,* as well as their importance to the fictive universe. It is reasonable to assume that Şafak's translingual journey across *Honour* and *İskender* would have been a difficult one: English and Turkish are linguistically very distanced, the cultures are substantially different and the Turkish culture has an abundance of nearly untranslatable words and culture-specific elements which are difficult to capture in a Western context. However, by documenting the differences between *Honour* and *İskender*, I have come to realise that the discrepancies in the fictive universe is rarely caused by these underlying reasons. Instead, their existence is predominantly a direct result of Şafak's intentional rewriting.

As mentioned before, I observed that Şafak has a consistent tendency to heighten the emotivity in the Turkish text. The characters also tend to have more sentimental utterances and attributes in the translation. Several culture-specific elements, regardless of belonging to the British or the Turkish culture, are either glossed over or domesticated. Şafak's literary style is enhanced in her Turkish writing, through additional embellishments, the use of Ottoman Turkish words and narrative techniques.

The amount of additions to the Turkish translation far outweighs the deletions from the English original. Both in terms of volume and the narrative effect, the additions are the most expansive category. Studying *Bastard of Istanbul* and *Baba ve Piç* together, Akbatur maintains: "There is, for instance, a considerable amount of additions to the Turkish version, which far outnumber the omissions from the English. In this sense, the alterations resulted from Şafak's own decisions, and not actually in collaboration with the translator."[142] In line with Akbatur's conclusion, Şafak's additions to *İskender* were instigated by her authorial licence.

The nature of discrepancies between *Honour* and *İskender* makes it impossible to simply position them as source and target texts. I believe that a certain terminology, such as "original" and "translation" is necessary in comparative analysis; however, this study proves that when it comes to self-translation, these terms do not entirely correspond to the terms we use to differentiate in translation studies.

Şafak's self-translation practice in this instance certainly conforms to Bassnett's depiction of reconstructing and recreating. The issue of originality remains as a mystified question across the self-translation field. What is certain

[142] Akbatur, 2010, p. 226.

is that, in this particular case of Şafak, both *Honour* and *İskender* seem to bleed into each other. *Honour* is still to be considered as the origin story, but *İskender'*s position is complicated. It is the native reproduction of a non-native text with an abundance of extraordinary additions, therefore, *İskender* might also possibly claim some form of authority.

If we were to look at this from an extratextual perspective, this is what we encounter: The novel's further translations into Western-languages used *Honour* as the source text, which is only natural. However, some translations, like the Azerbaijani translation, appointed *İskender* as the source text. Consequently, this creates an odd-one-out dynamic within *Honour/İskende*r's translations into the third languages. It is almost like a game that the reader is unaware of: Pick the right one and Adem lives, or he commits suicide. Choose wisely or you will never get to know Roxana's backstory. The outcomes can go on and on.

As a final observation, it should be noted that the extent and the nature of discrepancies between *Honour* and *İskender* proved to be considerably different from Beckett's practice. The comparative analysis on their self-translation practices will be discussed in the next chapter.

4. Comparative Analysis of Beckett and Şafak's Bilingual Prose in Self-Translation: In Practice, Towards a Theory?

In the preceding chapters, I have analysed and exemplified both Beckett's and Şafak's bilingual writing and self-translation practice, respectively. Beckett and Şafak are very different artists from one another, for various reasons: Beckett's modern, spare narratives are at odds with Şafak's plot and character-heavy novels. The authors' respective use of language and literary style does not even cross paths. Yet, these differences, when combined with their bilingualism, allow a comparative look to be fruitful in my research. Beckett and Şafak are certainly two of the most dedicated authors in terms of bilingual production. For neither of them the bilingualism in their art was a phase, or an odd experiment. They consistently wrote in a second language, but never abandoned their native language, as well as self-translating majority of their works, regardless of directionality.

The aim of this final chapter is to compare my previous findings on Beckett and on Şafak, in the hopes of coming to a meaningful analysis on the two author-translators, taking their literary attitudes and cultural belongings into account. In doing so, this chapter aims to understand Beckett and Şafak's respective positions held within the self-translation axis.

Brian Fitch, when comparing Beckett's self-translations, stresses a necessary attitude one must take into account in research:

> To compare the two versions and define the relationship between them involves taking into account, at one stage or another, the necessary differences between two language systems, two literary traditions, two critical traditions, two cultures, and two societies, not to mention

> the differences between a mother tongue and an acquired second language.[1]

Fitch then follows by stating that “one way to begin to clarify this situation” is to discard the differences that are due to language systems, in Beckett’s case the dissimilarities arising from English and French. Fitch employs this strategy in order to maintain clearer view on the impact of Beckett’s self-translations on the fictive universe, without dwelling on inevitable linguistic realities. This is understandable from Fitch’s point of view as his research interest is not linguistics and he is focused solely on Beckett’s bilingual practice. I do, however, still find Fitch’s quoted statement valuable as it contains a brief overview of the elements which *complicate the situation* in self-translation. The act of literary self-translation cannot be considered outside the personal background of the author-translators, as well as the cultural realm their two literary existences belong to. In this chapter, following my research on Beckett, and on Şafak, I will explore the necessary linguistic, cultural and political elements of bilingual prose which make up the building blocks of a coherent understanding of self-translation. To do this, in addition to self-translators’ respective languages and cultures, I will also draw up on the theories previously mentioned in Chapter 1, such as bilingualism, self-translation and the translator’s invisibility.

[1] Fitch, p. 96.

4.1. The Mother, the Mother Tongue and the Motherland

"The mother" here does not refer to Beckett's tumultuous relationship with his mother, or Şafak's adoption of her mother's name as her surname, but to the respective places of their births, as this information turned out to be important in their bilingual writing. Beckett being born in Ireland, near Dublin, to a middle-class Protestant family in 1906, inherently positioned him within a sociocultural context, the "Anglo-Irish". His native language, thus, is English. Beckett's alienation towards Gaelic is often seen in his in-text references to the Gaelic language. Beckett's characters, when confronted with something that they cannot can grapple with, liken the incomprehensibility to their reception of Irish Gaelic, such as in "so much Irish to me" in *Watt,* similarly, in "for [...] it to have no more effect on him than speech in Bantu or in Erse" in *Company*. Seán Kennedy explains Beckett's position against the language revival as the following:

> Given its use as a symbol of Irish independence, it is no surprise that a majority of Irish Protestants viewed the language with antipathy. They called it "Erse" and refused to learn it. Beckett was no different, and conducted a quietly hostile campaign against the language throughout his oeuvre. [2]

In another article, Alan Graham traces Beckett's relationship with Gaelic by looking at the in-text references. He points out a noteworthy modification in self-translation, how *Molloy* in French bears "les pleurs et les ris, je ne m'y connais guère", but it is translated into English as "Tears and laughter, they are

[2] Seán Kennedy, '"In the street I was lost": cultural dislocation in Samuel Beckett's *The End*', in *Beckett and Ireland*, ed. Seán Kennedy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 96-113 (p.104).

so much Gaelic to me." Graham states that, "As a Protestant educated prior to and in the immediate wake of the foundation of the Irish Free State, Beckett had little engagement with the Irish language during his formative years."[3] These remarks by Beckett characters are easily read as autobiographical, or at least tied to what Beckett had witnessed in his surroundings. Vivian Mercier, an Anglo-Irish literary critic who had a similar background to Beckett, writes in his book *Beckett/Beckett* in 1977: "To employ two modern clichés, alienation and the search for identity are both serious problems for an Irishmen of that heritage."[4] Mercier, drawing from his own experiences in relation to Beckett, argues that "The typical Anglo-Irish boy […] learns that he is not quite Irish almost before he can talk; later learns that he is far from being English either."

Mercier further argues that "Samuel Beckett […] is an Irishman, but to call him an Irish writer involves some semantic sleight of hand."[5] Notwithstanding, Mercier claims that Beckett still unconsciously picked up "Gaelic elements in the oral culture of English speaking Ireland."[6] Similarly, Declan Kiberd, in *Inventing Ireland,* argues that even *Company*'s opening, "A voice comes to in the dark. Imagine." is "utterly bardic in tone" and is reminiscent of "The processes of composition was carried out by the Gaelic *filí* as they lay on pallets on small, darkened room."[7] If Irish as a language is missing in Beckett's works, Ireland and Irish people are that much more prevalent in his stories, from *More Pricks than Kicks* throughout his later works, though not always explicitly. In a letter dated 1954, Beckett writes to German

---

[3] Vivian Mercier, *Beckett/Beckett* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 164.

[4] Ibid. p. 25.

[5] Ibid. p. 21.

[6] Ibid, p. 22.

[7] Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland* (London: Random House, 1996), p. 535.

translator Hans Naumann, who was asking if Beckett's writing in French is any way related to his country's linguistic dynamics. Beckett contests the idea and states: "I do not consider English a foreign language, it is my language. If there is one that is really foreign to me, it is Gaelic."[8]

While Beckett had no intentions to "reclaim" the Irish Language, Şafak on the other hand, is very much concerned with this, in her case the yearning for Ottoman Turkish (*Osmanlıca*) language. As I have shown in Chapter 4, Şafak has a very flowy and flowery writing style in Turkish, often embedded with what is called "the old Turkish", or "Ottoman" words. Şafak's use of these words are so prevalent in her writing that they define an important aspect of her literary style. Sure, these words are not exclusive for Şafak's use, and many of them are still used throughout daily life in Turkey. For instance *tesadüf* [coincidence] is a word of Ottoman origin, and its "new Turkish" counterpart is *rastlantı.* They are still used interchangeably, in fact the former arguably still is used more than the latter in daily life. There are countless more examples in the same vein. However, Şafak's interest goes beyond that; she states that she loves reading the Ottoman-Turkish dictionary, to find the forgotten words and she keeps the dictionary by her side while she is writing, often referring to it.[9] I should stress that, however, her writing is still Turkish after all and in no way inaccessible to an ordinary Turkish reader. The old words she skilfully uses works in remain in harmony with her contemporary writing for the most part. Curiously, she states in an interview: "Many literary critics praise the richness of my language but it is because my contact with my mother tongue has been cut off at several points.

---

[8] *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume II: 1941–1956*, ed. George Craig, Martha Fehsenfeld, Dan Gunn and Lois Overbeck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 464.

[9] *Aykırı Sorular*, CNN Turk, 05.07.2012.

Sometimes people take their mother tongue for granted."[10] Here, she refers to her upbringing as a nomadic child: Şafak was born in Strasbourg in 1971 to Turkish parents. This biographical information, in fact, has little to do with Şafak's language acquisition as she came to Turkey with her mother soon after she was born, following her parent's separation. Şafak grew up in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, with her mother and her grandmother. Thus, her learning Turkish, as a Turk in Turkey, is fairly uneventful.

In later years, when Şafak was about eleven years old, her mother qualified as a diplomat and was sent abroad for official duty. Şafak and her mother then went on to live in Madrid, where Şafak attended an international school and started learning English. This is the first shift in Şafak's relationship with her native language. Suddenly, Turkish stops being the *language of everything* and is confined to Şafak's house she shared with her mother, whereas she spoke English at school, naturally exposed to Spanish in the outside world, followed by brief stints in Jordan and Germany, exposed to yet many more languages. Şafak returns to Turkey several years later, finishing high school in Ankara, followed by her higher education including her PhD degree in the same city.

Unlike Beckett, Şafak is very vocal about her feelings towards her languages. In almost every interview she has given since 2004, she talks about how she sees language as a vast land full of discoveries. Şafak is very welcoming on questions related to her native or second language and their poetics and politics. A subject matter that always shows up in her discourse is the purification of the Turkish language as she is extremely critical of the loss of Ottoman words. Şafak always inserts her criticism on what she describes as

[10] 'Linguistic Cleansing', *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 2005, 19-29.

“linguistic purification”. Every language related question Şafak gets asked regarding her writing, she makes sure her Anglophone interviewers, who would otherwise be oblivious to her style in Turkish, learn about this matter. Following is an excerpt from an interview with British Council:

> *BC*: When you’re writing, are there things which are better expressed in Turkish than English, and vice versa?
> *EŞ*: There are, oddly. Sorrow, melancholy, lament… these are easier to express in Turkish. Humour, irony, satire, paradox… much easier to express in English. Each language is equipped differently. On the other hand, we have removed hundreds and hundreds of words from the Turkish language in the name of 'linguistic purification'. Words coming from Arabic and Persian have been purged. I am very critical of this linguistic cleansing and I use both old and new words in Turkish. It’s a political statement. But it’s also a declaration of my love for words. All words, regardless of their ethnic or national origin. [11]

Şafak openly expresses that this stance of hers is a “political statement.” It is unclear what she means exactly by referring to this as a political statement, as she does not elaborate on it. To understand the importance of this statement, I shall offer a (very) brief background on the perceptions on simplification of the Turkish language: The language reform has had both its supporters and opponents going back to the late Ottoman era. The simplified language spoken in public as opposed to the Palace’s complex language heavy with foreign words and the rupture between the two was the starting point of these discussions, and the debates carried on for tens of years to come, in literary magazines, academic circles and even in the parliament. However, the debates on the “linguistic purification” have been mostly quiet since the early 2000s.

---

[11] Elif Shafak: 'Writing in English brings me closer to Turkey, British Council, 19 Nov 2014, https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/elif-shafak-writing-english-brings-me-closer-turkey#:~:text=Words%20coming%20from%20Arabic%20and,It%27s%20a%20political%20statement.

Even though the debates are not as active as they used to be, in today's conjuncture, the way people, especially politicians, use the language became almost like a code on its own for deciphering their political positions. This did not happen overnight: historically, the right-wing governments have always opted to use the archaic usage, whereas the leftist, and secular parties championed Turkish. When Demokrat Parti came into ruling as Turkey's first right-wing governing party in 1950, one of the first things they did was to change the constitution back into its old Ottoman language. From then on, a pattern of intentional, heavy usage of Ottoman era language is perceived as a right-wing usage. In today's climate, this is visible in current right-wing religious government AKP's speech dialects as well.

It is a fact that Şafak is highly proficient in both Turkish history and politics, evidenced by many of her interviews, articles as well as her novels. Therefore, it is curious that she leaves her "political statement" to be open to speculation. Every time Şafak mentions her political position, she immediately switches to talk about the poetics of language, never offering an explanation on what her political stance may be exactly. Furthermore, in another interview in English, she states that she finds this linguistic purification very dangerous because she thinks "that linguistic cleansing is something comparable to ethnic cleansing."[12] This highly problematic statement again goes unresolved, as she continues to say "We have generations of people who don't know the things their grandparents know, who cannot read the writing of their grandparents" and that the "The language of the Ottoman time is quite magic and unique."

Şafak's spoken Turkish is, on the other hand, different from her written Turkish. Her spoken language is, in fact, mostly free of any conspicuously

[12] 'Linguistic Cleansing'.

Ottoman words. As discussed before, there are many old words still used in the daily language of Turks and even Istanbulites, and for the most part these go unnoticed because they are still heavily used. She speaks without any accents, as opposed to what is usually the case for Turks brought up abroad. The fact that she spent her formative years in Turkey means that unlike a second generation Turk brought up in Germany, England or elsewhere, commonly described as *gurbetçi*s, Şafak learned to read and write in Turkish first. Therefore she is free of the *gurbetçi* accent that is very obvious to Turkish ears. Şafak's spoken Turkish is what is often described as the *Istanbul Turkish,* free of any regional dialect or accent, often linked to the education level and the socioeconomic background of a person.

Like Şafak, Beckett's spoken English also carries hints to his well to-do upbringing, despite his characters' frequent struggles with linguistics. Vivian Mercier explains Beckett's spoken English "has a distinctly Dublin quality of the kind often described as "a Trinity accent"", but in fact "it belongs to middle-class Dubliners who live on the South Side of the River Liffey."[13] The natural state of the spoken languages of both authors prove that neither of them are "outcasts" within their own language, so to speak. But in the end, neither was happy with what they got. Şafak states in an interview:

> Language is a continuous, almost perpetual discovery for me and that was also the case with the Turkish language to begin with. I wasn't happy with the language that was given to me and I continuously tried to explore it. I discovered all Ottoman words, Sufi expressions and then the next step was discovering a new language. I moved into the English language the way I moved along with the Turkish language. I'm always curious if there are any boundaries drawn in front of me. I want to transcend those boundaries and see what is beyond them. So that is one instinct

[13] Mercier, p. 43.

> that I had; it's like an animal instinct: You are being trapped in a certain linguistic category and you just want to escape from that category.[14]

Şafak's discontent towards the language she had pushed her to discover more, explore more, move and learn and use more. All in all, Şafak's solution to her linguistic dissatisfaction was in the "more". Beckett, on the other hand, was concerned with the "less". His famous letter 1937 to Axel Kaun reads the following:

> It is indeed getting more and more difficult, even pointless, for me to write in formal English. And more and more my language appears to me like a veil which one has to tear apart in order to get to those things (or the nothingness) lying behind it. Grammar and style! To me they seem to have become as irrelevant as a Biedermeier bathing suit or the imperturbability of a gentleman. A mask. It is to be hoped the time will come, thank God, in some circles it already has, when language is best used where it is most effectively abused. Since we cannot dismiss it all at once, at least we do not want to leave anything undone that may contribute to its disrepute. To drill one hole after another into it until that which lurks behind, be it something or nothing, starts seeping through - I cannot imagine a higher goal for today's writer.
>
> [...]
>
> In the meantime I am doing nothing. Only from time to time do I have the consolation, as now, of being allowed to violate a foreign language as involuntarily as, with knowledge and intention, I would like to do against my own language, and - Deo juvante - shall do.[15]

It is all the while curious that, whilst coming from completely different angles and despite having opposite intents, both Şafak and Beckett found their

---

[14] 'Linguistic Cleansing', p. 21.

[15] Samuel Beckett, *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume I: 1929-1940*, ed. Martha Dow Fehsenfeld, Lois More Overbeck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 518.

solutions in writing in a second language. They both seem to be looking for freedom in the end. For Şafak, this signified a greater space, more words, abundance of expressions. For Beckett, the freedom was in the undoing, in the abuse and misuse.

4.2. The Second Language and Its Fiction

Exactly how far Beckett's *lessness,* to borrow his story's title*,* is in alignment with the same solution as Şafak's *moreness,* can be somewhat explained in their works of fiction. The use of the foreign tongue equipped each with what they seek in their narratives — whether this was intentional or not does not matter. Şafak's already colourful writing all of a sudden had more shades to paint with: More life to her already vivacious characters, as well as more dread for the unlucky ones; more land to explore, more historical facts and artefacts to refer to. Beckett's fiction, on the other hand, seemed to find solace in rupture, in the transgression only a foreign language could bring: Less certainty around the locations, as well as less ability for the characters and less of a plot for the story. More importantly, the foreign language is used as a threshold to the world full of different kinds of people, to exploring and negotiating with "the other" in Şafak's fiction, contrary to Beckett's often desolate and introspective characters.

Before discussing the second language fiction, it is important to trace their respective bilingualism ahead of the "official switch". Understanding their bilingualism, free from the literary context, will shed light on the conception of their bilingual writings. As explained in detail in Chapter 1, the type of

bilingualism these authors subscribe to inevitably affects their relationships with their languages on a cognitive and semantic level.

According to the bilingual theory, both Beckett and Şafak are coordinate bilinguals. However, the conditions of Şafak's acquisition of English was more acute than Beckett's introduction to French. As mentioned before, having moved away from Turkey where her daily life existed solely in Turkish, Şafak was thrown into what would become her second language, English, quite intensely at the school. Şafak maintained English as her school-language until she returned back to Turkey several years later. Beckett, on the other hand, had a smoother journey into the French language. He first learned and studied the language and then moved to France.

Şafak expresses how she did not speak a word of English or Spanish[16] when she moved to Madrid as a child, and there she had to learn both. For four years, Turkish was confined within the walls of her house she shared with her mother. She remembers, despite still being fluent in her native language, how her Turkish lost its intricacies, its humour, its idioms and slang. Upon her return to Turkey, Şafak recognised the loss of these essential elements of Turkish turned the language into something that needed to be studied.[17] In the long run, this allowed Şafak to rediscover her native language.

It should be emphasised that both Beckett and Şafak embarked on writing fiction in their respective second languages by choice. By choice, as in neither of the author's language switch was forced by exile. Also by choice, as they were both able to speak in more than one foreign language. Şafak states that she first started writing in Turkish as a child even before she moved abroad,

---

[16] Elif Şafak, *İzzet Çapa'nın Blogu*, 2014 <https://izzetcapablog.tumblr.com/post/79864605698/elif-%C5%9Fafak-mevlanay%C4%B1-kulland%C4%B1-demeleri> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[17] Elif Şafak, *Roll,* 2002 <https://www.elifsafak.us/roportajlar.asp?islem=roportaj&id=222 > [accessed 1 January 2024].

but she also wrote in English and in Spanish while she lived in Spain.[18] In this sense, Şafak's situation is different than Beckett's, as she had started experimenting with writing in other languages earlier, stimulated by her temporary migration as a child. However, Beckett indeed had more foreign languages in his arsenal, more to choose from. He translated French poetry and essays into English well ahead of the official switch and also translated Mexican poetry from Spanish post-war time to support himself, along other commissions. It is important to note that before Beckett became a self-translator, he was — albeit occasional — a translator. This surely gave him the head start in noticing the dynamic between translingual textual spaces, with all its pain and gain. This also marks an important difference between Beckett and Şafak, something that also carries on into their self-translation practice. It is further important to note that, Beckett's first attempt at literary self-translating was, in fact, from English into German. Ahead of his travels in Germany, Beckett translated the manuscript of his poem *Cascando* into German, however it remained only as a typescript. [19]

Harry Cockerham, in an early article in 1975, assesses Beckett's French as a foreign language "learned at a comparatively late stage"[20]. We know now, thanks to Knowlson's authorised biography of Beckett (first published in 1996) that this is not exactly the case, as explained earlier. It is worth noting, as Cockerham's states, Beckett possesses an "extraordinarily wide stylistic register" that reflects itself in his writings, and this is due to many positions he held in France, from being a temporary worker during the Occupation to being

---

[18] Elif Şafak, *Cosmopolitan*, 2004 <https://www.elifsafak.us/roportajlar.asp?islem=roportaj&id=80> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[19] Knowlson, p. 234.

[20] Harry Cockerham, "Bilingual Playwright", *Beckett the Shape Changer*, ed by Katherine Worth, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), pp. 139-160 (p. 155).

an attendee of Parisian literary events. Cockerham explains that this particular bilingualism of Beckett's reflected itself in the ways his characters verbally express themselves, subsequently resulting in a naturalism that the French theatre was not accustomed to.[21] Beckett's French's wide reach did not stop at countryside dialects. One particular element of Beckett's bilingualism that is often overlooked is that French was not just his daily language out in the world, but it was also the language of his home. Beckett's partner Suzanne Deschevaux-Demesnil did not speak English, and the couple communicated in French. Maria Kager recognises this as "a French home", thus Beckett gaining "an increasingly intimate relation to the language".[22] Beckett's private home life, in that sense, ensured Beckett with access to yet another level within the language and a new way of experiencing it. Linguists have shown that experiencing and expressing emotions are some of the most complex areas in bilingualism.[23] Beckett's usage of his second language daily on different socio-affective levels must have further deepened his relationship with the French language.[24] For the purpose of comparison, this is an additional component in bilingualism Beckett retains, unlike Şafak, who is married to a Turkish native.

Maria Kager argues that recognising the dynamics of Beckett's bilingualism is essential. She maintains that, neither language surpassed the other in Beckett's mind, but a "competing dominance" existed of English and

---

[21] Ibid, p. 160.

[22] Maria Kager, 'Comment Dire: A Neurolinguistic Approach to Beckett's Bilingual Writings', *L2 Journal*, 7 (2015), 68-83.

[23] For more information on this subject, see:
Aneta Pavlenko, *Emotions and Multilingualism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

[24] Linguists who work on bilingualism agree that age of acquisition remains an important factor for bilingualism, however a sustained close-contact with the language is also very important. A study by Kinsella and Singleton, carried out on Anglophone adult speakers who migrated to France and who all had native-like command in French found that what the three most successful participants had in common was that they all lived in France for a long time, engaged with the community and were all married to French native speakers.
Ciara Kinsella and David Singleton, 'Much More Than Age', *Applied Linguistics,* 35:4 (2014), 441-462.

French, since *Watt*. Kager analyses the manuscript of *Watt* and also scrutinises the code-switching in Beckett's letters (an example is *"*Won't you keep me au courant*"*). *Watt,* the last English novel before the official switch, is recognised by scholars who work on Beckett's bilingualism as a turning point in his bilingual writing, particularly with its gallicisms. Similarly, Fletcher states that, even though *Watt* was written in English, because Beckett lived and wrote *Watt* in France, he was unconsciously shifting into French. Fletcher further argues that " […] *Watt* translates easily into French which is a further indication that Beckett, in his last English novel, was already moving towards a more distinctly French idiom."[25]

Kager also uses Beckett's last poem *Comment dire* as an example of the tip of the tongue phenomenon that bilinguals often suffer from. She states that "Through dashes, repetitions, and elisions, Beckett represents and explores the frustrating bilingual search for the right word."[26] Laura Salisbury, on the other hand, explores *Comment Dire* as a reflection of Beckett's aphasia and calls to recognise this connection between Beckett's disability and the poem, that had been overlooked.[27] Following a fall in 1988, Beckett suffered from a temporary aphasia resulting in a loss of speech. Beckett began writing his last poem while recovering from his depleting condition at the hospital. Salisbury assesses the "stuttered dashes, abrupt elisions, compulsive repetitions and controlled echoes" not as a by-product of Beckett's bilingualism like Kager, but as a "a representation and exploration of Beckett's aphasia and the fruitless compulsion to search for words."[28]

---

[25] Fletcher, p. 92.

[26] Kager, p. 81.

[27] Laura Salisbury, ''What Is the Word': Beckett's Aphasic Modernism', *Journal of Beckett Studies,* 17 (2008), 78-126.

[28] Salisbury, p. 78.

Beckett's fascination with words, or with the loss of them, is also apparent in his fiction. Beckett's characters and narrators have long been obsessed with the language, and from *Watt* onwards, they experiment and agonise over speech and its elements, its repercussions on the body and vice versa, suffering more and more. Beckett's short French prose *L'Image* opens with the following sentence*: "*La langue se charge de boue un seul remède alors la rentrer et la tourner dans la bouche la boue l'avaler ou la rejeter question de savoir si elle est nourissante […]"[29] This part of a sentence makes up the only sentence in the prose, as it is carried over across nine pages, without any punctuation. *L'Image* is the predecessor of *Comment C'est* with its experimental style and muddiness. However, *Comment C'est* is written in blocks reminiscent of verses in prose and is nearly ten times longer than *L'Image* and still does not possess any punctuations. The novel is divided into three parts, as before, with and after Pim, the central character. The narrator tries to recover Pim's muteness in a tortuous and systematic manner, sadistically pushing Pim to communicate. *Comment C'est* is an example of Beckett's misuse of language in French after the official switch as he challenges any perceived proper use, discarding even punctuations, focusing on loss in a new stylistic manner.

4.2.1. Migrant Words, Native Roots

It is known that Beckett started experimenting with writing poetry in French soon after his permanent move to France in 1937, but he waited until after the war to write fiction in French. Şafak, on the other hand, started writing

[29] Beckett, *L'Image*, p. 9.

her first English novel, *The Saint of Incipient Insanities,* soon after she moved to Massachusetts on a fellowship, which is also the major setting of the novel. Şafak's English fiction is often trailed by her physical location: The places she lived in on an extended stay in United States of America reflects their images in her fiction, such as Massachusetts again in *Forty Rules of Love* and Arizona in *The Bastard of Istanbul.* Nevertheless, a Turkish setting as well as Turkish characters are essential in all of Şafak's writing: *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* ends in Istanbul, *The Bastard of Istanbul*'s proof is in its title, *Forty Rules of Love* inevitably travels through Turkey. These three novels — the first three novels in English, in order — is chronologically located between Şafak's last Turkish novel *Bit Palas (The Flea Palace)* and her first "British" novel *Honour (İskender),* which were the case studies for this study.

This "American" era in Şafak's writing, between 2004 and 2009, creates a rather bizarre and now defunct categorisation of Şafak as an author of Turkish-American literature.[30] It is understandable from the point of view of her critics: After Şafak's consecutive three novels in English, set between the Turkish and American context, and especially the international sensation sparked by *The Bastard of Istanbul* and carried on with *Forty Rules of Love;* Şafak became the most prominent Turkish author of Americanised stories. This image further reinforced by Şafak herself, as she frequently highlighted how she often felt like a foreigner in her own motherland Turkey, but she does not feel that way in America.[31] She was carving an important space for her textual presence overseas. Surprisingly, Şafak departed from the United States of America, leaving the American context behind. After some time back home in

---

[30] Elena Furlanetto had written extensively about the subject, but she does not use the hyphen. See her book *Towards Turkish American Literature: Narratives of Multiculturalism in Post-Imperial Turkey* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2017).

[31] 'Lingustic Cleansing'.

Turkey, she moved to London and started to write stories set between England and Turkey; a rather abrupt switch for her critics who had just welcomed Şafak to a variant of American literature. Suffice to say, Şafak's belonging within the American literature ceased to exist after she moved onto writing within the British context and relabelled her author's page as British-Turkish. All of her subsequent novels (all written in English) after *Honour* follow multi-layered, multi-cultured stories across different settings and periods, which is a trait of Şafak's writing in any language.

Her new novels continue with this accustomed narrative style by discovering new locations and new (non)-belongings, mainly between Turkey and England. Similar to *Honour*'s London setting, *Three Daughter's of Eve* (2016) is set between Oxford and Istanbul, spanning multiple decades and continents. We follow Peri the protagonist as a child, as a student at University of Oxford, and later as drop-out due to her unrequited love for her Professor; and finally back in Istanbul, married with kids to a rich man she does not particularly love. Peri's childhood household represents a caricature of Turkey: The conservative mother devoted to Islam and the secular, modern, Kemalist father; a leftist, communist brother and another brother who is an ethnic ultranationalist. It is doubtful if such family would really exist in Turkey, but in the narrative sense Şafak employs Peri's family as a space of old and modern debates in Turkish with respect to religion, with Peri herself being the "confused" one. Peri's confusion further increases when she meets two other friends from Muslim backgrounds at Oxford; an atheist Shirin, whose family left Iran, and an Egyptian-American Mona who is a devout Muslim, forming the 'three daughters' in the book. They take Professor Azur's "God" seminars in which multiple students from different religious backgrounds debate about their beliefs and

non-beliefs. Religion, especially Islam and Sufism in particular, has been the backbone of Şafak's storytelling since her first novel *Pinhan*. In *Pinhan* and later *Forty Rules of Love*, Sufism is the explicit subject matter of the novel. However, in many of her other works, such as *The Gaze* and *The Flea Palace,* Şafak's cyclical narratives correspond to the circularity of Sufism[32] in a more cryptic manner.

Şafak's novel *The Island of Missing Trees,* travels between Cyprus during the problematic partition years and current day London, telling the story of a Londoner teenage daughter of a Greek Cypriot father and a Turkish Cypriot mother in search of answers, somewhat reminiscent of *Bastard of Istanbul*'s structure. Another one of Şafak's English novels, *10 Minutes 38 Seconds in This Strange World,* recounts the story of Tequila Leila, a sex worker in Istanbul, and her four friends from different backgrounds, at the fringes of the society, telling their stories in parallel to the backdrop of Turkish history and politics. Turkey, especially Istanbul, Turkish characters and Turkishness, as well as the Ottomans, all remain incontestable fixtures in Şafak's English fiction.

Beckett, on the other hand, does not write about his homeland in his second language as explicitly as Şafak does. Beckett's first French novel *Mercier and Camier* is set in an ambivalent place, "an island", which resembles Ireland if looked for the clues such as the canals, the countryside and the currencies mentioned. Seán Kennedy suggests that *Mercier and Camier* has more references to Irish political history than meets the eye and that Beckett's fiction is as not as removed from the history as it was once assumed, in fact

[32] Şafak's fiction has been studied substantially in relation to circularity and Sufism in her narrative. For some English-language sources see Laschinger's analysis in 'Whirls of Faith and Fancy: House Symbolism and Sufism in Elif Shafak's Flea Palace', *Journal of World Literature* (2020). Also see Atayurt-Fenge's article '"This Is a World of Spectacles": Cyclical Narratives and Circular Visionary Formations in Elif Shafak's *The Gaze', Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 58:3 (2017).

Beckett is "working within historical structures, albeit in a manner that is deliberately obscured."[33] Obscured indeed is an apt depiction of Beckett's French writing. As I have shown earlier, throughout the *Premier Amour,* the only visible reference to the potential location of the story was the passage "*N'étant pas française elle disait Loulou. Moi aussi, n'étant pas français non plus* […]"., which still required some mental gymnastics for the French reader, before vanishing altogether in the English self-translation. Belacqua's Dublin, as well as Murphy's Irishness and London fades into less obvious surroundings at the same time Beckett's characters in French become more isolated and self-enclosed. The trilogy, *Molloy, Malone meurt and L'Innomable* is described by Michael Edwards as "hybrid works, divided between French signifiers and Irish signifieds."[34] William Davies also notes the existence and importance of Ireland in Beckett's texts, even later ones: "Always at risk of dissolving into an elsewhere, Ireland is discovered through a "wandering for home" in Beckett's writing that is at once nostalgic and mournful, dispossessed and self-consciously distanced."[35] The distance, both physical and linguistic, seems to be the key element that enables bilingual writers to write freely about their homelands. Declan Kiberd also emphasises this distance, but he is also adamant that Beckett's works are still "unambiguously Irish". Kiberd states:

> The Irish landscape of south county Dublin in particular was celebrated through famous passages of the trilogy in the concrete, chaste, descriptive style of Celtic nature poets, without the burden of abstract metaphorical meaning, without any

---

[33] Seán Kennedy, 'The Cultural Memory in *Mercier and Camier:* The Fate of Noel Lemass', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui,* 15 (2005), 117-129 (p. 117).

[34] Michael Edwards, 'Beckett's French', *Translation and Literature*, 1(1992), pp. 68-83 (p. 74).

[35] Davies, William, '"Home and Visiting Temperaments": Beckett's Diasporic Encounters' in *Samuel Beckett and Europe: History, Culture, Tradition*, ed. by Michela Bariselli, N. M. Bowe, and William Davies (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), pp. 55-76.

> patriotic eroticising of this or that landscape as a synecdoche for the whole of Ireland. But as with the Celtic nature poetry, what was offered in such passages was an *exile*'s celebration, which seemed once again to illustrate a bleak law: the imaginative possession of the Irish landscape seemed possible only to those who were removed from it.[36]

In this sense, being distanced or removed to only get closer to what had been left behind reminds us of Şafak's statement on how writing in English sometimes makes it easier to write about Turkey: "Strangely, over the years I have come to understand that sometimes distance brings you closer, stepping out of something helps you to see that thing better. Writing in English does not pull me away from Turkey; just the opposite, it brings me closer."[37] This is in line with what linguist Pavlenko observes about translingual writes, as writing in a second language "creates a distance between their writing and memories and allows them to gain control over their words, stories, and plots."[38]

As I explained throughout this section, employing the second language for literary writing seems to serve both Şafak and Beckett well in finding new aspects in their narratives. With the use of English, Şafak was able to open up to world more, in and out of her stories. Beckett, on the other hand, slowly but surely turned to the "self". In the last part of the trilogy, *L'Innomable,* the unnamable voice famously revolts against telling the stories of previous Beckettian heroes:

> Ces Murphy, Molloy et autres Malone, je n'en suis pas dupe. Ils m'ont fait perdre mon temps, rater ma peine, en me permettant de parler d'eux, quand il fallait parler seulement de moi, afin de pouvoir me taire. Mais je viens de dire que j'ai parlé de moi, que je

---

[36] Kiberd, p. 535.

[37] Elif Shafak, *British Council,* 2014 <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/elif-shafak-writing-english-brings-me-closer-turkey> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[38] Pavlenko, p. 183.

> suis en train de parler de moi. Je m'en fous de ce que je viens de dire. C'est maintenant que je vais parler de moi, pour la première fois.[39]

Unnameable decides to talk about himself for the first time. His contempt over ever having told the stories of Murphys, Molloys and Malones almost signals the upcoming era in Beckett's fiction, mainly bidding farewell to the remnants of traditional notions of fiction. The narrator as a voice was to be an essential element for the rest of Beckett's fiction, as the world closed in on the pages, small spaces of remarkable discomfort, rotundas and cylinders and cubes and beds and the bodies crawling through the remnants of a fractured reality.

4.3. Attitudes in Self-Translation

Much of Beckett's fiction is self-translated solely by Beckett. My case studies *Premier Amour*/*First Love* and *Company*/*Compagnie* are also translations in this manner. However, before Beckett embarked on a totally individual self-translation practice, he tried out co-translation on a few prose pieces (and theatre plays). It was Alfred Péron who initiated the French translation of *Murphy,* with Beckett's help. The two friends took on the task together, working in Parisian cafés before Péron was called for army duty and Beckett was left to finish it alone.[40] Furthermore, *Watt*'s French translation by Minuit reads: "traduit de l'anglais par Ludovic at Agnes Janvier, en collaboration avec l'auteur". Beckett also translated *The End* with Richard Seaver and, most

---

[39] Samuel Beckett, *L'Innomable* (Paris : Editions de Minuit, 1953), p. 28.

[40] Knowlson, p. 290-303.

famously, *Molloy* with Patrick Bowles. Van Hulle and Verhulst explain how the process of co-translation with Bowles was impeded because he was prioritising his own work. They state that “This left Beckett with the feeling that he was rewriting rather than revising Bowles’ translation, so that he decided to do the rest of “trilogy" on his own.”[41] Beckett realised how time consuming co-translation proved to be, as he decided to take the matters into his own hands. Fletcher, noting this collaboration on *Molloy* with Bowles, argues that perhaps due to this co-translation practice, the English *Molloy is* closer to the original in the textual sense than the English *Malone Dies*. Fletcher also states that *Molloy* in English “is inevitably less ‘creative’”[42], as opposed to additions in the rest of the trilogy in English, produced by Beckett only.

It is curious to see how both Beckett and Şafak started out with co-translation as a way to produce the same text in the other language. Unlike Beckett, however, Şafak did not make the switch from co-translation to fully self-translating, at least not yet. Throughout my research, I have used both the terms ‘co-translation’ and ‘self-translation’ interchangeably for Şafak’s practice, however in this particular section I shall emphasise once more that Şafak’s practice is different from that of Beckett’s self-translations, as she always uses a professional translator to translate the base text, before she ‘rewrites’ it.

When interviewing Omca A. Korugan, the professional hand in *Honour*’s co-translation, I asked about the discrepancies between the two texts, such as the character Adem staying alive in the English original and dying in the Turkish translation, among other modifications. Korugan answered: “*Honour* kitabını

---

[41] Dirk Van Hulle and Pim Verhulst, ‘Beckett’s Collaborative Translations In The 1950s’, *Samuel Beckett Today/ Aujourd’hui*, 30.1 (2018) 20-39 (p. 23)

[42] Fletcher, p. 133.

okumadım." ("I did not read the book *Honour*.") This puzzling statement required a few moments to grasp the idea behind it. Korugan continued:

> Bu sözünü ettiğiniz farkların varlığını sizden ve başkalarından duyuyorum. […] bu değişiklikler benim çeviri sürecimden bağımsız olarak -ve o sürecin sonrasında- yapıldı. Ben çeviri yaparken bunların yapılacağını bilmiyordum, hatta belki Elif Hanım da bilmiyordu henüz.
>
> I hear these differences you mentioned from you and some others. […] these changes have been made independent of -and after- my translation process. I did not know these [changes] will be made, maybe even Ms Elif did not yet know then. (my translation)

Korugan had translated the English "draft" — that is the term she uses — and because Şafak was the last one to revise both texts, even the professional translator who collaborated with her did not know how the "original" English text resulted in its published form. The difference between the *text of origin* and the published *book* becomes clear. Korugan recalls being able to see the the final Turkish typescript of *İskender* after Şafak's revision, and remembers having suggested a few more corrections, but does not know or remember how much of it reflected itself in the final text. She states: "Sonuçta kitaplardaki her cümlenin son halinin ne olacağına Elif Hanım karar veriyor." ("In the end, it is Ms Elif who makes the decision on the final versions of all the sentences in the books.")

As I have explained in Chapter 3, Şafak's other translators have stated they do not feel fully responsible for the final translated text, as the author retains the right to revise it as she wishes. This is also visible in an interview Şafak had given about *Forty Rules of Love* (*Aşk* in Turkish):

> -You say, “Both the English and the Turkish versions of this book are original,” in one of your interviews. What do you mean by that?
>
> -[…] In *The Forty Rules of Love* I tried a completely new technique. I wrote the novel in English first. Then it was translated into Turkish by an excellent translator. Then I took the translation and I rewrote it. When the Turkish version was ripe and ready, I went back to the English version and rewrote it with a new spirit. In a way I have built two parallel books in the same span of time. It is a bit insane, I have to admit. It is a crazy amount of work. I do this because language is my passion.[43]

Perhaps then it is not a coincidence how much Şafak’s self-translated texts differ from each other between English and Turkish. *The Forty Rules of Love*’s Turkish translator Kadir Yiğit Us echoes the same practice in an interview[44]: “ […] ama zaten şimdi insanlar İngilizce metne baktıklarında, benim çevirdiğim metni görmüyorlar.” (“[…] but when people look at the English text now, they do not see the text I have translated from.”) The interviewer Abdullah Küçük notes how he found that the forty rules in the novel differ massively between English and Turkish versions. The translator Us maintains that he translated those parts literally, but Şafak took and rewrote them all, and he is glad that she did. According to Us, the Turkish reader who is accustomed to a certain style of Şafak’s writing in Turkish has expectations from the Turkish text that are only made possible by the author’s intervention. He also explains that because the subject matter in the novel is Sufism and what Şafak understood from that is very personal, it was better to let the author’s free will take precedent in the Turkish translation. Us considers Şafak’s rewriting a form of

---

[43] Elif Şafak, *Today’s Zaman*, 2009 <https://www.elifsafak.us/en/roportajlar.asp?islem=roportaj&id=19> [accessed 1 January 2024].

[44] Abdullah Küçük, ‘The Context and Translations of *The Forty Rules of Love* and *Aşk*’ (Unpublished Master’s Dissertation, Dokuz Eylül University, 2016).

translation, as he perceives translation as reproducing a source text for another culture, and he claims that Şafak is indeed a translator, and a good one.

Şafak openly admits to not only rewriting the Turkish novel, but also rewriting the English original following her work on the Turkish text. This is only possible, in Şafak's circumstances, because up until her latest novel *Island of Missing Trees* (2021), the Turkish translation has always been published prior to the English original. Thus, Şafak had the chronological opportunity and the authorial license to revise and rewrite both English and Turkish versions. As I have demonstrated in Chapter 2, Beckett had a similar (minus the professional translator, of course) experience with *Company*. We now understand that the majority of Şafak's English fiction had been self-translated into Turkish this way. For Beckett, though, publishing the self-translated *Compagnie* before *Company* was an anomaly in his practice. Both Şafak and Beckett admit self-translation is a lot of work, yet they remained undeterred. It seems to me that once a bilingual author is established enough for two different language readerships, self-translation becomes a necessary component in their writing to tie their works and languages together, to be able to create and own their bilingual art. Similarly, Van Hulle and Verhulst agree that self-translation becomes "a way of "going on" as a writer for Beckett.[45] The same can be said for Şafak.

Another thing to note when comparing Şafak and Beckett's self-translation practices is the fact that Şafak has not written fiction in Turkish since *Bit Palas* in 2002, therefore has not co-translated from Turkish to English since *The Flea Palace* in 2004. Beckett had an even longer time period in which he did not write fiction in English, between finishing *Watt* in 1945 to *Company* in 1979. Beckett's return to English did not stop his self-translation activity, in fact

[45] Van Hulle and Verhulst, p. 34.

he translated his English long prose into French on his own, without the help of others such was the case with Péron on *Murphy* or Janviers on *Watt*. Only time will tell if Şafak would come back to writing fiction in Turkish and it will be interesting to see if she would continue her co-translation practice or embark on a solitary self-translation like Beckett.

I have already established that both Şafak and Beckett sign off the final self-translations, regardless of the professional help Şafak seeks. This fact allows us to be certain that any and all changes between the texts are due to author-translators' intervention. In Şafak's case, this is more complicated as we do not have access to her manuscripts in English, therefore how much a given self-translation impacted the original cannot be known. By the time *The Flea Palace* was being translated, the source text *Bit Palas* was published for over two years, therefore we know the translation could not have affected the original in that case. However, for *Honour* and *İskender*, and all her other works from English to Turkish, it is not possible to assess to what degree the translation impacted the original.

4.3.1. Impact of Self-Translation

I now will extend my comparative analysis on Şafak and Beckett's self-translations in accordance with the works' directionality, evaluating the consequences of their authorial licence on the fictive universe and the reading experience. What I gathered from my particular case studies, one novel written in native language (henceforth L1) and another written in the second language (henceforth L2), accompanied with both their self-translations (into L2 and L1,

respectively) provided me with the following observations on Şafak and Beckett's self-translation. When observing a self-translation, it is crucial to acknowledge which of the author's languages the text was originally written in, as the types of modifications the author makes fluctuate in accordance with this directionality.

Some similarities I have observed are, when the original text is written in L1, the L2 translation is less altered in comparison to when the directionality is reversed. Even though Şafak's *Bit Palace* is modified substantially more than Beckett's *Company* in translation, both works remain less modified in comparison to the authors' L2 originals, *Honour* and *Premier Amour*, respectively. Another similarity is that L1 texts, whether it is the original or the self-translation in a particular pair, affirm an elevated level of emotivity. The characters and/or narrators and their interactions with each other are seemingly more nuanced and more emotionally heightened than their L2 counterparts. It could be said that L2 texts are generally more neutral and muted in comparison to the prose found in L1 texts.

When the original is an L2 text and the self-translation is in L1, both Şafak and Beckett modify substantially more. Here, it could be observed that the writers feel compelled to edit their original text once they are faced with the content in their L1, what I refer to as native reproduction. I have mostly refrained from making too many generalised remarks, but the attitudes I have observed above conceivably inform a pattern in Şafak's and Beckett's self-translations and perhaps others' too.

Nonetheless, Şafak's and Beckett's self-translations are also inherently different. To begin with, Beckett is not subjected to some challenges Şafak has faced, such as retaining the semantics of the Ottoman language words across

translation or trying to communicate elements of a non-Western culture to an Anglophone audience. Şafak loses (or gains, depending on the perception) a lot more in self-translation than Beckett does. I have observed that, between *Bit Palas* and *The Flea Palace*, Şafak's flowy, long sentences are broken down in the English translation with several punctuation strategies, such as creating multiple sentences from one original sentence, the use of an em dash to relieve the heavy chain-effects of Turkish, as well as the use of parentheses for the same reason. One of Şafak's stylistic trademark, her usage of slash in Turkish is also modified into numbered entries. This is partly due to the syntactical incompatibility between Şafak's languages, but also because of the attempts Şafak is making to adapt to Anglophone market. Beckett does not suffer such losses. He slightly modifies his style in translation, such as the reiterations of the original *Company,* but he manages to conserve the repetitive elements of the texts. It is also worth noting that, it is easier to translate between English and French and vice versa, in comparison to Şafak's Turkish bound linguistics. However, it would be wrong to say that this is the key element in Beckett's translations being "better" than Şafak's; many more factors such as Beckett's own writing style have an impact on this, the essential factor being the authorial intention and intervention.

Beckett does not tamper with the narrative's structure in translation. As I have shown in Chapter 2, he also modifies some of the images within the fictive universe, but the narrative remains intact. In other words, Beckett's original and self-translation do not tell different stories, regardless of the directionality. On the contrary, Şafak changes an extreme amount of details into L1 translation, to the point where it is doubtful if *Honour* and *İskender* are even the same novel. She has a persistent tendency to modify and add to her Turkish translations and

this attitude ultimately changes the plot, characters and the reading experience.

Take, for instance, how Esma's chapters are written from her own point of view in *Honour*, but are then completely modified into omniscient narration in the Turkish text, causing Esma to lose her voice in translation. I have not observed such a tendency in Beckett's self-translation practice. Sure, Beckett's narrators' level of emotivity and comical absurdity change in translation, but none of them are ever robbed of their voice. I should also note that this type of interference by Şafak in self-translation is not an isolated incident specific to *Honour/İskender*. Between *The Architect's Apprentice* and its Turkish version *Ustam ve Ben*, the same switch takes place in reverse order. Meaning the omniscient narration in some chapters of the original English mutate into a first-hand account by the character Cihan in Turkish, becoming heavily embroidered and emotionally charged in the process. Therefore it is safe to assume that Şafak is susceptible to changing narrators in translation, however there is no correlation between a loss of voice in regards to L1 or L2 translation. As a side note, it is curious to see that a female figure loses her voice and the male figure gains his voice in Turkish. However I should also note that, upon Esma's voice being neutered as the omniscient narrator, many more details of the outside world are added to the text. What remains a constant in Şafak's practice is that self-translations into L1 gain additional details, embroidered language and many more side stories.

In the end it is interesting to see that even though Beckett works as a sole self-translator, and Şafak seeks the help of a professional translator, it is Şafak whose translations differ greatly from the norms of translation proper. It is difficult to remain unstirred by Beckett's level of loyalty to the original text in comparison to that of Şafak and how he manages to remain within the general

boundaries of the fictive universe. To put it simply, Beckett's bilingual readers do not come across contrasting narratives. They might and will encounter fluctuating emotivity, maybe a joke less comical or an additional reference; but they will not read contradictory stories. The same cannot be guaranteed for Şafak's bilingual readers. As a result of Şafak's extensive rewriting, her bilingual fictive universe is prone to be paradoxical. However, I argue that this rewriting is not merely a poetic or imaginative process, indeed it feeds on many sociocultural factors and power dynamics within literature. This brings me to my next section, where I expand my comparative take to evaluate how *invisible* Şafak and Beckett are as self-translators.

4.4. Author's Visibility and Self-Translator's Invisibility

"The more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and, presumably, the more visible the writer"[46] argues Lawrence Venuti early on in his book. Throughout my dissertation, I have used Venuti's terms 'foreignisation' and 'domestication' proposed here for assessing the status of sociocultural elements in self-translation and shared my findings. Even though Venuti's theory has been formed around "the translator" and "the author" as separate beings, it is also highly suitable for evaluating the self-translator's practice.

Thus, I will start by examining whether the author's visibility imposes itself on that of the translator. This *visibility*, Venuti argues, can show itself both in paratextual and textual elements. As per Gérard Genette's terminology,[47] I will refer to peritexts (the elements provided within the book but not the main

[46] Venuti, *The Translator's Invibility*, p.1

[47] Gérard Genette, *Seuils,* (Paris: Seuil, 1987).

text itself, such as the title page, blurb, author's bio etc.) and epitexts (the elements outside of the book but related to the book, such as interviews, media coverage, book reviews and so on).

In English self-translations Şafak's visibility as the author is clear, but her role as self-translator is sometimes obscured by her novels' peritextual components. *The Flea Palace*'s title page, underneath Şafak's author credit, reads "Translated from the Turkish by Müge Göçek". *The Gaze,* Şafak's only other Turkish novel translated into English, also appoints the professional translator with sole responsibility of the translation. The uninitiated reader would be forgiven for assuming that Şafak had no hand in the translation whatsoever. Reaffirming this misapprehension is the very page opposite in *The Flea Palace*, titled "About the author and translator", where short biographies for each are written. In making the transition from L1 to L2, Safak's status as self-translator is unwritten. Here the peritextual elements give way to Göçek as the perceived sole translator, who also retains ownership over the translation's copyright.

Beckett's L1 to L2 self-translation *Compagnie*, on the other hand, does contain reference to the author as self-translator, albeit obscured. It is not until the very end of the text that "*Traduit de l'anglais par l'auteur*" is shared with the reader. While it may make clear that Beckett is both the author and the translator, this declaration is far from up-front. If the reader had known this before starting the text, would their perceptions have changed? Although the publisher does declare Beckett's role as self-translator, there is a detectable pattern in both these instances of L1 to L2. In highlighting Şafak's supposed non-involvement and burying Beckett's involvement, these peritextual elements serve to shroud the self-translator in service of emphasising their primary status as the author.

In contrast, the author as self-translator is made plain in the peritext of L2 to L1. For example, in *İskender,* Şafak's co-translation is acknowledged on the Turkish text's title page. Similarly, Gerry Dukes' introduction to *First Love* makes evident that Beckett had first written these works in French, supplying a first-time-reader with significant context for what follows. That is, if the reader possesses an edition with an introduction, and only then if he/she does indeed read the introduction to the book, the reader will find evidence of Beckett as self-translator. If not, the only other peritextual indication is found on the copyright page, which states that Beckett owns the translation rights in fine print. In English versions, the peritext certainly diminishes Beckett's role as self-translator; his history of originally writing in French is somewhat washed away and reconfigured by the bias of his native language. These findings, combined with my earlier observation on the authors' tendency to interfere more in native reproduction, indicate that Şafak and Beckett — the latter a little less then the former —- are arguably wary of the weakening effect of the translation which might compromise their 'authorship' in their respective native languages. This illusion of originality, imposed on the self-translated L1 text, created mainly by their publishers yet uncontested by the authors, creates this notion of a transcendent authorship. Even when the said text is reproduced as a result of a linguistic transfer, the expectation from the reader is for them to perceive the self-translated novel as a carbon-copy of the source text. As the author's visibility becomes clearer, the self-translator remains invisible beyond the subtle copyright reference. Thus, the most prominent domestication in self-translation, if to look for it, is the domestication of the self-translator's persona.

According to Venuti, the utmost criterion a translation is judged by is its fluency. This "regime of fluency" requires and feeds upon domesticated texts

which reinforces the stagnancy towards the foreign in the Anglophone UK and USA markets. Venuti describes this desire of fluency as an appearance of a text so fluent “that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the “original.”[48] Venuti shows just how invisible the translator is in the Anglophone publishing industry, insofar as the book reviews rarely mention the translator’s name, with praise always depending on fluency of the translation. In this vein, Şafak’s attitude to translation is a part of the problem that Venuti criticises. In an interview, Şafak talks about her attitude towards her self-translations: “Ben çok da önemsiyorum kendi anadilimde nasıl okunacağını. Hani bir deyim var, *çeviri kokmasın* istiyorum o anlamda.”[49] (I value very much how [the text] will read in my native language. You know, there is this idiom, I do not want it to *smell of a translation* in that sense.) Here, Şafak is referring to her self-translations into her native Turkish when she indicates her preference. However, taken as a general attitude in translation, she is describing what Venuti criticises, meaning valuing the translation when and only if it reads fluently like an original. Şafak’s statement also emphasises my earlier point on the vulnerability around the authorship on native reproduction.

In my textual analyses, I have shown both Şafak and Beckett domesticate and also foreignise in their self-translations. However the practical and theoretical consequences of these techniques are different in each author’s circumstance. Beckett and Şafak’s shared language English imposes different “rules” upon each of them. English being Beckett’s native language, Beckett’s original English novels and arguably even his self-translations are not impacted by this regime of fluency. However for Şafak, Turkish to English self-translations are certainly subjected to the problematic criteria Venuti depicts; arguably even

[48] Venuti, *Invisibility*, p. 1.

[49] Elif Şafak, *Anlatsam Roman Olur*, 22.01.2024 .

her originally English novels can be regarded as “mentally” self-translated, especially so in regards to the overwhelming majority of the Turkish motifs in the novels. These differing forces can be traced in Venuti’s framework, as it is a cultural critique as much as it is a literary device. He states:

> By routinely translating large numbers of the most varied English-language books, foreign publishers have exploited the global drift towards American political and economic hegemony since World War II, actively supporting the international expansion of British and American cultures. British and American publishers, in turn, have reaped the financial benefits of successfully imposing English-language cultural values on a vast foreign readership, while producing cultures in the United Kingdom and United States that are aggressively monolingual, unreceptive to foreign literatures, accustomed to fluent translations that invisibly inscribe foreign texts with British and American values and provide readers with the narcissistic experience of recognising their own culture in a cultural other.[50]

Venuti depicts the results of this trade imbalance in the global publishing industries in line with the “geopolitical economy of culture”. To put simply, the English and American literary texts have been historically translated into other languages in great succession, but the markets they originated from have been less accepting of other foreign texts in translation. In this sense, Venuti’s critique is in line with Said’s views on Orientalism, as they are both suspicious of the reinforcement of dominant Western practice founded on power imbalances. However, Venuti’s critique is not employed on a West-East dichotomy, as he recognises English of UK and USA specifically as the dominant powers against other language literatures, including the European ones. By this accord, Beckett’s English works — if considering these as works of Anglo-Irish literature — do not belong in the dominant literary cast with imperious powers that Venuti

[50] *Invisibility*, p. 12.

describes; yet these works also do not require a “translation” to be read in the UK or USA. Even though Venuti frames his critical view around British and American English, he also states that his argument can be extended to other languages and literatures in the position of power against the ones that have less representation, as the dynamics of power are matters of relativity and not stable. In this sense, Beckett’s case is open to interpretation as to whether the French language and literature of France have more influence than the Anglo-Irish or vice versa. Grutman, for instance, considers Beckett as having two symmetrical languages and therefore not being constrained by the deeply rooted power imbalances in contrast to bilingual authors with asymmetrical linguistic configuration — Şafak is an example of the latter.

Because of Şafak’s asymmetrical bilingualism, the constraints she faces are inherently different that of Beckett’s, as I have argued throughout this chapter. These parameters cause self-translator’s invisibility to have different — and more problematic — repercussions in Şafak’s case. Beckett is immune to most part of the criticism Şafak’s self-translations receive. Regardless of whether Beckett domesticated or foreignised his self-translations, the perception of Beckett as a European author positions him firmly under the umbrella of Western literary tradition. In other words, this symmetrical bilingualism of Beckett mostly encouraged scholars to bypass the topic of “power dynamics” in his self-translations, as Beckett’s attitude was deemed removed from such external concerns. Had Beckett’s writing language been Gaelic, it would of course have been a different story. Beckett’s Irishness, in this sense, did not have an impact on circulation of his writings, as he wrote in English. He did not embark on writing in French to reach a wider audience, nor did he have a calculated motive of mercantile gain. If anything, Beckett knew all

too well that an Irish author in Paris could excel while still writing in English, as he had witnessed first hand from being around James Joyce.

Moving onto Şafak, her attitudes in self-translation cannot be considered exempt from the power dynamics in the literary world. Her use of English along with Turkish inherently positions Şafak in the midst of these issues, whatever and wherever she writes. As Venuti states:

> […] the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that preexist it in the translating language and culture, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation, and reception of texts.[51]

In this regard, it can be argued that Şafak, by creating modified version of a text in accordance with the target market values, reinforces the already established preoccupations in the receiving culture. As I have explained in Chapter 3, Şafak domesticates some notions of *Bit Palas,* such as as how the reference to Conquest of Istanbul is rewritten as the "Fall of an infidel city" in Flea Palace, employing the Western historic term "Fall of Constantinople" against "Conquest of Istanbul" of Turkish history, effectively employing the target culture's usage and subsequently confusing the story who was being told from the perspective of a Turkish character. Ironically, if we momentarily forgo the aforementioned dynamics of production in Şafak's self-translation process and take *Honour* as the source text and *İskender* as the target text, Şafak domesticates much more while translating into Turkish. *İskender* is visibly rewritten not only in terms of style and narrative, but also according to the Şafak's implied reader in the Turkish market. As I have shown before, this time

[51] Ibid, p. 14.

she domesticates the British references, such as the instance where National Front's racist chants being subdued in Turkish text. As Venuti points out, translation "is always limited by its address to specific audiences and by the cultural or institutional situations where the translated text is intended to circulate and function."[52] It is therefore essential to observe the self-translated text's reach and to consider appropriate strategies when translating. Venuti's refusal of domestication as a strategy is not to encourage production of unreadable works or a translationese, but a considered approach where the translator can convey the meaning whilst remaining visible. As such, Şafak could very well have retained the meaning without the problematic domestications above.

Venuti describes the foreignisation strategy in translation as a tool for resistance against the target market's oppressive values and an opportunity to challenge the "ethnocentric violence" that had been inscribed within the publishing industries of UK and USA as a result of their historical preference of domesticated foreign translations. Şafak's general attitude in her self-translations passes up this opportunity to confront established notions of the British/American translation industry, as well as those of the Turkish market. The Anglophone market is not welcoming of Şafak's winding sentences, therefore she cuts them up in pieces for absorption. She appropriates her characters and elements of the narrative in accordance to receiving culture's presumed literary expectations, both stylistically and philosophically.

Beckett's position is unique in the sense that he already challenged the language, the literature and the canons in whichever language he wrote in. Regarded as an excellent example of minor use of language, Beckett's writings

---

[52] Ibid.

do disrupt the established notions of the receiving market. As explained before, his narratives and characters challenge the idea of not only English or French market values, but quite possibly also the notion of traditional literature. Therefore, in regards to his self-translations, however much Beckett interferes with the fictive universe, it is certain that he does not employ these changes to conform with the established values of a dominant literature. This is possibly the most crucial difference that I have observed between Beckett and Şafak's self-translation practices.

As a final observation, I shall stress that scholars working on bilingualism of Beckett, and Şafak, or any other bilingual author for that matter, should also contribute in making self-translator's visibility clearer. I would like to echo Fitch's criticism in 1988 directed at the existing research at the time for ignoring Beckett's bilingual existence as an author. Studies on Beckett's bilingualism has come a long way since then, and I do not consider this as a major issue in Beckett studies today. However, there is an urgent need for Şafak's Anglophone critics to understand and demonstrate Şafak's bilingualism in their research. Şafak's English literature is inherently and intrinsically bound with her Turkish works. These texts, like Fitch suggests, are interdependent and cannot be observed as a single text. Above all, for the reasons I have argued throughout this dissertation, only taking into account one version of a Şafak's bilingual works could be deceiving. As I've argued before in Chapter 4, such was the case when Llena considered Esma's narration in *Honour* as the character's healing method, like a narrative exposure therapy, against the brutality of the honour killing of the story[53] — without a consideration of the loss of Esma's first-person narration in the Turkish version. As long as Şafak writes about Turkey,

[53] Carmen Zamorano Llena, *Fictions of Migration in Contemporary Britain and Ireland* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021)

Turks and self-translates into Turkish, her English texts cannot be considered separately from the Turkish versions. Doing so would not only provide more accurate evaluations in studies on Şafak, but also contribute to demystifying bilingual writing and self-translation.

Conclusion

This thesis set out to investigate Samuel Beckett's and Elif Şafak's bilingual writing and their self-translation practices with the hopes of gaining a better understanding of the dynamics of literary bilingualism. The present study was undertaken to understand and evaluate the impact of self-translation on the fictive universe in bilingual textual pairs. By paying particular attention to the shifts and ruptures in literary style and the narrative flow, as well as to the status of in-text sociocultural elements and the characters among others, this study aimed to observe the workings of the bilingual text.

This study has identified the different levels of intervention employed by Beckett and Şafak in their co/self-translations. The findings of the case studies showed that Şafak's authorial interference impacted the fictive universe substantially more than Beckett's modifications. Furthermore, the directionality of the self-translation proved to be a common denominator, with both authors revising the text considerably more when translating into their native language, thus the repercussions on the fictive universe are greater in second into first-language translations.

By comparing two authors-translators with different linguistic configurations, Beckett's symmetrical self-translations (Grutman, 2013a) and Şafak's asymmetrical practice are understood to be bound by different power dynamics. However, the results of this study indicate that despite the different linguistic and cultural challenges faced by Beckett and Şafak, the utmost important factor for the discrepancies in self-translation resulted from the authorial intention and intervention. Şafak has proven to revise drastically more in self-translation than Beckett, inasmuch as changing the narrative plot and

characters' personal traits. Beckett's self-translations are less interventionist and more concerned with the poetical.

One of the more significant findings to emerge from this study was the impact of bilingual writing on the invisibility (Venuti, 1995) of the self-translator. This proved to be a more problematic issue in Şafak's case with repercussions suggesting a form of self-orientalism in self-translation. Overall, this study strengthens the idea that bilingual writing and self-translation cannot be observed on their own without considering the neurolinguistic, psychological, and cultural implications on the author-translators' practice. Another key finding of this study is that the freedom offered by the second language fiction was the driving factor for both Beckett and Şafak in their language switch, despite being used as an apparatus to reach *moreness* by Şafak and *lessness* by Beckett. Furthermore, the findings of the case studies proved that even after their physical and linguistic migrations, the stories Beckett, and Şafak subsequently wrote inherently carried motifs of their homelands.

Although this study focuses on Beckett and Şafak, the findings may well have a bearing on the studies on other self-translators, as well as literary bilingualism and self-translation in general. The four-step categorisation I have used in reading self-translation might be of interest to future researchers as a preliminary framework for observing the changes in self-translation. The biographical similarities that have risen when studying Beckett and Şafak's bilingualism, such as both coming from cultures with divided opinions concerned with language reforms, as well as both being coordinate bilinguals with mid-life migrations could be useful for future research.

The scope of this study was necessarily limited in terms of literary and cultural critique; however, it provides the necessary groundwork for further

research to expand on. Fluctuating status of Şafak's multicultural narratives in translation could be of interest to cultural studies, as well as cosmopolitanism and migration studies. The contradictory representations of women characters between *Honour* and *İskender* provide a fertile ground for the growing research from the feminist criticism viewpoint on Şafak. The study was also pragmatically limited in looking at Anglo-Irish, French and Turkish literatures from a broader perspective, as it maintained a comparative approach throughout the thesis that did not allow to scrutinise the details and canons of the receiving literature.

This dissertation appears to be the first study to compare the specific pairs *Honour/İskender* by Şafak, and also *Premier Amour/First Love* by Beckett with detailed textual analysis, adding to the growing body of original research in self-translation studies. By studying four novels and eight texts comparatively across Anglo-Irish, French and Turkish contexts; this dissertation contributes to outstretching the European focus in self-translation studies. It also highlights the value of diversity in the cross-cultural literary studies and a decentralised comparative approach. This study also appears to be the most in-depth research on Şafak's bilingual practice after Akbatur's (2010) seminal work and it provides insights that could be useful in future studies on Şafak by Anglophone researchers who do not have direct access to Şafak's Turkish works.

The bilingual author is intrinsically bound by the fragile power of words and their fluctuating connotations across linguistic borders. Recognising the inner workings of self-translation with its poetics and politics requires an interdisciplinary perspective which in turn would provide us with a renewed and holistic understanding of the author-translator's *œuvre*.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Beckett, Samuel, *Compagnie* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1980)

———-, Nouvelles et Textes pour rien (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1965)

———-, *First Love and Other Novellas* (London: Penguin Modern Classics, 2000)

———-, *L'Image* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1956)

———-, *L'Innomable* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1953)

———-, *Nohow On* (London: John Calder, 1989)

———-, *Premier Amour (*Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1970)

Şafak, Elif, *Bit Palas* (Istanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2002)

———-, *İskender* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2011)

———-, *Ustam ve Ben* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2014)

———-, Baba ve Piç (İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2006)

Shafak, Elif, *The Architect's Apprentice* (London: Penguin Books, 2015)

———-, *The Bastard of Istanbul* (London: Penguin Books, 2007)

———-, *The Flea Palace*, trans. by Müge Göçek (London: Penguin Books, 2015)

———-, *Honour* (London: Viking, 2012)

———-, *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2004)

———-, *The Three Daughters of Eve* (London: Viking, 2016)

Secondary Sources

Adil, Alev, 'Western Eyes: Contemporary Turkish Literature in a British Context', in *Writing Turkey: Explorations in Turkish history, politics, and cultural identity*, ed. by Gerald MacLean (London: Middlesex University Press, 2006), pp. 129-144

Akbatur, Arzu, 'The Power and Burden of Self-Translation: Representation of "Turkish Identity" in Elif Shafak's *The Bastard of Istanbul*', in *Self Translation and Power*, ed. by Olga Castro, Sergi Mainer, and Svetlana Page (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 119-141

—— ,"Writing/Translating In/to English: The 'Ambivalent' Case of Elif Şafak", (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: Boğaziçi University, 2010)

Anselmi, Simona, *On Self-Translation: An Exploration in Self-Translators' Teloi and Strategies* (Milan: LED Edizioni Universitaire, 2012)

Bassnett, Susan, 'The self-translator as rewriter', in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), pp.13-25

Beaujour, Elizabeth Klosty, *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989)

Beckett, Samuel*, Company/Compagnie and A Piece of Monologue/Solo: A Bilingual Variorum Edition, ed. by Charles Krance (New York: Garland Publishing, 1993)*

———*,* *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume I: 1929-1940,* ed. Martha Dow Fehsenfeld and Lois More Overbeck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2009)

———, *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume II: 1941–1956*, ed. George Craig and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

———, *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume III: 1957-1965,* ed. George Craig and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
———, *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume IV: 1966-1989,* ed. George Craig and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016)

Beer, Ann, 'Beckett's Bilingualism', in *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett,* ed. by John Pilling (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 213-221
———-, ”The Use of Two Languages in Samuel Beckett's Art” (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: University of Oxford, 1987)

Berman, Antoine, *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1995)

Bloomfield, Leonard, *Language* (New York: Holt 1933)

Butler, Lance St. John, 'Two Darks: A Solution to the Problem of Beckett's Bilingualism', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 3 (1994), 111-135

Carmen Zamorano Llena, *Fictions of Migration in Contemporary Britain and Ireland* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021)

Casanova, Pascale, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. By M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2004)

Castro, Olga, and others, *Self Translation and Power* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017)

Chancy, J. A. Myriam, ‘A Meridians Interview with Elif Shafak’, *Meridians*, 4:1 (2003), 55-85 (p. 77)

Cockerham, Harry, ‘Bilingual Playwright, in *Beckett the Shape Changer*, ed by Katherine Worth, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), pp. 139-160

Cohn, Ruby, *A Beckett Canon* (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press. 2004)

———-, *Back to Beckett* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973)

———-, *Samuel Beckett: The Comic Gamut* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1962)

Collinge-Germain, Linda, 'Cultural In-Betweenness in "L'expulsé"/"The Expelled" by Samuel Beckett', *Journal of the Short Story in English*, 52 (2009), 105-11

Collinge, Linda, *Beckett traduit Beckett* (Paris: Librairie Droz, 2000)

Cordingley, Anthony, 'The passion of self-translation: A masocritical perspective', in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), pp. 81-94

Davies, William, '"Home and Visiting Temperaments": Beckett's Diasporic Encounters' in *Samuel Beckett and Europe: History, Culture, Tradition*, ed. by Michela Bariselli, N. M. Bowe, and William Davies (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), pp. 55-76

Dennis, M. Amanda, 'Poets Of Their Own Acts: Tactics, Style and Occupation in Beckett's "Nouvelles."', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, vol. 27 (2015), 43-55

Diebold, A. Richald Jr., 'Incipient Bilingualism', *Language*, 37.1 (1961), 97-112

Dirlik, Arif, 'Chinese History and the Question of Orientalism', *History and Theory*, 35.4 (1996), 96-118

Eco, Umberto, *Mouse Or Rat?: Translation as Negotiation* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003)

Edwards, Michael, 'Beckett's French', in *Translation and Literature*, 1.1 (1992), pp. 68-83

Ermelino, Louisa, 'East Meets West', *Publisher's Weekly*, 253:48 (2006), 28-29

Federman, Raymond, 'The Writer as Self-Translator', in *Beckett Translating/ Translating Beckett*, ed. by Alan Warren Friedman and others. (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987), pp. 7-16

Férnandez, José Francisco, '"The same blinding void as before": Irish Neutrality in Samuel Beckett's nouvelles"', *Arcadia*, 52.2 (2017), 346-60

Finnan, P. Joseph, 'Punch's Portrayal of Redmond, Carson and the Irish Question, 1910-18', *Irish Historical Studies*, 33 (2013), 424-45

Fitch, Brian T., *Beckett and Babel* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988)

Fletcher, John, *The Novels of Samuel Beckett* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964)

Furlanetto, Elena, 'The 'Rumi phenomenon' between Orientalism and cosmopolitanism: The case of Elif Shafak's *The forty rules of love*', *European Journal of English Studies*, 17(2) (2013), 201-13
———-, '"Imagine a Country Where We Are All Equal": Imperial Nostalgia in Turkey and Elif Shafak's Ottoman Utopia', in *Post-Empire Imaginaries?*, 182.19 (2015), pp. 159–80

Genette, Gérard, *Seuils* (Paris: Seuil, 1987)

Green, Julien , *Souvenirs des jours heureux* (Paris: Flammarion, 2007)
———-, *Le langage et son double* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1987)

Grosjean, François, *Bilingual* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010)

Grutman, Rainier, 'A sociological glance at self-translation and self-translators', in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley, (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), pp. 63-80

———-, 'Beckett and Beyond: Putting Self-Translation in Perspective', *Orbis Litterarum*, 68.3 (2013) 188-206

———-, 'Self-Translation', in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, Third Edition*, ed. by Mona Baker, and Gabriela Saldana (Oxon: Routledge, 2020), pp. 514-18

Hamers, Josiane F., and Michel H.A. Blanc, *Bilinguality & Bilingualism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Haugen, Einar, *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behaviour* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953)

Hermans, Theo, 'Schleiermacher and Plato, Hermeneutics and Translation'. *Friedrich Schleiermacher and the Question of Translation*, ed. by Larisa Cercel, and Adriana Serban (Berlin, München, Boston: De Gruyter, 2015), pp. 77-106

Hill, Leslie, *Beckett's Fiction In Different Words* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Hockett, C. F. A., *Course in Modern Linguistics* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1958)

Hokenson, Jan Walsh, and Marcella Munson, *The Bilingual Text* (Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 2007)

Hulle, Vann Dirk and Pim Verhulst, 'Beckett's Collaborative Translations In The 1950s', *Samuel Beckett Today/ Aujourd'hui*, 30.1 (2018), 20-39

Kager, Maria, 'Comment Dire: A Neurolinguistic Approach to Beckett's Bilingual Writings', *L2 Journal*, 7 (2015), 68-83

Karadağ Evirgen, Şilan, 'Çeviride İkidillilik Sorunsalı: Özçeviri ve Yazar-Çevirmenler' (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Yıldız Technical University, 2016)

Kennedy, Seán, '"In the street I was lost": cultural dislocation in Samuel Beckett's The End', in *Beckett and Ireland*, ed. Seán Kennedy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 96-113

———-, 'The Cultural Memory in Mercier and Camier: The Fate of Noel Lemass', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 15 (2005), 117-29

Kinsella, Ciara and David Singleton, 'Much More Than Age', *Applied Linguistics*, 35:4 (2014), 441-62

Kippur, Sara, *Writing It Twice: Self-Translation and the Making of a World Literature in French*, (Chicago: Northwestern University Press: 2015)

Knowlson, James, Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett (London: Bloomsbury, 1997)

Korugan, Omca A., 'E-mail interview by İrem Kasar Harris', 2021

Küçük, Abdullah, 'The Context and Translations of The Forty Rules of Love and Aşk', (Unpublished Master's Dissertation, Dokuz Eylül University, 2016)

Lau, Lisa, 'Re-Orientalism: The Perpetration and Development of Orientalism by Orientals', *Modern Asian Studies,* 2 (2009), 571-90

Lefevere, André, *Translation, Rewriting and Manipulation of Literary Fame* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017)

Louar, Nadia, 'Le bilinguisme comme genèse du projet beckettien, *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 30.1 (2018), 113-26

Mercier, Vivian, *Beckett/Beckett*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977)

Montini, Chiara, 'Bilinguisme et autotraduction à l'œuvre dans l'écriture de Samuel Beckett', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 30.1 (2018), 85-96

Mooney, Sinéad, *A Tongue Not Mine: Beckett and Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Najder, Zdzislaw, *Joseph Conrad: A Life* (New York:[Camden House, 2007)

Nugent-Folan, Georgina, *The Making of Samuel Beckett's Company/ Compagnie* (London: Bloomsbury, 2021)

O'Brien, Eoin, *The Beckett Country* (Dublin: Black Cat Press, 1986)

Ogarkova, Anna, Fontaine, Johnny J.R., and Irina Prihod'ko, 'What the GRID can reveal about culture-specific emotion concepts: A case study of Russian "toska", in *Components of Emotional Meaning: A Sourcebook,* ed. by Johnny J.R. Fontaine and others (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2013), pp. 353–65

Oustinoff, Michael, 'Le bilinguisme d'écriture', in *Métamorphoses d'une utopie*, ed. by Fulvio Caccia and Jean-Michel Lacroix (Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1992), pp. 65-76

————————- , *Bilinguisme d'écriture et auto-traduction, Julien Green, Samuel Beckett, Vladimir Nabokov* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2001)

Oztabek-Avci, Elif, 'Elif Şafak's *The Saint of Incipient Insanities* as an "International" Novel. *Ariel*, 38 (2007), 83-99

Pamuk, Orhan, *Istanbul, Memories and the City*, trans. by Maureen Freely (London: Faber and Faber, 2005)

Pavlenko, Aneta, *Emotions and Multilingualism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Popovič, Anton, *Dictionary for the analysis of literary translation* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976)

Pushkin, Aleksandr, *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse: Commentary*, 2 vols, trans. by Vladimir Nabokov (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991)

Ricks, Christopher, 'Racine's Phedre: Lowell's Phaedra', *Arion*, 1.2 (1991), 44-59

Romaine, Suzanne, *Bilingualism,* 2 vols (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995)

Rose, Gaddis Marilyn, *Translation and Literary Criticism* (Manchester: St Jerome, 1997)

Said, Edward W., *Orientalism*, rev. edn (London: Penguin, 2003)

Samuel Becket and Alan Schneider, *No Author Better Served: The Correspondence of Samuel Beckett and Alan Schneider*, ed. by Maurice Harmon (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2000)

Shafak, Elif, 'Linguistic Cleansing', in *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 22.3 (2005), pp. 19-25

Salisbury, Laura, '"What Is the Word": Beckett's Aphasic Modernism', *Journal of Beckett Studies*, 17 (2008), 78-126

Santoyo, Julio-César, 'Autotraducciones: una perspectiva histórica', *Meta,* 50, no. 3 (2005), 858–67

———— 'On mirrors, dynamics and self-translation', in *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, ed. by Anthony Cordingley, (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), pp. 27-38

Sardin-Damestoy, Pascale, Samuel Beckett autotraducteur ou l'art de l'empêchement (Artois: Artois Presses Universitaire, 2002)

Sardin, Pascale, 'Becoming Beckett', *Samuel Beckett Today / Aujourd'hui*, 30.1 (2018), 70-84

Sengupta, Mahasweta, ‘Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds’, in *Translation, History and Culture*, ed. by Susan Bassnet, and André Lefevere (London: Pinter, 1990), pp. 56-63

Slote, Sam, 'Bilingual Beckett: Beyond the Linguistic Turn', in *The New Cambridge Companion To Samuel Beckett*, ed. by Dirk van Hulle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 114-25

Tekalp, Selen, ‘A Study on the Self-Translation of Allusions in *Bit Palas* by Elif Shafak’, *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 22 (2020), 117- 38

Toury, Gideon, *Descriptive Translation Studies - and beyond,* rev edn (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012)

Venuti, Lawrence, ‘Introduction’ in *The Translator,* 4.2 (1998), pp. 135-44
———-, The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference (London: Routledge, 1998)
———-, The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation (London: Routledge, 2008)

Waite, Genevieve, 'Julien Green: *L’écrivain double* in Self-Translation', *French Forum*, 44 (3) (2019), 361-76

Warner, Marina, '“Who can shave an egg?”: Beckett, Mallarmé, and Foreign Tongues', *Raritan*, 27.4 (2008), 62-89

Weller, Shane, 'For a migrant art: Samuel Beckett and cultural nationalism', *Journal of European Studies*, 48.2 (2018), 168-182
———-, Beckett, Literature, and the Ethics of Alterity (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Zaritt, Saul Noam, Jewish American Writing and World Literature: Maybe to Millions, Maybe to Nobody (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020)

Electronic Resources

10 Minutes 38 Seconds in this Strange World', *Kirkus Review*, 2019, <https://www.kirkusreviews.com/book-reviews/elif-shafak/10-minutes-38-seconds-in-this-strange-world/>

Bedell, Geraldine, 'This Turkey's been overstuffed', *The Guardian*, 2007, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2007/jul/29/fiction.features1>

Elif Şafak, *Cosmopolitan*, 2004 <https://www.elifsafak.us/roportajlar.asp?islem=roportaj&id=80>

——, *İzzet Çapa'nın Blogu*, 2014 <https://izzetcapablog.tumblr.com/post/79864605698/elif-%C5%9Fafak-mevlanay%C4%B1-kulland%C4%B1-demeleri

——-, *Roll,* 2002 <https://www.elifsafak.us/roportajlar.asp?islem=roportaj&id=222 > [accessed 1 January 2024]

——- *Today's Zaman*, 2009 <https://www.elifsafak.us/en/roportajlar.asp?islem=roportaj&id=19>

Eva Gentes, *Self-translation*, <https://self-translation.blogspot.com/>

'Faggot', in *Oxford English Dictionary* <https://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/67623>

Gürsoy Sökmen, Müge, 'Being a Woman Publisher in Islamist Country', *Bianet*, 2002 <http://bianet.org/english/people/14841-being-a-woman-publisher-in-islamist-country>

'Katzenjammer', in *Merriam Webster* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/katzenjammer>

McCarthy, Niall, 'The Countries Imprisoning the Most Journalists in 2019', *Forbes*, 2019, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/niallmccarthy/2019/12/12/the-countries-imprisoning-the-most-journalists-in-2019-infographic/#37665e1213d6>

Phillips, Julia, ‘After Her Heart Stops Beating, a Woman Continues to Think’, *The New York Times*, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/16/books/review/10-minutes-38-seconds-in-this-strange-world-elif-shafak.html>

Segal, Francesca, ’10 Minutes 38 Seconds in This Strange World by Elif Shafak’, *Financial Times*, 2019, <https://www.ft.com/content/10be5b18-7ae4-11e9-8b5c-33d0560f039c>

Shafak, Elif, 'Writing in English brings me closer to Turkey’, *British Council*, 2014, <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/elif-shafak-writing-english-brings-me-closer-turkey#:~:text=Words%20coming%20from%20Arabic%20and,It%27s%20a%20political%20statement>

‘The Saint of Incipient Insanities’, *Publisher’s Weekly*, 2004 <https://www.publishersweekly.com/9780374253578>