TRANSLATION and RECEPTION of FEMINIST SPECULATIVE FICTION in

TURKEY: A MULTIPLE-FOREGROUNDING ANALYSIS

Nil Özçelik

Boğaziçi University

2009

December 2009

Abstract

This thesis studies a corpus of three works of feminist speculative fiction (*Handmaid's Tale* - Margaret Atwood, *Woman on the Edge of Time* -Marge Piercy, *Female Man* - Joanna Russ) that distinguish themselves from traditional sci-fi books through their choice of themes and experimental narrative technique. The thesis examines the translation into Turkish and the reception of linguistic creations and neologisms (or *nova* in Darko Suvin's terms) in this body of works.

The main theoretical framework is Foregrounding Theory and its cognitive/empirical use by several literary scholars such as Willie van Peer (1986), David S. Miall & Don Kuiken (1994), Jameljan Frank Hakemulder (2004) who have examined how linguistic distortions and parallelisms affect readers' responses to texts. Through a comparative reading test conducted on a group of Turkish and English-speaking readers, the thesis explores how the translation of feminist *nova* reshapes and differentiates target readers' reception of the author's and characters' perspectives from that of source readers.

Assigning a central place to foregrounding as a large-scale manipulation strategy in the source texts, and using Teun A. van Dijk's method of discourse analysis, the thesis also examines feminist *nova* and their relationship to axiological perspectives of the novels under analysis. Briefly, it carries out a multiple-foregrounding analysis of the production, translation and reception of the feminist *nova* that serve as "ideologemes" (Julia Kristeva) in feminist speculative fiction.

Özet

Bu doktora tezi, konu ve deneysel anlatım tekniği bakımından geleneksel bilimkurgu kalıpları dışına çıkan feminist spekülatif kurgu türündeki başlıca üç yapıtı (*Handmaid's Tale* - Margaret Atwood, *Woman on the Edge of Time* - Marge Piercy, *Female Man* - Joanna Russ) ele almakta ve bu yapıtlardaki deneysel dilin, Darko Suvin'in deyimiyle, dilsel *novum*ların nasıl çevrildiklerini ve alımlandıklarını araştırmaktadır.

Tezin temel kuramsal çerçevesini oluşturan, yazınsal normlardan içsel ve dışsal sapmalar (deviations) ve tekrarlamalar (parallelism) yoluyla, yazarların metinlerin çeşitli düzlemlerinde öncedikleri ya da ön plana çıkardıkları söylemsel öğelerin okurlar üzerindeki etkilerini inceleyen Önceleme Kuramı'dır (Foregrounding Theory.)

Willie van Peer (1986), David S. Miall & Don Kuiken (1994), Jameljan Frank Hakemulder (2004) gibi araştırmacıların deneysel/bilişsel araştırmalarından yola çıkılarak, bu tezde, karşılaştırmalı bir okuma anketi çerçevesinde, incelenen bütüncedeki feminist karakterdeki *novum*ların ve bu *novum*ların çevirisinin kaynak ve erek dil okurlarının yazar ve roman karakterlerine karşı bakış açılarını nasıl etkiledikleri, okur yanıtlarını nasıl çeşitlendirdikleri ve ayrıştırdıkları incelenmiştir. Bu anket kapsamında, kaynak metnin öncelenen öğelerini erek dilde yeniden yapılandıran bir çeviri okurun algısını nasıl etkiler, nasıl dönüştürür? gibi sorulara yanıt aranmıştır.

Söz konusu *novum*ların, bütüncedeki romanların aksiyolojik evreniyle olan ilişkileri de, öncelemeyi geniş ölçekli bir manipülasyon aracı olarak tasarlayan Teun A. van Dijk'in söylem çözümlemesi yöntemiyle incelenerek, çoklu bir önceleme analizi gerçekleştirilmiştir.

NAME of AUTHOR: Nil Özçelik
PLACE of BIRTH: İstanbul
DATE of BIRTH: 18 December 1978

GRADUATE an UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED

2001-2003 MA Yıldız Technical University – Department of Translation and Interpreting in French
1997-2001 BA Yıldız Technical University – Department of Translation and Interpreting in French
1989-1997 Secondary and High School Education – Saint Benoît French Lycée

TRAINING

(September 2004 – 3 weeks), "Formation des formateurs de traduction", University of Rennes II (by the grant offered by Institut Français d'İstanbul)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

12. 2009 Turkish teacher – FLIO (Foreign Language Institute of Ottawa)
2008 Fall Term Part-time professor of terminology and terminotics - University of Ottawa (Canada) - School of Translation and Interpretation
04. 2008-06.2008 Researcher for a project carried out by Prof. Luise von Flotow (Director of the University of Ottawa's School of Translation and Interpretation)
2001 – 2008 Teaching assistant – Yıldız Technical University (İstanbul ,Turkey) – Department of Translation and Interpreting in French

PUBLICATIONS

National Conference Papers

1. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2006), « Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak ve Feminist Çeviri Etiği » (Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Feminist Translation Ethics) , II. Congress of Applied Ethics organized by the Middle East Technical University (Ankara/Turkey), 18-20 October 2006.

2. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2003), « Les difficultés rencontrées dans la traduction d'un ouvrage féministe: Et *l'une ne bouge pas sans l'autre* de Luce Irigaray » (Difficulties Encountered in the Translation of a Feminist Text : *Et l'une ne*

bouge pas sans l'autre by Luce Irigaray), III. National Congress of Francophony organized by the University of Hacettepe (Ankara/Turkey) Ulusal Frankofoni Kurultayı, 5-7 November 2003, published in the proceedings book.

International Conference Papers

1. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2010), "Using the Interdisciplinary Concept of "Foregrounding" in Empirical Translation and Reception Research", 23th Annual CATS The Canadian Association for Translation Studies) Conference organizied by the University of Concordia, Montreal, Quebec, May 28-31.

2. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2010), "Recreation of an Empathetic Reading Experience through Translation", NEMLA 41st Annual Convention, Montreal, Quebec, April 7-11.

3. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2009), The Concept of "Foregrounding" and Its Relevance to the Study of a Translated Feminist Speculative Corpus", Translating Beyond East and West, The 11th Prague International Conference in Translation and Interpreting Studies organized by the Institute of Translation Studies, Charles University in Prague, 14-16   October 2009.

4. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2008), "Feminist Speculative Fiction as a Reclaimed and Reinvented Narrative", *Narratives and Politics*, Interdisciplinary conference organized by the University of Ottawa's Political Studies Graduate Student Association, 14 March 2008.

5. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2004), « Traces d'Intertextualite dans la littérature féministe » (Traces of Intertextuality in Feminist Fiction), International Symposium of Imagology organized by the University of Mugla (Mugla/Turkey), 26-28 April 2004.

6. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2003), « Voyage de la femme turque à travers le féminisme » (Turkish Woman's Journey Through Feminism), Seuils & Traverses 4 organized by the University of Ankara, 2 July 2003, published in the proceedings book.

Articles

1. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2007) « Kadın Gözüyle 'Oryantalizm' : Lady Mary Wortley Montagu ve Demetra Vaka », *Siyahi Journal*, Spring, No: 9, pp.132-135.
2. ÖZÇELİK, Nil (2006) « Coğrafyalar Farklı, Stratejiler Aynı: Normlara Meydan Okuyan Çevirmenler », *Siyahi Journal,* Fall, No: 8, pp. 130-133.

<u>List of Translations</u>

- Books
1. PARKES CORDOCK, Richard (2006), *Milyoner* (*Millionaire Upgrade*), Alteo.
2. POUQUEVILLE, F.C.H.L, *L'histoire de la régénération de la Grèce*, tome II. (Forthcoming).

- Articles

1. HUWS, Ursula (2007), "Teknoloji Ev işini Azaltır mı ?" *Pazartesi Journal*, February-March, No: 112, pp. 62-69.
2. IRIGARAY, Luce (2006), "Ve Biri Öteki Olmadan Kımıldamaz", *Siyahi Journal*, Spring, No : 7, pp. 80-85.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the memory of my dearest friend, Serpil Türk Hotaman

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

How experimental texts were translated and received has always been of interest to translation scholars. In the Canadian context of translation, two prominent scholars, Luise von Flotow and Sherry Simon have examined a wide range of strategies used in the translation of Quebec feminist avant-garde writers such as France Théoret, Louky Bersianik and Nicole Brossard. The research by these scholars shows that besides being a good site of stylistic experimentation, innovative texts also tell us a lot about the ideology of their translators:

> "Where the feminist project of translation finds its more felicitous applications is in regard to texts which are themselves innovative writing practices" (Simon, 1996).

Obviously, an analysis of translation strategies used, not used, or misused in the translation of experimental texts inevitably leads us to explore not just the aestehetic, but also the ideological factors involved in the translation process.

So far, innovative texts like Quebec feminist avant-garde texts, French feminists' texts, surrealist texts, postmodernist texts have extensively been analysed by translation scholars while feminist speculative fiction has not been dealt with from a translation studies perspective. However, characterised by innovative and subversive textual strategies, feminist speculative fiction seems to be a very interesting object of study for translation scholars as for literary scholars.

In the framework of this PhD thesis, I will examine the translation and reception of linguistic creations and neologisms (or *nova* in Darko Suvin's terms) in a feminist speculative corpus that consists of three novels and their Turkish translations:

Corpus Under Analysis

My corpus comprises the most representative works of contemporary feminist speculative fiction by American women writers and their translations into Turkish. Under the entry "Women" of *The New Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*, apart from some other novels, Pamela Sargent (1988) considers three novels in my corpus as the most striking examples of science fiction raising questions about the roles of women.

Margaret Atwood

- *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* (*The Handmaid's Tale*) (1992). Trans. Sevinç-Özcan Kabakçıoğlu. Afa Yayınları.

Joanna Russ

- *Dişi Adam (The Female Man*) (2000), Trans. Çiçek Öztek. Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Marge Piercy

- *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın* (*Woman on The Edge of Time*) (1992). Trans. Füsun Tülek. Ayrıntı Yayınları.

The writers in my corpus problematise how language can be transformed when gender relationships become more egalitarian (*Women on the Edge of Time* 1976), in favour of women (*The Female Man* 1975) or change to the disadvantage of women (*The Handmaid's Tale* 1985). All these writers envision futuristic worlds with significant changes from present day society. These new worlds have new words and new names, as indicated below:

- *The Female Man* (1975): Whileaway

- *Women on the Edge of Time* (1976): Mattapoisett

- *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985): Gilead

The writers in my corpus have another common trait: they are all mainstream writers who also choose to benefit from possibilities offered by feminist speculative fiction. My corpus excludes some speculative works, which are neither feminist nor experimental in terms of language use. Others are excluded from my corpus for not having been translated into Turkish.

In this thesis, I will examine English and Turkish readers' responses to feminist *nova* in my corpus of study by using a comparative, foregrounding-based reception analysis, which has not been used in translation studies before. In this sense, I hope my thesis will contribute to the discipline of translation studies by bringing up an interdisciplinary method.

"Foregrounding Theory" and its empirical application constitute the main theoretical and methodological framework of this thesis. Foregrounding as a concept closely related to the Russian Formalist critic Viktor Shklovsky's *estrangement* (ostanenie) has been first employed by the Prague linguist, Jan Mukarovský to indicate a distortional literary device, which is consistently and systematically used in poetic genre for aesthetic purposes. Having applied later to prose analysis and then to empirical research on literary reading, foregrounding has never gone out of use, and still seems to be a productive concept for scholars from various disciplines such as literary studies, psychology, visual arts etc. Distortion of conventional language being the major mechanism of foregrounding, the concept is obviously interesting to analyse lexical creativities in feminist fiction.

My main objective in this thesis is to investigate the role of foregrounding on the readers' responses to feminist speculative texts in translation. In order to investigate the role of foregrounding in differentiating readers' responses to feminist speculative texts, I will carry out an empirical reception analysis of both source text and target text readers. In addition, I will use Teun A. van Dijk's method of discourse analysis to examine the source texts' feminist *nova*, which are indicative of fictional characters' positive and negative perceptions of other groups (Us versus Them Contrast).

In my thesis, I will seek answers for a number of related questions inspired by John Clute's distinction between "strangeness of the world" and "strangeness of the mode of telling":

For Turkish translators who do not have an established tradition of speculative fiction, could the *novum* be the strangeness of the world more than the strangeness of the mode of telling. What exactly is the *novum* was for the Turkish translator? Can these two *nova* (strangeness of the world and strangeness of the mode of telling) be isolated from each other? How is the reader's response affected if the translator privileges the strangeness of the world over the strangeness of the mode of telling?

I will also question how the translation of feminist *nova* affects target readers' empathy for strange worlds depicted in feminist speculative fiction. As known, translation can play a significant role in the promotion of empathy between languages and cultures as well as it can also serve to reduce or suppress target readers' empathy and sympathy with the language and culture of the Other represented in the source text. As Suzanne Keen (2007, p. 93) points out, there are many elements that have been supposed to contribute to readers' empathy. Foregrounding devices (stylistic distortion

and parallelism) are among these elements that affect readers' empathetic relationship with texts. Keen's focal point being "narrative empathy" with fictional characters in source texts, I am particularly interested in the recreation of an empathetic experience through translation.

When foregrounding devices constitute an important aspect of a source text, as in the example of feminist speculative fiction, what kind of role can translators assume to evoke readers' empathy with the futuristic and defamiliarising worlds depicted in these linguistically experimental texts? Or, could it be that some strategies used in the translation of feminist speculative fiction lead readers to an altruistic action vis-a-vis these texts? Now, I will briefly introduce the outline of my thesis:

The first chapter of my thesis aims to give an overview of the history and language of feminist speculative fiction. In this chapter, I will examine how women writers gained "visibility' within the science fiction genre that has long been "masculinist." Feminist speculative genre being at the crossroads of the literary New Wave movement and the Second Wave feminism, I find it worth discussing how these movements resonated in the language of feminist speculative fiction. I will also attempt to clarify why I chose to call this genre "feminist speculative fiction" rather than "feminist fabulation" (Marleen Barr) or science fiction. After critically dealing with the main feminist/epistemological debates on objectivity, subjectivity and representational politics, I will discuss representational politics used in feminist speculative fiction. I will explain why feminist speculative fiction has to be considered as a "powerful infidel heteroglossia" in Donna Haraway's terms. I will present distinctive features of feminist speculative fiction. I will draw attention to feminist speculative fiction's similarities to and differences with "écriture feminine." After mentioning "deconstructive" aspects of

feminist speculative fiction, I will also mention its "constructive" aspects. I will take a look at the language and linguistics of feminist speculative fiction. The translation scholar, Jean-Marc Gouanvic drawing attention to the untranslatability of the exolects or "fictive words" that belong to a "third linguistic system", I will conclude this chapter by saying that feminist speculative fiction does not use "fictive words' to refer to an "exolinguistic alterity" and although they might be sometimes a challenge for the translator, all the "neologic creations" in feminist speculative fiction come out of and are translatable to our languages.

In the second chapter, which is focussed on my foregrounding-based methodology, I will first present the historico-theoretical trajectory of the terms *foregrounding* and estrangement. Then, I will discuss foregrounding devices and their role in the reception. I will refer to previous research, which has investigated the effect of foregrounding on readers' aesthetic appreciation of literary texts. Then, I will argue that foregrounding is relevant to investigate readers' responses to translations as well. I will compare "foregrounding" to some translational concepts like *homology* (Jean-Marc Gouanvic) and *metonymics* (Maria Tymozcko). By departing from Darko Suvin's concept of *novum* which characterises the new and "estranging" element in science fiction, I will consider foregrounding devices in feminist speculative fiction as *nova.*

In the third chapter of my thesis, I will use Teun. A. van Dijk's method of discourse analysis to examine Anglo-American feminist *nova* and their translations into Turkish. To investigate the role of foregrounding in differentiating readers' responses to feminist speculative texts, I will undertake an empirical reception analysis. I will also carry out a critical analysis on the discourses of Turkish agents involved in the editing and translation of feminist speculative fiction.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY and LANGUAGE of FEMINIST SPECULATIVE FICTION

In Search of Visibility within a Male-dominated Genre: Science Fiction

> *"Science fiction and fantasy serve as important vehicles for feminist thought, particularly as bridges between theory and practice. No other genres so actively invite representations of the ultimate goals of feminism: worlds free of sexism, worlds in which women's contributions (to science) are recognized and valued, worlds in which the diversity of women's desire and sexuality, and worlds that move beyond gender"*
>
> (Helford, Elyce Rae, p. 291).

Although the writer of *Frankenstein, or, the Modern Prometheus* (1818), Mary Shelly[1] has been conventionally recognized as the founding mother of science fiction, science fiction developed as a masculinist genre that excluded women writers, created conventional characters such as "the alien woman" and perpetuated traditions of the male voice in narration. In her book entitled *In the Chinks of the World Machine: Feminism and Science Fiction*, the critic Sarah Lefanu (1988) succinctly puts this situation in the following words:

---

[1] Pamela Sargent (1988) states that "Mary Wollstonecraft Shelly's *Frankenstein* (1918) may be the first true work of SF because it reflects an awareness of new scientific discoveries at the dawn of the Industrial Age and anticipates the methods of H. G. Wells" (p. 510).

The point is that 'woman' in conventional contemporary science fiction is an absence, at best a pale imitation of 'man', if not actually the feared castrating other. So to imagine a woman as having a self that can be liberated from the strictures of male dominance, of narrative form as well as the real world, as these feminist utopias do, is itself a liberating experience. (p. 54)

In the same line with Sarah Lefanu; in his article "Science Fiction Women Before Liberation", the critic Eric. S. Rabkin (1981) also recognizes science fiction's omission and stereotypical portrayal of women by pointing out:

"The first criticism we raised of sf is that it ignored women, or it portrayed them, drew them stereotypically. This is certainly true." (p. 19)

Although Eric. S. Rabkin (1981) completely agrees with the criticism of women's non-representation or misrepresentation in sci-fi, he also mentions some male writers who have responded to women's liberation and "have honestly tried to overcome the pitfalls of omission and functional determinism of women by imbuing their female characters with what they believed to be truly admirable traits alternative to those in their male characters" (p. 14). However, some critics think that the representation of women in this progressive genre is not at all progressive and rather maintains the status quo.

Science fiction writer, editor and translator, Sam J. Lundwall (1971) points out that "although science fiction is on the whole a very progressive literature", "woman in science fiction remains what she was, a compulsory appendage" (p.143). In his article "Women, Robots and Other Peculiarities", Lundwall (1971) gives further explanations as well as some striking textual and paratextual examples on how women have been represented in traditional sci-fi books and magazines.

> The hero/scientist was important, as were the usual standard equipment of robots, space ships, aliens and so on. The woman, except as a concession to the demand for some puerile love interest, was not. Perhaps some of the younger readers of the magazines appreciated the sight of the scantily dressed females on the magazine covers, but that was about all. Women were purely decorative, period (p. 146).

As is evident from Sam J. Lundwall's statements, women were just decorative in science fiction. Science fiction's writers, themes and readers were almost exclusively male although women have become progressively more involved with every decade. In his article "Women and Science Fiction", William Sims Bainbridge (1982) gives some statistical information on science fiction's overwhelmingly male readership:

> *Astounding Science Fiction,* the leading magazine, polled its readership in 1949 and discovered that only 6.7% were female (July 1949 : 161); in 1958, the same magazine found that the proportion of women among its readers had risen to 11.9% (May 1959 : 136). In the same year, women constituted 10 percent of readership of the British magazine *New Worlds* (May 1959 : 2). An unpublished 1978 poll of 1,000 subscribers to a relatively new American magazine, *Galileo,* found that 26% were women (p. 1082).

The above statistics being so revealing, in the same article, Bainbridge (1082) gives other statistics that indicate that the physical and astronomical sciences which inspired traditional science fiction stories were also male-dominated although opportunities for women in the sciences have been increasing. The most interesting aspect of William Sims Bainbridge's (1083) article is his survey on "women in science fiction" which is, in his terms, "the first large, well constructed social science survey of the genre". Basing his work on an earlier pilot research, Bainbridge designs a 237-item questionnaire, which he applies to 595 persons attending the 1978 World Science Fiction Convention held in Phoenix, Arizona. 41.5% of all informants, were women.

> Women tend to like the traditional Hard- Science science fiction less than men do; and not a single female author studied writes this variety. Therefore, the continuing influx of women into science fiction may not result in promoting engineering and the physical sciences among women,

because the female authors express very different values in their fiction and are urging social activism rather than technical competence (p. 1092).

William Sims Bainbridge's 1978 survey allows some interesting conclusions on literary tastes of female readers of speculative fiction. However, I think that Bainbridge's conclusions must be taken further with a more recent survey, which could give us a diachronic perspective on the transformation of female readerships. Since feminist speculative fiction is "both a reading and a writing practice", as Justine Larbalestier describes it (2002, p. 2), studies on female readers of speculative fiction are as important as literary analyses of feminist speculative books. In her *The Battle of the Sexes in Science Fiction*, Justine Larbalestier focuses on sci-fi fandom between 1926-73 and analyses fan debates about sex and women in science-fiction magazines not only as a site of female readers' self-expression, but also as a site which reflects the hostility of some male fans and editors. Admitting the importance of reception studies in feminist speculative scholarship, in my thesis, I will carry out a foregrounding-based analysis of male and female readers in order to test the role of foregrounded elements in source text and target text readers' reception of feminist speculative fiction. Chapter III of my thesis contains further information on this reception analysis.

Now, I would like to briefly mention the historical development of the genre of science fiction whose impetus was the progress in science and technology. Developments in science and technology have caused a growing interest in novels and stories that depict, through futuristic atmospheres, how a highly developed technology could affect people's lives. In order to respond to this growing interest, in the 1930s, three large science fiction magazines were launched for the American audience: *Amazing Stories*, *Wonder Stories* and *Astounding Stories of Super-Science*. The field of

science fiction continued to grow in the forties and fifties and during these years, science fiction witnessed an era often referred to as 'The Golden Age'.

In the era called 'The Golden Age', which is certainly not the 'Golden Age' of women, a great number of male writers entered the field. One of the most striking common traits of these male writers was that they all possessed a background in science or technology: Isaac Asimov (biochemistry), Robert Heinlein (naval engineering), Arthur C. Clarke (physics and mathematics) (Rabkin and Scholes 1977, pp. 17-20). In the stories written by these men, women were still invisible or largely presented in stereotypical images. Writer Joanna Russ (qtd. in Le Guin 1979, p. 98) discusses the problem of the misrepresentation of women in these stories by saying that "there were no "real" women characters in these stories, only "images" of women". Ursula Le Guin (1979, p. 98) calls this type of female characters the `Oh?' and `Ooooh!' type, never the clever brave hero, only the admirer.

Traditional science fiction did not just portray female characters stereotypically, but created enormous hurdles for women who attempted to penetrate the masculinist realm of science fiction. In a literary climate in which female heroes were depicted as secondary and inferior compared to male heroes with super powers, women writers found themselves obliged to disguise their female identity by using masculine pseudonyms or initials.

Some, like Alice Mary Norton (Andre Norton), Catherine Lucille Moore (C. L. Moore), Alice Sheldon (James Tiptree Jr.) and Leigh Brackett (George Sanders) were amongst the most popular writers who wrote under masculine pseudonyms or initials to break into the field of science fiction to which they would have no access otherwise. Even the most acclaimed writer of contemporary science fiction and fantasy, Ursula Le

Guin had to write under the initials U. K. Le Guin to be accepted in the conservative atmosphere of the 1960s. As the science fiction writer Susan Schawartz (1982) points out, "1969 was the year that Playboy asked Ursula Le Guin for permission to run 'Nine Lives' (her story of love, clones and extraterrestrial mining) under the byline 'U.K. Le Guin' because, as a Playboy editor put it, "Many of our readers are frightened by stories by women authors.'" It wasn't until the end of the twentieth century that an increasing number of women began to get their sci-fi published. Even then, many kept using male pseudonyms and initials.

There is an interesting anecdote on James Tiptree's passing as a male sci-fi writer for years. Robert Silverberg, a well-known writer and editor of sci-fi introduced the collected works of a new, unknown and pseudonymous writer as follows:

> there is to me something ineluctably masculine about Tiptree's writing(...) his work is analogous to that of Hemingway (...) that prevailing masculinity about both of them – that preoccupation with questions of courage, with absolute values, with the mysteries and passions of life and death as revealed by extreme physical tests (qtd. in Russ, p. 44).

James Tiptree Jr. being a pen name of a retired woman biologist, Robert Silverberg's statement is nothing but an illusion. By associating Tiptree's style with a masculine character due to the writer's preoccupation with "courage, absolute values, mysteries and passion of life", Silverberg actually reveals his conception of sci-fi as an "adventure-minded and action-oriented" genre. Silverberg's statement is also characteristic of a traditional gender narrative which attributes all these qualities (courage, absolute values, mysteries and passion of life) to men. Rosi Braidotti's following statement sheds light on the conception of sci-fi coinciding with relatively traditional gender narratives:

> "As adventure-minded and action oriented tales of exploration, war,
>
> conquest and destruction, science fiction coincides with relatively traditional
>
> gender narratives; it is quite a male-dominated adventure story" (2003 , p.
>
> 151).

As Rosi Braidotti (2003) states above, traditional science fiction is "a quite male-dominated adventure story." However, by struggling so hard to exist within science fiction, women writers somehow proved they were as adventurous as their male counterparts. Despite all the pressures they were subjected to, women writers have not given up the desire to make their voices heard in a field that is largely considered to belong to men. Their exclusion from sci-fi became for women an impulse for raising their feminist consciousness. So, as soon as they found a propitious climate to express themselves, they chose to manipulate genre and gender conventions through the use of various techniques of experimentation.

Women began to access science fiction in the sixties and seventies due to the revival of feminism and the inception of the literary "New Wave" movement. In this period, Ursula Le Guin published the *Left Hand of Darkness* (1969) which is viewed as the first contribution to feminist science fiction. However, the classification of *The Left Hand of Darkness* as a work of feminist science fiction is problematic to many critics for the following reasons:

> Le Guin uses the male pronoun to refer to the biologically androgynous inhabitants of Gethen. Feminist criticism of this novel has focused on the use of the generic "he" and on the choice of a man, Genly Ai, as the main character and interpreter of Gethen. Gethen would have looked different to us if Genly Ai had been a woman (Annas 1978).

James Schellenberg who is an on-line reviewer of sci-fi and fantasy, writes that *The Left Hand of Darkness* "doesn't gracefully fit the category of feminist" since Le Guin's

"anthropological project of creating a culture with depth and history" is "long way off from the typical feminist agenda."

http://www.challengingdestiny.com/reviews/feminist1.htm

I think that Le Guin's controversial feminism depends to a great extent on "her failure to engage fruitfully with linguistic re-ordering of the fictional universe(s)" she created (Davis Logan 2002, p. 36). A similar criticism is directed to Ursula Le Guin by the speculative fiction writer, Samuel Delany who thinks that the sexual politics Le Guin conceived for Annares, the fictional world of *Dispossessed* falls short of being feminist for not having been enhanced by a creative textual politics (qtd. in Logan, 2002, p. 37).

Linguistically experimental or not, as a book tackling the theme of androgyny, Ursula Le Guin's *Left Hand of Darkness* (1969) probably became a source of inspiration for other women writers who, like her, problematised gender issues through androgenised bodies. Marge Piercy is another woman writer who envisioned an androgynous world in *Woman on the Edge of Time* (1976). Marge Piercy and Joanna Russ are two American writers who penned works of feminist speculative fiction through which they deconstructed the traditional patriarchal discourse of science fiction by tackling issues such as women's subjectivity, reproduction, and sexuality and by experimenting with narrative techniques. This new openness and resistance to closure was also shared by writers of the new dystopias of the eighties and nineties (e.g. Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*). Except Ursula Le Guin who I do not consider experimental enough in her use of language, all the above mentioned writers (Marge Piercy, Joanna Russ, Margaret Atwood) are part of my corpus of study. I will

deal with these writers' discursive features in detail in Chapter III of this thesis where I will undertake a discourse analysis of this body of works.

Apart from the above-mentioned feminist speculative writers, many other women have managed to break into the field of science fiction and after many years of invisibility, these writers have finally received prestigious sci-fi awards. While there were a few female winners of the Hugo Award between 1953 (the year of the award's inception) and 1967, between 1968 and 1984 there were eleven female Hugo Award winners. In the 1990s, several scholars like Marleen Barr, Jenny Wolmark, Sarah Lefanu, Jane Donawerth, and Robin Roberts have published extensively on women writers and gender in science fiction and established a body of scholarly works on feminist speculative fiction. A new generation of scholars such as Patricia Melzer and Lisa Yazsek seem to be following the path opened up by the above-cited critics. While science fiction is not deaf to women anymore, the newly emerging feminist speculative fiction seems to have created its own theoretical framework and scholars. At this point, it would be apt to discuss how women became visible within science fiction. Thus, I will now deal with two major movements that enhanced the inclusion of women in science fiction: The *American* New Wave and Second Wave *Feminism.*

From Science Fiction to Speculative Fiction: An Experimental Genre at the Crossroads of the American New Wave and Second Wave Feminism

The 1960s are called 'The Age of Rebellion' of sci-fi by Lester del Rey, an American sci-fi writer and editor. This era witnessed "the advent of the 'New Wave' writers", "feminization of sci-fi audience", inclusion of the female protagonist and "a new

openness about sexuality, sensuality and androgyny" (King, 1984, p. 107). The 1970s are years characterized by the portrayal of "more real, more human, and even more heroic characters." In the 1980s, sci-fi audiences reached maturity with the "steadily increasing percentage of women readers and female characters" and "the girl in sci-fi" who has finally "matured into a woman" (King, 1984 : 207).

As briefly mentioned above, from the 1960s onwards, science fiction, has gone through a considerable change that allowed female writers, characters and readers to be strongly included and well represented in sci-fi genre. This transformation of sci-fi is the consequence of two movements: the literary movement of the New Wave and the political movement of Second Wave feminism.

The New Wave Movement

Although the science fiction genre has provided women writers with imaginative freedom that allowed them to create their fictional worlds more flexibly than in any other genre, sci-fi had first to be transformed thematically and stylistically before it could be used as a potent medium for feminist issues and agendas. The New Wave movement, characterized by an emphasis on style and experimentation, helped a group of women writers transform sci-fi by developing new textual and narrative techniques. At this point, it will be fit to give a brief history of the New Wave movement that is probably not familiar to most of us as much as Second Wave feminism.

Borrowed from *La Nouvelle Vague*[2] in the French cinema, the term New Wave was first applied, by anthologist Judith Merril, to the avant-garde stories published in the British science fiction magazine *New Worlds* for a few years starting in 1964. Although the magazine *New Worlds* had been published since 1946, it was only under Michael Moorcock's editorship eighteen years later that the movement began to flourish (Lupoff 1988: 328). An early contributor to the New Wave is the British writer J. G. Ballard. According to the critic, Richard A. Lupoff, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four* (1949) and Alfred Bester's *The Demolished Man* are forerunners of the speculative fiction promoted by the New Wave movement:

> This movement is characterized by an emphasis on style and experimentation; the structure of the narration could be anything an author found successful. Resulting structural and linguistic experiments, although far from startling in the context of mainstream experimental or avant-garde literature, were startling to readers whose ears had been trained on the pages of *Astounding Science Fiction*. By these criteria, both George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four* (1949) and Alfred Bester's *The Demolished Man* (1953) may be seen as the forerunners of the New Wave (pp.328-329).

Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985) who is often acclaimed by critics for having created an Orwellian vision of near future is, to my mind, a novel that is marked by New Wave movement's literary perspectives. In her article "Orwell and Me", Margaret Atwood (2003) admits George Orwell's influence on her literary production, but she also adds that "she didn't rely on Orwell alone":

> Orwell became a direct model for me much later in my life - in the real 1984, the year in which I began writing a somewhat different dystopia, *The Handmaid's Tale*. By that time I was 44, and I had learned enough about real despotisms - through the reading of history, travel, and my membership in Amnesty International - so that I didn't need to rely on Orwell alone (Atwood, 2003).

Like Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985), Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* (1976) also displays some New Wave features in terms of its use of an

---

[2] *New Wave* is a term coined by the French critic, François Giroud to refer to a group of French filmmakers of the late 1950s and 1960s.

experimental language. Actually, there is not "a formal membership list" of the New Wave writers. From this aspect, the New Wave was subjected to some criticism by those who rejected the New Wave in science fiction, arguing that "the New Wave as a literary movement lacked organization, a broadly accepted credo, or a formal membership list" (Lupoff 1988, p. 328). However, like most scholars, Lupoff maintains that "an identifiable group of writers and editors operating for approximately ten years, from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s, did have an immense impact on the field so that they represented a defacto literary school" (p. 328). Like Lupoff, Joe Bolt and John R. Pfeiffer (1982) also mention a group of writers who were distinguished from the general field for their thematic and stylistic choices:

> (...) the mood of the 1960s was so stark and wrenching that a special group of writers became identified who seemed to express it more appropriately. For lack of a better term they are referred to as the "New Wave", including Aldiss, Ballard, Brunner, Delany, Disch, Ellison, Malzberg, Moorcock, Spinrad, Reed, and Russ (to name a core). These authors were distinguished from the general field for the emphasis on formerly constrained subject matter and literary experiment (Bolt and Pfeiffer p. 131).

Joanna Russ being the "core", but the only female name in the list of the New Wave writers cited above, this list can probably be extended in such a way to include other women writers like "Catherine Moore, Judith Merril, Cele Goldsmith and Leigh Brackett" who were considered by the speculative fiction writer and editor Michael Moorcock[3] as "the true godmothers of the New Wave." From my perspective, mainstream writers like Marge Piercy and Margaret Atwood also seem to have been influenced by the characteristics of the New Wave style in their speculative works.

---

[3] In a memoir about Leigh Brackett reprinted in *Martian Quest*, Michael Moorcock writes: "With Catherine Moore, Judith Merril and Cele Goldsmith, Leigh Brackett is one of the true godmothers of the *New Wave*. Anyone who thinks they're pinching one of my ideas is probably pinching one of hers." http://www.grasslimb.com/sallis/GlobeColumns/globe.09.brackett.html

Although very powerful from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s, the New Wave movement continues to influence female and male writers to our day.

Now, I will deal with the characteristics of the New Wave style in comparison with more traditional science fiction, because as Richard A. Lupoff (p. 328) clearly states, the essential nature of the New Wave science fiction can best be seen in comparison with more traditional science fiction, particularly that categorized as 'pulp'.

In contrast to traditional sci-fi that mostly depicts physical struggles, the New Wave science fiction chooses to foreground, through a more complex narration, fictional characters' moral and psychological ambiguities. Through a futuristic scenario, the New Wave writers make readers think about what would happen if the society was restructured with radical alterations in the psyche and the language. Thus, the New Wave is more focussed on characters' internal conflicts than conflicts between the good protagonist and the bad antagonist. Traditional sci-fi's interest in outer space is shifted towards inner space in the New Wave fiction. In his famous literary manifesto, "Which Way to Inner Space?" (1962), J. G. Ballard[4] (1997) attracts attention to "inner space" as an important site of exploration for speculative fiction:

> "The biggest developments of the immediate future will take place not on the Moon or Mars, but on the Earth, and it is inner space, not outer, that needs to be explored. The only truly alien is Earth" (Ballard, 1996, p. 1997).

J. G. Ballard's emphasis on the Earth as "the only truly alien" is also shared by Roberta Rogow, who, in her *Futurespeak* (1991) has mentioned the New Wave's concern for the "Alien in Us":

---

[4] In 1970s, J.G. Ballard rebuilds "inner space" within a technological landscape or "technoscape" through a trilogy consisting of *Crash* (1973), *Concrete Island* (1973) and *High-Rise* (1975).

"There are few certainties in New Wave SF, and Aliens are regarded in a more reasonable (if not affectionate) light. Battles are not "us against them"; in the post-Vietnam America, "Us" is as likely to be the Enemy as "Them" (Rogow, 1991, p. 227).

As can be inferred from the above quotation, the New Wave can be said to have changed the speculative fiction writer's conception of the "Alien." The extraterrestrial creatures that represent the other worlds in the traditional sci-fi are often replaced in speculative fiction by human and humanoid individuals. This changing conception of the Alien resonates also in the language of speculative fiction so that the Alien in speculative fiction generally speaks a "deconstructed" language that is not completely invented and can be understandable without the author's inclusion of a bilingual glossary at the end of the book.

Joe Bolt and John R. Pfeiffer (1981) give some information on textual and narrative strategies used by the New Wave Writers:

In literary art and craft, The New Wave authors introduced to SF techniques long common in the mainstream. Their characters were unique and complex, not stereotypes. Narratives featured stream of consciousness, word play, prose/poetry counterpoint, and scenario-structuring techniques borrowed from such nonprint media as radio, film, television. In addition, they were often appallingly erudite, employing eclectic vocabulary and displaying consummate control of the esoteric detail of virtually all sciences (De Bolt and Pfeiffer, 1981, p. 131).

Word play, a commonly used strategy in speculative fiction and a significant device in foregrounding the speculative feminist worlds occupies a central place in my thesis. To my mind, the New Wave movement that obviously seems to have influenced the writers in my corpus can be distinguished from the traditional sci-fi by the following traits:

- Stylistic experimentation techniques.

- Interest in "inner space" (identity-related issues) instead of "outer space" (technology-related issues).

- Use of soft sciences, and especially the social sciences (anthropology, sociology, psychology, political science, and so on) rather than hard sciences (for example, physics, astronomy, or chemistry).

- More courageous treatment of taboo themes such as sexuality and gender.

- Tendency to re-baptise this innovative writing style as "speculative fiction"[5] instead of fantasy or science fiction.

After mentioning the main traits of the New Wave, I would like to introduce some critical points on the New Wave. Sci-fi traditionalists such as Sam Moskowitz, John J. Pierce, Isaac Asimov, Lester del Rey and Stanislav Lem have cited the following aspects critically:

- Pessimistic tone

- Technophobia

- Use of literary paradigms as surrealism

William Sims Bainbridge responds to the criticism on the sense of despair in speculative fiction as follows:

> "Critics find the new wave pessimistic and pathological. But even in its darkest stories, the new wave exalts human spirit, because the author becomes a hunter in the forests of the night, bagging the biggest wild game

---

[5] The only writer in my corpus who insistently considers herself as a" speculative fiction" writer is Margaret Atwood. Joanna Russ and Marge Piercy never insist on being called "speculative fiction" writers. They usually place their works in a "feminist utopian" context. However, unlike Samuel Delany, they never reject any attempts to call them "speculative writers".

of all, the monsters of the id and cultural repression." (qtd. in Lupoff, 1988, p. 330)

In complete agreement with Bainbridge, I think that despair and hope go hand by hand in speculative fiction. As a response to the criticism on technophobia, I could say that all the books in my corpus somehow represent technology: Margaret Atwood's *the Handmaid's Tale* is marked by feminist skepticism towards reproductive technologies of the future. However, as Patricia Melzer (2006) clearly states in her *Alien Constructions*:

> "Joanna Russ's the *Female Man* and Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* both anticipated the complex workings of technology in later feminist science fiction by exploring the advantages of feminist technologies" (p. 178).

Thus, let alone being technophobic, feminist writers such as Marge Piercy and Joanna Russ embrace technology to achieve women's liberation. The use of reproductive technology for feminist purposes is theoretically based on radical feminist Shulamith Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex* (1970), in which the author defends that gender inequality would be suppressed if cybernetic techniques were used to carry out human reproduction in laboratories. In brief, feminist speculative writers don't fear technology, as argued by some critics. On the contrary, they embrace technology as a vehicle of liberation for women.

As for the use of surrealist techniques in speculative fiction, it is not "an indication of poverty" as argued by the Polish sci-fi writer, Stanislav Lem (qtd. in Lundwall 1971, p. 233). Contrary to what Lem argues, this experimental technique is

not a 'surrealist' alternative to "'the realism' in the 'serious' sci-fi." Given its

deconstructive capacity, speculative experimentalism is actually a very 'realist'

alternative to "masculine realism" in traditional sci-fi. Interestingly, even Barry N.

Malzberg who is often considered as a speculative fiction writer was critical of the New

Wave at some point. Although the New Wave was subjected to some criticism as any

other innovative movement that deviates from the canon, it still stands out as a source of

inspiration for writers who want to challenge the traditional sci-fi. Scholars keep

discussing the New Wave, sometimes by broadening the scope of the concept, as did

William Sims Bainbridge:

> While Malzberg feels that the New Wave came into this sudden and
> depressing end, other disagree. William Sims Bainbridge, a professor of
> sociology at Harvard University, applies the term new wave in a broad
> sense, taking in much socially and psychologically oriented SF, whether it
> involves the stylistic experimentation associated with the *New Worlds*/New
> Wave school or not (Lupoff, 1988, p. 330).

To conclude this section, I could say that the New Wave, which had a deep impact on

the experimental style of the books in my corpus, has fulfilled a significant poetological

function by incorporating in*nova*tive textual strategies into the sci-fi genre. However,

the political force behind feminist speculative fiction was certainly Second Wave

feminism. In conjunction with the feminist spirit revived by Second Wave feminism, the

New Wave has offered female writers an experimental style that can be used to subvert

the masculinist language of traditional sci-fi. The experimentation technique introduced

by the New Wave, has many similarities with the *écriture feminine* of the *Third Wave*,

which I will discuss in the section entitled "Objectivity, Subjectivity and

Representational Politics: Some Feminist Epistemological Perspectives."

The Second Wave Feminism

While the New Wave influenced both male and female writers, the Second Wave feminism mostly inspired female writers who, in their works, employed foregrounded elements such as word play and neologisms to criticize gender constructions of patriarchal society. All the writers in my corpus are closely related to feminism. These writers' relationship to feminist ideology based on their own discourse on feminism is discussed next. In the following quotation, Joanna Russ expresses how becoming a feminist changed her literary perspective:

> Long before I became a feminist in any explicit way (my first reaction upon hearing Kate Millet speak in 1968 was that of course every women knew that but if you ever dared to formulate it to yourself, let alone say it out loud, God would kill you with a lightning bolt) I had turned from writing love stories about women in which women were losers, and adventure stories about men in which the men were winners, to writing adventure stories about a woman in which the woman won. It was one of the hardest things I ever did in my life" (qtd. in Cortiel, 1999, pp. 22-23)

Joanna Russ's statement shows that her discovery of feminism had a deep impact on her writing while driving her to find ways of representing women as being strong in her stories. As for Marge Piercy who is another writer in my corpus, she assumes her identity as a feminist. The following statement from Marge Peircy's web site is the writer's answer to the "FAQ" question: "Do you consider yourself a feminist? (Or, the variation: Why are you a feminist?)"

> Yes, I consider myself a feminist. I was involved in the second wave of feminism when it began, basically around 1966 and I remain politically active and involved. Why am I a feminist? I was born a woman. I can't imagine not identifying strongly as a woman and not wanting things to be better and safer and more fun and less dangerous for myself and other women.
>
> http://www.margepiercy.com/interviews/faqs.htm#5

As should be evident from the above statement, Marge Piercy's has been in a "politically active" relationship with feminism. This political activism undoubtedly resonates in her textual politics. A writer's assertion of her feminist identity can be an indication of her consciousness of and sensitivity to gender issues. However, the writer's consciousness of gender issues, as it is reflected on her work, is more important than her assertion of a feminist identity. More precisely, a writer can have an ambivalent relationship with feminism, but she might still adopt some thematic and stylistic choices that intersect with those of feminists. Margaret Atwood is one of the writers who does not feel very comfortable about being labeled as 'feminist' although her *Handmaid's Tale* has often been considered a feminist masterpiece:

> "If you're a woman and a writer, does the combination of gender and vocation automatically make you a feminist, and what does that mean exactly? You shouldn't put a good man into your books, even though you may in real life have managed to dig up a specimen or two?" (Atwood, 2002, pp. 106-107).

As can be inferred from her statement, Margaret Atwood approaches the label of feminist cautiously by thinking that such a categorization could negatively influence the representation of men in her books. Although she is so wary of picking up a "feminist" label, Margaret Atwood has always had a "feminist" consciousness, from the early stages of her literary career. Apart from *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985) that is considered a feminist masterpiece, the novels such as *The Edible Woman* (1969), *Surfacing* (1972), *Lady Oracle* (1976), *Life before Man* (1979), *Bodily Harm* (1981), *Cat's Eye* (1988), *The Robber Bride* (1993) have brought Atwood's "feminist" consciousness to the surface. Her poem "Spelling", for example, depicts the victimization of powerless

women without language. If I formulate it in her own terms, Atwood (2002 : 107) is not "an F-word feminist in a strict ideological sense" but her works say a lot about her "feminist" consciousness. In this sense, she reminds me of Julia Kristeva, who, in a similar way, rejected the label of feminist, but made big the contributions to feminist thinking with her writings. The quotation below illustrates Margaret Atwood's observation of the male dystopian writer's stereotyped representation of women as "sexless automatons" or "rebels acting as the temptresses of the male protagonist":

> The majority of dystopias - Orwell's included - have been written by men, and the point of view has been male. When women have appeared in them, they have been either sexless automatons or rebels who have defied the sex rules of the regime. They have acted as the temptresses of the male protagonists, however welcome this temptation may be to the men themselves" (Atwood, 2003).

As a response to the traditional dystopian novels written from a male perspective, Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* is a speculative novel from a female perspective:

> "Thus Julia; thus the cami-knicker-wearing, orgy-porgy seducer of the
>
> Savage in *Brave New World*; thus the subversive femme fatale of Yevgeny
>
> Zamyatin's 1924 seminal classic, *We*. I wanted to try a dystopia from the
>
> female point of view - the world according to Julia, as it were" (Atwood,
>
> 2003).

In *The Handmaid's Tale*, Margaret Atwood tries a dystopia from the female point of view, but she still hesitates to consider this work feminist since she thinks that giving a woman a voice is not ideological, but natural:

"However, this does not make *The Handmaid's Tale* a "feminist dystopia", except insofar as giving a woman a voice and an inner life will always be considered "feminist" by those who think women ought not to have these things" (Atwood 2003).

Although Margaret Atwood is wary of the categorization as "feminist writer", she is considerably influenced by the ideas propagated by Second Wave feminism. Dr. Fiona Tolan who won the Margaret Atwood Society's Best Book Award in 2007 for her work, *Margaret Atwood: Fiction and Feminism* (2007) charts the relationship between Atwood's fiction and the history of Second Wave feminism. She examines in-depth how Second Wave feminism affected Atwood's literary choices.

The mid-sixties were crucial years of revival and restructuring for feminist movements in both theoretical and practical terms. Inspired by the idea of social equity prompted by the civil rights movement in this period, a group of women writers enthusiastically engaged in the reshaping of science fiction through female lenses. In her essay entitled "Prospects for Women in Writing" (1989), Ursula Le Guin also refers to the sixties as a period during which most women writers rediscovered the subversive nature of their writing:

"There is no more subversive act than the act of writing from a woman's experience of life using a woman's judgement. Woolf knew that and said it in 1930. Most of us forgot it and had to rediscover it all over again in the sixties" (Le Guin, 1989a, pp. 177-178).

Like Ursula Le Guin, in his *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*, John Clute (1995) also points out that the 1960s were a turning point in science fiction history:

> "In the 1960s the genre of science fiction took a different turn, combining its existing sensationalism with political and technological critique of society. With the advent of feminism, questioning women's roles became fair game to this subversive, mind expanding genre" (p. 424).

The late 1960s and 1970s were the years during which writers such as Joanna Russ (1937-), Ursula K. Le Guin (1929-), Marion Zimmer Bradley (1930-1999), Marge Piercy (1936), Sally Miller Gearhart (1931), Suzy McKee Charnas, Sheri Stewart Tepper (1929), Anne Inez McCaffrey (1926) Kate Wilhelm (1928) and Dorothy Bryant (1930), began to turn their attention toward gender issues by writing explicitly feminist speculative fiction. These female writers' choice of writing within the speculative genre was first of all a reaction to masculinist sci-fi that was inaccessible to women for long time. Secondly and most importantly, the speculative genre differed considerably from mainstream or straight fiction by providing female writers with larger liberties of expression through a science fictional world. The writer Joanna Russ considers the language of science fiction as a site of possibilities:

> "The language in science fiction functions differently, the conventions are different, the sorts of expectations you bring to these texts are different, the kinds of inferences readers have to make are different. Science fiction provides a wonderful, open-ended possibility to authors in the way they can use language" (qtd. in McCaffery, 1990, pp. 176-177).

Interestingly, speculative fiction's freedom from constraints of realism have also been prolifically exploited in mainstream texts by Margaret Atwood and Marge Piercy. Thus, in Pamela Sargent's terms (1988), speculative fiction becomes "the mainstream's heart":

> "In the early 1970s, SF itself became a matter for serious study in the literature and humanities department of American universities. All the moods, traditions, and resources of SF coalesced. (...) There was a convergence of the mainstream with the SF writers' ghetto, which strongly implied that once-unthinkable proposition –science fiction or "speculative fiction"- might indeed become the mainstream's heart" (p. 510).

Two key early texts of the feminist revival were Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Left Hand of Darkness* (1969) and Joanna Russ's *The Female Man* (1970). These texts served to highlight the socially constructed nature of gender roles by creating alternative worlds. In James Gunn's *The New Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* (1988), Pamela Sargent (1988) concludes as follows:

> "All these novels raise questions about the role of women and emphasize the fact that, in both SF and the real world, women and men are still far from true equality" (p. 524).

As Pamela Sargent rightly points out above, all the novels in my corpus raise questions about the role of women and they produce more questions than answers about the changing power differentials' possible effects on women's lives. To recapitulate, while the incorporation of experimentation into science fiction is a consequence of the literary New Wave movement, the integration of gender-based critique into speculative fiction is a consequence of Second Wave Feminism, which provided women writers with a propitious climate to make their "voices" heard after many years of silence. Seen from this angle, the 1960s and the early 1970s can be considered the "feminist turn" in sci-fi.

In the foregrounding-based discourse analysis I will carry out in Chapter III, I will analyse feminist textual strategies that foreground gender-based word play and neologisms deployed by the writers in my corpus. Now, I would like to briefly discuss my usage of speculative fiction as an umbrella term.

The Place of Sci-Fi and Feminist Speculative Fiction in Turkey

The sci-fi genre's development in Turkey is obviously different from its development in the world for many reasons. This difference is important since it necessarily affects translation and reception of sci-fi in Turkey. In this section, I will take arguments formulated by a number of Turkish intellectuals involved in sci-fi as writers, translators or editors as my starting point, I will attempt to analyze why the sci-fi genre has followed a different development path in Turkey and question the implications of this for sci-fi translation. In *Metis* translation journal's special issue devoted to science fiction (1991), we encounter interesting debates on science fiction's place and problems in Turkey. In an interview included in the beginning of this issue under the title "On Science Fiction, Its Language and Translation", Orhan Duru (1991) who is one of the few writers who also produced works in sci-fi, questions why sci-fi occupies a secondary place in the Turkish literary canon:

> Ben edebiyatımızın fazla gerçekçi olduğunu düşünüyorum: köy edebiyatı, toplumsal sorunlar, en önemlisi kendi yaşamını alıp, "hayattan gerçek parçalarla" anı roman yazanlar… Oysa bizim toplumumuz düş kurabilmeli hayal kurabilmeli. Gerçi çocukluğumuzdan beri masallarla büyüyoruz. İslam kültüründe ki biz de bunun bir parçasıyız, masallar, ütopyalar var. Bugünse düş kurmak neredeyse ayıp. Ben edebiyatımızda fazla kurgu göremediğim için, bilim

kurgu da olmayan bir şey üzerine kurgu kurmak, gerçekten bir öykü oluşturmak gerektirdiği için yararlı olacağını düşündüm (p. 16).

I think that our literature is too realist: books of village literature, books dealing with social problems and mostly memoir books made out of real-life fragments…However, our society must be able to dream, to imagine. It is true that we grow up with tales. The Islamic culture of which we are a part has a tradition based on stories and utopias. But today, it is almost shameful to have imagination. When I discovered that there are few examples of fictional works in our literature, I thought that it could be useful to write sci-fi because sci-fi meant to construct something fictional that does not exist in real life (p. 16).

As will be inferred from Duru's statement, sci-fi's secondary place in Turkey largely owes to the fact that the Turkish literary tradition has been influenced by social realism rather than magical realism. The Turkish cinema of the 1950s-1970s is also characterized by the same trend. Social realism may be said to prevail in Turkish literature for a long time, until the Nobel lauriate Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* (1990, 1995 *Black Book*) "represented a definite break with the governing social realism in Turkish literature." (http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2006/bio-bibl.html)

In his article entitled "Orhan Pamuk: A Novelist Where the Currents Cross", Peter Byrne also draws attention to Orhan Pamuk's rupture with social realism:

He did in fact begin writing twenty-five years ago with a definite bias against "social realism" and didacticism. He found the generation of Turkish writers who preceded him, which included the giants Nazim Hikmet and Yashar Kemal, to be excessively concerned with putting across political and moral doctrines. The emphasis on "social commentary" hurt their art. (http://www.swans.com/library/art12/pbyrne07.html)

Thus, Orhan Pamuk's novelty lies in his breaking with the long-established tradition of social realism and didacticism that goes back to the mid-nineteenth century. Social realism is also the most dominant literary ideology in the Republican period, which begins with the foundation of the Turkish Republic by Mustafa Kemal in 1923 and

continues to the present day. One of the most prominent Turkish literature scholars, Talat Sait Halman also highlights, in his *Overview of Turkish Literature*, social realism's long-term effect:

> Since the mid-nineteenth century, the most vital debate of Turkish literature has been between the proponents of art for art's sake and the advocates of commitment to realism and social causes. Mustafa Kemal himself, in a conversation that took place in 1921, about two years before he proclaimed the Republic, exhorted the nineteen-year-old Nazım Hikmet, already a famous poet, who would soon embrace the Communist ideology and influence the course of modern Turkish literature, particularly poetry, more profoundly than anyone else, to "write poems with a purpose." The advice was heeded by each generation of writers since then, giving rise to patriotic verse in abundance on the one hand, and to socialist realism on the other. http://www.tedaproject.com/TR/Genel/dg.ashx?BELGEANAH=248999&DIL=1 &DOSYAISIM=talat.pdf.

Briefly, the common trend of social realism could be seen as one of the factors that prevented the sci-fi genre to develop in Turkey. However, there are also other factors underlying sci-fi's immature and retarded development in Turkey:

The sci-fi critic, Bülent Somay who always harshly criticizes Turkish intelligentsia's insufficient use of positivism repeats the same arguments in a most recent article:

> Türkiye'de neden polisiye ya da bilimkurgu yazılmaz?' yollu sızlanmalarımızın temel cevabı budur diye düşünüyorum: Çünkü Türkiye (ve Osmanlı) popüler kültürü, tekinsizi, bilinmeyeni evcilleştirebilecek, açıklarmış gibi yapacak düşünsel araçlardan yoksundur. Kuşkusuz pozitivizme ve rasyonalizme aşina aydınlar arasından bu türlerde yazma denemeleri çıkmıştır, ancak şöyle bir açmazla: Bu düşünce sistemlerine aşina olan aydın çoğunluğu da popüler edebiyat yazmaya gönül indiremezler bir türlü, daha 'elit' türleri tercih ederler; ya şiir ya da tiyatro oyunu yazarlar ya da gerçekçi roman. 1990'larda Ahmet Ümit, Celil Oker gibi yazarlar polisiyenin bu ülkede de doğru dürüst yazılabileceğini gösterdiler; bilimkurgu ise bu kadar şanslı olamadı, birkaç deneme dışında kalıcı, sürekliliği olan bir bilimkurgu edebiyatı yeşeremedi Türkiye'de.
>
> (http://www.bilimkurgu2000.com/makaleler/Mak51.asp)
>
> As a response to lamentations on why there are no detective fiction or science fiction writers in Turkey, I could say that Turkish and (Ottoman) culture are deprived of the intellectual tools that could serve to familiarize, to seem to reveal what was spooky and unfamiliar. Among the intellectuals who are acquainted

with positivism and rationalism, there had certainly been some who had attempted to write in these genres, but this was also an impasse because the majority of them didn't condescend to popular fiction and preferred to write more "elite" genres so they wrote either poetry or drama or realist fiction. In 1990s, writers such as Ahmet Ümit, Celil Oker showed that good detective novels could also be written in this country. However, science fiction was not so lucky in the sense that, except a few attempts, a sci-fi literature that has continuity could not grow up in Turkey.

(http://www.bilimkurgu2000.com/makaleler/Mak51.asp)

All these statements place a common emphasis on the non-existence of a long and established sci-fi tradition in Turkey, which is due to two main reasons:

- literary reason: the long-term centrality of social realism in the Turkish literary canon

- social reason: the lack of positivist thinking and scientifism in Turkish society

Although some critics such as Bülent Somay argues that Kemalist positivist ideals are not internalized by some intellectual circles as much as necessary, they seem to have played a certain role in the choice of "hardcore" science fiction to be translated into Turkish:

"(…) ülkemizde Kemalist aydınlanma ideallerinin hala ne kadar gücünü koruduğunu düşünürsek, 1950'ler Amerikası'nın bu bilim ve teknoloji fetişisti bilimkurgusunun bugün hala Türkiye'de popülerliğini korumasına şaşmamak gerek belki de" (Güney, 2007, p. 43).

"Given the fact that the Kemalist modernization ideals are still strong in Turkey, it is perhaps not surprising that technology and science-based American hardcore sci-fi of 1950s is still popular in Turkey." (Güney 2007 : 43)

33

Although hardcore science fiction has become popular in Turkey, as stated above by Murat Güney, there was actually a delay in the development of sci-fi genre in Turkey. In a climate in which even hardcore science fiction had difficulty to boom, it would not be so difficult to understand why feminist speculative fiction could not emerge. When we also take into account the delay in the development of the feminist movement in Turkey, we understand better why feminist speculative fiction stayed so immature in Turkey. Müge İplikçi draws attention to the lack of feminist speculative writers in Turkey as follows:

> Geçmişi masala bu kadar yatkın bur toplumda çağdaş masalların yeni yeni söylenmeye başladığı bir ülke Türkiye. Ancak bu çağdaş masal anlatıcılar hâlâ kadın değil. Hâlâ Türkiye'de kadın bilimkurgucu yok. Oysa tüm bu zaman ve mekânları bölmeye, gölgeleştirmeye şiddetle ihtiyacımız var. Yani karşıt – ütopyaların "kadın" sesine.
> http://www.milliyet.com.tr/ozel/kitap/utopya/muge.html

> In Turkey, which has a very old story-telling tradition, contemporary tales only started to be told very recently. However, narrators of these tales are still not women. There is still no woman sci-fi writer in Turkey. Yet, we are desperately in need of deconstructing the boundary of time/space. We need the "female" voice of anti-utopias.

Müge İplikçi rightly criticizes the lack of feminist speculative writers in Turkey above. While there are no feminist speculative writers in Turkey, there are just a few feminist speculative works, which have been translated into Turkish. For example, Ursula Leguin is undoubtedly the most translated woman speculative fiction writer in Turkey. In the appendix IV, you will find a short bibliography of women's speculative fiction translated into Turkish. However, needless to say that the list of untranslated feminist speculative works is much longer than that of translated women speculative writers in Turkey.

The following are some of the feminist speculative writers who still have not been translated into Turkish: Katharine Burdekin, Octavia Butler, Suzette Elgin

Hayden, Margaret Cavendish, Nicola Grifith, Charlotte Haldane, Katherine Maclean, Vonda McIntyre, Judith Merrill, Naomi Mitchison, C.L. Moore, Andre Norton, Leslie F. Stone, Sherri Tepper, James K. Tiptree Jr. This list can definitely be extended. Now, I would like to mention how the term speculative fiction came into usage.

Speculative Fiction as an Umbrella Term

The term "speculative fiction" was coined by the popular "hard-core" science fiction writer, Robert A. Heinlein. In his essay entitled "On Writing of Speculative Fiction" (1948), Heinlein explicitly used the term synonymously with "science fiction." But the term speculative fiction was forgotten for the next fifteen years until it was resurrected with the New Wave movement in the 1960s and brought a completely new meaning into a new context. British SF magazine *New Worlds* played a major role in popularising the term speculative fiction. Invested with a new meaning, speculative fiction referred now to the experimental science fiction under the New Wave influence. One of the writers in my corpus, Margaret Atwood describes herself as a "speculative fiction" writer by rejecting the label of "science fiction writer". In her essay "Writing Oryx and Crake", Atwood (2005) explains why her works such as *The Handmaid's Tale*, *Orynx and Crake* must be considered as speculative fiction:

> "Like *The Handmaid's Tale*, *Oryx and Crake* is a speculative fiction, not a science fiction proper. It contains no intergalactic space travel, no teleportation, no Martians" (p. 285).

Margaret Atwood's above statement sheds light on the main traits of speculative fiction. Speculative fiction seems to came into usage again. In 1996, an interdisciplinary

feminist journal *FEMSPEC* was founded to revitalize interest in feminist speculative fiction. Today, editors, readers, academics and some writers use speculative fiction as an umbrella term to refer to science fiction, utopian, dystopian, fantasy and mystery genres. Science fiction as a genre that consists of many sub-genres, the use of an inclusive term can sometimes be very helpful for critics and researchers. However, scholars keep inventing new terms to refer to feminist texts authored by women and men.

The scholar Marleen Barr (1992) who popularised the term "feminist speculative fiction" in the academy, recently coined the terms "feminist fabulation" and "feminist fabulator" thus broadening the scope of the terms "feminist speculative fiction" and "feminist speculative fiction writer" in such a way as to include all feminist texts by men and women (p. xiii). Barr defines "feminist fabulation" as "a supergenre of women's writing (...) which includes works now thought of as mainstream, SF, fantasy, supernatural, and utopian as well as feminist texts men author" (p. xiii). Thus, Marleen Barr's "feminist fabulation" signals "a new understanding of postmodern fiction which enables the canon to accommodate feminist difference and emphasizes that the literature which was called feminist SF is an important site of postmodern feminist difference" (p. xv)

In coining the term "feminist fabulation", Marleen Barr is inspired by the term "fabulator", which the literary critic, Robert Scholes first used in *The Fabulators* (1967) and then expanded upon in his *Fabulation and Metafiction* (1979). As used by Robert Scholes, the term "fabulation" refers to a large body of mostly 20th century novels that stylistically deviate from traditional realism and novelistic romance by displaying magical realist features. In this sense, "fabulation" seems to be a precursor term to the

concept of "postmodernism." For example, John Barth was called a fabulist long before he was considered a "postmodernist."

Although Marleen Barr connects Scholes's "fabulation" with "feminism", the usage of the term "feminist speculative fiction" still seems to be more common among critics and scholars[6]. From my perspective, the term "feminist fabulation", by covering both "mainstream" and "postmodern" fiction", blurs "generic" aspects of a type of feminist fiction that intentionally operate within the boundaries of science fictional, utopian and dystopian worlds. Writers of feminist utopias and dystopias use deconstruction, but constructing utopian and dystopian worlds is not a generic aspect of postmodern literature. The postmodern qualities of feminist utopias and dystopias are an already controversial issue. In her article "Post-modernism and Feminist Science Fiction" Robin Roberts (1990) considers many works of feminist SF published in 1980s, including *the Handmaid's Tale* (1985) as "post-modern":

> Many works of feminist SF published in the 1980s focus on language and reveal a post-structuralist sensibility to the power and contradiction inherent in communication. More significantly, their authors criticize the use of language for creating hierarchy and domination. At the same time, they themselves use language to expose hierarchies of dominance embedded in the practice of science. In this regard, these feminist SF writers modernize, or more accurately, post-modernize the issues that dominate SF (...) (pp. 138-139)

Robin Roberts (1990) mentions above "using language to expose hierarchies of dominance." To expose hierarchies of dominance, for whatever reason, means according to some critics, to be very concerned with power and control, and this may not compatible with a postmodern approach. In her article "The Changing of the Avant Garde: The Feminist Utopia" in which she dealt comparatively with feminist discourse

---

[6] Many scholars use the term "feminist speculative fiction." For exp, Rosinsky, Natalie M (1984) *Feminist Futures: Contemporary Women's Speculative Fiction*, UMI Research Press.

theorists and utopian authors like Marge Piercy and Joanna Russ, Jean Phaelzer (1988)

argues that feminist utopias are not post-modernist:

> Although feminist utopias do distort time to propose alternative politics, I would argue that they are not postmodernist. And they are not entropic. Feminist utopian novels, from the linear *Herland* to the deconstructionist *Les Guerill☐res*, are very much concerned with power, ownership, and control. Are not issues of parenting, sexuality, collective work, harmonious ecology, and technology very much issues of power, ownership, and control? (p. 291)

Jean Phaelzer's question is really very suggestive. Although, in the section entitled

"Feminist Speculative Fiction as "a Powerful, Infidel Hetereglossia", I maintain that

"the encounter of the Self with the Other is re-imagined, in feminist speculative fiction,

without privileging only an empowered female discourse", I think that "the exposition

of power through language" is sufficient to make these texts infidel to postmodernism.

There is undoubtedly a strong element in these texts that allow us to call them

"feminist." In this case, the term "feminist fabulation" can be said not to be suitable to

describe these works that are heteroglot, but not postmodernist. In her article "A New

Alliance of Postmodernism and Feminist Speculative Fiction: Barr's Feminist

Fabulation", Veronica Hollinger (1993) also draws attention to Marleen Barr's hastiness

to identify all feminist speculative fiction as postmodern fiction:

> "Barr has, I think, been too hasty in her claim that all feminist SF-all feminist
>
> speculative fiction, in fact--can be identified as postmodern fiction." (Hollinger,
>
> 1993)

Another criticism I would like to raise against the term "feminist fabulation" is

that this term is empty of historical context. Although the writer, Samuel Delany (1990)

criticises the term "speculative fiction" for being "uninformed, anti-historical, and

promoting only mystification", I suggest that "speculative fiction" has a historical content that goes back to the literary New Wave movement. The New Wave writers' re-baptising their works as "speculative fiction" inscribes the term with a historical meaning. Thus, the conceptual transformation of the term "speculative fiction" since its inception by Robert Heinlein can be schematized as follows:

- In 1950s, speculative fiction = science fiction (introduced by Robert Heinlein, a popular usage)

- In 1960s, 1970s, speculative fiction = the experimental New Wave fiction (introduced by Judith Merrill, a popular usage)

- Around the mid 1970s, speculative fiction = a term that fell into disuse

- The late 1980s, speculative fiction or the New Wave fiction = socially and psychologically oriented SF, whether it involves stylistic experimentation or not (an idiosyncratic usage by William Sims Bainbridge)

- The early 1990s, (feminist) speculative fiction = "feminist fabulation" or feminist postmodern fiction. (an idiosyncratic usage by Marleen Barr)

- From the early 1980s to our day, speculative fiction = an umbrella term that encompasses science fiction, utopian, dystopian, mystery genres. (a popular usage)

Now, I would like to clarify why I prefer to use the term "speculative" fiction to refer to the body of works whose translation and reception were analysed within the framework of this thesis. The books in my corpus are sometimes called "feminist science fiction" by scholars. Although they resort to science fictional tropes, these books result from a

critique of traditional sci-fi and most importantly, they use New Wave style and experimentation. Therefore, "speculative" fiction seems to be the term that best describes the books in my corpus that are sometimes seen to be named differently: feminist utopia, feminist dystopia, feminist science fiction. Ursula Le Guin (1989) for exemple considers the term "utopia" inadequate to for contemporary works like Joanna Russ's the Female Man and her own *Always Coming Home*:

"Some people have been writing utopian novels which get called utopian; but the word fit them only if we totally defined it and could ignore its connotations, such as didacticism, unrealism, and unreadability" (p. 8).

As Le Guin (1989) clearly states above, utopianism of feminist speculative works is very different from that of traditional utopias. The wide variety of the terms used to refer to the books in my corpus is another reason that led me to adopt an umbrella term. Now, I would like to discuss objectivity, subjectivity and representational politics of feminist speculative fiction by using a theoretical framework that consists of feminist epistemologists' and poststructuralist feminists' perspectives.

Objectivity, Subjectivity and Representational Politics: Some Feminist Epistemological Perspectives

Although Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818) is generally regarded as the initiator of the genre of science fiction (Cranny-Francis, 1990, p. 8), science fiction was long a male-dominated genre from which women writers were excluded. This exclusion depended on the very idea that the relationship between women and science/technology could never be strong. Given the fact that Western metaphysics creates a clear binary opposition between "irrational" women and "rational" men, it is not difficult to understand why science and technology which have been thought to be highly rational

realms were traditionally identified with men. Interestingly, throughout history, women's sexual difference has been used as "evidence" to judge their intellectual capacities believed to be lower than those of men. Citing sexual differences again as "evidence", nineteenth-century anatomists claimed that "women's development had been arrested at a lower stage of evolution" while "eighteenth century craniologists analyzed the skulls of men and women, whites and blacks, hoping to measure more exactly the intellectual capacities of each of these groups." (Schiebinger 1989, p. 206)

In her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Mary Wollstonecraft (1792) ironically takes up the association of irrationality with women:

> My own sex, I hope, will excuse me if I treat them like *rational* creatures. I earnestly wish to point out in what true dignity and human happiness consists - I wish to persuade women to acquire strength, both of mind and body. Dismissing those pretty feminine phrases, which the men condescendingly use to soften our slavish dependence, and despising that weak elegancy of mind, exquisite sensibility and sweet docility of manners, supposed to be sexual characteristics of the weaker vessel, I wish to show that...the first object of laudable ambition is to obtain a character as a human being, regardless of the distinction of sex; and that secondary views should be brought to this simple touchstone (pp. 8-10).

An eighteenth century liberal feminist and Mary Shelley's mother, Mary Wollstonecraft explains that her own sex deserves to be treated like *rational* creatures since both mind and body can be strengthened, "regardless of the distinction of sex." Although she doesn't say so explicitly, Wollstonecraft means here "strengthening mind through education." Like several other liberal egalitarian feminists of her time, Wollstonecraft seems to support the equal right to education as a remedy to women's absence in the fields of knowledge. Fortunately, today's women don't have to struggle for many liberal civic rights eighteenth century feminist had to. In many parts of the world, women have education and voting rights. However, regardless of their geographic, cultural, economic

and social environment, women still have to struggle against other forms of oppression and patriarchal challenges. For instance, women are still looking for the ways of existing in some traditionally masculinist fields that have not been accessible to them for so long. Science and science fiction that are most frequently characterized by women's non-representation or misrepresentation are among those fields in which women have to struggle to exist. The question is: how to exist in these fields without being critical of epistemological and ontological structures underlying them?

Feminist scholarship that emerged in 1970s and put into question gender constructs, which have been produced and disseminated through scientific texts of masculinist and exclusive character, also discussed women's relationship to objectivity, rationality and knowledge which appear as pre-requisites to women's admission to the scientific community. In this context, some contemporary feminists focussed on the problem of female objectivity in relation to gender roles and very reminiscently of Mary Wollstonecraft's utterances on "strengthening (female) mind", they ended up arguing that women's scientific and objective thinking would be strengthened if there were a transformation in gender roles like child-rearing. For instance, feminist epistemologists of science who base their work on the "object-relations theory" assumed that the transformation of social relations between the sexes, and especially the relationship of both sexes to children, could create new relations with nature and new forms of scientific understanding. To attain objectivity being a primary goal for this group of feminists, some other feminists like Sandra Harding and Donna Haraway adopt a counter-approach by directing the following questions: Whose science? Whose knowledge? Whose objectivity? Why couldn't there be a feminist version of objectivity?

Drawing upon the insights of "feminist standpoint epistemology", Sandra Harding sought to replace current models of objectivity with a new form of "stronger objectivity" in such a way to include the experiences of women who have been traditionally left out of the production of knowledge. Harding (1986) who considers women's experiences and social values as a basis for generating knowledge states in a much quoted passage :

> (W)hen we began theorizing our experiences during the second women's movement a mere decade and a half ago, we knew our task would be a difficult though exciting one. But I doubt that in our wildest dreams we ever imagined that we would have to reinvent science and theorizing itself in order to make sense of women's social experience (p. 252).

While mentioning "reinventing science", Harding means reconstructing objectivity rather than simply embracing total relativism. Donna Haraway (1988) is another feminist who calls for a "feminist objectivity" based on "situated knowledges":

> "I would like a doctrine of embodied objectivity that accommodates paradoxical and critical feminist science projects: Feminist objectivity means quite simply *situated knowledges*" (p. 581).

Donna Haraway (1988: 580) is also critical of feminists who base their ideas on current forms of objectivity, which she finds reductionist:

> Science has been about the search for translation, convertibility, mobility of meanings, and universality- which I call reductionism only when one language (guess whose?) must be enforced as the standard for all the translations and conversions. (...) That is the deadly fantasy that feminists and others have identified in some versions of objectivity, those in the service of hierarchical and positivist orderings of what can count as knowledge. That is one of the reasons the debates about objectivity matter, metaphorically and otherwise. Immortality and omnipotence are not our goals. But we could use some enforceable, reliable accounts of things not reducible to power moves and agonistic, high-status games of rhetoric or to scientistic, positivist arrogance (p. 580).

In the above quotation, Donna Haraway obviously warns feminists against the dangers of being on the "god-trick", by stating that claims such as objectivity, translation or universality are not compatible with feminist goals. What Donna Haraway (590) suggests instead is a kind of "embodied objectivity" that "resists fixation and is insatiably curious about the webs of differential positioning." Although admitting that "there is no single feminist standpoint", Haraway seems to recognise the potential of feminist standpoint theorists' epistemological accounts:

> There is no single feminist standpoint because our maps require too many dimensions for that metaphor to ground our visions. But the feminist standpoint theorists' goal of an epistemology and politics of engaged, accountable positioning remains eminently potent. The goal is better accounts of the world, that is, "science (p. 590)

Donna Haraway seems to summarize feminist scientists' and speculative fiction writers' goal which consists in giving a more critical and realistic account of our experiences as gendered bodies. The possibility of a realistic representation in the confines of the fictional microcosm of feminist speculative text may first seem unfamiliar, but I will attempt to give a more detailed account of this issue in the subsection entitled "The Strong Connection with the Alien."

The existence of a completely value-free or gender-neutral account has always been controversial among feminist scholars. One of the prominent feminist epistemologists, Evelyn Fox Keller (1985) who has published extensively on gendered construction of science draws attention to "subjective meanings" behind male scientists' so-called "objectivity":

"The scientist is not the purely dispassionate observer he idealizes, but a sentient being for whom the very ambition of objectivity carries with it a wealth of subjective meanings." (p. 96)

In the following quotation, the French feminist psychoanalyst thinker, Luce Irigaray (1993) seems to parallel Evelyn Fox Keller arguing on the "sexist" bias on the discourse of modern science:

> Every piece of knowledge is produced by subjects in a given historical context. Even if that knowledge aims to be objective, even if its techniques are designed to ensure objectivity, science always displays some choices, certain exclusions and these are particularly determined by the sex of the scholars involved (p. 204).

In illustration of Irigaray's above statement, traditional science and science fiction display some choices and certain exclusions of sexist character, which I will mention in the subsection entitled: "The Gendered History of Science Fiction". Luce Irigaray is, to my mind, one of the biggest contributors' to feminist epistemology of science. Irigaray's doctoral thesis and major book *Speculum of the Other Woman* (1974), which was closely followed by the cessation of her employment at the University of Vincennes is a critique of women's exclusion from both Western "phallocentric"[7] or "androcentric"[8] philosophy and psychoanalytic theory. In this book, Luce Irigaray (2004) critically takes up Plato, Freud and other Western thinkers' appropriation of woman as a speculum, mirror, negative alter ego of man by disrespecting woman's

---

[7] A term associated with psychoanalysis, phallocentrism refers to the advancement of the masculine as the source of power and meaning through cultural, ideological and social systems. Phallus here does not indicate the biological penis, but rather, the authority of the Father as the natural locus of law and meaning, thus attributing symbolic power to the penis as the apex of male power. Through this reordering of the symbolic meaning of the phallus, female subjectivity is constituted as "Other," or "marginal," in a move that effectively strips women of agency, displaced as they are by the discources of phallocentrism. [See *The Icon Critical Dictionary of Feminism and Postfeminism*, edited by Sarah Gamble, p. 294. (Cambridge: Icon Books, 1999).]

[8] This term was first used by the American writer Charlotte Perkins Gilman in 1911 in her essay "The Man-Made World or Our Androcentric Culture." Gilman used the term to describe a system of thought centred around male identity and values.

subject position and sexual difference. As she has further elaborated in her subsequent books, "sexual difference" is, for Irigaray, equivalent to women's "salvation":

> "Sexual difference is probably the issue in our time which could be our 'salvation' if we thought it through" (p. 7).

Like another French feminist Hél□ne Cixous, Luce Irigaray (1981) deconstructs woman's difference to a positive conception of otherness, which resonates in woman's differential use of language:

> She' is indefinitely other in herself (...) 'she' goes off in all directions and in which 'he' is unable to discern the coherence of any meaning. Contradictory words seem a little crazy to the logic of reason, and inaudible for him who listens with ready-made grids, a code prepared in advance. One must listen to her differently in order to hear an '*other meaning which is constantly in the process of weaving itself, at the time ceaselessly embracing words and yet casting them off to avoid becoming fixed, immobilized*' (...) Moreover, her statements are never identical to anything. Their distinguishing feature is one of contiguity. They touch *(upon)* (p. 103).

In this statement, Irigaray draws attention to difference between what she calls "parler femme" or "woman-speak" and phallocentric language. "Parler femme", or the "semiotic" (Julia Kristeva), or "écriture féminine" (Hél□ne Cixous) is based on the idea of opening up a discursive space where the representation of women's sexual difference becomes possible:

> If woman has always functioned "within" the discourse of man, a signifier that has always referred back to the opposite signifier that annihilates its specific energy and diminishes or stifles its very different sounds, it is time for her to dislocate this "within", to explode it, turn it around, and seize it; to make it hers, containing it, taking it in her own mouth, biting that tongue with her very own teeth to invent for herself a language to get inside of (Cixous, 1999, p. 418).

Like Irigaray and Cixous; the writer of the book *Man Made Language*, Dale Spender (1980) also agrees on men's monopoly over language, which will continue to oppress women unless it is changed, subverted or "deconstructed."

> (...) the English language has been literally man made and that is still primarily under male control (...). This monopoly over language is one of the means by which males ensured their own primacy, and consequently they ensure the invisibility or 'other' nature of females, and this primacy is perpetuated while women continue to use, unchanged, the language we inherited. (p. 12)

Deconstruction of phallocentric language seems to be what Jacques Derrida (1991 : 25) has called "the ideological consensus of feminists." What some feminist and non-feminist counter is the idea of replacing male language by a female language. In her groundbreaking work, *In a Different Voice*, Carol Gilligan (1993) draws attention to differences in female voices and perspectives as a result of women's different social experience:

> As we have listened for centuries to the voices of men and theories of development that their experience informs, so we have come more recently to notice not only the silence of women but the difficulty in hearing what they say when they speak. (...) The failure to see the different reality of women's lives and to hear differences in their voices stems in part from the assumption that there is a single mode of social experience and interpretation (p. 173).

Like Luce Irigaray and Hél□ne Cixous, Carol Gilligan seems to promote difference feminism by underlining differences in female voices. However, Gilligan's emphasis is on women's social and cultural experience as a site of difference rather than biological difference inscribed in female body and sexuality. While Luce Irigaray and Hél□ne Cixous make a call for a "corporeal" female language, which they believe would be created by women's discovery of their autoeroticism and "jouissance"[9], Julia Kristeva

---

[9] A Lacanian psychoanalytic term appropriated and refined by French feminist critics, "jouissance" is most often used as a concept that refers to bodily pleasures brought back into discourses. Kristeva (1994 :

doubts, however, whether women should aim to work out alternative discourses. Such a feminist position that could easily degenerate into an inverted form of sexism seems dangerous to Kristeva (1986) who, in her landmark article "Women's Time', has mentioned multiplicity of female languages:

> In its present form, is not feminism in the process of becoming one? Or is it, on the contrary as avant-garde feminists hope, that having started with the idea of difference, feminism will be able to break free of its belief in Woman, Her power, Her writing, so as to channel this demand for difference into each and every element of the female whole, and finally to bring out the singularity of each woman, and beyond this, her multiplicities, her plural languages, beyond the horizon, beyond sight, beyond faith itself? (p. 208)

As can be inferred from the above quotation, Kristeva is more concerned with deconstructing women's plural languages rather than constructing a female language. Kristeva (1980) criticizes the constructionist role some feminists want to play in the following words:

> "If women have a role to play... it is only in assuming a negative function: reject everything finite, definitive, structural, loaded with meaning, in the existing state of society" (p. 66).

By basing on Vološinov's and Kristeva's semiotic approaches to language, Toril Moi (2002), in her *Sexual/Textual Politics*, criticizes some feminist claims on "man-madeness" of language by suggesting "contextuality" of language.

> "For if we hold with Vološinov and Kristeva that *all* meaning is contextual, it follows that isolated words or general syntactical structures have no meaning until we provide a context for them" (p. 156).

---

79) views art as "the flow of *jouissance* into language." Irigaray (1991 : 45) claims that women experience two types of *jouissance*: a phallic one and one "more in keeping with their bodies and their sex" (p. 45).

I completely agree with critics like Julia Kristeva and Toril Moi who locate sexism in language use rather than language itself. As Toril Moi (2002) repeats throughout her *Sexual/Textual Politics*, "(one) cannot pretend to be writing in some pure feminist realm outside patriarchy" (p. 139) and "(t)here is no *other space* from which we can speak: if we are able to speak at all, it will have to be within the framework of symbolic language" (p. 169). Thus, deconstructed or "constructed", all meanings must be somehow based on symbolic language to be meaningful to instances of reception. A new language which is a sum of constructed or invented words won't be meaningful to instances of reception unless it's offered to them like the famous Rosetta stone, with the translation of this constructed language. If one means by female language, the creative use of language by female and male[10] subjects, we could say that creativity does not come out of nowhere:

> "To be creative means to be flexible and go beyond the standard form and meaning, and the conventional vision, however, using the existing stylistic patterns, as "innovation and novelty are not miraculous; they do not come out of nowhere. They are built using the tools of everyday metaphorical thought" (Lakoff and Johnson, 2003).

Lakoff and Johnson rightly argue above on the impossibility of an out of context creativity. Jonathan Culler (1989) also draws attention to an utterance having meaning only in the context of a pre-existing system of rules and conventions by saying that:

> "Meaning is context-bound, but context is boundless" (p. 1923).

---

[10] For Cixous, écriture féminine is not only a possibility for female writers; rather, she believes it can be (and has been) employed by male authors such as James Joyce.

Jonathan Culler rephrases Derrida's comment that:

> "No meaning can be determined out of context, but no context permits saturation" (Derrida, 1979, p. 81).

Jacques Derrida insists that all the linguistic possibilities of creativity or critique are within language. In contrast to Irigaray and Cixous who have maintained that the "feminine" requires a new language, Derrida (2001) reveals the ways in which language always deconstructs itself, and "bears within itself the necessity of its own critique" (p. 358). With language bearing within itself all the possibilities, is there really a need to create a new language for women? Is there a feminine writing? Is language that is believed to empower men really incapable to empower other marginal groups like women and transgendered people by the same token? French materialist feminist writer, Monique Wittig who often makes language experiments to "lesbianise" her works, rejects the concept of "woman's writing":

> "That there is 'feminine writing' must be said at the outset, and one makes a mistake in using and giving currency to this expression. What is this 'feminine' in feminine writing? It stands for Woman, thus merging a practice with a myth, the myth of Woman" (Wittig, p. 59).

As Wittig questions above, it's really difficult to give a clear-cut definition of feminine writing and its ties with the concept of 'femininity', which appears somewhat mythical rather than historical. Essentialist feminists insist that "the term *women* denotes a common identity."[11] To my mind, this so-called "common identity" and its biological foundations being so unknown, what we certainly know is that women share in common

---

[11] Butler, Judith (1999) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, p. 5.

is the same patriarchal life experience and, if they are feminists, a "collective subjectivity" that leads them to use similar strategies to deconstruct patriarchal usages:

> "Our collective identity as feminists can be formulated in terms of a collective capacity to interpret and articulate collective needs, to set collective goals, through a continual process of dialogue based on a commitment to the inclusion of all voices." (Weir, 1996, p. 132)

Although admitting that women share in common the same patriarchal life experience, I agree with Judith Butler (1999) who has drawn attention to the multiplicity of power relations involved in shaping woman's experiences, more precisely, to "racial, class, ethnic, sexual, and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities" (p. 6).

The conception of "common identity" appearing so mystical and out of historical context, in her "Women's Time", Julia Kristeva (1986) suggests the reconciliation of maternal time with linear or historical time. A maternal body that looks more "essentialist" than "historical" cannot translate female "voices" and experience. If feminine writing is a de/constructive and linguistically experimental language that incorporates undiscovered pleasures of a "gendered" body, that is to say, a body that is also shaped to a great extent by socio-cultural norms; there must be, within it, a space for every(body) who are repressed by and have the ability to critically take the same socio-cultural norms surrounding them. Hél☐ne Cixous considers James Joyce's later works as examples of feminine writing while Monique Wittig is often associated with feminine writing although she rejects the concept of "feminine writing" and asserts her identity as a "lesbian", not a woman. If a man and a lesbian who probably have different bodily pleasures and gender-based experience can effectively use "feminine writing", it

means that the definition of this form of writing must be extended in such a way to include men's and queer people's "jouissance" and gender-based experience. The question is: If this form of writing could embrace every(body) independently of their biological sex and sexual orientations, then, why is it supposed to be called "feminine"?

What is called 'feminine writing' is actually a "gender de/constructionist" writing that aims to liberate or de/construct the "Self" by providing him/her a more consolidated and self-reflexive position in discourse. The unusual use of the usual textual strategies (word plays, neologisms, repetitions and syntactic changes), as I call them "foregrounded elements" can offer the "Self" the means of being a "liberated Self." I think that Mary Daly's following explanations of what she calls "gynocentric writing" tell us a lot about the strategies used by "gender de/constructionist" writing:

> Gynocentric writing means risking. (..) At times I make up words (such as *gynaesthesia* for women's synaesthesia) Often I unmask deceptive words by dividing them and employing alternate meanings for prefixes (for example, *glamour* as used to name a witch's power). Sometimes I simply invite the reader to listen to words in a different way (for example, *de-light*)   when I play with words I do this attentively, deeply, paying attention to etymology, to varied dimensions, to deep Background meanings and subliminal associations. There are some woman-made words which I choose not to use for various reasons. Sometimes I reject words that I think are inauthentic, obscuring women's existence and masking the conditions of our oppression (for example, *chairperson*) (Daly, 1990, p. 24).

Mary Daly's explanations shed light on the main strategies the female "Self" could employ to wrench words away from patriarchal usage in order to discover their power for women. At this point, I would like to clarify my use of the concept of "Self." Since the publication of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1951/52), woman has been considered as the other of man. In contrast to this common tendency, I think it's preferable that women and all the other marginal groups must be considered as "the Self" rather than the "Other." While the dominant groups see and call the marginal

groups the "Other", why should women call themselves "the Other" by paradoxically looking at themselves from a certain distance, taking an outside perspective that is not theirs. Although alienated from her/self, woman's Self is always a Self in the existence of her consciousness.

In this section, I have discussed how the concepts of objectivity, subjectivity and feminine writing have been dealt with critically by several scholars. Objectivity being a central concept for science, and subjectivity being so important for poststructuralist feminists, I find it worth analysing how feminist speculative fiction treats the issues of objectivity and subjectivity in its fictional world.

Feminist Speculative Fiction as a "Powerful Infidel Heteroglossia"

As a genre at the intersection of science fiction and feminine writing, feminist speculative fiction seems to have a very "democratic" representational politics that avoids drowning out other fictional voices, no matter if they are uttered by the Self or the Other. In all the feminist speculative fiction works I've analysed, the Other is the one who is depicted as the holder of the power of speech. In the fictional world of these works, the Self is always represented by women who suffer from patriarchal oppression while the Other is sometimes represented by totalitarian men and women (*The Handmaid's Tale*), sometimes by women in a female-dominant society (*The Female Man*) and sometimes by humanoid individuals in a genderless society (*Woman on the Edge of Time*).

The representation of the Self as disempowered by patriarchal usage, seems very compatible with the objective historical reality of women's lives. In the feminist

speculative works under consideration, women can't speak an empowering language, but they keep discovering the power of the language, as it's used by the Other, which often represents their "idealised Self". In these works, two conflicting discourses co-exist. In contrast to feminine writing, in these feminist speculative works, the female Self who speaks the patriarchal language is always there, but in a dialogic tension with the Other who speaks an empowering language. In other words, these works fictionalise both functions of language as an empowering and disempowering tool. By letting readers oscillate between two different worlds and languages, the feminist speculative writer seemingly assumes the role of "a distanced observer." Thus, the reader starts "wandering a mindscape", as Teresa de Lauretis (1980) calls it:

> Displaced from the central position of the knowledgeable observer, the reader stands on constantly shifting ground, on the margins of understanding, at the periphery of vision: hence the sense of wonder, of being dislocated to another spacetime continuum where human possibilities are discovered in the intersection of other signs with other meanings" (pp. 165-166)

In feminist speculative fiction, the reader is vis-a-vis a text that is full of possibilities to be explored. More precisely, in these works, the discourse of the Other is not assimilated to the discourse of the Self. The encounter of the Self with the Other is re-imagined without privileging only an empowered female discourse. In this sense, if I formulate it in Sara Ahmed's terms (2002), these feminist speculative works avoid the violence of negating or giving up the historical Self that reflects the particularity of the (patriarchal) Other.

> (...) this assumption that an attention to the particularity of others involves a negation of otherness needs to be challenged. (...) by attending to the particularity of *this other* that we can show that which fails to be grasped in the here and the now, in the very *somebody* whom I am faced with. (...) To negate or give up on the particularity of others would involve its own violence. (p. 560)

As Sara Ahmed clearly states above, the representation of the Self (the reality) and the Other (the possibility) together and with all their particularities, allows us to see what fails to be grasped in the here and the now. From this perspective, these feminist speculative works can be said to have engaged in a "heteroglossic" representational politics that illuminates the relationship of both instances of discourse, the female Self and the Other alongside the communicative axis. "Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) considers *heteroglossia* as a main feature of literary creativity.

> Literary language is in effect a dialogue of languages, a 'highly specific unity of several "languages" (…). At the moment of creativity, literary language is already surrounded by heteroglossia. Consciousness finds itself inevitably facing the necessity of *having to choose a language*. With each literary-verbal performance, consciousness must actively orient itself amidst heteroglossia, it must move in and occupy a position for itself within it; it chooses, in other words, a 'language.' (p. 295)

"Heteroglossia," which Mikhail Bakhtin relates to literary creativity, is a device that shows readers the interplay of alternative and oppositional voices in a discourse. The term "heteroglossia" is also used by feminist scholars like Donna Haraway as a counter-alternative to "dreams of a common language." In her influential essay entitled "The Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century," Haraway (1991) states that she dreams of "not a common language, but a powerful infidel heteroglossia (p. 181). An imagination of a feminist speaking in tongues (…) both building and destroying machines, identities, categories, relationships, space stories. Though both are bound in the spiral dance, I prefer to be a cyborg rather than a goddess." Haraway seems to be referring to feminist speculative fiction while she talks about "destroying space stories."

Donna Haraway's aspiration for 'a powerful infidel heteroglossia' can be said to have been realized in feminist speculative works. The only example of feminist

speculative work that constructs a 'female language' is Suzette Haden Elgin's 'woman-made' language Láadan, which I will refer to in the subsection entitled *Language and Linguistics of Feminist Speculative Fiction*. Apart from this, feminist speculative fiction tends to place readers in confrontation with two different worlds in order to show them all the linguistic and ontological possibilities rather than proposing a "unified" language or 'language of goddess', as Donna Haraway describes it ironically.

The Distinctive Features of Feminist Speculative Fiction

One of the male target text readers who answered my questionnaire on literary reading made the following comment in his e-mail: "Ok, but this is just feminism disguised in speculative fiction. However, mission is accomplished." Having found this comment very provocative, I looked at this reader's answer to another question on his familiarity with speculative fiction and I found out that he answered no when he was asked about his familiarity with speculative fiction. Although he had no knowledge of speculative fiction, this reader interestingly seemed to be thinking that all the text fragments and plot synopses he had read were more related to feminism than speculative fiction. This reader's comment prompts the following question: What are the boundaries between feminist speculative fiction and the two other genres (speculative fiction and feminist fiction) from which feminist speculative fiction seems to have arisen? I think this question can be answered by a simple analogy.

Like a new born baby, feminist speculative fiction can be said to have inherited some characteristics of each of the two genres from which it was generated. However, like any child who develops his or her own personality over time, feminist

speculative fiction shows certainly some similarities and differences with its parental genres. Feminist speculative fiction having its own specificity, it is extremely important for a researcher to identify similarities and differences of feminist speculative fiction with other related genres.

The Use of Strategies of *Ecriture Féminine*

Feminist speculative fiction employs a variety of creative strategies that are reminiscent of *écriture feminine* in the 1970s. Jean Pfaelzer (1988) summarizes the main similarities and differences among both genres as follows:

> Both disciplines deconstruct material space in order portray what has not happened, what has not happened yet, what might happen. But they split what to do next. Feminist discourse theorists (The New French Feminists) deconstruct representational (read 'masculine') space: subvert the old order by subverting old perceptual orders. Dislocate syntax. Dislocate plot. Dislocate persona. Utopian authors construct ideal space in order to subvert inequality and inevitability. Dislocate geography. Dislocate time. Dislocate historical determinism. (p. 282)

As Jean Pfaelzer (1988) suggests, deconstruction is an aspect common to both forms of writing and consists in subverting the traditional patriarchal language. The main difference lies in the "constructivism" of feminist speculative fiction. Thus, unlike French feminists' "imagined", "indeterminate" space, feminist speculative fiction writers construct an "ideal" space through which they reinscribe women in history, language, and narrative activity (p. 284).

Margaret Atwood who considers herself a "speculative fiction writer" applies French feminist theory in her cult novel *The Handmaid's Tale*. In her *Fictional Feminism: How American Bestsellers Affect the Movement for Women's Equality*, Kim A. Ludermilk (2004) suggests that "Atwood's writing style contains many of the

elements of *écriture féminine* or feminine writing, as described by Cixous and Irigaray"

(p.132). Ludermilk also clarifies why *The Handmaid's Tale* conforms to the description

of feminine writing:

> It does not follow syntactical rules. Sentences are short, choppy, incomplete, or
> they are long, flowing, run-on. They ignore the conventional order of the subject,
> verb, and object. The language is fluid and poetic, very close to Cixous' concept
> of feminine writing that embodies the mother's voice, the mother's body, breast
> milk, and the *imaginaire* (p. 132).

Ludermilk who further draws attention to non-linear narrative in Atwood's novel,

maintains that "feminine writing is also evident in Atwood's use of wordplay and pun."

(p. 133) Although *The Handmaid's Tale* contains many of the elements of *écriture*

féminine, Kim Ludermilk (p. 136), echoing the critic Lucy M. Freibert[12] argues that this

novel is also based on a critique of French feminist theory because it shows that even

creative writing cannot change cultural systems. From my perspective, this is a

pessimistic and monolithic reading that doesn't reflect the spirit of Atwood's novel. In

dystopias, like in utopias, there is always a straw of hope, although not explicitly

formulated. Thus, instead of considering that "even a powerful language can't abolish

oppression", you could interpret it as "even under oppression, you could use a powerful

language". This is how Michael Cornier Magali (2003) interprets it:

> Although *The Handmaid's Tale* depicts a dystopia, its lenghty first-person
> narration also highlights how those who are oppressed can use the power of
> language themselves. Indeed, Offred asserts herself as a person by telling her
> story. Much like American slave narratives, her story not only points to the
> oppressive structures that victimize her but also allows her to move beyond the
> role of victim, creating herself as an individual with whom the reader can
> sympathize and identify (pp. 135-136).

---

[12] According to Freibert (1988), "In satirizing, and thereby demystifying, Western phallocentrism in the
worst of all possible contexts, Atwood also tests the viability of French feminist theory." "Control and
Creativity: The Politics of Risk in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*," *Critical Essays on
Margaret Atwood,* (ed. Judith McCombs, G. K. Hall), 1988, pp. 280-91.

Magali's statement sheds light on how the main character Offred asserts her agency through her use of language. It is interesting that even a dystopian novel that depicts how language could be used to disempower women provides the female character with the power of language.

A "Critical" and "Constructive" Genre

A detailed review of the existing literature on SF clearly delineates that history and language of SF is generally divided into two major periods: The pre-1960s period and the post-1960s period. As can be inferred from this divide, the 1960s is a turning point for SF, which, with the rise of a new writing, has passed through a metamorphosis. In his article entitled "New Roles for Men in Recent Utopian Fiction", the SF critic Peter Fitting (1985) draws attention to how "(..) in the hand of a newer generation of writers, the generic potential of (SF and Fantasy) to describe *other* worlds (…) has been richly developed" (p.157). The most significant aspect of this new writing, which Fitting (1985) considers as both "critical" and "constructive" is that it is based on feminist critique:

> "Each novel grows out of the feminist critique of the ideological, psychological, social, and economic forms of gender division and their interlocking with the exploitative and oppressive structures of capitalism; and each novel constructs an alternate society based on egalitarian social and sexual relations" (p. 157).

This new writing that was strongly "political" and "feminist" in its critique has constructed alternative worlds by depicting utopian and dystopian futures. However, for

the writers who adopted this new writing style, they didn't only challenge gender conventions, but also genre conventions.

Language and Linguistics of Feminist Speculative Fiction

Language and linguistics[13] have been always of interest to science fiction writers and scholars. As Walter E. Mayers (1980) points out:

> "Even in Mary Shelly's embryonic SF, we see a concern with problems of communication; communication, with language as its chief discipline, is centrally important to an enormous portion of science fiction and crucial to its understanding" (p. 1).

Science fiction's concern with problems of communication depends on the difference between human languages and alien languages, with Sapir-Worfian[14] premises in mind. Yet, sci-fi writers in the pre-1960s period were not very creative in the solutions they proposed to ensure the communication between the earthlings and the aliens. As Robert Scholes and Eric S. Rabkin (1977) have asserted (*Science Fiction: History, Science, Vision*); in the pre-1960s, the great majority of SF writers had "everyone talk English" or some "lingua franca," often called "galactica" or "Galactic English" (p. 154). Telepathy and various translation machines were the other means of having earthlings and aliens communicate "without any recourse to language". In his article "Language and Techniques of Communication as Theme or Tool in SF", John Krueger (1968) give

---

[13] The three major works on the language and linguistics of sci-fi are: Myra Edward Barnes (1975), *Linguistics and Languages in Science Fiction-Fantasy*, Samuel R. Delany (1977), *The Jewel-Hinged Jaw: Notes on the Language of Science Fiction*, Walter E. Meyers (1980), *Alien and Linguistics: Language Study and Science Fiction*.

[14] "Whorf/Sapir Hypothesis: A thesis associated with the American linguist Edmund Sapir (1884-1939) and his pupil Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897-1941) which contends that we dissect nature and reality along the lines laid down by the language we speak." Macey, David (2000 : 398), "Whorf/Sapir Hypothesis", Critical Theory, Penguin Books.

a list of the languages spoken by the aliens: Glot, lingua spacia, prime galactic, terrestrial, pidgin solarian, intergalactic language, cosmoparla, galac, cosmoglotta, galingua, galactic standard.

In the post-1960s period, as a consequence of the New Wave, a strong linguistic sensibility developed so that language and communication were included into sci-fi as subject matters. Extraterrestrial creatures were replaced by human or humanoid characters in the writings of feminist speculative writers and as a consequence of this radical transformation of the traditional alien, writers had to give this more human and more real looking alien a new voice that is different from that of extraterrestrial creatures. The new alien's language was a sum of our everyday words loaded with new meanings and word play with cultural references to our present day society. Thus, the readers shared framework with this alien world, which enables them to understand and translate the alien language despite all its estranging effects on us. In his article "The Image of Translation in Science Fiction & Astronomy", Brian Mossop (1996) illustrates the distinction of human/human versus human/alien communication by the following analogy:

> The situation of Erwin Shrödinger returning to the 17th century in a time machine to explain quantum physics to Newton is not similar to that of an alien professor from Vega trying to teach us their science. Shrödinger and Newton have a shared bioecology, not to mention a shared history – Shrödinger would already be familiar with Newton's outlook (p. 21).

As Brian Mossop describes above, the existence of a shared framework or a common ground of understanding allows us to translate the intent of the alien's message. The alien in feminist speculative fiction (except Suzette Haden Elgin's Láadan) doesn't speak a constructed language, but a language that is a deconstructed or re-constructed form of our standard language. Even linguistic innovations and playful language in this

world are created by basing them on our standard language. In this sense, what feminist speculative fiction writers do is:

> "to take recognizable syntagms and substitute in them, here and there, signifiers from a till then wholly unexpected paradigm. The occurrence of unusual, if not downright opaque, signifiers in the syntagm focuses our attention on the structures implied (...)" (Broderick, 1994, p. 34).

The alien in feminist speculative fiction is distinguished from the traditional alien by the possession of a human language:

> "Where aliens in a science fiction novel engage in direct communication, we are presented not only with hypotheses about an extraterrestrial nature ('exobiology') but with an extraterrestrial linguistics. The possession of a non-human language is, indeed, the fundamental distinguishing-mark of 'alien intelligence'" (Parrinder, 1980, p. 113)

Because feminist speculative fiction does not present a non-human language, it is often disregarded in the books studying "exolinguistics". Exolinguistics as Myra Edwards Barnes (1975) terms it, is "the study of the language of the life forms beyond Earth" (p. 11). "Exolinguistics" which is sometimes referred to as "xenolinguistics" or "astrolinguistics" is focussed on imaginary languages originating from alien species. As James B. McMillan (1972) has stated in the early 70s, "exolinguistics" has never become a standard term either in linguistics or anthropology, but it has persisted in both periodicals and books for twenty years, and it refuses to obsolesce" (p. 261). In his *Sociologie de la Traduction: La science-fiction américaine dans l'espace culturel français des années 1950*, Jean-Marc Gouanvic analyses the translation of fictional "technolects" and "exolects" from English into French. Gouanvic (1999) states that the translation of fictional "technolects" from English into French occurred quite easily since both languages largely use the same Greco-latin roots to create brachylogies and

portmanteau words (p. 80). Thus, "In *Guerre aux Invisibles*," 'gyrocars' is translated as 'gyrautos', le 'stratosphere plane' as le 'stratoplane'" (Gouanvic, 1999, p. 80). As for the translation of the exolects or "fictive words" that belong to a "third linguistic system", which is equally unfamiliar to both French and English, Gouanvic (1999) maintains that it's quite plausible to leave these elements untranslated to create the same effect of estrangement in the target culture:

> L'altérité exolinguistique radical pour l'anglais n'est pas ici différente de celle du français, du fait que les deux vocables Tlanan et Oxcta appartiennent à un système linguistique tiers. Il en va quelque peu différemment du mot-fiction Viton (Guerres aux Invisibles) traduit – traduit avec raison – par Viton en français (p. 80).

> The radical extralinguistic alterity, which was created here in English is not different from its translated form into French so that the words Tlanan and Oxcta belong to a third linguistic system in both source and target languages. It is not very different from the example of the fictive word "Viton", which was rationally translated into French as Viton (p.80).

As should be evident from the above statement, Jean-Marc Gouanvic considers "fictive words" as belonging to the "radical exolinguistic alterity" of a ""third linguistic system." The concept of "fictive word" is introduced by Marc Angenot who contends that mot all invented words in sci-fi are neologisms, but "fictive words" that "differ from the fictive words of nonsense literature in that they imply a consistent (though absent) paradigm" (qtd. in Parrinder, 1980, p. 113). Thus, feminist speculative fiction doesn't use "fictive words' to refer to an exolinguistic alterity. What feminist speculative fiction uses, are neologic creations that make sense when we read them: for example in Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time*, *sweet friends*, *co-moms*, *brooder*, *kidbinder*, etc. I will study instances of neologism and word play in the novels in my corpus in more depth in Chapter III of this thesis. For now, I just want to draw attention to their difference from "fictive words" in Marc Angenot's sense. At this

point, one might wonder if it represents a more human alien speaking a humanlike language, what does feminist speculative fiction has in common with sci-fi.

Like sci-fi, feminist speculative fiction uses science fictional tropes and conventions. As Roberts (1993, pp. 4-6) points out, "using the tropes of science fiction, feminist writers reconstruct science to provide a critique of and an imaginative alternative to real-life science, a field still inhospitable to women (…)", but on the other hand, while using science fictional tropes, these writers end up deconstructing "science's grand narrative". What are the science fictional tropes and conventions?

Gordon R. Dickson (1988) gives a detailed list of sci-fi conventions: Time-Dilation Effect, superman, antigravity, invisibility, mutations, time travel, center of the earth, parallel universes and continua, contact with aliens, telepathy, teleportation, intelligence in a new body, animal intelligence, machine intelligence, androids, immortality, post-catastrophe worlds, alien invasion, other dimensions, terraforming, weapons. From the conventions cited here, Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* uses "telepathy" and "androids", Joanna Russ's *the Female Man* uses "time travel" and "parallel universes" and Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* a radical political and social "mutation" that evokes a "post-catastrophe world." And all the books in my corpus, deal with "contact with aliens." In feminist speculative fiction, the Self is more strongly connected to the Alien which projects an idealized (gender egalitarian or female dominated) or despised (totalitarian and oppressive) image of the Other. In her interview with Steve Izma, the granddaughter of the famous feminist speculative writer Judith Merril and the author of the 2003 Hugo winning book *Better to Have Loved: The Life of Judith Merril* (2002), Emily Pohl Weary sheds light on Judith Merril's strong connection with the alien:

The alien in her work represents the other form the point of view of American culture: those who don't fit into the mainstream, or into the conventional American "dream" of what is good or what is right. In fact, growing up Jewish in America with a Zionist suffragette mother and no father, Judith said that when she was writing her stories she connected with the alien. http://www.btlbooks.com/Links/merril_interview.htm

Like Judith Merril, all the feminist speculative writers are strongly connected with the alien. The contact with the alien being so central to sci-fi, Alexandre Hougron (2000 draws attention to the psychoanalytic foundations of the Self's obsession with the Other as a perfect mirror image of the Self and the Self's ongoing struggle with his/her internal monsters.

If there are psychoanalytic foundations of the representation of the Other in sci-fi, the Other in the traditional sci-fi is supposed to project the masculine Self. However, the Other in the feminist speculative fiction is a projection of the feminine Self and the feminine Self challenges conventional language through the Other. From my perspective, the Other's language and the translatability of that language are the best indicators of the level of connection between the Self and the Other. When we look at the language spoken by the Other, in feminist speculative fiction, the Self seems to be more connected to the Other. As I mentioned above Suzette Haden Elgin's *Native Tongue* is the only example of "conlang" (constructed language) in feminist science fiction.

In her feminist speculative work, *Native Tongue*, the linguist Suzette Haden Elgin invents a language for women in a futuristic society as an alternative to the present day masculinist society. Elgin constructs Láadan as a scientific experiment to test four interrelated hypotheses:

1) that the weak form of the linguistic relativity hypothesis is true [that is, that human languages structure human perceptions in significant ways]; (2) that Goedel's Theorem applies to language, so that there are changes

you could not introduce into a language without destroying it and languages you could not introduce into a culture without destroying it; (3) that change in language brings about social change, rather than the contrary; and (4) that if women were offered a women's language one of two things would happen -- they would welcome and nurture it, or it would at minimum motivate them to replace it with a better women's language of their own construction.

http://www.sfwa.org/members/Elgin/Láadan.html

To test the above-mentioned hypotheses, Suzette Haden Elgin invents a new dictionary and grammar. Unlike English, sentences in Láadan place the verb first, then the subject and object. Gender is not normally marked but when it is marked the male category is specified by adding the suffix *-id.* For example, the word for parent is *thul* but with the addition of *-id* it becomes *thulid* ('male parent'). In the Appendix to the novel, Elgin provides several examples from her *First Dictionary and Grammar of Láadan*:

> doóledosh: pain or loss which comes as a relief by virtue of ending the anticipation of its coming...
> lowitheláad: to feel, as if directly, another's pain/grief/surprise/joy,anger...
> raduth: to non-use, to deliberately deprive someone of any useful function in the world, as in enforced retirement or when a human being is kept as a plaything or pet…
> rarilh: to deliberately refrain from recording; for example, the failure throughout history to record the accomplishments of women...
> rashida: non-game, a cruel 'playing' that is a game only for the dominant 'players' with the power to force others to participate...
> sháadehul: growth through transcendence; either of a person, a nonhuman, or a thing (for example, an organization, or a city, or a sect)...
> wonewith: to be socially dyslexic; uncomprehending of the social signals of others…
> zhaláad: the act of relinquishing a cherished/comforting/familiar illusion or frame of perception (qtd. in Teslenko, 2003, pp. 59-60).

As is evident from the above examples, the vocabulary Elgin invented for women is semantically very loaded. Each word refers to a cluster of concepts related to female emotions and perceptions. After testing her initial hypotheses for ten years after the novel came out in 1984, Suzette Haden Elgin finally admits that the experiment did not produce the desired outcome: "hypothesis that if women were offered a women's

language they would either welcome and nurture it or would replace it with a better one was proved false." http://www.sfwa.org/members/Elgin/Láadan.html

Her experiment on "female language" being a failure, Elgin still believes in "divine magic of creating an entirely new thing with language out of nothing". However, she can not help mentioning processes of creating that are "humanly possible":

<u>Linguistic bootstrapping</u>

Take something that already exists (or is believed to exist) and use metaphor to create something else, linked to it by analogy. Take WAGON TRAIN, already part of consensus reality, tweak its features and parameters, and you get STAR TREK -- WAGON TRAIN in space. Tweak different features and parameters and put it somewhere else -- under the ocean, inside the earth, in my coat pocket, wherever you like.

<u>Positive linguistic refocusing</u>

Take something that already exists and create something new by changing what gets attention. I did my best to demonstrate this in my science fiction novel titled NATIVE TONGUE: "When you look at another person, what do you see? Two arms, two legs, a face, an assortment of parts. Am I right? Now, there is a continuous surface of the body, a space that begins with the inside flesh of the fingers and continues over the palm of the hand and up the inner side of the arm to the bend of the elbow. Everyone has that surface; in fact, everyone has two of them. I will name that the 'athad' of the person. Imagine the athad, please. See it clearly in your mind -- perceive, here are my own two athads, the left one and the right one. And there are both of your athads, very nice ones. Where there was no athad before, there will always be one now, because you will perceive the athad of every person you look at, as you perceive their nose and their hair. From now on.... Now it exists."

<u>Negative linguistic refocusing</u>

Take something that already exists and hide it away by making it difficult or impossible to pay attention to it, or by focusing on some aspect of it that will hide the parts you want to hide and emphasize those you don't. Like taking "firing employees" and naming that action "letting people go" (as if you were giving them a freedom they'd been longing for) or "shedding employees" (as if it were a natural process, the way trees shed their leaves in the fall, out of the company's control and therefore not their responsibility).
 http://www.webspawner.com/users/sfling/

I think that the above processes can be used in a large-scale analysis of linguistic *nova*. However, I will be basing on Teun A. Van Dijk's method of ideological/discourse analysis in the examination of feminist *nova* in my corpus. In contrast to the constructed language used in Suzette Elgin's *Native Tongue* and its sequels, feminist *nova* in my corpus do not consist of "fictive words" that belong to a "third linguistic system." In this sense, I could argue that all these *nova* that come out of our language are translatable into our language.

Chapter II

FOREGROUNDING-BASED RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

"At first it looks strange to Trojans, the wooden horse, off color, outsized, barbaric... Then little by little, they discover familiar forms which coincide with those of a horse." (Wittig, p. 68)

Foregrounding as a concept closely related to the Russian Formalist critic Viktor Shklovsky's *estrangement* (ostanenie) has been first employed by the Prague linguist, Jan Mukarovský to indicate a distortional literary device, which is consistently and systematically used in poetic genre for aesthetic purposes. Having applied later to prose analysis and then to empirical research on literary reading, foregrounding has never gone out of use, and still seems to be a productive concept for scholars from various disciplines such as literary studies, psychology, visual arts etc. Distortion of conventional language being the major mechanism of foregrounding, the concept is obviously interesting to analyse lexical creativities in feminist fiction.

Definition and Historico-theoretical Trajectory of the Term *Foregrounding*

Willie van Peer (1986, p. 20) describes the notion of foregrounding as "a pragmatic concept, referring to the dynamic interaction between author, literary text and reader." In our context, the translator and target culture readers are also involved in this interaction. Since foregrounding is an interdisciplinary term of broad scope that is crucial to my thesis, I will trace the historico-theoretical trajectory of the term to lead to a better understanding of its applicability to the field of reception and translation studies.

The notion of foregrounding is based on an analogy with a fundamental characteristic of human perception that consists in distinguishing a *figure* against a *ground* (Van Peer, 1986, p. 21). The principles of foregrounding are also used by the Gestalt psychologists of the early 1900s, particularly by the Danish psychologist Edgar Rubin who, in his two-volume work, *Synsoplevede Figurer* (*Visual Figures*), introduced the distinction figure/ground to human perception. The Gestalt psychologists' figure/ground constellations are mostly related to cognitive/experimental aspects of the term foregrounding that can be situated in a wider area of poetics, text linguistics, stylistics and narratology. However, it should be noted that various uses of the term are complementary rather than being incompatible.

In a poetological sense, the term *foregrounding* has its origin with the Czech theorist Jan Mukarovský's *aktualisace* that has been translated by Garvin (1964) into English as foregrounding instead of actualization. Willie van Peer & Frank Hakemulder (2006) draw attention to the fact that this translation, that rendered a temporal metaphor by a spatial one, allowed the term to be more related to perception psychology.

Mukarovský (2000) conceives of foregrounding as a deviation from conventional language:

> Foregrounding is the opposite of automatization, that is, the deautomatization of an act; the more an act is automatized, the less it is consciously executed; the more it is foregrounded, the more completely conscious does it become. Objectively speaking: automatization schematizes an event; foregrounding means the violation of the scheme (p. 226).

According to Jan Mukarovský (2000), another aspect of foregrounding is its "consistency and systematic character." Mukarovský also mentions a hierarchical structuring of foregrounding:

> The systematic foregrounding of components in a work of poetry consists in the gradation of the interrelationships of these components, that is, in their mutual subordination or superordination. The component highest in hierarchy becomes the dominant. All other components foregrounded or not, as well as their interrelationships, are evaluated from the standpoint of the dominant (p. 227).

Although he doesn't use the term foregrounding, Roman Jakobson (1987, pp. 41-46) also mentions a "dominant" poetic function and the capacity of poetic devices in increasing "palpability." In formalist and structuralist criticism, the term foregrounding has been used as a distortional poetic "device" that is realized at phonetic, grammatical and semantic levels of poetry to gain it a quality of "literariness" and evoke its readers' aesthetic appreciation. The term foregrounding that seems to be an invention of the Prague Structuralists, heavily draws on the Russian formalists' ideas, most notably, Viktor Shklovsky's estrangement (*ostranenie*) that will be further dealt with under the section entitled " The Concept of 'Estrangement' or 'Defamiliarization' ". British stylistics, most notably, Geoffrey Leech uses the term foregrounding in stylistic analysis of "salient" aspects of the text. Although Leech's use of foregrounding is in the same line with formalist and structuralist schools, his use of the term in prose analysis can be considered as a novelty. The following is Leech's definition of foregrounding:

Such deviations from linguistic or other socially accepted norms have been given the special name of 'foregrounding', which invokes the analogy of a figure seen against a background. The artistic deviation 'sticks out' from its background, the automatic system, like a figure in the foreground of a visual field. (Leech, 1969, pp. 57)

In stylistics, the definitions of the term foregrounding are always based on the same postulates such as 'stylistic distortion' and 'parallelism':

Foregrounding refers to a form of textual patterning which is motivated specifically for literary-aesthetic purposes. (…) FG typically involves a stylistic distortion of some sort, either through an aspect of the text which deviates from a linguistic norm or, alternatively, where an aspect of the text is brought to the fore through repetition or parallelism (Simpson, 2004, p. 50).

As Simpson states in his definition, deviation and parallelism are the two major mechanisms of foregrounding. S. R. Levin (1965) has distinguished between two types of deviations: Internal and external deviation (qtd. in Van peer, 1986, p. 17). In an earlier article (1963), Levin has also distinguished between two types of external deviations: determinate and statistical deviation (qtd in Van Peer 1986, p. 18). Now, I will briefly mention these deviational foregrounding mechanisms, as they are defined by Willie van Peer (1986):

1. Deviation: A selection of a linguistic item outside the range of normally allowed selections.
a. Internal deviation: The deviation from a norm set up by the text itself.
b. External deviation: The deviation that occurs against the background of a norm outside the text itself.
b.1 Determinate deviation: The deviation that is constituted by a departure from a linguistic, literary, social, cultural or other kind of rules and convention that can be made explicit.
b.2 Statistical deviation: The deviation not from an absolute, but from a relative norm, i.e. one that should be described in terms of probabilities.
2. Parallelism: The repetition of the same or similar choices where the normal flux of language would tend to variation in selection (pp. 22-23).

Willie van Peer states that twelve different cases of foregrounding can be observed since each of these four devices may occur at the three levels of the text: phonological, grammatical and semantic. In the context of feminist speculative fiction, neologisms

that are abundantly used in these works as dominant foregrounding devices may be considered as examples of determinate deviation. Willie van Peer and J□meljan Frank Hakemulder (2006) also consider neologisms as clear examples of deviation:

"Cases of neologism, live metaphor, or ungrammatical sentences, as well as archaisms, paradox, and oxymoron (the traditional tropes) are clear examples of deviation" (p. 547).

In his *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature*, Robert H. Stacey (1977) deals with some defamiliarizing methods that could be also considered as foregrounding devices: anonyms, anagrams, tmesis, aphaeresis, puns, metaphors, tropes, paronomasia, portmanteau words, skaz (i.e, ideoloect or 'yarn' technique), malapropisms, neologisms, the abuse of words or metaphor (catachresis), metathesis, heterophemy, Spoonerism, gibberish, acronyms, archaisms, antonomasia, provincialisms, dialecticisms, oxymora, copound and hyphenated words, repetition, typographical emphasis (italics, letter spacing, different fonts), omissions, stigmonyms, hyperbata (chiasmus, hysteron proteron, prolepsis, syncysis), ancolutha, asyndeton, synaesthesia, polyptoton, zeugmas, syllepsis, similes, metalepsis, etc. All these rhetorical, grammatical, syntactical aberrations Stacey has illustrated by concrete examples from world literature are worth-considering.

I should also mention how foregrounding became an interesting empirical research topic in the 1980s. Van Peer (1986) investigated foregrounding's possible effects on readers, under headings such as strinkingness, importance and discussion value. Miall & Kuiken (1994), studying readers' responses to short stories have consolidated the validity of Van Peer's previous findings and found out that foregrounding is related to reading time and affect. According to these authors,

foregrounding creates similar effects on readers independently of their literary competence or interest. The focus of these studies is on readers' cognitive and emotional processes. Van Peer (1986) systematizes the theory and Miall & Kuiken (1994) work on the emotional effects of foregrounding structures.

The Concept of *Estrangement* or *Defamiliarization*

The Russian Formalist critic Victor Shklovsky (1965) coins the term *ostranenie* in his landmark essay "Art as Technique" (1965) in which he develops some reflections on aesthetics.

> The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make objects 'unfamiliar', to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged. Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object; the object is not important (p. 12).

Shklovsky coins this concept under the inspiration of Aristotle who, in his *Poetics*, wrote that inscribing strange, unfamiliar, foreign words into the metrics of a native idiom creates the language of art. This is an old, but never outdated concept. Bertolt Brecht uses Shklovsky's "ostranenie" to describe aesthetics of epic theatre and coins the concept of "the alienation effect" (Verfremdungseffekt) to refer to a theatrical and cinematic device "which prevents the audience from losing itself passively and completely in the character created by the actor, and which consequently leads the audience to be a consciously critical observer."

It is interesting that this concept leads to a plurality of concepts through translation. The proper English translation of *Verfremdungseffekt* is a matter of controversy. The

word is sometimes rendered as *defamiliarization effect*, *estrangement effect*, *distantiation*, *distancing effect* or *alienation effect*. Fredric Jameson, in his book *Brecht and Method*, translates it as "the V-effekt", and many scholars simply leave the word untranslated. This is a popular concept in academia. Darko Suvin applies this concept to SF studies. Roland Barthes uses it in his *Mythologies*. Marxist Theory of Alienation uses the term often to refer to economic and social conditions. Hegel whose concept of *alienation* subsequently influence Marx, as well as 20th century existentialist thought considers *alienation* (*Entfremdung*) as a characteristic of the modern life that causes the feelings of dissatisfaction. The concept of *estrangement* or *alienation* has also been used by Heidegger and many other philosophers.

How *estrangement* is dealt with by different scholars is an interesting object of study. However, what is of primary concern to us is how it applies to translation studies and feminist speculative fiction. There is no doubt that among the contemporary translation scholars, Lawrence Venuti is the one who has written extensively on the concept of *estrangement*. Venuti (1995, p. 20) argues that "foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. In its effort to do right abroad, this translation method must do wrong at home, deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience - choosing to translate a foreign text excluded by literary canons for example, or using a marginal discourse to translate it."

In regards to feminist speculative fiction, a number of issues arise: While being expected to offer "an alien reading experience", how do translators translate a text that is already alienated? Do they double or maybe triple alienation effect? Or, do they try to reduce alienation effect to offer target readers a "fluent" text in order to be considered a

'competent' translator? Are they able to recreate in the target language a particular experience of estrangement not equivalent, but similar to the one created by feminist speculative fiction writers for the source text readers.

The third chapter of my thesis will shed light on the issues I problematize here. By putting aside these questions for now, I would like to mention on how estrangement effect is created in feminist speculative fiction. In his *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature* (1977), Robert H. Stacy attempts to show on the basis of numerous examples from literary texts, how this concept is applicable to language and literature. In the third chapter entitled "Forms and Varieties of Verbal and Phrasal Defamiliarization", Stacy (1977) shows also how this concept could apply to the genre of speculative fiction:

> (..)the writer of fiction dealing with an alien world (e.g., in science fiction, utopias or dystopias), where presumably, a language other than his own is spoken, must decide between two extremes: whether to defamiliarize completely (in which case his fiction would be incomprehensible unless accompanied by a glossary) or to use his own language and explain, somehow, the lack of verisimilitude (p. 55).

As Stacy (1977) mentions, there are degrees and forms of defamiliarization. Experimentation in narrative form and exploration of female voice are part of this politics of defamiliarization. In *Feminist Futures: Contemporary Women's Speculative Fiction* (1982, 1984), Nathalie Rosinsky has outlined the experiments in narrative form and in democratizing heroism that make contemporary science fiction by women very different from that by men. In her *Where No Man Has Gone Before: Women and Science Fiction* (1991, p. 5), Lucie Armitt devotes one section to essays that explore "the extent to which these [women] writers have subverted the form [of science fiction] and its conventions for their own ends, and how they have contributed a specifically female voice to this seemingly patriarchal genre". The following statement by Jean

Pfaelzer (1988) underlines the role of "rhetorics of estrangement" in creating alternate worlds for women:

> "Rather than by the negation of history and representation, it is through the poetics and rhetorics of estrangement that feminist utopias give us a glimpse at what women's lives can be" (p. 292).

"Estrangement" and "foregrounding" are the two interconnected terms, which are highly productive terms in sci-fi studies. In his article entitled "On the Poetics of the Science Fiction Genre," published in 1972, the critic Darko Suvin defines the genre as a "literature of cognitive estrangement" (p. 372). Darko Suvin's definition is important because language plays a key role in creating effects of "estrangement" or "defamiliarization". In her "Beyond Defensiveness: Feminist Research Strategies" (1983, p. 151), the feminist thinker Daphne Patai considers "defamiliarization" or "estrangement" as a major technique in utopian fiction having an "extraordinary capacity to move the reader to a new awareness", as well as a "great potential as a feminist strategy in all areas". As Patai (1983) points out, foregrounding devices play a significant role in reception.

Foregrounding Devices and Their Role in the Reception

According to Caroline-Isabelle Caron (2003), reception of a cultural product can be analysed in two ways:

> "The first is directly, by asking questions to a chosen sample. The second is indirectly, by looking at the reappropriation of a cultural product" (p. 346).

Although I find the two methodological ways of analysing reception Caroline-Isabelle Caron mentions here relevant to reception studies, I think that we should first

distinguish between professional and non-professional reception. Professional reception that is usually called as critical reception can be analysed by looking at professionals', more precisely scholars' and critics' reception of cultural products. A wide range of documents such as articles, reviews, comments etc. are valuable sources we could use while carrying out a research on critical reception. As a result of easy access to materials to be analysed, most of the scholarly works are focussed only on critical reception. However, we must bear in mind that professional and non-professional reception might be so different from one another. In other words, the scholarly and theoretical interpretations of a cultural product are not always identical to the public's practical use of and response to this product.

As in the case of *Star Trek* translated in a Francophone context, a closer look at how cultural products have been practically used and reappropriated can also provide us with significant data that could shed light on reception. For instance, an analysis of *Star Trek* parodies and pop culture references in the target culture can be very revelatory in terms of reception of this cultural product. However, this is not the only way of analysing reception. Henry Jenkins (1995) who co-authored with John Tullach *Science Fiction Audiences : Doctor Who, Star Trek, and Their Fans* attempts to demonstrate, in his sections of the book, the ways three different fan communities - male MIT students, female fanzine writers, and the members of a queer fan club-interacted with *Star Trek*. This case study leads Jenkins to the conclusion that each group took something different from their encounter with the series, depending on, among other things, their understandings of science fiction as a genre, their existing interests and fantasies, and their forms of social interaction and cultural production. This case study, by basing on a completely different methodology, shows that reception is not to be considered as a

monolithical phenomenon since there might be differences even among the responses of diverse groups in the same society. Thus, regardless of their methodology, all these reception analyses somehow extend the boundaries of knowledge about reception. However, the general tendency in reception research is to examine visible works that have been highly reviewed or have tremendously influenced a large group of fans.

If we return to our main topic, translations and their reception, it is not so difficult to realize that most of the researchers seem to be less interested in analysing reception of translations whose impact on the target audience is slight or absent with regard to the source text's impact on the source audience. As Mikhail Bakhtin says: "For discourse nothing is more frightening than the absence of answer" (Bakhtin 1974; cited in Todorov 1984, p. 111). Thus, I suggest that in translation research, "the absence of responses" might be as interesting as "the plurality of responses." A contextual analysis can provide us with significant clues about the reasons behind this lack of response.

> "Context in translation involves all the conditions affecting the production, the publication, the dissemination, the reception, the lack of reception, and the revival of a text" (Luise von Flotow, 2005, p. 44).

Indeed, contextual analysis is of paramount importance for translation studies. However, a mere contextual analysis is not enough to account for the lack of response. A contextual analysis is much more useful when it is complemented with an in-depth ideological-discursive analysis and a cognitive-psychological experiment aimed at measuring translation effects. An ideological-discursive analysis can help us understand better the ideological factors behind the translator's choices and to explore how the translator receives the source text, while a cognitive-psychological experiment can

demonstrate how various strategies could create different effects on target readers. For example, when a group of readers receives two different translations of the same text, a real translation as well as a modified translation that is sensitive to the foregrounding devices of the source text, and when their responses to the real translation are much weaker than to the alternative translation, then the translation strategies used, misused and abused in the real translation may account for the readers' lack of response. Another way to empirically analyse the role of translation in shaping readers' responses consists in comparing the source and the target text readers' responses to the same text. Anybody involved in translation as a theoretician or practitioner can benefit from learning about cognitive-pyscological dynamics of translation by exploring which stimulus creates which perception on translation readers.

In sum, an experimental method is indispensable for analysing the effects of translations that have remained almost invisible in the target context although the source texts which they are based on have been highly acclaimed in their own English-speaking context. Experimental research seems to be the only way of stimulating readers' responses while there is a lack of responses. When there is not enough data to measure professional or non-professional reception, there is no other solution, for a translation researcher, than to bring this particular translation or body of translations to an experimental group of readers and simulate, according to certain parameters, a reading process akin to a real reading experience. As Caron (2003, p. 346) states, the sociological method of the questionnaire can be efficiently used in empirical reception research. However, how can one persuade the experimental group to read all the works under consideration? And, how does one analyse all the translation effects? I suggest we can have our experimental group read not the whole texts, but a representative sample

drawn from these texts and focus on the reception of some particular devices or what Nils Erik Enkvist calls, "style-markers." Enkvist (1988, p. 128) defines style-markers as "what makes up the characteristic style of a text." According to him (pp. 127-128), "one of the prime tasks of linguistic stylistics is to simulate the matching of a text and norm through explicit linguistic procedures. A precise methodology for doing just this has been developed, for instance, for author-attribution studies." Enkvist (1988) also provides further explanation on the precise methodology he refers to:

> The linguist begins by analysing and describing the text. He then circumscribes and analyses and describes a representative sample of a carefully chosen norm, noting significant similarities and differences and describing them at a suitable level of abstraction and delicacy. Thus he arrives at an inventory of style-markers, of those features whose occurrence and density are significantly similar to, or significantly different from the corresponding features in the norm. Intuitive judgements of significance can be supported with statistical calculations if need be (p. 128).

Nils Erik Enkvist (1988) warns also against some pitfalls surrounding this kind of simulation of text comprehension:

> One of the hazards is the selection and the circumscription of the norm. It is not in itself a linguistic procedure, but one determined by sociocultural considerations. All the same, it will determine the results. Ultimately the choice of norm must rely on a competent and knowledgeable investigator's judgements as to what is worth comparing with what in a particular investigation (p. 128).

Although he maintains that foregrounding is "an important concept that provides formal criteria for locating style-markers such as deviation from normal usage, repetitive patterning or clustering, etc.," and "such salient features may be relevant to literary effects", the linguist Peter Verdonk (1986) also shares the same preoccupations as Enkvist regarding the researcher's objectivity and selection criteria of foregrounding devices:

"However, it is not an objective criterion because the question what is and what is not foregrounded against the background of language can only be answered on the basis of subjective impressions" (p. 45).

Peter Verdonk (1986) extends his criticism further by saying that:

> Secondly, it has to be admitted that literary stylistics does not offer a theoretical framework validating a statement that a given foregrounded linguistic feature contributes to such and such literary effect. So if particular linguistic features are supplied with a mimetic interpretation, however tentative or straightforward, then such an interpretation relies heavily on the literary sensitivity of the stylistic critic (p. 45).

This criticism seem to be irrelevant because as the translation scholar, Jean Boase-Beir (2006) points out:

"Although it is often difficult to explain in what sense something in a text is striking, studies such as those by van Peer (e.g. 1986 : 22, 176) show a high degree of agreement among readers of literary texts as to what elements are foregrounded" (p. 94).

According to Boase-Beir (94), "the notion of universality (...), is important, because it suggests that a concept such as foregrounding as a reflection to attention to salience is a universal characteristic of animate beings, and that literature exploits this." In line with Jean Boase-Beir, Willie van Peer (1986, p. 22) who empirically tested the validity of the concept of foregrounding and found that both experienced and inexperienced readers responded to foregrounding in unambiguously poetic texts also underlines the concept's universality although having admitted that "different (groups of) readers may also display marked differences between the kind of relationships they perceive between their constructed foreground and background in the text":

"there will be serious (sub)cultural constraints on the range and quality of interpretations readers may produce. The devices of foregrounding contribute to

(culturally and historically) restrain the number and kind of interpretations readers may engage in when confronting a text" (Van Peer, 1986, p. 22).

Willie van Peer's statement shows how effective foregrounding devices can be in restraining the number and kind of interpretations of a text. In other words, foregrounding devices might function as significant meaning-carrying units that contribute to the overall interpretation of a text. However, as Geoffrey Leech (1965) points out, the significance of foregrounding devices lies in their "cohesion" within a text. Thus, foregrounding devices are not random collections of textual units, they constitute a pattern that makes the text cohere. M.A.K Halliday's distinction between "prominence" and "foregrounding" also has a common thread with Leech's concept of "cohesion." Halliday (1971) who defines prominence as "departures from some expected pattern of frequency" distinguishes it from true foregrounding that is "a motivated prominence."

> (...) a feature that is brought into prominence will be 'foregrounded' only if it relates to the meaning of the text as a whole. This relationship is a functional one: if a particular feature of the language contributes, by its prominence, to the total meaning of the work it does so by virtue of and through the medium of its own value in the language- through the linguistic function from which its meaning is derived. Where the function is relevant to our interpretation of the work, the prominence will appear as motivated (p. 339).

It is evident from the statement above that M.A.K Halliday who has characterized foregrounding by its functionality and motivatedness fundamentally agrees with the Czech theorist Jan Mukařovsky (2000, p. 227) who highlighted "consistency and systematic character of foregrounding" as the key component in poetic language. Thus, as patterned, structured semantic units, foregrounding devices are crucial for the interpretation of a text.

In Van Peer's terms (1986, p. 16), these devices that function vertically in the different layers of linguistic structures and give the text a density by constituting a "nexus of foregrounding" are also the key parts of the discourse. Thus, within the discourse, they assume a constructive role rather than serving as a mere representational tool. For instance, foregrounding devices used in the works of feminist speculative fiction show us that these devices are not only employed for esthetic purposes, but also for political and ideological purposes. In this sense, foregrounding devices as value-laden units can also serve as what Kristeva calls "ideologemes". Therefore, I could argue that the ideology of the text is constructed by the use of foregrounding devices in relationship with a background so that a subtle analysis of these devices can make us explore the ideology of the text as well as the context in which it has been produced. Like Robert C. Holub (1984, p. 19), I also think that the *Prague School* linguist, Mukařovsky's "foregrounding" has extended the scope of the concept of "device" conceived of by the Russian Formalists as an artistic feature that "compels the reader to ignore the social ramifications by directing attention to the process of defamiliarization as an element of art." Jan Mukařovsky who chose to look more closely at the semiotic character of the artwork and affirmed the social nature of both the sign and the recipient has bridged the gap between social and literary functions of "device" by introducing the concept of foregrounding:

> "(...) what Mukařovsky detects in Shklovskii's work and what he himself will
> place at the center of his theory is the interpenetration of social reality and
> literary text" (Holub, 1984, p. 31).

From my perspective, not only social reality, but also ideological tendency play a major role in the use of foregrounding devices. This is why I will insist more on the

ideological character of foregrounding devices throughout my thesis. More precisely, I will attempt to show how foregrounding devices in the target text might be used for feminist purposes and how the translator's use, abuse and non-use of foregrounding devices can manipulate the meaning by creating different translation effects on readers. My approach to translation effects is cognitive-psychological as well as ideological-discursive. Thus, I won't just limit myself to analysing how ideology reshapes textual and translational strategies, but I will also examine, through an empirical analysis, how various translation strategies manipulate the reading and reception of the target audience. From this angle, my research is a contribution to a field that deserves to be held in a higher esteem in translation studies. In her article where she has focussed on the translation of sexual terms and references to sexuality in a number of Beauvoir texts, Luise von Flotow (2000) draws attention to the translation effect and its implications for reception as a noteworthy topic that has not been investigated sufficiently in translation studies so far:

> Translation as a textual operation that makes literary, scholarly, and pragmatic materials available across cultures is inordinately valuable: texts live on in translation, differently. The translation effect- the visible and verifiable changes a text undergoes in translation and the effect this has on its reception in a new culture- is, however, rarely discussed (p. 14).

Having already mentioned semantic and ideological aspects of foregrounding devices, I will now briefly deal with foregrounding devices' perceptual, emotional and cognitive implications. Up to this point, we have discussed that foregrounding devices convey meaning and ideology; we will now draw attention to their capacity to evoke feelings.

In Canada, two literary scholars, David Miall and Donald Kuiken have produced a large body of work exploring emotional and "affective" responses to literature, drawing on the concepts of "defamiliarization" or "foregrounding." They have used both

experiments and new developments in neuropsychology, and have developed a questionnaire for measuring different aspects of a reader's response. David Miall and Donald Kuiken's main focus is the cognitive and mostly the psychological process a reader undergoes when encountering foregrounding. They also examine the generality of the relationships between foregrounding, strikingness, affect and reading time. One of the many findings of Miall and Kuiken's (1995) experimental research is that foregrounding evokes *aesthetic feelings* that initially unsettle conventional conceptions and then help to guide the reconceptualization of textual referents.

The guidance foregrounding provides to readers to reconceptualise textual referents, makes it a significant object of study for translation scholars as well. At this point, I will suggest that foregrounding is one of the most useful concepts for interdisciplinary research that has been largely promoted by today's academia. It is not without reason that foregrounding has been called by Leech & Short (1981, p. 69) "the meeting point of linguistic and literary concerns". David Miall and Donald Kuiken's research has shown that foregrounding is also compatible with psychologic and more particularly psychonarratologic concerns.

The concept of foregrounding that originally comes from visual arts has also been a fruitful concept in this area and in measuring spectators' responses. The effect of foregrounding in film has been lately studied by Frank Hakemulder. With its broad scope of application, foregrounding seems also to be relevant to reception studies, as a concept that could not only shed light on the author-text relationship, but also on the reader-text relationship. In the context of translation studies, a multiple foregrounding analysis can provide us with data on four types of relationships: author-ST relationship

and ST reader-ST relationship, Translator-ST relationship, TT reader-TT text relationship.

Since the use of and the response to foregrounding have always been the result of a writing strategy, all the above-indicated types of relationships can be said to be directly related to the matter of reception. How does the author use foregrounding devices in the ST? How does the ST reader respond to these devices? How does the translator translate them? How does the TT reader respond to them? What is the role of foregrounding in reception? My efforts to seek answers to these questions prompt me to ask new questions about reception. At this point, it is fitting to dwell on how a focus on examples of foregrounding and their translation can contribute to translation studies.

- Foregrounding devices function as significant meaning-carrying units that contribute to the overall interpretation of a text.

- As Willie van Peer shows, foregrounding devices can be very effective in restraining the number and kinds of interpretations of a text.

- Foregrounding devices can shed light on the aesthetics and ideology of the text.

- Focus on foregrounding devices shows that, in translation research, "the absence of responses" might be as interesting as "the plurality of responses".

- The translation or non-translation of foregrounding might account for the "the absence of responses" to the target text.

- The translator's use, abuse and non-use of foregrounding devices can manipulate the source text's meaning by creating different translation effects on readers.

- Foregrounding, one of the most useful concepts for interdisciplinary research, is compatible with discursive/ideological and empirical/cognitive concerns of translation studies.

- Literary foregrounding is analysable in the light of following questions: How does the author use foregrounding devices in the ST? How does the ST reader respond to these devices? How does the translator translate them? How does the TT reader respond to them? What is the role of foregrounding in reception?

Relevance of Foregrounding Theory to Translation Studies

To illustrate the concept of foregrounding, the *Prague School* linguist, Bohuslav Havranek (1964) uses a translation example:

> What do we understand by the different automatisation and foregrounding of the devices of the language? Let me start with an example taken from the relationship between different languages where these differences are most conspicuous. If we, for instance, translate the common Russian greeting formula *zdravstvuyte* into Czech by the phrase *bud'te zdrav* [be healthy], everyone who does not know the literal meaning of the greeting *zdravstvuyte*, but knows its use, will immediately note that such a translation is unsuitable; in Czech this greeting has a whole series of equivalents. Why is this? A common Russian greeting form has been translated into Czech by an uncommon form, that is, we have changed an automatised expression into a foregrounded one although, of course, the phrase *bud'te zdrav* for many other purposes, for instance at the end of a letter, in saying goodbye, and the like, will be a completely common and automatised expression.(...) (p. 19).

Bohuslav Havranek's selection of a translation example to clarify the concept of foregrounding is very meaningful. Havranek's suggestion is very close to Lawrence Venuti's concept of foreignizing translation. With his landmark lecture *Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens* (1813), Friedrich Schleiermacher becomes the forerunner of Venuti's concepts' of foreignizing and domesticating translation.

According to Venuti (1995, p. 20): "Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. In its effort to do right abroad, this translation method must do wrong at home, deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience - choosing to translate a foreign text excluded by literary canons for example, or using a marginal discourse to translate it." Venuti who explicitly advocates foreignizing translation might be thought to be in line with French translation theorist, Antoine Berman (1985) who maintains:

> "La visée éthique, poétique et philosophique de la traduction consiste à manifester dans sa langue cette pure nouveauté en préservant son visage de nouveauté. Et même, comme disait Goethe, à lui donner une *nouvelle* nouveauté lorsque son effet de nouveauté s'est épuisé dans sa propre aire langagière" (p. 89).

Although they both are usually thought to echo the same views on translation, Venuti (1991) opposes Berman by criticizing him for his "naive" reading of Schleirmacher:

> Schleiermacher's methodological distinction can be radical in this sense only pour *notre époque* since he doesn't describe the authentic translator's "aim" in ethical terms; rather his terms are social, with translation offering an understanding of the foreign text which is not merely ethnocentric, but relative to a specific social group (pp. 129-130).

Venuti (1991) seems to be more concerned by social agenda behind foreignizing translation rather than conceiving it in ethical terms, and his views shed light on some foreignizing strategies used for feminist purposes:

> "Some English-language translators are selecting foreign texts and developing foreignizing strategies to intervene in cultural political divisions, serving a

feminist agenda, for example, by challenging patriarchal representations of author and translator in the target-language culture" (p. 148).

However, for some feminists like Gayatri Chravorty Spivak, foreignizing is not empty of its ethical significance. For Spivak (2000, p. 398), the ethics of translation reside in "the translator's task to facilitate (...) love between the original and its shadow." Thus, the translator can perform this task by "surrendering to the source text" and its "rhetoricity". Spivak also underlines that surrendering to the source text is, for her, "more erotic than ethical" (p. 400). To my view, Spivak has preferred to stress the erotic rather than ethical implications of the translator's relationship to the source text because ethical behaviour is often conceived to be a learned, internalised, idealistic and necessary behaviour while erotic behaviour that combines sensations such as pleasures, desires and emotions seems to be more natural and instinctive than socially and culturally motivated. In this sense, the act of surrendering seems to be realized when the translator comes to perceive the universe of the source text by pursuing "the trace of the other in the self" in such a way as to explore the self.

As mentioned by Spivak (2000), translators' establishment of an "erotic" or "intimate" relationship with the source text, their pursuit of "the trace of the other in the self" and their grasp of "rhetorical silences" evoke a phenomenological relationship with language described by Merleau-Ponty in following terms:

"The failure of the body or language to coincide with themselves exposes to view the texture of the flesh, the specific rapport of visibility to invisibility and of sound to silence" (p. 59)

Thus, if we reformulate Spivak's ideas on translation in phenomenological terms, the translator as a perceiving subject is expected to enter a dialectical relationship or a fleshly contact with the text already imbued and incarnated with meaning in such a way as to interrogate his/her own being in the world.

In her article entitled "Flesh, Folds and Texturality: Thinking Visual Ellipsis via Merleau-Ponty, Hél□ne Cixous and Robert Frank", Jenny Chamarette (2007) gives a clear account of Merleau-Ponty's concept of "flesh":

> "For Merleau-Ponty, 'flesh' is the incarnation of Being within sensibility; that is, our ability to sense the world that also permits us to recognize ourselves as sensing bodies. In other words, 'flesh' constitutes a point of departure for meaning" (p. 38).

As Chamarette (2007, p. 39) states further, Merleau-Ponty's concept of "flesh" can also resonate with the Derridean concept of "trace", which is described by Jacques Derrida (1976, p. 65) as "the differance [*différance*] which opens appearance [*l'apparaître*] and signification." In his *Margins of Philosophy*, Derrida (1982) elucidates his concept of "trace":

> Since the trace is not a *presence* but the *simulacrum* of *a presence*, that dislocates itself, displaces itself, refers to itself, it properly has no site – *erasure belongs to its structure*. And not only the erasure which must always be able to overtake it (without which it would not be a trace but an indestructible and monumental substance), but also the erasure which constitutes it from the outset as a *trace*, which situates it as the change of site, and makes it disappear in its appearance, makes it emerge from itself in its production (p. 24).

The Derridean concept of "trace" reminds us of Gayatri Spivak (2000, p. 398) considering language as "a vital clue where the self loses its boundaries." In her "Politics of Translation", Spivak informs the feminist translator on the importance of

considering "language as a clue to the workings of gendered agency." Thus, traces are like clues that facilitate and, at the same time intricate the task of the translator.

At this point, one might ask where translator must seek for these clues that will bring them to deeper structures of meaning. I think that Spivak (p. 398) has also provided us with the answer to this question: "rhetorical silences" or "the ways in which rhetoric or figuration disrupt the logic." What Spivak understands by rhetorical silences is much similar to what Boris Havranek understands by "foregrounding devices." This similarity of perspective has also been approved by Spivak's example from the two different translations of Mahasweta Dewi's "Stanadãyini": In one of those translations, the title is translated as "Breast-giver" while in the other, as "The Wet-Nurse." Spivak (p. 400) maintains that when translated as "The Wet-Nurse", the translator "neutralizes the author's irony in constructing an uncanny word; enough like "wet-nurse" to make that sense, an enough unlike to shock." As this example illustrates, for Spivak, traces or rhetorical silences that catch readers' attention by bringing to the foreground their differences are foregrounding devices.

In a more recent article entitled "Translating into English", Spivak (2005, p. 105) suggests "thinking of trace rather than of achieved translation: trace of the other, trace of the history, even cultural traces." Ideological traces and presuppositions can also be called "ideologemes" and may take part in a discourse, in our case, feminist discourse, as foregrounding devices. For example, feminist writers can resort to several foregrounding devices such as word play, neologisms etc. to foreground their ideological tendency. However, it should be noted that although the translator may claim to share the same ideology with the source text writer, they can be observed to have chosen to foreground different elements in their translation. As Spivak (2000, p.

400) clearly states: " the good-willing attitude "she is like me" is not very helpful."

However, some feminists such Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood (1991) are willing to

assume an authorial role in feminist translation, which they consider as a cooperative

project where the translator and the author "speak out of the same mouth":

> "Through the "power of two mouths speaking" together, feminine meaning has been given to the relationship between author and translator as well as to the production of meaning itself. The two women's signatures on the translated text identify it as a joint project realized in the spirit of solidarity" (Lotbinière-Harwood, 1991, pp. 154-155).

Venuti and Spivak who both theorized on translation as a site of promoting alterity

rather than sameness explicitly advocate literalist strategies:

> "Surrendering to the text in this way means, most of the time, being literal"
>
> (Spivak, 2000, p. 406).

Obviously, literalist translation is conceived by these scholars as a sensibility on the part

of the translator to preserve potential and referential meanings of the source text. Such a

sensibility or consciousness that leads the translator to use the source text optimally as a

frame of reference by the aim of reframing it in the target context is not far from playing

a subversive role on the target language and culture. In other words, as Vladamir

Nabokov's translation of *Eugene Onegin* has shown, even a morphemic translation that

is the extreme form of literalism could be considered as a creative and norm-breaking

translation. However, one must bear in mind that to translate something foreignizing

and recreate the difference of the source text in the target culture is not always possible

by the use of literal strategies. For example, when it depends on the translation of the

puns, the translator cannot always produce literalist solutions. In such cases, to

reinscribe the difference in the target culture, the translator has no other solution than

"hijacking" the source text as its co-author by the use of non-literal, but creative and

effective translation strategies. This is why I propose to think about difference in cognitive-psychological terms more than ethical terms. Having admitted that translator's ethics is an important area of research, I am rather concerned by thinking about difference in terms of its cognitive, perceptual and emotional effects. I, of course, mean translation effects. It seems to me that we should be more concerned about the effects and functions when we consider translation not as a search of equivalence, but difference. Absolute equivalence being a utopian project; it's possible to create, in Bourdieusian terms, an *illusio* of the source text in the target culture. As Eugene Nida et al. (1983) clearly state in their *Style and Discourse* (1983), what we should reflect on is how we could functionally transfer rhetorical features:

> "The question is basically 'what is the function' of rhetorical feature or features? (...) Though the features may not be universal, the functions are, for all languages have devices for such functions as emphasis, marking, similarities and contrasts, foregrounding and backgrounding (...)" (p. 168).

It is interesting that Nida et al. have drawn attention to the role of foregrounding devices in making rhetorical features functional. Foregrounding being so important in translation, I completely disagree with Rosemary Arrojo who criticized Suzanne Jill Levine, Lori Chamberlain and Luise von Flotow for basing on a "double standard" in their conception of feminist strategy:

> Like Suzanne Jill Levine's and Lori Chamberlain's, Luise von Flotow's conception of a "feminist" strategy of translation is based on a double standard. At the same time that she sees violence in the patriarchal, logocentric tropes that have reduced the translator's role to an impossibly neutral recovery of someone else's meaning, she

considers "hijacking" to be a desirable and, we may assume, non-violent approach for the kind of translation pursued by feminists (Arrojo 1994, p. 157). Just by basing on a couple of statements by the above-mentioned translators and scholars, Rosemary Arrojo argues that all these translators and scholars unjustly praise "unfaithful" translations as "feminist" translations. I think that if Rosemary Arrojo did more than focusing on metadiscourses on translations, for example, if she examined the strategies used in these translations in terms of their functions and effects on target culture readers, she would have reached to a completely different conclusion and have noticed that the translations she argues to be "unfaithful" actually fulfill in the target context a function similar to that of the source text. Thus, one must bear in mind that even a subversive translation can be as "faithful" as a submissive translation given its ability to transpose the source text's difference to the target culture. In brief, there might be various ways of translating difference or creating foregrounding in the target context.

Up to this point, we discussed foregrounding devices as foreignizing units braided with the difference and ideology of the text. Now, I will attempt to illustrate by two examples how the ideology of a text could be reversed and replaced by the translator's own ideology when foregrounding devices different from those of the source text are used in translation. For the first example, I will refer to Anthony Pym who has mentioned about the case of Nietzchean translator, Henri Albert who, through the prism of his personal background, provided the 19th century French audience with an anti-German and misogynous image of Nietzsche.

This translation of Nietzsche that was a true reflection of its translator's inner world has been concretized by the translator, Henri Albert's creation of his own foregrounding of the source text. In his article entitled "Lives of Henri Albert,

Nietzchean Translator, Anthony Pym (1995, p. 124) points out that Henri Albert "emphasized Nietzschean disdain for women and the family" and "stressed Nietzsche's preference for life in a European non-Germany" in his translations of Nietzsche. Regarding Henri Albert's translation strategies, Pym (1995, p. 121) states that "he initially selected the fragments that were the most specifically French in temperament and reference; he constantly transformed titles so as to cater to Parisian taste (...); he spent little time elaborating and standardising the more complex concepts (..)."Anthony Pym *mmk* who, in his *Method in Translation History*, handled the case of Henri Albert once again, has underlined that Albert "gave prominence to Nietzsche's misogyny" as a translational manifestation of his own homosexuality and "denied the Germanness of the source texts, making Nietzsche as anti-German and as pro-French as himself" (p.171). The verbs used by Pym to describe Albert's translation strategies make sense in our context: "emphasize", "stress", "give prominence". Anthony Pym's (1995) critical attitude towards Henri Albert's re-foregrounding of the source text is clear:

> "As the case of Henri Albert shows, the work of translators can effectively separate rather than bridge cultures, flattening rather than pluralizing the image of the other, edging toward transcultural mistrust rather than cooperative understanding" (p. 124).

Another example showing that the translator can easily create a new foregrounding by adding, omitting and modifying some elements in the source text, is the 1944 dated French translation of John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath*, a translation carried out in Belgium under the Nazi occupation. This translation to which Jean-Marc Gouanvic (2001, p. 208) refers as "a case of unethical translation practice" was first done by Karin de Hatker, "final version by Albert Debaty", and published in 1944 by the Éditions De

Kogge under the title *Grappes d'amertume*. As Gouanvic (209) clearly states, to make it "serve the interests of Nazi Germany", the Hatker/Debaty translation re-foregrounds Steinbeck's text. Their main translation strategy is to suppress all the references related to the bombs, the workers' movement and Marxist ideology and to use instead lexical items that could substantiate the very spirit of national identity. For example, the word "the land" becomes "pays" in translation (Gouanvic, p. 208). Obviously, Gouanvic's critical position towards the translation in hand is similar to Anthony Pym's views on Henri Albert's translations of Nietzsche, which I have mentioned above. Jean-Marc Gouanvic (2001) suggests that:

> "In order for the translation to present an ethical image of itself, the source and target texts must be in a relationship that can be described as a 'community of destinies'." (p. 209)

Jean-Marc Gouanvic (2001) also calls this idea of 'community of destinies" as the principle of homology in translation. While developing this principle of homology, Gouanvic has in mind French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu who, in his *Choses Dites* (1987), defined homology as a "resemblance in difference" (qtd. in Gouanvic, 2007, p. 360). Gouanvic (2001, pp. 210-211) maintains that, as in the case of Boris Vian's translation of van Voght, if the translator makes the target culture readers adhere to the *illusio* of the source text and the literary genre to which it belongs, at the expense of diverting from it by the use of different strategies such explicitation and colloquialization, homology in translation may still be said to be ensured because these strategies help the translator foreground the effect of "willing suspension of disbelief" that is typical of science fiction. It is obvious that foregrounding seems to be considered by Jean-Marc Gouanvic as an effective and ethical strategy when it is used to promote

the source text and genre in the target culture. Although Gouanvic does not refer to Maria Tymoczko, his "homology" is reminiscent of target text's metonymic relationship to its source text, which Tymoczko (1995, p. 21) argues to be used in all translations "to avoid an information load while at the same time honouring the fact that a marginalized text represent its culture and literary tradition" :

> "all translators, including scholarly ones, select specific aspects of the metonymic relationship between text and literary system or text and culture to realize and to privilege" (Tymoczko, 1995, p. 19).

When translators choose to privilege some aspects of the source text in the target culture, as Maria Tymoczko says, it means that they create their own foregrounding of the source text. As for the creation of a new foregrounding in the target context, I would like to respond to Maria Tymoczko by saying that the selection of metonymies to be preserved in the target language is not always done for the purpose of managing an information load or promoting a marginalized text. As the above-mentioned examples show, foregrounding is not always in favour of the source text and its writer and there might be various reasons behind the selection of the elements to be foregrounded in the target culture: psychological (Henri Albert's own Anti-German and misogynist feelings), political and ideological (Nazist ideals). Although I am critical of Maria Tymoczko for not having questioned causes and consequences of metonymic relationships that seem to be more complex than she argues, I sincerely appreciate her vision of the importance of an understanding of the metonymics of translated texts for translation research:

> "An understanding of the metonymics of translated texts makes it more possible to grade more finely the sorts of larger and relatively inoperable classifications

of translation strategies that are generally proposed in the literature of Translation Studies" (Tymoczko, 1995, p. 22).

To my view, an analysis of foregrounding can offer us a better understanding of the metonymics of translated texts. If translation is an act that consists of the translator's selection of some source text aspects to foreground in the target culture, the easiest way of learning about the translator's overall strategy or ideology is to look at how s/he treated what has been already foregrounded. A foregrounding-based analysis has to be comparative because as Sara Laviosa (1998) points out:

> "When studying translation as a product entirely in the target language environment, we can only put forward suggestions regarding the possible causes that may have led to certain patterns. In order to find an explanation for our results, we would need to construct and analyse in parallel another corpus that would include the source texts of the translational component (...)." (p. 565)

My use of a comparative analysis doesn't imply that I naively expect from the target text to be "identical" to the source text. I aim to work on a comparable corpus just to see how certain foregrounding devices that are very characteristic of the source texts have been transformed through translation. My primary concern is to build my analysis on a critical ground. What I understand by being critical is as Ruth Wodak clearly states:

> "Critical" means not taking things for granted, opening up complexity, challenging reductionism, dogmatism and dichotomies, being self-reflective in my research, and through these processes, making opaque structures of power relations and ideologies manifest."Critical", thus, does not imply the common sense meaning of "being negative"—rather "skeptical". Proposing alternatives is also part of being "critical"" (Kendell, 2007, paragraph 17).

Proposing an alternative translation to the existing translation in order to measure the effect of foregrounding on the readers is also part of my critical perspective. Up to this point, I attempted to show translators can resort to negative and positive foregrounding of the source text.

I think that the professor of discourse studies, Teun A. van Dijk's findings regarding how emphasizing and de-emphasizing strategies in a discourse, in our terminology foregrounding devices, can be indicative of our positive and negative perceptions of other groups. Van Dijk (1998, p. 41) stresses that particularly in public discourse, group members choose to bring to the fore positive attributes of the perceived ingroup and the negative attributes to the perceived outgoup, while de-emphasizing information that is negative about the ingroup or positive about the outgroup.

> Speakers or writers may emphasize our good things by topicalizing positive meanings, by using positive lexical items in self-descriptions, by providing many details about good actions, and few details about bad actions, by hyperbole and positive metaphors, by leaving implicit our negative properties, or by de-emphasizing our agency of negative acts through passive sentences or nominalizations (...) such formal and meaning aspects of dominant discourse not only express and enact power, but are also geared to the construction of desired mental models and social representations, that is, to influence, manipulation or control of the mind (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 108).

Emphasizing and de-emphasizing strategies to which van Dijk draws attention, may also be used in the translated discourse. The translator holds the power to use his/her own discursive strategies to narrate, describe and argue in the target language by manipulating the source text author's *parole* according to his/her own social or personal cognition. Discursive manipulation as defined by Teun A. van Dijk (2006) is determined how emphasis is used in the discourse:

> "Discursively, manipulation generally involves the usual forms and formats of ideological discourse, such as emphasizing Our good things, and emphasizing Their bad things" (p. 359).

We could also apply van Dijk's above definition to the field of translation and say that for the translator, the way of manipulating the source text is to have recourse to

foregrounding devices. Language offers the translator a broad range of possibilities to emphasize and de-emphasize certain aspects in the source text.

"language and discourse have a broad range of structural possibilities to emphasize and de-emphasize information and hence also the ideologically controlled opinions about ingroups and outgroups" (Van Dijk, 1995 b, p. 145).

At this point, one might ask what kind of foregrounding devices could be used to manipulate the source text. Van Dijk (1995, p. 145) who admits that 'emphasis' is a very general structural notion states that this notion may apply to fallowing levels of written and verbal discourse:

- phonological structures (stress, pitch, volume, intonation)
- graphical structures (headlines, bold characters)
- overall ordering and size (first and later, higher and lower, bigger and smaller, primacy and recency)
- syntactic structure (word order, topicalization, clausal relations: main and subordinate, fronted or embedded; split constructions)
- semantic structures (explicit vs. implicit, detail and level of description, semantic macrostructures vs. details)
- lexical style (positive vs. negative opinion words)
- rhetoric (under- and overstatement, euphemism, litotes; repetition)
- schematic or superstructures (expressed or not in prominent conventional category, e.g., Headline or Conclusion; storytelling and argumentation)
- pragmatic (assertion vs. denial; self-congratulation vs. accusation)
- interactive (turn-taking: self-selection and dominance; topic maintenance and change; non-verbal communication: face, gestures, etc.) (Van Dijk, 1995 b, p. 145).

I think that Van Dijk's findings and proposed framework of analysis are highly interesting from two aspects. Firstly, Van Dijk is very clear on that ideological manipulation is realized at the level of foregrounding. Secondly, differently from Russian formalists and the Prague School theorists who have analysed foregrounding as an aesthetic phenomenon at the rhetorical level of poetical genre, Van Dijk considers foregrounding as an ideological phenomenon that is realized at many levels of any

manipulated discourse. Before discussing in more detail how we could use and develop Van Dijk's above-mentioned analytical framework in our discursive-ideological and cognitive-pyschological experimental research, I would like to refer to several translation scholars who have highlighted the relevance of foregrounding to translation studies.

In their collective article entitled "Foregrounding as a Criterion for Translation Studies", Chinese translation scholars, Jingmin Li & Shuhua Xu (2003), mention the applicability of the theory of foregrounding to translation studies:

> "With the theory of foregrounding, translating and its products can be observed and evaluated from a new angle, and foregrounding itself will become an interesting subject for the study of translation criticism" (pp. 302).

In their article, Li & Xu also refer to the American scholar, Zinan Ye (2000) who has already mentioned the applicability of the theory of foregrounding to translation studies. As Zinan Ye's book *The Principles and Practice of English-Chinese Translation* has been written in Chinese, I won't be able to discuss here how he applies foregrounding to translation studies. However, I will briefly explain how Jingmin Li & Shuhua Xu made use of foregrounding in their own research. Li & Xu (2000) distinguish two types of foregrounding:

- Foregrounding associated with the SL
- Foregrounding associated with the TL

Li & Xu (2000, pp. 303) state that "the first type refers to the foregrounding made by the author of the SL, who intentionally deautomatizes the linguistic device to create

prominence". To illustrate this type of foregrounding, they also give as an example the Peggotty character in Charles Dickens's *David Copperfield*, where Dickens has resorted to some linguistic defects, grammatical mistakes, and awkward words to portray Peggotty who is a kind, simple and honest, but uneducated and illiterate character. Li & Xu (p. 303) who cited an excerpt of the two different Chinese translations of the novel, have found out that in one of these translations, foregrounded version with many linguistic defects was kept while in the other, the foregrounded remarks were automatized. Li & Xu (p. 303) who associate the second type of foregrounding to the TL defines it as follows:

> "The devices of the SL in the text are not deviated from the norm, but the translator, influenced by the features the SL, deviates from the norm of the TL and renders automatized expressions into foregrounded ones" (Li & Xu, p. 303).

To my mind, if one considers foregrounding in terms of translation strategies and translators' purposes, one could distinguish at least six types of foregrounding:

Six Types of Foregrounding

- Propagandistic foregrounding: Due to personal or ideological factors, the translator modifies the use and the distribution of some foregrounded elements in the source text and/or systematically uses some elements that don't exist in the source text. These translations can be considered propagandistic or self-promotional because they serve to revive in the target culture the translator's personal or ideological aspirations rather than glorifying the source text and its writer. In these translations that often exercise censorship over and inject an artificial ideology to the source text, the self dominates the source text. For exp.

Henri Albert's Nietzschean translations. Hatker/Debaty translation of Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath*.

The translator profile: Dictator

- Neutralizing foregrounding: Due to his/her lack of understanding of linguistic subtleties and his/her inability to overcome linguistic challenges presented by the source text, the translator just tends to neutralize foregrounded elements of the source text without any recourse to new foregrounding strategies. Although the translator doesn't use new foregrounding strategies, s/he manipulates somehow the textual cohesion and causes the reader to have a new foregrounding of the source text. In these translations, the self doesn't care the source text's deeper structures enough. For exp. The Chinese translation that suppressed linguistic defects of the Peggotty character in Charles Dickens's *David Copperfield.*

The translator profile: Unskilled worker

- Equalizing foregrounding: The translator tends to modify or suppress the source text's foregrounded elements due to ideological factors. In these translations, the self directs towards the text to gain the text a new foregrounding based on a more egalitarian perspective. In these translations driven by the aim of creating a more egalitarian relationship between the source text and its readers, the translator resists the domination of the source text. For exp. Gender-inclusive Bible translations. Extreme feminist Bibles may refer to "God the father" as

"God the father-mother" or "God the eternal one" (e.g., see Oxford's *Inclusive New Testament*).

The translator profile: Judge

- Promotional foregrounding: The translator modifies the use and the distribution of some foregrounded elements in the source text and/or systematically uses some elements that don't exist in the source text to promote the source text's ideology or literary merit and/or to exhibit his/her own talent as a translator. In these translations, the self and the source text are in a fruitful collaboration so the self glorifies the source text and the gloried source text helps its translator and his/her aspirations to be glorified in the target culture. For exp. Boris Vian's translation of Van Voght. Clémence Royer's translations of Darwin.

  The translator profile: Advertiser

- Didactic foregrounding: The translator tries to bring into the notice of target readers all the foregrounding devices used in the source text by also foregrounding his/her own presence in the form of abundant footnotes or extratextual signs. In these translations, the self treats the source text as a teaching material that serves pragmatic goals. For exp. Erika Wisselinck's German version of Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*.

  The translator profile: Scholar

- Emotional/Creative foregrounding: His/her ideological and/or literary impulses push the translator to assume the role of a re-creator by producing creative translation solutions, which are based on the source text's foregrounded

elements. These translations aim to create similar cognitive, perceptual, emotional effects on target culture readers. In these translations, where the source text precedes the self; the translator completely devotes himself/herself to the source text. For exp. Barbara Godard's translations of Nicole Brossard. Gayatri Spivak's translations of Mahesweta Devi.

The translator profile: Artist

The above six-tiered model for foregrounding typology and six different profiles of translators as foregrounding agents, which I proposed after I reflected upon various strategies and purposes involved in translation process, is not hierarchically-designed with ethical codes in mind, so it must be underlined that the model under consideration doesn't prioritize or idealize none of these types of foregrounding for any reason. Although my main concern within the framework of this thesis is to examine the use and the effects of emotional/creative foregrounding in translation, I think that it's also of crucial importance to consider all these types of foregrounding according to personal, political, cultural and social contexts in which they were produced and according to the role they played in the target culture.

I proposed this alternative model to show how foregrounding marks translation strategies and how each translator is vis-a-vis a decision in regard to the mode of use of foregrounding in translation process, but of course, this model and identified translator profiles can be developed by an analysis of a larger corpus of translations. Further models can also be designed by basing on the detailed strategies used to create each type of foregrounding and the impacts of foregrounding strategies on the target culture. Foregrounding that is a very complex tool of linguistic manipulation seems to function like a semiotic theory of language by offering us some nodal points where discourse and

ideology are tightly interwoven in such a way to affect readers' overall understanding of the translated text. Therefore, Willie van Peer's concept of "nexus of foregrounding" seems be very relevant to the ideological/discursive analysis I will carry out:

> "Other things being equal, such a nodal point will be more foregrounded than the occurrence of deviance or parallelism on only one level of linguistic organisation" (Van Peer, 1986, p. 16).

To reinforce their intended effects on readers, authors and translators can choose to persistently foreground a specific set of isotopic patterns at several levels of linguistic structure such as lexical-semantic, grammatical-syntactic or narrative-discursive and in so doing, they construct a "nexus of foregrounding". This is why the translation researcher has to look at different layers of a text to develop a sharper perspective with regard to the main foregrounding strategy used in translation. However, one must bear in mind that foregrounding devices can be also used extensively at a particular level of the text. For example, Gustavo Martin-Asensio's (2000) book entitled *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles: A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective* is based on an investigation of foregrounding at grammatical-syntactic level (use of present and aorist tense forms, clause-structure analysis, transitivity patterns). In his article "Foregrounding and its Relevance for Interpretation and Translation with *Acts* 27 As a Case Study", which is then integrated into his book as a sub-section, Martin-Asensio (1999) also gives some suggestions to Bible translators to interpret and translate the foregrounding schema used in the source text in a more in*nova*tive way. Martin-Asensio's work is very original since it is one of the few works dealing with the relevance of foregrounding to translation studies. His analysis of foregrounding in the light of M.A.K Halliday's functional-grammatical approach is also

interesting. Having admitted that Hallidayan theory of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) and the three interconnected metafunctions of language (ideational, interpersonal, textual) introduced by M.AK Halliday have been very useful to critical linguists and then, critical discourse analysts (for example. Norman Fairclough). This theory, whose particular focus is on grammar and syntax, considers language as a carrier of social meaning. However, SFG's focus on social theory and ideology analysis is much weaker than its focus on language and textual analysis. Therefore, Teun. Van Dijk's ideology-based CDA approach that tries to develop the notion of cognition in relation to discourse and power seems to be more relevant to my research. The goal of CDA according to Van Dijk (2003) is:

> to spell out these general social strategies of dominance and knowledge management at the more detailed level of cognitive knowledge structures and strategies and how these affect discourse structures, and vice versa; how these discourse strategies may in turn affect the cognitive and then the social properties of the audience and society at large" (p. 88).

Teun. A. van Dijk who proposes to deal with discourse in its interaction with cognitive and social structures, also informs us on what kind of discourse analysis we need to carry out if we intend to shed light on these complex structures:

> a. Examining the context of the discourse: historical, political or social background of a conflict and its main participants
> b. Analyzing groups, power relations and conflicts involved
> c. Identifying positive and negative opinions about Us versus Them
> d. Making explicit the presupposed and the implied
> e. Examining all formal structure: lexical choice and syntactic structure, in a way that helps to (de)emphasize polarized group opinions. (Van Dijk, 1998, pp. 61-63)

A multi-layered foregrounding analysis of syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes of the discourse heavily based on Teun. A. van Dijk's model can allow us to explore the target text's axiological schema, power differentials, ideological polarizations and

focalizations to which Philippe Hamon (1984) has drawn attention in his *Texte et Idéologie*:

> Il s'agit de voir dans quelle mesure (…) les textes construisent, manipulent, proposent au lecteur, incorporent à leur organisation – ou sabotent – certains dispositifs stylistiques destinés à signifier une échelle de valeurs (…), des rapports évaluatifs, une 'mesure', des axiologies, des systèmes de dominantes locales ou globales, des ensembles de polarisations ou de focalisations, bref tout ce qui peut 'mettre en perspective', 'mettre en échelle' ou 'mettre en liste' (…) (p. 54).

> What is important is to see to which extent (…) texts construct, manipulate and invite the reader, incorporate to their organisation, or sabotate certain stylistic devices, which aim to signify a scale of values (…), evaluative reports, measures, axiologic perspectives, locally and globally dominant systems, polarisations or focalisations, briefly anything, which could serve to put into perspective, scale or list (p. 54).

With its capacity to shed light on textual perspectives, hierarchies and opinions about Us versus Them; foregrounding can be considered to respond to Philippe Hamon's expectations from an ideological/discursive analysis:

> "Ce qui est à élaborer, c'est une 'poétique de l'échelle', ou des hiérarchies textuelles" (Hamon, 1984, p. 54).

> "What needs to be devoloped is a poetics of scale or textual hierarchies" (Hamon, 1984, p. 54).

It is by the use of rhetorical and narratological devices that foregrounding can be created in a text. As Monique Wittig (1992, p. 72) persuasively argues: "(...) the shock of words is produced by their association, their disposition, their arrangement, as well as by each one in its isolated use." Therefore, I maintain that the scope of the term foregrounding can be extended in such a way that it would include narrative concepts such as focalization, temporality (analeptic, proleptic shifts), speech and thought representation, levels and voice.

In one section of their recent article entitled "Complexity and Foregrounding: In the Eye of the Beholder?", Sonia Zyngier (2007, p. 660), Willie van Peer and J☐meljean Hakemulder "focus on one specific stylistic feature in texts, which is crucial to narratives and which may be manipulated by the writer in order to obtain foregrounding effects, namely, speech and thought representation." The above-mentioned article shows that foregrounding that is introduced at the beginning of the last century, has been considerably elaborated since then. Today, foregrounding is not used only used to analyse a series of figures of speech and linguistic novelties, but also more complex narratives structures. However, one must bear in mind that the choice of the foregrounding devices to be used is also closely related to the literary genre within which one operates. For exp. in feminist speculative fiction, foregrounding is mostly established as an external deviation, in the form of a linguistic novelty or "*novum*" in Darko Suvin's terms.

Differently from linguistic novelty in traditional SF, *Nova* in feminist speculative fiction serve as "ideologemes". Although I will analyse foregrounding at different textual levels in my translation research, I will mainly focus on feminist *Nova* in my experimental research in order to analyse the effects of foregrounding devices on readers' aesthetic and ideological responses to feminist speculative texts. A similar research on effects of foregrounding devices on readers has been carried by J☐meljan Hakemulder (2004) in the field of literary studies. In this research, Hakemulder who presented Dutch participants with the initial six hundred words of Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* and a manipulated version in which he shortened the sentences and removed unusual metaphors and ironic adjectives, provides more evidence than Willie van Peer (1986) regarding the role of foregrounding on aesthetic appreciation.

Hakemulder's research being very interesting, in empirical reception analysis, I avoided using manipulated texts. The source readers in my experimental group have read and answered questions on source text fragments while target readers in the same experimental group have read and answered questions on the translations of the text fragments that have been submitted to source readers. Chapter III contains further information on this experiment.

I would like to conclude this section by saying that I conceive of foregrounding as a key concept that would contribute to the development of empirical cognitive translation studies. Before I dwell on Darko Suvin's concept of *novum*, I will recapitalise this section that is rich in arguments:

- Foregrounding is more than an aesthetic device since it might serve as an "ideologeme" in text production and manipulation.

- The ideological/discursive perspective of the text that includes its axiological schema, power differentials, ideological polarizations and focalizations, is determined by the use of foregrounding.

- Foregrounding, which is realized on syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes of the discourse, has rhetorical and narratological aspects.

- The "nexus of the foregrounding" can be found at different levels or at a particular level of the text.

- Teun. A. van Dijk's multi-layered analysis of discourse can be adapted to translation to examine the use of foregrounding in target texts.

- The choice of the foregrounding devices to be used is also closely related to the literary genre within which one operates.

- In feminist speculative fiction, foregrounding is mostly established as an external deviation, in the form of a linguistic novelty. "*Nova*" in feminist speculative fiction serve as "ideologemes.

- According to his/her personal or political agenda, the translator can resort to different types of foregrounding: (propagandistic, neutralizing, promotional, didactic, equalizing, emotional/creative).

- It's important to consider all the types of foregrounding according to personal, political, cultural and social contexts in which they were produced and according to the role they played in the target culture.

- To the contrary of what is commonly believed, literalist strategy is not the only way of translating foregrounding device that functions as a *novum*, a foreignizing element.

- For a better understanding of translation strategies, researchers need to avoid taking translation of foregrounding or difference in ethical terms. The translation of foregrounding or the use of foregrounding as a translational device cannot be thought independently from their effects and functionality in target culture.

- There might be a relationship between foregrounding and aesthetic/ideological reception of the translation.

- Foregrounding can contribute to the development of empirical cognitive translation studies.

Translation of Feminist *Nova*

I have already mentioned that there are two foregrounding mechanisms: linguistic deviation and parallelism (repetition). In feminist speculative fiction, foregrounding is mostly established as an external deviation, in the form of a linguistic novelty. Therefore, throughout my thesis, I will use the term *novum* to refer to foregrounding in the form of a linguistic novelty. It should be noted that differently from linguistic *nova* in science fiction, *nova* in feminist speculative fiction are laden with feminist meanings and the most importantly, they don't belong to a "third linguistic system" that is untranslatable to our language as "fiction words" of traditional sci-fi did. Now, I would like to give more explanations on the term *novum*.

Darko Suvin borrows the term *novum* from the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch to refer to a novelty, an innovation deviating from the reader's norm of reality, which appears as an alternative form to that norm, and which functions as an analogy to that empirical reality (1979, p. 64). As conceived by Suvin (1979), a *novum* that is constitutive of SF, functions as a textual unit, which by its novelty, causes an estranging effect on the reader:

> SF is distinguished by the narrative dominance or hegemony of a fictional "*novum*" (novelty, innovation) validated by cognitive logic. [...] Quantitatively, the postulated innovation can be of quite different degrees of magnitude, running from the minimum of one discrete new "invention" (gadget, technique, phenomenon, relationship) to the maximum of a setting (spatiotemporal locus), agent (main character or characters), and/or relations basically new and unknown to the author's environment (p. 64).

In his review on a Taiwanese sci-fi novel *The City Trilogy* translated into English, John Clute criticises the translator of the novel John Balcom for being ignorant of *nova* that represent strangeness of the mode of telling:

"For Western readers, the *novum* is the strangeness of the world as seen through the lens of SF, for that world is unlike any world any Western SF reader has ever encountered before. For Taiwanese readers, the *novum* is almost certainly the strangeness of SF as a mode of telling that world. In both cases, the *novum* lies not in the substance of the tale." http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue317/excess.html

John Clute's above distinction between "strangeness of the world" and "strangeness of the mode of telling", prompted me to question whether for Turkish translators who do not have an established tradition of speculative fiction, the *novum* could be the strangeness of the world more than the strangeness of the mode of telling. What is the *novum* for the Turkish translator? Can these two *nova* (strangeness of the world and strangeness of the mode of telling) be isolated from each other? How would the reader's response be affected if the translator privileged the strangeness of the world over the strangeness of the mode of telling?

Novum being a cohesive and dynamic device of the discursive structure, in my thesis, my focal point is on how the translation of feminist *novum* shapes readers' responses to the text. I would like to underline that my objective here is not to judge the translators' competence. Maurice Blanchot (1999, p. 386) conceives the ideal translator as the secret master of the linguistic difference:

"The translator is the secret master of the linguistic difference: his task is not to abolish this difference but to use it, to alter his own tongue in such a way to as to awaken it to what differences exist in the original." (p. 386)

Maurice Blanchot (1999) considers above the use of linguistic difference in translation as a "task" and relates it to the "mastery' of the translator. As I have mentioned earlier, my aim in this thesis is not to criticize competence or "mastery" of the translator through his/her use of linguistic *novum*. I am primarily concerned with the "effects" of

the translated *nova* or foregrounded elements on target readers' responses to the feminist speculative works.

Foregrounding: A Central Concept in a Transactional Mode of Reading

In this section, I will explain why foregrounding has to be considered as a key concept in an interactional model of reading. Before shedding light on foregrounding's relationship to an interactional model of reading, I will first introduce main debates on different modes of reading in reception and reader-response theories.

Throughout my thesis, I have used the concepts of *reception* and *reader-response* synonymously, but among the concepts of *reception theory* and *reader-response criticism*, there is actually a difference to which Robert C. Holub (1984) draws attention in his book entitled *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. As Holub (1984, p. xiii) clearly states, *reception theory* is a more "cohesive, conscious, and collective undertaking" while *reader-response criticism* is characterized by the "disparity of (the) various positions." I agree with Holub's distinction of *reception theory* and *reader-response criticism.* However, if we set aside their theoretical framework, we see that the concepts of reception and reader-response are being used almost interchangeably in our day.

Reception Theory or *Rezeptionsästhetik* (aesthetics of reception) which originated in West Germany in the 1960s is associated with the works of Hans Robert Jauss, Wolfgang Iser and other followers from the University of Konstanz. The University of Konstanz scholars contribute new concepts to *Reception Theory* that give the reader an active role in the interpretation of the text. For instance, Hans Robert Jauss develops the term *horizons of expectations* to refer to the role played by readers'

expectations in their interpretation of a text. Although he is often thought to emphasize time- and history-bound factors underlying readers' *horizons of expectation*s, Jauss (1974) attributes an immense role to textual strategies in shaping readers' *horizons of expectation*s:

> "A literary work, even if it seems new, does not appear as something absolutely new in an informational vacuum, but predisposes its readers to a very definite type of reception by textual strategies, overt and covert signals, familiar characteristics or implicit allusions" (p. 16).

We can add to strategies Jauss cites above "defamiliarising" characteristics through which feminist speculative texts predispose their readers to a very definite type of reception. As for Iser (1974 : xii), he develops the concept of the "implied reader" as an incorporation of "the prestructuring of the potential meaning by the text, and the reader's actualization of this potential through the reading process."

Briefly, both Jauss and Iser, by granting the reader an active role in the interpretation of the text, have challenged the traditional view that considers the text a closed structure having a single, determinate meaning. However, as they wanted to avoid giving a totally subjective and arbitrary meaning to readers' interpretation, at some point, both theorists had to call upon a determinate text:

> "At some level, both Iser and Jauss, as well as other reception theorists, call upon a determinate text (sub-text) to prevent what threatens to be a totally subjective and arbitrary reader response" (p. 150).

As should be evident from the statements above, Jauss and Iser, they both admit that texts provide readers with "guidance", as readers transform them through their experiences and expectations. Inspired by Roman Ingarden's notions of textual

schemata, Iser (2002, p. 291) states that "the texts offer 'schematized' aspects through which the aesthetic object of the work can be produced." Obviously, Iser promotes a more balanced interactional model of reading based on the claim that reader and text contribute equally to the realization of the aesthetic work. However, as Joanne M. Golden and John T. Guthrie (1986, p. 410) rightly say, Iser does not specify the nature of the text factors and reader factors that influence response:

> Although Iser acknowledges the balanced roles of reader and text in the construction of a literary work, he does not specify the nature of the text factors and reader factors that influence response. He emphasizes instead the processes involved in text construction. It is important, therefore, to address more specifically the sources of influence on literary response. That is, what factors contribute to variation in response to literary texts, and what factors contribute to commonality of response? (Golden & Guthrie, 1986, p.410).

Golden & Guthrie's criticism seems to be very persuasive since Iser himself admits that the structures underlying text-reader interaction need further inquiry:

> "(W)e must search for structures that will enable us to describe basic conditions of interaction, for only then shall we be able to gain some insight into the potential effects inherent in the work..." (Iser, 2002, p. 292).

In complete agreement with Iser, I think that structures generating reader-text interaction need further investigation. I consider "foregrounding devices' or *nova* as one of the most important structures that can be used to test the basic conditions of text-reader interaction. Iser's (1974, pp. 34-35) "implied" reader fills the "gaps" as the text directs him/her to. The readers' interpretation is not just actualized by their filling the textual "gaps" or "blanks", but also by their deconstructing what is held in the forefront of their attention. In his *Act of Reading*, Iser mentions "a network of response-inviting structures":

"Thus the concept of the implied reader designates a network of response-inviting structures, which impel the reader to grasp the text" (Iser, 1980 , p.34)

The "network of response-inviting structures" Iser mentions above consist of "the narrator, the plot, the characters and the fictitious reader" (Iser, 1980, p. 35). However, it is still unclear how these structures seduce the reader into interaction with the text. Like Wolfgang Iser's, Louise Rosenblatt's model of reading is based upon an interaction between readers and texts, which Rosenblatt terms a *transaction*. Decades before Iser argued for text-reader interaction, Louise Rosenblatt, in her 1938 publication (*Literature as Exploration*) argued for a transactional theory where readers were placed in the centre of reading. From my perspective, Rosenblatt's work is one of the most important contributions to reader-response theory because by borrowing John Dewey's concept of *transaction* and William James's psychological concept of *selective attention*, Rosenblatt (1986) deals with reading as a "transactional" process triggered by the "selective attention":

"During the transaction between reader and text, what is brought into awareness, what is pushed into the background or repressed depends on where, on what aspects of the triadic symbolization, the attention is focused" (Rosenblatt, 1986, p. 123).

Using Louise Rosenblatt's statement, we could argue that "what is foregrounded in the text" and "how the reader interprets it" can help us describe basic conditions of text-reader interaction. Louise Rosenblatt (1978, p. 11) considers the text a "blueprint" at the intersection of the writer's and the reader's *selective attention*.

> "the text serves as a blueprint for the selecting, rejecting, and ordering of what is being called forth. The text regulates what shall be held in the forefront of the reader's attention" (Rosenblatt 1978, p. 11).

Like Rosenblatt, the discourse analyst Teun. A. van Dijk (1979) also maintains that text offers a set of relevance "cues" that allow readers to cognitively process and build a coherent mental representation of the text. In his article "Relevance Assignment in Discourse", Van Dijk (1979) distinguishes between textual and contextual types of relevance:

> "Textual relevance is defined in terms of textual structures, such that certain structures are assigned a higher degree of relevance than others on general structural grounds. Contextual relevance is the assignment of a relevance value on the basis of any kind of contextual criterion, such as the interest, attention, knowledge, wishes, etc., of the reader" (p. 113).

Teun. A. van Dijk's statement shows that like Iser and Rosenblatt, van Dijk conceives reception as a reader-text interaction. Teun. A. van Dijk (1995) does what Iser did not do by giving a detailed list of "Relevance Signals in Discourse." At a textual level, Van Dijk (1979, p. 125) also distinguishes between *normal relevance* and *contrastive or differential relevance*, where *semantic differential relevance* "involves contrasting or foregrounding elements with respect to other elements at the same level (background)." Thus, foregrounding devices or feminist *nova*, which I study here, in the context of translation and reception fit into van Dijk's category of *semantic differential relevance*. That type of relevance can be very useful in a reception analysis because as van Dijk (1979) states below, all readers perceive *semantic differential relevance*, independently of the contextual relevance (readers' interest, knowledge, wishes, etc.) :

> "different readers, or the same reader at different times, may assign the same kind of differential relevance to some aspect of the source text" (p. 118).

From my perspective, the invariability of responses to *semantic differential relevance* makes this an important object of study for translation and reception research. Just by looking at their responses to *semantic differential relevance* (in our terminology foregrounding device or *nova*), we can pinpoint commonality and variation in source text readers' and target text readers' responses and the relations between these responses. In this way, we basically learn about how translation affects target readers' perception of the transformation and reframing of the source text aspects which are very characteristic to feminist speculative genre. Van Dijk also illustrates *semantic differential relevance* by a simple analogy:

> "A picture may consist of a large amount of black circles; however, one of the circles is red. This means that the red circle will be assigned differential relevance with respect to the other circles. In the perceptual process, this means that the red circle is noticed more easily, focused upon longer, memorized better, etc. than the other (individual) circles" (van Dijk, 1979, p. 119).

As can be inferred from this statement, Van Dijk (1979) focuses on *semantic differential relevance* as a salient textual stimulus that triggers readers' selective attention. Following Van Dijk, I analyse below how foregrounding devices triggers source and target readers' selective attention. Foregrounding devices or linguistic *nova* seem to be the most inviting structures in a text. Given their potential to trigger reader response, linguistic *nova* have to be positioned in a central place in reader-response analysis of feminist speculative fiction. While it's quite difficult to predict how effective Iser's response-inviting structures (the plot, the narrator, the characters and the fictitious reader) are in putting readers into interaction, there is no doubt that readers always perceive and respond to linguistic *nova* as they perceive and respond to the only red circle in a picture full of black circles according to Van Dijk's above-mentioned analogy.

So far, I have mentioned interactional approaches to reader-response. Apart from interactional or *transactional* approaches, there are two other approaches to reader-response: text-based and reader-based approaches. For example, the *New Criticism*, which is formalist in its approach, conceives an iconic text as having an inherent meaning that is closed to the reader's interpretation. A dominant trend in English and American literary criticism from the 1920s to the early 1960s, the *New Criticism* insists on "close reading" with the the text being central. However, the phenomenological reception theories of the University of Konstanz researchers and Roland Barthes's proclamation of the "death of the author" or "birth of the reader" in 1967 have shifted scholars' interest from text-based approaches to reader-based approaches. After subjectivity of the reader gained importance in reader-response and literary criticism, different conceptions of the reader have been developed by several critics: the subjective reader (David Bleich), the psychological reader (Normand Holland), the social reader (Stanley Fish). I will now briefly explain these conceptions of the reader and what kinds of readers the major works on reader-response analysis of science fiction and utopian literature have projected. I will also explain why I relate foregrounding to the concept of "cognitive reader."

Foregrounding and the "Cognitive" Reader

In his books *Readings and Feelings* (1975) and *Subjective Criticism* (1978), David Bleich outlines the reader's interpretation of the work as a projection of his personality.

"Opposing the tenets of the Derridean school of deconstruction and modifying the insights of Edmund Husserl, Bleich argues that it remains important to begin not with texts but individual consciousness" (Hatch, 1993, p. 256).

As Ronald B. Hatch clearly states above, Bleich completely disregards the role of the text in interpretation. Normand Holland's psychoanalytic model is similar to Bleich's model in that the reader in both models is viewed as constructing the text, and his or her interpretive strategies constitute the text. Holland whose theory can be distilled in his famous phrase "identity re-creates itself", sees the interpretive practice as the representation of individual psyche and leaves no room for the role of the social in the interpretive practice. On the other hand, Stanley Fish considers reading as the projection of the social. By introducing the concept of *interpretive communities*, Fish argues that any individual reader is necessarily part of a 'community' of readers. According to Fish, the 'interpretative community' to which readers belong plays a major role in readers' responses to the text.

In recent years, Stanley Fish's concept of *interpretive communities* seems to have regained popularity in reader-response analysis. Belonging to an interpretive community is thought to determine how the text will be "poached." Henry Jenkins, for example, uses in his *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture* (1992) Michel de Certeau's notion of "textual poaching" to demonstrate how the canonical texts of Star Trek are revised and re-envisioned by Trekkies. Indeed, Henry Jenkins continues to use the concept of *interpretive communities* in *Science Fiction Audiences: Watching Doctor Who and Star Trek* (1995), which he co-authored with John Tulloch. In this work, (*Science Fiction Audiences : Doctor Who, Star Trek, and Their Fans* (1995)), Tulloch and Jenkins adopt a rigid division of labour. Tulloch takes

the Doctor Who chapters, focusing on the responses of Australian high-school students. Jenkins, for his part, studies groups of Star Trek fans including his own MIT students.

In his sections of the book, Jenkins shows how different groups (male MIT students, female fanzine writers, and the members of a queer fan club) each take something different from their encounter with the series:

> "In our work on science fiction audiences, we found enormous variability in the ways that fans talked about their favourite series. For example, asked about the characters one by one, most of the MIT students defined them as autonomous problem-solvers, whereas most of the female fans read them as part of a social network with the other characters."
>
> http://henryjenkins.org/2006/07/can_one_be_a_fan_of_high_art.html.

As Jenkins clearly states above, there might be different modes of reading of science fiction series (science student reading, queer reading, female reading). However, the multiplicity of reading positions is a consequence of "fandom."

> "Fandom is a cultural community, one which shares a common mode of reception, a common set of critical categories and practices, a tradition of aesthetic production, a set of social norms and expectations. I look upon fans as possessing certain knowledge and competency in the area of popular culture that is different from that possessed by academic critics and from that possessed by the 'normal' or average television viewer" (Jenkins, 1992, p. 86).

'Fandom' being a significant factor that conditions reading positions, as Jenkins states above, I do not carry out my empirical analysis with fans of feminist speculative fiction. To the contrary, the respondents who volunteered to take part in my experiment are not very well acquainted with feminist speculative fiction. In this sense, my experimental sample does not consist of readers who are supposed to be members of an "interpretive community" that is characterized by a common mode of reception. When readers ask about the narrator, the plot or the characters, they focus on very different aspects of these structures through their readerly experiences and expectations, in such a way as to

propound a plurality of interpretations. It is often extremely difficult to analyse the complexity of cause-effect relationships behind these responses. How effective are personal life, gender, nationality and ethnic background in these responses?

In his *Utopian audiences : how readers locate nowhere* (2003), Kenneth Roemer analyses readers' responses to Edward Bellamy's utopian novel, *Looking Backward* (1888). Roemer has a huge research population that consists of 733 readers (students, colleagues, members of a retirement community and a reading group from seven US states and four countries). Roemer's respondents answer a questionnaire following their reading of *Looking Backward* (1888). The questionnaire ask whether readers "liked or disliked" particular episodes and characters. In his book, Roemer shows how readers transformed this utopian text, and how they were transformed by their readerly experience. In the section entitled *Women and the Interpretive Communities of Classrooms and Cultures*, Roemer (2003) refers to different factors underlying the wide variety of *transformational associations* women experience as a result of Bellamy's female characters and writes:

> "The responses to Bellamy's women indicated the tremendous impact of work
> experience associations and socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds" (p. 209).

Kenneth Roemer makes a very subtle analysis when he states that even responses of female readers could vary depending on their background. Roemer shows how white, middle class Texan women's responses vary from Japanese and Palestinian women's responses. Indeed, cultural background and familiarity with the genre conventions can influence reader responses. However, any reader having a cognitive capacity is assumed to recognise foregrounding in a text. Therefore, I relate foregrounding to a cognitive model of reader. Foregrounding-based reader-response analyses (Van Peer 1986, Mial

and Kuiken 1994) show that the recognition of foregrounding is independent of reader's interest and training.

> "By studying readers with widely different levels of literary competence and interest, we have provided evidence that these effects are independent of literary background and interest. Our current findings, together with the studies described in the introduction, support the view that literary response follows a distinctive course in which foregrounding prompts defamiliarization, defamilirization evokes affect, and affect guides "refamiliarizing" interpretive efforts" (Miall and Kuiken, 1994, p. 404).

Although all readers are "cognitively" capable of discerning foregrounding devices as Miall and Kuiken state above, I think that in the process of refamiliarization, other factors can be involved in interpretive practice. More precisely, cognitive readers can easily recognise the most striking or unfamiliar line in a poem, but when they are asked why they found that line striking, they might have different answers. From my perspective, foregrounding-based reader-response analysis needs to provide more "descriptive" accounts of readers' responses to foregrounding devices. I think foregrounding-based reader-response analyses must consist of open-ended questions more than Likert type rating questions. My questionnaire, which mainly consists of open-ended questions, aims to provide a more "descriptive' account of patterns of responses to linguistic *nova* in feminist speculative texts. To my mind, foregrounding has the capacity to put readers into interaction with the text and help them reflect on the problematic of the text. In this sense, foregrounding contains the entire molecular structure of the feminist speculative novel. How the reader responds to linguistic *nova* is closely related to the reader's overall response to the novel.

The translator as a cognitive subject is also expected to recognise and translate linguistic *nova*. However, the translator's encounter with linguistic *nova* does not always end up with the translator translating linguistic *nova* with the same

defamiliarising effect as in the source context. I have mentioned earlier how translators might use foregrounding for ideological or literary manipulation. Evidently, foregrounding can be transferred to the target context through the filter of translation and maybe with a new foregrounding. The best way to learn about how translation recreates foregrounding in the target context is to compare, through an empirical analysis, how source readers receive linguistic *nova* in the source text and how target readers receive linguistic *nova* in target texts. The specification of convergent and divergent patterns of responses can provide a "descriptive" account of source and target readers' *transformational associations* of linguistic *nova* and the role of translation in the formation of these *transformational associations*.

CHAPTER III

MULTIPLE-FOREGROUNDING ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I will carry out an ideological/discursive analysis by using Teun. V. Dijk's method of discourse analysis as well as an empirical reception analysis based on the premises of Russian Formalism, the Czech critic Jan Mukařovský and Willie van Peer's groundbreaking study on foregrounding's defamiliarising effects on readers. Through an empirical reception analysis, I will examine commonality and variation in reader response to innovative and defamiliarising aspects (linguistic *nova*) in the source and target texts and the relations between these responses. After specifying source and target readers' convergent and divergent patterns of responses, I will question how "foregrounding" affects source readers' reception of linguistic *nova* of the source text and how the translations of "foregrounded" elements transform these source texts' linguistic *nova* to differently affect target readers' reception of these devices.

Ideological/Discursive Analysis of Linguistic *Nova* in the Three Books

Teun A. van Dijk's method of discourse analysis focuses "on the ways that events and their participants are being represented in the text, and whether the structures of the text do convey a generally positive or negative opinion about Us versus Them." (Dijk, 2000, p. 42) Although, Van Dijk's main focus has been the discursive reproduction of racism, as he states elsewhere, we can apply his ideological discourse analysis to "any property of discourse that expresses, establishes, confirms or emphasizes a self-interested group

opinion, perspective or position, especially in a broader socio-political context of social struggle" (Van Dijk, 1995 a, pp. 22-23).

As a genre that portrays different worlds and ideologies, feminist speculative fiction discursively reproduces the Us versus them contrast to which Teun A. van Dijk often refers. Now, I will briefly mention how the Us versus Them contrast has been reproduced in the discursive universe of feminist speculative works in my corpus.

The Worlds Portrayed in the Three Novels and Their Translation

As I have mentioned earlier, all the books in my corpus portrays different worlds and ideologies.

The Handmaid's Tale (1985) by Margaret Atwood

Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* portrays a futuristic Republic of Gilead where women with viable ovaries, "handmaids" as they are called, are assigned to a Commander for the purposes of reproduction. In this society, infertile women who have been given a position of command over handmaids are called "aunts". Apart from handmaids and aunts, in the totalitarian and sexist Republic of Gilead, there are also some other categories of women like the Marthas, the Wives and the Jezebels:

> "What we see in the Republic of Gilead, Atwood's antiutopia, are women reduced to their respective functions. There are the Marthas, or domestics; the Wives, or social secretaries and functionaries; the Jezebels, or sex prostitutes; and the Handmaids, or reproductive prostitutes." (Tong, 1989, p. 82)

In addition to the categories Rosemarie Tong (1989) has mentioned above, there are also two other categories of women in the Republic of Gilead: Daughters (the natural or

adopted children of the ruling class) and Econowives (women who have married relatively low-ranking men). Despite the multitude of these categories, we could say that women in the Gilead society do not represent a unity of identity and difference because they are just reduced to their social/biological functions:

> "No woman is whole in Gilead; all individual women are reduced to parts or aspects of the monolith, Woman." (Tong, 1989, p. 92)

In the Republic of Gilead, like women, men also are classified into different categories like Commenders of the Faithful (the ruling class), Eyes (the internal intelligence agency), Angels (soldiers who fight in the wars in order to expand and protect the country's border), Guardians of the Faith (soldiers used for routine policing), Gender Traitors (males who engage in homosexuality or related acts). *Unwomen* as a category embraces all women (and some men) unable to fit within the Republic of Gilead's gender categories. As should be evident from all these categories, the Us versus Them contrast is at the heart of Atwood's novel: Contrast among different categories of women, contrast among different categories of men and finally, contrast between women and men. The text fragment I have submitted to a group of source readers within the framework of a literary reading test reflects these contrasts very strikingly:

ST1 (p.234)

> The pen between my fingers is sensuous, alive almost, I can feel its power, the power of the words it contains. Pen is Envy, Aunt Lydia would say, quoting another Center motto, warning us away from such objects. And they were right, it is envy. Just holding it is envy. I envy the Commander his pen. It's one more thing I would like to steal (Atwood 1986 : 234).

The narrator of the above excerpt, Offred belongs to the class of Handmaids forced to bear children for Commanders. Offred refers here to both the most powerful of the Aunts, Aunt Lydia who is in charge of re-educating Handmaids and the Commander for whom she has to conceive and give birth to a baby. Through the concepts of *pen*, *penis*, *envy*; the above paragraph illustrates the contrasts between Offred, Aunt Lydia and the Commander who belong each to different social categories in the Gilead:

- The Commander: The highest ranking official of the Gilead who has the pen and the power it represents.

- Offred: A handmaid craving the pen, which symbolizes the right of communication she is deprived of.

- Aunt Lydia: A woman, by echoing the Center's motto "Penis is Envy", keeps warning Handmaids about the dangers of handling a pen.

The contrasts between the above characters and their mental representations are embodied in the word play "Pen is Envy" which is an explicit reference to Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic concept of "penis envy." Sigmund Freud suggested that *penis envy*, which can be defined as the female counterpart of castration complex occurs when the girl realizes that she does not have a penis. This concept of Freud has been criticized by several feminist scholars like Karen Horney who even came up with an opposing theory called *womb envy* which states that men are envious of women's ability to give birth. As a response to *penis envy*, some other feminists have initiated *vagina pride* partly popularized by *The Vagina Monologues*. *Penis envy* being the target of many criticisms by feminists, it is not without reason that Margaret Atwood uses here the

word play: Pen is Envy. Atwood uses this play on pen/penis to show "the phallocratic valence of the word, and of reading and writing." (Schüssler 1992 : 3)

The phallus has always been a sign of power, masculinity, and status in the Western world; whether the pen is a metaphorical penis has been questioned by feminists like Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar who, in the first sentence of their famous *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979) ask: "Is the pen a metaphorical penis?" Following this question, Gilbert and Gubar begin to document exhaustively how "pen=penis has been the dominant metaphor for all of literary creation since at least Middle Ages" (qtd. in Klages, 2006, p. 94).

Given that the Freudian concept of penis envy and the metaphorical equation between pen and penis have been recurrent topics of discussion in feminist and literary theory, it is not surprising that Atwood chose to incorporate a word play on pen/penis into her novel. It is not just indicative of the fictional characters' life styles, but also of the writer Atwood's social critique of phallocracy.

In the six-sentence excerpt taken from the book, Margaret Atwood uses some textual devices whose importance in the discourse is highlighted by Teun van Dijk:

Repetitions as Rhetorical devices:

- The word *envy* occurs four times.

- The word *pen* occurs three times.

- The word *power* occurs twice and back to back in the same sentence.

The high frequency words in the above list are used to support the meaning of the word play *Pen is Envy*. In this sense, all these words function as foregrounding devices.

Capitalization as Graphical Structure:

The first letter of the word "envy" in the word play "Pen is Envy" is written in uppercase. This graphical device undoubtedly aims to attract readers' attention to the word play. However, this aspect is omitted in the Turkish translation of the word play. In the questionnaire part, I will demonstrate how these devices and their omission in translation affect the target readers' reception of this text fragment in such as way as to differentiate their responses from those of the source readers. Before I briefly mention how the Us versus Them contrast resonates in the discourse of *Woman on the Edge of Time*, I will also give another example of translated word play from *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*.

ST

I'm sure we are all aware of the unfortunate circumstances that bring us all here together on this beautiful morning, when I am certain we would all rather be doing something else, at least I speak for myself, but duty is a <u>taskmaster</u>, or may I say on this occasion <u>taskmistress</u>, and it is in the name of duty that we are here today (p. 343).

TT

"Hepimizin, başta benim, başka bir şey yapmayı tercih edeceğimden emin olduğum bu güzel sabah bizleri buraya toplayan talihsiz koşullardan hepimiz haberdarız, kuşkusuz. Ne var ki vazife zorlu bir <u>angaryacı</u>dır, bu durumda belki <u>angaryeci</u> de diyebilirim, işte bugün burada vazife adına bulunmaktayız" (p. 312).

Since the word "angarye", which is used in the translated fragment above is almost empty of a gender-based semantic scope, the translators' efforts to recreate the pun in

the target language are useless. Although in Turkish, proper nouns can sometimes be feminized by adding "ye" at the end of a male name [for exp. Naci (male name) ,Naciye (female name); Sami (male name) ,Samiye (female name)]; this rule is not valid for feminizing common nouns. Thus, although this vowel softening in the last syllable of the word angarya (angar*ye*) might seem uncanny to the careful reader, it is still far from making the reader think of the feminist character of the pun. There are also problems in the translation of other puns, which are not of feminist character, but still representative of the strangeness of the world depicted in the novel. For example, the word "prayvaganza" is translated as "dua töreni" while "salvaging" is translated "kurtulus ayini." There is no doubt that none of these equivalents are likely to have a potential, estranging effect on the target readers.

 Woman on the Edge of Time (1976) by Marge Piercy

Differently from the Republic of Gilead depicted in the *Handmaid's Tale*, Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* does not describe multiple social categories within the same society. Instead, in *Woman on the Edge of Time*, there are two separate worlds: The world of Connie, the main character of the novel who lives in present-day New York and the world of gender egalitarian society of Mattapoisett in 2137. The contact among these two different worlds starts when Connie, a Mexican-American woman unjustly confined to a mental hospital telepathically communicates with Luciente from Mattapoisett. As can be imagined, there are some contrasts between Connie's world and the futuristic world of Mattapoisett. These contrasts are highly shocking for Connie:

> "Mattapoisett consequently shocks (Connie) on a number of occasions:
>
> by the absence from it of gender-specific dress codes and activities, by

the easy acceptance of homosexuality, and, most deeply, by the sight of a

man breast-feeding a baby (...)" (Fitting, 1985, p. 171).

Undoubtedly, one of the most shocking aspects of Mattapoisett is its parenting system. In the gender egalitarian society of Mattapoisett, children are conceived in laboratories through random selection of genetic attributes and raised to viability in artificial wombs. As members of communities die, random groups of three (male or female) that are seldom romantically involved, are selected to parent. In the text fragment I have submitted to my experimental group, Connie asks Luciente some questions about the parenting system in Mattapoisett:

ST2 (p.74)

- Is your lover Bee their father? Or the other one?
- Father? Luciente raised her wrist, but Connie stopped her.
- Dad. Papa. You know. Male parent.
- Ah? No, not Bee or Jackrabbit. Comothers are seldom sweet friends if we can manage. So the child will not get caught in love misunderstandings.
- Comothers?
- My coms (...)

As should be evident from the above excerpt, the language of the futuristic society of Mattapoisett is full of neologisms that indicate the difference between this fictional world and Connie's real world. This six-sentence dialogue contains a number of neologisms like comother, coms, sweet friends, charactonyms like Luciente, Bee, Jackrabbit.

Given that Teun A. van Dijk (1995, p. 145) considers lexical style as one of the discursive devices that illustrate the Us versus Them contrast, I think that all these lexical creations in the text fragment provide readers with significant clues for the understanding of the writer's newly created world that is remarkably distinguished from

our present world in terms of social and sexual norms. Thus, strategies used in the translation of these devices foregrounding the difference of the fictional world will necessarily affect target readers' response to the new world that has been conceived by the writer as an idealistic society isolated from real world problems resulting from issues like the parenting system and "love misunderstandings." In the questionnaire part, I will analyse whether the translation of the above neologisms creates on the target readers an empathy with and sympathy for the new world they explored through the reading of the related text fragment.

In his preface to Turkish translation of Marge Piercy's *Woman on The Edge of Time*, the editor of the book, Tuncay Birkan (1992 :6) gives us an idea of the close relationship between words and worlds of the novel:

> As the fictional character Luciente stresses in the novel, the existing languages are not enough for expressing the most subtle nuances of their cognitive processes so that they are in need of new words. Therefore, Piercy invents new English words such as *inknow*, *outknow*, *catcher*, *reck* etc. We translated these words respectively such as *içbilme*, *dışbilme*, *alımlayıcı/yakalayıcı*, *bolgu*. Finally, a new world means equally new objects and institutions. Throughout the text, we translated *brooder* as *çocuk üretimevi*, *floater* as *uçucu*, *Shaping* as *Biçimlendirme*. We left untranslated *jizer*, a kind of weapon and *flimsy*, a special clothing since we were unable to find satisfactory equivalents to these terms. For this, we beg your indulgence (Piercy, 1992, p. 6).

Although the editor of the book seems to be aware of linguistic *nova* and their importance, only the reading test can shed light how these translated *nova* affect the target readers' reception of the new world depicted in the novel. However, regarding the Turkish translation of Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time*, we could say that overall, many references and neologisms are omitted in translation. For example, the futuristic society in the novel is called Mattapoisett, a real town in the American state of Massachusetts. In a part of her novel, Piercy talks about a "Podunk future." This term is

translated into Turkish as "bu garip gelecek." In American English, podunk, podunk, or podunk hollow has come to denote a small, unimportant, and isolated town. However, Podunk also refers to a village in Massachusetts. Since the translator did not use an end note to explain readers that this term has two meanings in English, Turkish readers have no access to the irony behind this reference.

To give another example of translation, in her book, Marge Piercy uses a neologism such as holies to refer to holographic techniques. In my reading of the Turkish translation of the book, I came across this neologism in many different forms: hayvanlar, resimler, yontular, gösteriler, korkunç şeyler, oyuncaklar. Needless to say that the diversity of the equivalents used in the Turkish translation is far away from making readers think that all these terms actually refer to a single concept.

The treatment of charactonyms in the Turkish translation of *Woman on the Edge of Time* is problematic, too. Almost all the charactonyms used in the novel are either common nouns, or derivations of common nouns, which are, of course, meaningful to the source readers. However, in the Turkish translation, most of these charactonyms are left untranslated: Luciente, Innocente, Hawk, Bee, Jackrabbit, Rose of Ithaca, Otter, Dawn, Morningstar, Barbarossa, Peony, Blackfish, Lux. Piercy's naming her characters with names based on nature and animals is not random, but a consequence of her eco-feminist approach. In other words, Piercy's futuristic world is an environmentally friendly world, which is, in this sense, highly different from our present day world. The non-translation of these charactonyms prevents Turkish readers from penetrating into the eco-feminist approach underlying Piercy's estranging world of Mattapoisett. The non-translation of charctonyms is also a problem, which occurred in the Turkish translation of Joanna Russ's *The Female Man*.

In her book entitled *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey: 1923-1960*, Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar (2003, p. 204) uses the treatment of proper nouns as a tool of analysis and shows that each strategy used in the translation of proper nouns defines a separate way of handling the source text. Gürçağlar also draws attention to the treatment of proper nouns as an indication of the translator's specific attitude towards the readers of a text. By adjusting the same arguments to the genre of feminist speculative fiction, I would say that the translation of proper nouns in the feminist speculative texts may be indicative of translators' ways of handling the estranging worlds depicted in these novels as well as their attitudes towards the readers of these texts. I will go deep into this argument in the section entitled "What is Strange About It?"

The Female Man (1975) by Joanna Russ

In the *Female Man* by Joanna Russ, there are four alternate, parallel worlds, which remain separate from one another:

> "The subjective narrator of *The Female Man* (1975) reflects, separately, four female protagonists from four alternate, parallel worlds. Communal consciousness is not a part of these worlds. Instead, a type of cinematic montage melds the four characters, while the four worlds remain separate" (Holt, p. 486).

The principal characters of the novel are four J's, very different women who share the same genotype:

Janet is from a world where there are no men, Whileaway, which has developed a woman-centered culture, free of sexism. Jeannine is from an alternate earth that did not experience World War II; its Great Depression continues in the 1960s. Joanna is from our earth (though the character Joanna is no more Joanna Russ than any of the other protagonists). Jael is from a world where the battle of the sexes became open warfare (Holt, p. 487).

Marilyn J. Holt succinctly explains the main characteristics of the worlds in which four Js live. Although these women belong to separate worlds or different social and historical contexts, we cannot argue that there is no contact among these worlds because during her stay on Earth, Janet Evason a traveler from the futuristic female-dominated society of Whileaway, is sometimes accompanied by Joanna, the feminist narrator of the novel on different occasions. The text fragment I have submitted to my experimental group consists of Joanna's observations of different women they meet at the party she attends with Janet Evason. This text fragment from *The Female Man* is relatively longer and lexically more complex than the other two fragments I have submitted to my experimental group. I chose this paragraph by thinking that it is "one of the most poignant examples of Joanna Russ's combination of characterization and theme" (Gilliam 1988, p. 67). The following is the text fragment, which is very descriptive of Joanna's observations of different women she meets at a Manhattan cocktail party she joins with Janet:

ST3 (p.34)

I knew most of the women there: Sposissa, three times divorced, Eglantissa, who thinks only of clothes; Aphrodissa, who cannot keep her eyes open because of her false eyelashes; Clarissa, who will commit suicide; Lucrissa, whose strained forehead shows that she's making more money than her husband, engaged in a game of ain't-it-awful with Lamentissa; Travailissa, who usually only works, but who is now sitting very still on the couch so that her smile will not spoil; and naughty Saccharissa who is playing a round of His Little Girl across the bar with the host. Saccharissa is forty-five. So is Amicissa, the Good Sport. I looked for Ludicrissa, but she is too plain to be invited to a party like this, and of course we never invite Amphibissa, for obvious reasons. (...) (Where is Domicissa, who

never opens her mouth in public? And Dulcisissa, whose standard line, "Oh, you're so wonderful!" is missing from the air tonight?)

The most interesting aspect in the above fragment is obviously how Joanna names most of women at the party. By using a series of meaningful charactonyms, Joanna attempts to show the gap or contrast between her feminist ideology and stereotyped images of women in her society. Rhonda K. Gilliam (1988) clearly states:

> "The one characteristic these cardboard characters have in common is deference to men. The one-dimensional characters serve to contrast the more "rounded" protagonists" (p. 68).

Since Teun van Dijk (1995, p. 45) underlines the key role of lexical style in conveying our positive vs. negative opinions, I think that the charactonyms Joanna uses to name stereotyped women at the party are extremely important for our understanding of contrasts between Joanna's feminist self and the world in which she lives. Joanna Russ's novel being so feminist, *Analog,* the traditional sci-fi magazine has published a harshly critical review calling this novel "ultramilitant feminism carried to the limit for propaganda purposes" and "a wish dream of vengeance, a vendetta against all the male half of mankind" (Del Rey, 1975, p. 168).

When we think that Joanna Russ expresses her feminism through her choice of charactonyms, we understand better the importance of these charactonyms that serve as foregrounding devices of feminist nova used not just for stylistic, but also ideological purposes. In *The Female Man*, the family names of women (for exp. Evason, Anaisson) end with the affix "son." This can be thought of as an allusion to our present day society in which women mostly inherit their fathers' family name. As a reaction to women's

use of the paternal family name, one of Joanna Russ's characters, Janet Evason utters at some point:

"Evason is not "son" but "daughter". This is *your* translation" (p. 18).

This sentence which is so crucial to our understanding of the contrast between Janet Evason and our present day society, is translated into Turkish as follows:

"Evason "oğul" değil "kız." *Sen* yanlış tercüme ediyorsun" (p. 24).

Evason, which is actually a combination of the words "Eve" and "son" is left untranslated in the above sentence in such as way as to make Russ's neologistic creation and word play less obvious for Turkish readers. In addition, the use of the personal pronoun "you" in second person singular form (sen) rather than in second person plural form (siz) in Turkish translation of the above sentence (This is *your* translation) has also to be criticized since Janet Evason, through her use of this sentence, aims to criticize not just a person, but the whole society that perpetuates patriarchal gender norms.

Somewhere in the novel, there is a sentence written in italics: "*I mene love.*" (64) One of the characters, Laura with whom Janet Evason will later have a lesbian relationship formulates this sentence to express her "heterosexual" love for a man from her school. The word "mene" that contains the word "men" and sounds like "mean" is obviously a word play, which is also foregrounded by the use of italics. This sentence is translated into Turkish as follows: "*Yani aşk demek istiyorum*" (p. 70). This translation suppresses the contrast between Laura's "forced" heterosexuality and Janet's same-sex sexuality, which is considered a normal practice in her female-dominant society of Whileaway. It is possible to give more examples of foregrounding devices from Joanna

Russ's novel, but I will focus here on charactonyms, which are, to my mind, the most prominent devices in *The Female Man*.

As should be evident from the above example, the translation of charactonyms is highly important since this will necessarily affect target readers' response to Joanna's modes of characterization. In the questionnaire part, I will demonstrate how target reader responses differ from source reader responses due to the untranslated charactonyms in Turkish. Now, I will briefly mention the comparative reading test.

A Comparative Reading Test

As Robert de Beaugrande (1989, p. 10) has put it, "Only empirical studies can resolve this state of affairs by freeing these (theoretical) claims from their absolute dependence on the personal eloquence or effrontery of the individual theorists and by providing progressively more reliable and intersubjective grounds for preferring any set of claims over any other." In Canada, David Miall, usually working with Donald Kuiken, has produced a large body of work exploring emotional or "affective" responses to literature, drawing on concepts such as "defamiliarization" or "foregrounding". They have used both experiments and new developments in neuropsychology, and have developed a questionnaire for measuring different aspects of a reader's response. Within the framework of this thesis, I also use a questionnaire drawing on the concepts of "foregrounding" and "*nova*." However, the comparative reading test I use here extends the scope of existing empirical research, in such a way as to include target readers.

My objective, experimental technique and sampling group

The empirical reception analysis I carry out within the framework of this PhD thesis aims to investigate the role of foregrounding devices or feminist *nova* on target readers' responses to feminist speculative texts. Since I also applied the same experiment to the source readers with the source texts, I had the opportunity to test comparatively the role of foregrounding on readers' responses. In the pre-experiment preparation process, I first chose from source texts and target texts a short fragment with the major foregrounding devices or feminist *nova.* Then, I submitted these fragments to source and target readers with a short contextual information on the novel. More precisely, the source readers in my experimental group have read and answered questions on source text fragments while target readers have read and answered questions on the Turkish translations of the same text fragments. This experiment has been carried out with the intent to analyse how linguistic *nova* and their translation affect source text and target text readers' answers' to feminist speculative texts.

Statement of the Problem

What kind of *transformational associations* of a specific set of linguistic *nova* do source and target text readers have and what is the role of the translation in target readers' *transformational associations* of linguistic *nova* containing the entire molecular structure of the feminist speculative novel?

Test Instruments

I used a qualitative test that consists of open-ended questions. My choice of open-ended

questions rather than Likert type rating questions was a result of my desire to provide

"descriptive" accounts of readers' responses to foregrounding devices. In addition,

open-ended questions were also easier to analyse with respect to statistical data.

Procedures of Data Collection

To collect the data, I used convenience sampling. A convenience sample is one of the

main types of non-probability sampling methods. A convenience sample is made up of

people who are easy to reach. Convenience sample is less labor-intensive, but it does

not necessarily make it a bad way to select a sample:

> In convenience sampling, the researcher generally selects participants on the
> basis of proximity, ease-of-access, and willingness to participate (i,e,
> convenience). (...) Although this method of selecting a sample is less labor-
> intensive than selecting a random or representative sample, that does not
> necessarily make it a bad way to select a sample. If my convenience sample does
> not differ from my population of interest *in ways that influence the outcome of
> the study*, then it is a perfectly acceptable method of selecting a sample (Urdan
> 2005, p. 3).

I chose my convenience sample from readers who volunteered to take part in my literary

reading experiment. Like an ethnographer, I kept choosing my subjects until new

additions to the sample no longer provided information that differs from that gathered

from other subjects previously selected in the sample:

> Where convenience sampling, quota sampling, or snowball sampling are used in
> connection with projects where representativeness is appropriate, the only
> safeguard is to follow the practice of ethnographers: keep selecting subjects until
> new additions to the sample are no longer providing information that differs

from that gathered from other subjects previously selected in the sample (Buddenbaum & Novak, 2001, p. 81).

My English speaking subjects consist of University of Ottawa students, members of http://www.readliterature.com web site and members of book clubs I reached through the Facebook social networking site. As for my Turkish subjects, they consist of Bogazici University students, members of http://www.readliterature.com web site and members of book clubs I reached through the Facebook social networking site.

LITERARY READING TEST

Personal Information

1. Age:

2. Gender:

3. Nationality:

4. First language:

5. Area of study:

6. Have you ever taken a stylistics course?

7. Are you familiar with Foregrounding Theory? If yes, what do you know about it?

8. Are you familiar with speculative fiction?

9. If yes, who are your favourite speculative fiction writers?

10. Please explain briefly why you like or dislike reading speculative fiction.

Objective

The objective of this test, which I am conducting within the framework of my PhD thesis, is to gather some empirical data on literary reading. Thank you for your valuable contribution. Nil Özçelik

Task

Below you will find a plot synopsis and a text fragment from three different novels. Please read these materials carefully at least twice, and then answer the questions.

Plot synopsis of *the Handmaid's Tale* (1985) by Margaret Atwood

In the futuristic Republic of Gilead, women with viable ovaries, as they are called, "handmaids" are assigned to a Commander for the purposes of reproduction. In this society, infertile women who have been given a position of command over handmaids are called "aunts". The most powerful of the Aunts, Aunt Lydia is in charge of a Center

where women are re-educated as Handmaids who do not have the right to communicate verbally or in writing. They are trained to serve as reproduction machines. In the following excerpt, one of the Handmaids, Offred remembers the words of Aunt Lydia.

ST1 (p.234)

> The pen between my fingers is sensuous, alive almost, I can feel its power, the power of the words it contains. Pen is Envy, Aunt Lydia would say, quoting another Center motto, warning us away from such objects. And they were right, it is envy. Just holding it is envy. I envy the Commander his pen. It's one more thing I would like to steal.

Questions

Have you ever read *the Handmaid's Tale?*

Do you recognize the foregrounded word play in the text fragment above? Yes or No?

If yes, please write out this word play below and explain what it means to you.

How related is this word play to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly related, unrelated or slightly related?

Please explain.

Plot synopsis of *Woman on the Edge of Time* (1976) by Marge Piercy

In the gender egalitarian society of Mattapoisett in 2137, children are conceived in laboratories through random selection of genetic attributes and raised to viability in artificial wombs. As members of communities die, random groups of three (male or female) that are seldom romantically involved, are selected to parent. Connie, the main character of the novel who lives in present time, is able to telepathically communicate with Luciente from Mattapoisett. In the following dialog, Connie asks Luciente some questions about the parenting system in Mattapoisett.

    a. ST2 (p.74)

- Is your lover Bee their father? Or the other one?
- Father? Luciente raised her wrist, but Connie stopped her.
- Dad. Papa. You know. Male parent.
- Ah? No, not Bee or Jackrabbit. Comothers are seldom sweet friends if we can manage. So the child will not get caught in love misunderstandings.
- Comothers?
- My coms (...)

Questions

Have you ever read *Woman of the Edge of Time*?

Do you recognize the foregrounded neologisms (new words or existing words with a new meaning) in the text fragment above? Yes or No?

If yes, please write out these neologisms below and explain what they mean to you.

How related are these neologisms to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly related, unrelated or slightly related?

Please explain.

Plot synopsis of *Female Man* (1975) by Joanna Russ

Janet Evason is a traveler from the futuristic female-dominated society of Whileaway to the Earth, which she describes critically from her point of view. She is sometimes accompanied by Joanna, the feminist narrator of the novel. The following fragment consists of the observations of Joanna on different women they meet at the party she attends with Janet Evason.

ST3 (p.34)

I knew most of the women there: Sposissa, three times divorced, Eglantissa, who thinks only of clothes; Aphrodissa, who cannot keep her eyes open because of her false eyelashes; Clarissa, who will commit suicide; Lucrissa, whose strained forehead shows that she's making more money than her husband, engaged in a game of ain't-it-awful with Lamentissa; Travailissa, who usually only works, but who is now sitting very still on the couch so that her smile will not spoil; and naughty Saccharissa who is playing a round of His Little Girl across the bar with the host. Saccharissa is forty-five. So is Amicissa, the Good Sport. I looked for Ludicrissa, but she is too plain to be invited to a

party like this, and of course we never invite Amphibissa, for obvious reasons. (...)
(Where is Domicissa, who never opens her mouth in public? And Dulcisissa, whose
standard line, "Oh, you're so wonderful!" is missing from the air tonight?)

Questions

1. Have you ever read *Female Man*?

2. Do you recognize the instances of word play in the text fragment above?

3. If yes, please write out all instances of word play below and explain what they
   mean to you.

4. How related are these instances of word play to the plot synopsis of the novel?
   Strongly related, unrelated or slightly related?

5. Please explain.

OKURUN EDEBİYAT METNİNE YANITI: ANKET

Kişisel Bilgi

1. Yaş:

2. Cinsiyet:

3. Yaşadığınız şehir:

4. Ana dil:

5. Bildiğiniz diller ve düzeyleri:

6. Mezun olduğunuz bölüm:

7. Stilistik (stylistics) ya da söylem çözümlemesi (discourse analysis) tarzı bir ders aldınız mı?

8. Önceleme Kuramı (Foregrounding Theory) hakkında bilginiz var mı? Varsa, lütfen açıklayınız.

9. Spekülatif kurgu (speculative fiction) hakkında bilginiz var mi?
10. Yanıtınız evetse, hangi spekülatif kurgu yazarlarını okudunuz?

11. Lütfen spekülatif kurguyu neden sevdiğinizi ya da sevmediğinizi açıklayınız.

Amaç

Doktora tezim çerçevesinde yürüttüğüm bu testin amacı, yazınsal yapıtlara okurların verdiği yanıtları araştırmaktır. Değerli yanıtlarınızla araştırmama katkıda bulunduğunuz için çok teşekkür ederim. Nil Özçelik

Testi nasıl yanıtlayacaksınız?

Aşağıda üç farklı edebiyat metnine ait birer konu özeti ve okuma parçası bulacaksınız. Lütfen bu bölümleri en az 2 kez dikkatlice okuyup, size yöneltilen sorulara açık ve ayrıntılı bir bicimde yanıt veriniz.

Konu Özeti: Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü (Margaret Atwood)

Gelecekteki Gilead Cumhuriyeti'nde, doğurgan nitelikteki kadınlar "damızlık kız" olarak adlandırılmakta ve komutanlara çocuk doğurmak vazifesiyle görevlendirilmektedir. Kadınların salt üreme amacıyla kullanıldıkları ve sözlü ya da yazılı tüm iletişim olanaklarından mahrum bırakıldıkları bu toplumda, doğurgan nitelikte olmayan kadınlar "teyze" olarak adlandırılmakta ve damızlık kızları idare etmekle görevlendirilmektedirler. Aşağıdaki pasajda, damızlık kız Offred, Lydia Teyze'nin sözlerini hatırlamaktadır:

EM1 (s.214)

Parmaklarımın arasındaki kalem duyusal, neredeyse canlı, gücünü hissedebiliyorum, içerdiği sözcüklerin gücünü. Kalem kıskançlıktır, derdi, Lydia Teyze, Merkez'in bir başka sloganını alıntılayarak, bu tur nesnelerden uzak durmamız için bizi uyararak. Ve haklıydılar, kıskançlık bu. Sadece onu elde tutmak bile, kıskançlık. ((5) Komutandan kalemini kıskanıyorum. (6) Çalmak istediğim bir şey daha. (214)

Sorular

Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü baslıklı romanı daha önce okudunuz mu*?*

Yukarıdaki pasajda on plana çıkan herhangi bir sözcük oyunu var mı? Evet ya da hayır?

Yanıtınız evetse, lütfen bu sözcük oyunun ne olduğu ve sizin için ne anlam ifade ettiğini yazınız.

Bu sözcük oyunu, romanın yukarıda özet olarak verilen konusuyla ne derece bağlantılıdır? Oldukça bağlantılı, bağlantısız, az bağlantılı.

Lütfen bir önceki soruda verdiğiniz yanıtı açıklayınız.

Konu Özeti: Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın (Marge Piercy)

Cinsiyet rolleri acısından eşitlikçi bir toplum olan, 2137 yılındaki Mattapoisett'de, çocuklar genetik özelliklerin rastgele seçimine dayalı olarak laboratuvarlarda tasarlanmakta ve yapay rahimlerde büyüyüp dünyaya gelmektedirler. Mattapoisett toplumunun üyelerden ölenler olduğunda, yerlerine, kadın ya da erkeklerden oluşan uçlu gruplar, rastgele seçilerek, doğan çocuklara ebeveynlik yapmak üzere atanmaktadırlar. Ebeveynlik vazifesiyle görevlendirilen bu kişiler çok ender olarak birbirleriyle gönül ilişkisi içinde bulunurlar. Romanın, günümüzde yaşayan başkahramanı Connie, Mattapoisett'ten Luciente ile telepatik iletişim kurma yeteneğine sahiptir. Aşağıdaki pasajda, Connie Luciente'ye Mattapoisett'teki ebeveynlik sistemi ile ilgili sorular yöneltmektedir.

EM2 (s.72)

- Sevgilin Bee mi babaları? Yoksa diğeri mi?
- Baba? Luciente bileğini kaldırdı ama Connie onu durdurdu?
- Baba. Bilirsin. Erkek ebeveyn.
- Ah? Hayır, Bee ya da Jackrabbit değil. Ortaklar çok nadiren yatak arkadaşlarımızdan olur, genellikle değildirler. Böylece çocuk aşk anlaşmazlıklarından etkilenmemiş olur.
- Ortaklar?
- Diger anneler (...)

Sorular

Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın başlıklı romanı okudunuz mu?

Yukarıdaki pasajda ön plana çıkan, yeni üretilmiş ya da yeni bir anlam yüklenmiş sözcükler var mı? Evet ya da hayır?

Yanıtınız evetse, lütfen yeni üretilmiş ya da yeni bir anlam yüklenmiş olduğunu düşündüğünüz sözcükleri ve sizin için ne anlam ifade ettiklerini yazınız.

Yeni üretilmiş ya da yeni anlam yüklenmiş olan bu sözcükler, romanın yukarıda özet olarak verilen konusuyla ne derece bağlantılı? Oldukça bağlantılı, bağlantısız, az bağlantılı.

Lütfen bir önceki soruda verdiğiniz yanıtı açıklayınız.

Konu Özeti: Dişi Adam (Joanna Russ)

Janet Evason, kadınların egemen olduğu, gelecekteki Hoşvakit toplumundan dünyaya gelmiş bir gezgindir ve dünyada yaşadıklarını kendi gözüyle, eleştirel bir bicimde irdelemektedir. Janet Evason'a, dünyadaki bu serüveninde, kimi zaman feminist roman yazarı Joanna eşlik etmektedir. Aşağıdaki pasaj, Joanna'nın Janet Evason ile katıldığı bir partideki çeşitli kadınlara yönelik gözlemine dayanmaktadır.

EM3 (s.40-41)

Oradaki kadınların çoğunu tanıyordum: Sposissa, üç kez boşandı; Eglantissa, aklı fikri giyim kuşamdadır; Aphrodissa, takma kirpiklerinden dolayı gözlerini acık tutamaz; Clarissa, intihar edecek; Lucrissa, alnındaki kırışıklıklara bakılırsa kocasından daha çok kazanıyor; Wailissa, Lamentissa ile ne-kadar-iğrenç oyunu oynuyor; Travaillissa, genelde tek yaptığı çalışmaktır, ama simdi sakin sakin kanepede oturuyor, bu nedenle gülümsemesi rahatsız etmez ve yaramaz Saccharissa, ev sahibiyle barın arkasından Benim Küçük Sevgilim oyununun bir raundunu oynuyor. Saccharissa kırk besinde. İyi Spor Amicissa da. Gözlerim Ludicrissa'yi aradı, fakat böyle bir partiye çağırılmak için fazla sade biri o ve elbette Amphibissa'yı da asla çağırmayız, herkesin bildiği nedenlerle. (...) Toplum içinde asla çenesini açmayan Domicissa nerede? Ya o standart "Oh, ne muhteşemsin!" cümlesiyle bu gece ortamda tuhaf bir şekilde eksikliğini hissettiren Dulcississa nerede?)

Sorular

Dişi Adam başlıklı romanı daha önce okudunuz mu?

Yukarıdaki pasajda ön plana çıkan sözcük oyunları var mı? Evet ya da hayır?

Yanıtınız evetse, lütfen bu sözcük oyunlarının ne olduğunu ve sizin için ne anlam ifade ettiklerini yazınız.

Bu sözcük oyunları, romanın yukarıda özet olarak verilen konusuyla ne derece bağlantılı? Oldukça bağlantılı, bağlantısız, az bağlantılı.

Lütfen bir önceki soruda verdiğiniz yanıtı açıklayınız.

Turkish Readers' Profile

32 participants took part in the reading experiment I conducted on Turkish readers. The following are the participants' profile information:

1. **Average age**

Participants consist of quite a young group of readers whose average age is 29, ranging from 18 to 52.

2. **Sex**

I conducted my experiment on the same number of men and women: 16 male, 16 female participants.

3. **City of Residence**

Participants are from ten different cities, mostly across Turkey: İstanbul (20), İzmir (1), Ankara (3), Balıkesir (1), Konya (1), Gaziantep (1), Erzincan (1), Tripoli Libya (1), Toronto (1), Ottawa (2).

Although most participants in my experimental group are university students from İstanbul (Turkey), there are also some Turkish Canadians as well as a Turkish expatriate in Libya who participated in the experiment.

4. **First Language**

All the participants have Turkish as their first language.

5. Language Skills

Language skills of the participants in my experimental group are highly developed. All the participants speak English and more than the half of the experimental group has an advanced level of English. Apart from English, some participants also speak other European languages such as French, German, Italian and Spanish. A few participants speak languages such as Russian, Kurdish, Latin, Classical Greek, and Ottoman Turkish.

English Beginner (5), Intermediate (7), Upper intermediate (3), Advanced (17); French Intermediate (3), Advanced (1); German Beginner (1), Intermediate (4), Advanced (1); Italian Beginner (2), Intermediate (1); Spanish Intermediate (1); Russian Intermediate (1); Kurdish Intermediate (1); Latin, Classical Greek, Ottoman Turkish Intermediate (1).

6. Area of Study

Participants come from a wide range of educational backgrounds such as:

High School (1), Civil Engineering (2), Geological Engineering (1), Latin Language and Literature (1), Social Sciences (1), Political sciences and International Relations (4), Psychology (2), Preschool Teaching (1), Chemistry (1), Mathematics (1), Molecular, Biology and Genetics (1), Business Administration (4), Public Relations (2), Public Administration (2), Economy (2), Mechanical Drawing (1), Translation and Interpreting (1), English Language and Literature (1), Electrical Engineering (1), Turkish Language and Literature (1), Accounting (1)

With the exception of one participant who is a high school student, all the other participants are university graduates with diverse educational backgrounds and

experiences. Like Turkish readers, English speaking readers to whom I applied this experiment have different educational backgrounds, too. Thus, readers in both experimental groups can be said to have almost the same level of education.

7. Have you ever taken a stylistics or discourse analysis course?

Yes (1), No (31).

31 participants answered "no" to this question. The only participant who answered "yes" to this question was a student in translation and interpreting. Thus, most participants in the experimental group consist of "non-professional" readers who have no knowledge of stylistics or discourse analysis.

8. Are you familiar with Foregrounding Theory? If yes, what do you know about it?

Yes (2), No (30).

Most of Turkish participants are not familiar with Foregrounding Theory. The following are the answers of the two participants who commented on Foregrounding Theory:

<u>Alp E.</u>

"Edebiyatın ne olduğunu belki de ne olmadığını ortaya çıkarmaya çalışan ve bununla ilgili farklı metod ve gereçlerin kullanımını inceleyemeyi amaçlayan bir bakış açısı."

"A perspective that attempts to show what literature is or is not and examines different methods and devices used for this purpose."

Although quite vague and incomplete, Ejderoglu's above definition of Foregrounding Theory shows that he is aware of foregrounding as a series of methods and devices used to determine literary value of a text. The following is another reader's definition of foregrounding:

Oya K.

> "Öne çıkarma kuramı. Belli bir konu üzerinde yoğunlaşıp o konuyu ön plana çıkarma."
>
> "The theory that consists in focussing on and foregrounding a given topic."

As should be evident from the above definition, unlike Ejderoglu, Oya Kocak doesn't relate foregrounding to literature, but she rightly argues that foregrounding consists in focussing on a given topic. Apart from these two readers, the rest of my experimental group has no idea about the Foregrounding Theory that theoretically and methodologically inspired my study.

9. Are you familiar with speculative fiction?

Yes (9), No (23).

Most of Turkish participants are not familiar with speculative fiction. Even those who assume they are have apparently different conceptions of speculative fiction. One of the participants conceives of speculative fiction as an alternate history, which is actually a subgenre of speculative fiction:

Alaattin T.

'*Metal Fırtına*[15] gibi olsa gerek.. yada *Fatherland*[16] tarzı bir alternetif evren

yaklaşımı olabilir.."

"*Metal Firtina* ("Metal Storm") or *Fatherland* as a work of alternate universe

can be an example of speculative fiction."

Most participants who claimed they were familiar with speculative fiction tend to use

the term *speculative fiction* interchangeably with *sci-fi*:

Burak T.

"Bilimsel temellere dayanan ancak bu temelleri de aşarak evren hakkında yeni bir

bakış   açısı getirmek şeklinde özetleyebilirim."

"A kind of fiction that has scientific foundations, which it goes beyond by offering

new perspectives."

Nuran B.

"Bilimsel kurgu sanırım."

"I guess, it means science fiction."

---

[15] **Metal Fırtına** (*Metal Storm*) is a 2004 novel by Turkish writers Orkun Uçar and Burak Turna. It became an immediate bestseller in Turkey, with several hundred thousand copies sold as of 2006. In the novel, set in the year 2007, the United States Military invades Turkey to gain control of its deposits of an important strategic resource, borax. After securing the principal cities in Turkey, the United States attempts to re-enact the Treaty of Sèvres by dividing Turkey up between its historic rivals Greece and Armenia. Turkey responds by forming a military alliance with China, Russia and Germany. A Turkish agent then steals an American nuclear bomb and detonates it in Washington, D.C., killing millions of people and forcing an end to the American invasion.

[16] **Fatherland** is a bestselling 1992 thriller novel by the English writer and journalist Robert Harris, which doubles as a work of alternate history. The novel is based on the premise of a world in which Nazi Germany was triumphant in World War II.

<u>Oya K.</u>

"Kuramsal ve hayal ürünü şeylerin bir arada kullanılması."

"The use of the theoretical and imaginary together."

<u>Dogukan</u>

Eğer spekülatif kurgu'dan kasıt, başka bir bilimkurgu tanımı ise, spekülatif bilimkurgudur. Judith Merrill'in bu terimi şöyle açıklar: "Spekülatif kurgu terimini, bir gerçek durum karşısında geleneksel bilimsel yöntemlerini(gözlem, varsayım, deney) kullanan, bildik olgular temelinde buna düşsel ya da yaratılmış değişiklikler ekleyen, böylelikle içinde buluşlar ve/veya kişiler hakkındaki tepkilerin ve algıların ortaya konduğu bir durumu tanımlamak için kullanıyorum.

If what you mean by speculative fiction is a different type of science fiction", I would say that speculative fiction is science fiction, as described by Judith Merrill as follows: "I use the term 'speculative fiction" here specifically to describe the mode which makes use of the traditional 'scientific method' (observation, hypothesis, experiment) to examine some postulated approximation of reality, by introducing a given set of changes -- imaginary or inventive -- into the common background of 'known facts', creating an environment in which the responses and perceptions of the characters will reveal something about the inventions, the characters, or both.

Although the reader named Dogukan defines speculative fiction by citing Judith Merril who popularised the use of the term *speculative fiction* as an "experimental and innovative" genre, apparently, like the other readers, he doesn't make any distinction between speculative fiction and traditional sci-fi. Turkish readers' definition of speculative fiction is not without problem in our context. However, if we consider speculative fiction as an umbrella term that encompasses all the forms of science fiction and fantasy, Turkish readers seem to have read quite a few books that fall into the category of speculative fiction.

10. If yes, who are your favourite speculative fiction writers?

The following is a list of twenty seven writers Turkish readers said they had read and liked:

Orkun Uçar & Burak Turna (*Metal Storm* Series), Isaac Asimov, Ray Bradbury (*Fahrenehit 451*), William Golding, George Orwell (*1984*), Plato, Thomas More, Zecharia Sitchin, Anne Rice, Jean Christhophe Grange, Margaret Atwood, John Ronald Reuel Tolkien, Jules Verne, Haldun Hürel, Melanie Tem, Steve Rasnic Tem; Adam Fawer, Frank Herbert, Stanislaw Lem, Arthur C. Clarke, Philip Jose Farmer, Theodore Sturgeon, H. G. Wells, Philip K. Dick, Kurt Vonnegut, Cormac McCarthy, Jose Saramago.

The list above contains some fantasy writers like John Ronald Reuel Tolkien and Jules Verne; some utopian writers like Plato and Thomas More; some dystopian writers like Ray Bradbury (*Fahrenheitt 451*), George Orwell (*1984*) and Margaret Atwood (*The Handmaid's Tale*) some sci-fi writers like Isaac Asimov, Arthur C. Clarke, Theodore Sturgeon, H. G. Wells, Philip K. Dick, Kurt Vonnegut; some mystery and gothic fiction writers like Jean Christophe Grange and Anne Rice; some post-apocalyptic fiction writers like Cormac McCarthy; some horror fiction writers like Melanie Tem, Steve Rasnic Tem, Adam Fawer; some alternative history writers like Orkun Uçar & Burak Turna (*Metal Storm* Series) and Zecharia Sitchin; and Jose Saramago as the writer of *Blindness,* a magical realist masterpiece that displays also some dystopian and allegorical aspects. The length and diversity of this list shows that Turkish readers are not totally indifferent towards the various forms of science fiction and fantasy. Turkish readers also seem to show an interest in the books of new and emerging Turkish writers like Orkun Uçar & Burak Turna (*Metal Storm* Series) and Haldun Hürel.

11. Please explain briefly why you like or dislike reading speculative fiction.

Turkish readers like speculative fiction for the following reasons:

Analysis of Different Alternatives

Alaattin T.

> İçinde yaşadığımız çağ ve insanlık olarak ulaştığımız medeniyet seviyesi çok önemli..ilerlememiz bugüne kadar yaptıklarımızı iyi analiz etmeyi ve bir sonraki gelişmeleri iyi tasarlamamızı gerektiriyor..bu çok önemli..alternatifleri anlamak en iyi tercihleri daha iyi analiz etmemizi sağlıyor.kolaylaştırıyor..tabii bu alternatiflerin belirli yönlendirmeler içermesi ve manipüle etme amaçları içermemesi gerekiyor. Bu anlaşıldığında etkisini ve alternatif evren yaklaşımındaki amaçları sıfırlamasını doğuruyor.. Bu yüzden iyi niyetli ve dikkatli tasarlanması gerekiyor… Düşünce egzersizi olarak tasarlanmalı.. Ve abartılmamalı…

> The century in which we now live and the point we have reached in our civilisation are very significant. Our future progress is dependent on our ability to analyse what we have done so far and on our capacity to wisely consider further steps to advance..This is really very important. To analyse different alternatives can allow us to make the best decisions. Of course, these alternatives must be used for guidance rather than manipulative purposes. These alternatives can be effective if they are not based on the same motivations as the approaches of alternate universe, but on some guiding principles. The alternatives must be compassionately and carefully conceived and mustn't be too exaggerated..

End of Monotony and New Perspectives for Readers

Damla

> "Seviyorum çünkü bu tür kitapların insanları monotonluktan kurtarıp çevredeki
>
> birçok şeye farklı gözlerle bakmasını sağladığını düşünüyorum."
>
> "I like this genre because I think that this genre gets readers out of the
>
> monotony and allows them to look at things from a different perspective."

Infinite Liberty of Imagination

Alp E.

"Hayal gücünün zaferi ve tradejisini gösterdiği için."

"Because it shows the victory and tragedy of the imagination."

Dogukan

"Bilimkurgu, şiir sanatı dışında, sınırların olmadığı, kısıtlamaların bulunmadığı tek edebiyat alanıdır. Sadece geleceğe gitmekle kalmazsınız, ayrıca "diğer" denen o muhteşem yerde bulursunuz kendinizi. Burası tamamen başka bir evren, başka bir gezegen, başka türlerdir" (Theodore Sturgeon.) Evet bu türü sevmemin asıl nedeni, bu türdeki yazarların genellikle en zor sorularla uğraşmayı seçmeleridir veya daha doğru bir ifadeyle en zor sorulara en yaratıcı cevapları vermeleridir. Çünkü gerçekten de bilimkurgu yazarına sınırsız bir özgürlük alanı sunan bir daldır.

"Apart from poetry, science fiction is the only literary field with no limits and restrictions. It does not just take you into the future, but also into the terrific world of the "other." This "other" world is a completely different universe, planet and species" (Theodore Sturgeon.) Yes, the reason why I like this kind of writing is that the writers of this genre have usually chosen to deal with the most difficult questions or more precisely, they have given more creative answers to the most difficult questions. Indeed, sci-fi is a genre that offers the science fiction author an infinite liberty.

Verisimilitude and Literary Taste

Nuran B.

"Gerçeğe yakın, hayal gücümüzü iyi yönde canlandırıyor, doğruyu ayırt etmemizi sağlıyor, aydınlatıyor, hikâye tadında aynı zamanda."

"Speculative fiction creates verisimilitude, triggers our imagination, enables us to distinguish realities, instructs us, and offers the same taste as the tale."

Turkish readers dislike speculative fiction for the following reasons:

Higher degree of verisimilitude

Burak T.

"Özel olarak bir hayranlığım olmamakla beraber her bilimkurgu türüne olan ilgimden ötürü bu türe de yakınım. Anlatılanların olabilirliği diğer bilimkurgu türlerine göre daha fazla ve bu yüzden biraz daha mesafeli duruyorum. İnsanın düşsel evreni bü dünyayı da aşmalı çünkü biz evrende hiçbir şeyiz."

Although I am not a big fan of speculative fiction, I am interested in all the subgenres of sci-fi, including speculative fiction. However, I'm kind of distant towards speculative fiction since speculative fiction has a higher degree of verisimilitude compared to other subgenres of sci-fi. I think that the human imagination should also go beyond the real world because we are nothing on this universe.

Lower Degree of Verisimilitude and Futuristic Worlds

Lale E.

"Diğer kurgu tarzlarına göre daha az seviyorum. Günümüzde veya geçmişte kurulmuş hikâyeler beni daha çok cezbediyor çünkü olabilirliği kanıtlanmış. Ne kadar inanma ihtimalim yüksekse, o kadar çok zevk alıyorum."

"I love speculative fiction less than other types of fiction. I am more attracted by stories that are based on the past and the present because they have truly happened. I take more pleasure reading a true or verisimilar story."

Mental Confusion Due to the Lack of Logical Conformity

<u>Oya K.</u>

"Sevmiyorum. Çünkü bilim kurgu ve hayal ürünü bir araya getirip bir şeyler uydurulduğunda mantık dışına çıkıldığını düşünüyorum bu da insanı düşündürmekten çok geriyor ve yoruyor. Ortada kalan tablo ise karışmış akıllar ve acabalar, içinden çıkılmayan sorular bırakıyor…"

"I do not like speculative fiction because science fiction and imaginary worlds are not compatible with logic and this is more tiring than thought-provoking for the reader who ends up with a confused mind and lots of unanswered questions."

As can be inferred from the above statements, Turkish readers in my experimental group like speculative fiction for getting them out of the monotony by offering them alternative worlds as well as an infinite liberty of imagination. Verisimilitude and literary taste for speculative fiction is also among the reasons why readers like this genre. However, while some readers like speculative fiction for its high degree of verisimilitude, some readers dislike speculative fiction for the same reason. Imaginary elements in speculative fiction being attractive to many readers, one of the readers in my experimental group stated that she disliked speculative fiction for imaginary elements, which she thinks lead the reader to a mental confusion due to the lack of logical conformity.

English speaking Readers' Profile

1. Average Age: Participants' average age is 35 ranging 17 from to 60.

2. Gender: Male (14), F (17).

3. Nationality: USA (9), CA (19), British(2) Australian(1).

4. First language: American English (9), Canadian English (19), British English (2), Australian English (1)

5. Field of study: Commerce (1), sociology (2), English/Literature/Writing (5), German (1), International Relations (1), Translation (4), Art History (1), Political Science (1), Library and Information Science (1), Philosophy (2), High School (2), Business administration (1), Psychology (2), French (1), Music (1), Law (1), Healthcare Administration (1), Anthropology (1), Education (2).

6. Have you ever taken a stylistics course? No (26), Yes (5).

7. Are you familiar with Foregrounding Theory? Yes. If yes, what do you know about it? Yes (5).

Compared to Turkish readers, English speaking readers seem to be more familiar with Foregrounding Theory.

<u>Alternative</u>

"That it postulates that certain elements of a work cause it to stand out, or reside in the 'foreground' of our perception."

Anna Grace

"Yes. I believe it defines how poetry and poetic language deviate from the ordinary usage of language, which can in turn, affect the comprehension of poetic material."

Desmond F.

"Yes. I know very little about it. I would surmise that it consists of making something obvious as opposed to making something less relevant."

Lachlan W.

"Sort of, maybe– is it that poetic language differs in some ways to the language we use to communicate in? I'm not really familiar with it."

Tia C.

"I have heard the term – I believe it means that an author is giving background information up front in literature, but not 100% sure."

8. Are you familiar with speculative fiction? Yes (18) No (13)

Compared to Turkish readers, English speaking readers seem to be more familiar with speculative fiction.

9. If yes, who are your favourite speculative fiction writers?

The following is the list of source text readers' favourite speculative fiction writers:

Gore Vidal *(Kalki)*, John Varley, George Orwell (*1984*), John Wyndham, Aldous Huxley (*Brave New World*), Brave New World, J.R.R. Tolkien, Pierre Boulle, Garcia

Marquez, Margaret Atwood, Joanna Russ, Marge Piercy, Suzette Haden Elgin, Ursula K. LeGuin, John Brunner, Peter Carey, Cormac McCarthy, Pratchett, Pullman, J. K. Rowling, Stephenie Meyer, Paul Park, Connie Willis, Gene Wolfe John Crowley, Arthur C. Clarke, Philip Jose Farmer, Ray Bradbury (Fahrenheit 450, Lois Lowry, Jeanne Duprau, Stephenie Meyer, Robert O'Brien, Charles De Lint, Terry Pratchett, Marian Zimmer Bradley.

The above list and the list of Turkish readers' favourite speculative fiction writers seem to have in common some writers like Margaret Atwood, Ray Bradbury, Arthur C Clarke, Philip Jose Farmer, George Orwell, and J.R.R. Tolkien. Despite these few commonalities, we will see further how source and target text readers' responses to the same fragment of speculative fiction text can diverge as a result of various translation strategies.

10. Please explain briefly why you like or dislike reading speculative fiction.

English speaking readers like speculative fiction for the following reasons:

A Better Understanding of Past, Current and Future Societies

Alternative

> "I have always been attracted to stories about the possible ways in which the end of the world takes place, as well as those of alternative worlds and societies."

Anna Grace

> "I enjoy them because they are imaginative and ponder current and past societies to create a new "world" in which their characters live."

Andrew M.

"I like reading pretty much anything. But I think speculative fiction inspires you to look around more at your own surroundings and really think about what's going on in your own world."

Bradley L.

"I like the way in which certain examples of speculative fiction are able to function as social commentary on current and historical events."

Desmond F.

"I enjoy reading about different possibilities, imagined environments, unusual things, the course of history, utopia and dystopia."

Jannah H.

"I like to stretch my mind's horizons to imagine extending the range of the possible, to explore alternative futures for the human race, to look at familiar issues from fresh points of view."

Lachlan W.

"I find it interesting to read an author's depiction of a world that is unlike the world I'm already familiar with. That being said, I have never read any science fiction or fantasy novels, but magical realism I find interesting as the distinction between what we consider reality is blurred with the imagination of the author. I am drawn dystopian/apocalyptic fiction as well, yet for different reasons. In novels such as 1984 or McCarthy's "The Road", the narrative does not reflect

the norm we live in today, yet it seems plausible that we could one day exist in such a state. It helps me to appreciate the positive aspects of society when I'm pessimistic, and to remain politically and socially alert."

Lucy N.

"It gives a different perspective on everything."

Rachel C.

"I enjoy being transported to a new way of thinking about certain things. I feel that speculative fiction allows the imagination to stretch and reshape our concepts of everyday things. This kind of literature, I believe, contributed greatly to the advancement of technology, filming of special effects, etc."

Sterling T.

In the best speculative fiction, one is treated to an involving story in a different world, but the story reflects and illuminates our world by isolating the elements to be examined. That is, mainstream fiction (which I also enjoy) tends to lose the theme in the quotidian, realistic details. The speculative fiction writer can tailor his or her world to the themes to be examined.

Steven D.

"I read science fiction almost exclusively when I was in my 20s and 30s, but very little since. I enjoyed its unlimited possibilities and the links to the physical sciences which also interested me very much at that time."

Tia C.

"I like to read about what an alternative world might be like."

<u>Tina J.</u>

I use the term Fantasy Fiction for this genre, and had not heard of the term speculative fiction before receiving this questionnaire. I enjoy the imaginative and intelligent structure within fantasy, which allows an exploration of the extremes of society, both good or bad (depending on the reader's perspective). The emotional, political and sociological results of such extremes can easily be related to our own society from these books, and the wide range of reading evidenced by the authors (particularly Terry Pratchett) in their writings opens new avenues of intellectual exploration.

<u>Lisa H.</u>

It was very prominent when I was growing up and the books were in the house. It makes objective observations about society and looks at political movements, etc, by disconnecting these trends from their societal and historical contexts. By putting them in different settings, the authors show them to us from a different perspective. We can then look at them from a distance and draw our own conclusions, if we like; however, they are really an indirect form of political commentary, which is mainly what I find interesting about it.

English speaking readers dislike speculative fiction for the following reasons:

The Complexity and Strangeness of the Fictional World

<u>Anna B.</u>

"I do not like horror fiction at all, but I also don't like too many science fiction

and fantasy works. When the worlds that the author is describing are completely

different from the world that I know and when this fictional world is too

complex and too foreign to me, I am not too interested in the work. I find it

unrealistic and irrelevant and therefore, I lose interest in it."

<u>Christel K.</u>

"I dislike, especially science fiction. I prefer something closer to home, even if

the commentary is supposed to be interpretative of our present situation. I

particularly disliked the feeling of reading the Handmaid's Tale, the subservience of women, although in general I like Margaret Attwood's writing, for example Cat's Eye, and others."

The Problem of Literary Value

<u>Christine Y.</u>

"My son, age 11, reads it!!!"

<u>Joffre R.</u>

"I don't read much because it seems very little has a real literary reputation. *The Handmaid's Tale* is the only one of these books I'd consider reading."

The target and source readers seem to like and dislike speculative fiction for pretty much the same reasons. Those who like speculative fiction are obviously fascinated by its infinite liberty of imagination and its ability to make the reader think of the past, current and future societies on the basis of alternative societies it depicts. Those who dislike speculative fiction are mostly critical of the complexity and strangeness of its fictional worlds. To the contrary of the target readers who are mostly concerned by the degree of verisimilitude of speculative fiction, the source readers do not focus on the issue of verisimilitude, they instead choose to discuss this genre's problem of literary value.

Evaluation of the Results of Literary Reading Test

The Handmaid's Tale: "Pen is Envy"

The great majority of source text readers (25 readers) considered "Pen is Envy" is word play. Since this word play was translated into Turkish literally as "Kalem kiskancliktir", the target readers were not able to reconstruct interrelationships between the concepts of *pen*, *penis* and *envy* without semantic gaps. As one of the source readers, Rachel C. clearly states:

Rachel C.

> "Well, she (Margaret Atwood) ties the entire thing together: Pen to power, pen to envy and finally the Commander to the pen and what it represents."

Source readers had no difficulty in "tying the entire thing together", and one reader was able to give a detailed explanation of the tripartite relationship between the concepts *pen*, *penis* and *envy*:

Desmond F.

> If the narrator is being 1) de-educated: the pen is the way to resist this process and regain some humanity; 2) desexualized (turned into a reproduction machine): the pen is a sexual object, a phallic symbol that stirs desire 3) disempowered: the pen, as man, is in control, so wanting it, especially the Commander`s, is to want power, status. Therefore, the motto is both a rule of terror upheld by the Center against women and a statement of what women feel as a result. It is deeply relevant to the plot.

On the other hand, Turkish readers were not able to "tie the entire thing together." One of the Turkish readers thought the word play is on the word *damizlik*, 5 readers focussed on phallic associations behind the word *pen*, 7 readers stated that the word play must relate to the words *pen* and *envy*, one reader mentioned strong emphasis on the word

envy and the majority of readers (12 readers) related the word play just to the word *pen* and mentioned a number of concepts they thought the word *pen* could be associated with: "child, danger, liberty (commanders' liberty), commanders' verbal communication, and prohibitions. Compared to the source readers, the target readers had a more partial and fragmented reception of the key concepts in the excerpt under study. Although some readers, by deconstructing the text fragment, came to explore metaphorical/symbolic meanings behind some concepts like the *pen*, they could not relate these "symbolic" meanings to the writer's stylistic experimentation. To my mind, the following statement by one of the Turkish readers, Afşin E. illustrates this point very well:

Afşin E.

> Hayır. Varsa bile anlamadım. Eğer 'kalem'in fallik bir nesne olması kastediliyorsa, bu bir sözcük oyunu değil bir fallik simge... "Catcher in the Rye"[17] ya da "ateşten gömlek"[18] sözcük oyunudur. Ben metinde böyle bir sözcük oyunu görmedim. Kastedilen "teyze" ise burada sözcük oyunu değil, sözcüğe baksa bir anlam yükleme var.
> No, even though there is a word play, I couldn't recognize it. If you mean by word play the pen that is a phallic symbol, it is not a word play, but a phallic symbol. "Catcher in the Rye" or "Shirt of Flame" is a word play. I could not recognize such instances of word play in the text. If you mean by word play "aunt", it is not a word play, but a word loaded with a new meaning.

As for how target readers came to explore metaphorical/symbolic meanings behind some concepts like the *pen*, it is also through foregrounding devices like metaphors and parallelisms.

---

[17] The title of J. D Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye* (1951) is an allusion to Robert Burns's poem "Comin' Thro' The Rye' , a poem that calls for self-responsability without busybodies interfering. Through his misinterpretation of this poem, the main character of Salinger's novel, Holden wants to "catch" and save children from growing up and possibly becoming phony.
[18] *Ateşten Gömlek* by Halide Edip Adivar (1922; translated into English as *The Daughter of Smyrna* or *The Shirt of Flame*).

- The use of the ontological metaphor of personification: Some target readers were defamiliarised when they the word *pen* was attributed a human quality.

Alp Ejderoglu

"Kalem kıskançlıktır. Cansız bir varlık üzerinden insana mahsus bir durumu ifade ediyor."

"Pen is envy. It describes an object by attributing a human sentiment to it."

Onur O.

"Kalemin canlı olması. Aslında burada kalem insanın içindeki duyguları belirten bir araçtır ama arada atlama yapılıp misyon direkt kaleme yüklenmiştir sanki o bireyden bağımsızmışçasına."

"Here, the pen is attributed an animate character. The pen is actually a tool used for writing on human feelings, but here the pen seems to represent a power on its own as if it's isolated from humans."

Questionnaire

"Kalemin insana benzetilmesi."

"The attribution of a human character to the pen."

Questionnaire 3

"Kalemin canlı olması, sözcük içermesi.

"The attribution of an animate character to the pen and the fact that the pen contains words."

- The use of parallelisms: In the text fragment that was submitted to the participants, the word *pen* occurs three times while the word *envy* occurs four times. Another related concept *power* occurs twice.

In their capacity of defamiliarised target readers, they can only identity the ontological metaphor of personification and parallelisms as foregrounding devices. When a foregrounding device or novum is omitted in translation, the target readers can reach some meanings related to this "absent paradigm" by deciphering other foregrounding devices used in the same context, but they "miss" the word play. While some meanings intended by the "missing" word play can be deconstructed by the target readers who critically analyse other foregrounding devices used in the same context, the creativity of the word play is suppressed in translation because the writers' interrelated concepts disappear with it.. An analogy is that of target readers missing pieces that prevent them from completing the puzzle.

Literal translation is one of the causes of these gaps in understanding. But we can argue that the non-capitilization of the word "kiskanclik" can also be seen to play a certain role in making the connection between *pen* and *envy* less obvious for Turkish readers. The following statement by one of the source readers, Jannah H. shows how important capitalization might be in attracting readers' attention on particular details in a text:

Jannah H.

"The use of capitalization in the phrase makes the reading "Penis Envy" all the more obvious."

Unlike target readers, almost all the source readers associated the word play with Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic concept of *penis envy* as well as the writer's feminism and her fictional characters' relationship to feminism. For example, the reader Lisa H. made a "joke" by saying that "*penis envy* is a bone of contention with every feminist". Another reader, Jim H. maintained: "It sounds like we have a bit of a rebellious feminist on our hands who is tired of being under someone else's control." The answers of Turkish readers show that they were not able to make any connections between the psychoanalytic or even feminist dimensions of Margaret Atwood's fictional characters. Just one of the target readers made a comment on the possibility of the writer being a feminist by creating a linkage between the writer's gender and the novel's theme:

Atalay Y.

> "Yazarın da adından anladığım kadarıyla yazar bir kadındır. Kadın bir yazar neden hemcinslerini hikayesinde alt bir sınıfa dahil eder. Yazar ya bir feminist ya da bir militarist veya bu roman bir distopyadır."
>
> "As far as I understand from her name, the writer is a woman. Why does a female writer include women as a subclass in her novel? The writer must be either a feminist or a militarist, or this is a dystopian novel."

Apart from this one assumption about the feminist identity of the writer Margaret Atwood, target readers made no other comments on the fictional characters' relationship to feminism. Source readers, on the other hand, definitely had a better understanding of feminist tones of some of Atwood's female characters. In the case of the source readers, it was obvious that foregrounding devices function as textual indicators of fictional characters and play a significant role in readers' reception of a writer's modes of characterization. The translation of foregrounding devices however can either help or

hinder target readers' perception of characters' traits. In our example, the literal translation of the feminist word play seems to hinder target readers' perception of characters' feminism. Contrary to Turkish readers who did not comment on feminist perspectives in the text fragment or the word play, source readers made plenty of comments not just on the author, but also on her characters' personal traits and ideology:

The following are some comments made by the source readers regarding the author's belief and intentions:

Carol B.

"'Pen is Envy' (l.2) is a play on "Penis Envy". hat it means to me: The author seems to be playing with psychological (Freudian) theories of women expressing "penis envy", female jealousy of the male reproductive organ, turning it into a trope for the male appropriation of other means of (literary, epistolary, etc) creation in the story, and women's jealousy of it."

Alternative

"The word play is clearly intended to show the author's belief that there is a link

between the power of language as a tool for control, and the power of gender."

The following are some comments made by the source readers regarding the narrator and the characters:

Desmond F.

The pen is a phallic symbol. The phrase "Pen is Envy" is a split version of the term "penis envy." It has a double meaning; it is a "double entendre." The narrator is experiencing this feeling. It is conflated in the third sentence with sexual desire for the Commander. There seems to be some contradiction between the Center motto, which is obviously sexual to the reader, and the intentions of the Center (but I would need more context to confirm that). There is definitely tension between the word play, the nature of the story (reducing women to unfree, illiterate sexual objects), the descriptive language used by the author and the reader`s own, contemporary reaction to the text.

Rachel C.

> "I think that the word play is between the pen being a dual sign of power and envy to the narrator. She views the pen as a kind of metaphor of the Commander with his power that she envies."

Jim H.

> "It seems like the word play here is important to what could be a central character (the feminist, who speaks in the first person), and likely the plot, though the synopsis seems to be more background than explanation."

Christine Y.

> "the characters appear to be highly schematized, i.e. types rather than individuals, similar to Freud's male/female theorizing."

From the comments given above, we see that with the guidance provided by foregrounding devices, the source readers are more focussed on the ideology of the author, the narrator and the characters. Given that this feminist novum is omitted in the literal translation of the same text fragment into Turkish (Pen is Envy- Kalem kiskancliktir), it is understandable why Turkish readers are focussed on the global meaning of the text rather than the ideology of the author, the narrator and the characters. This may also explain why target readers' answers are less detailed and explanatory, and most importantly less uniform than those of source readers. Target readers' capacity (22/30) to relate the word play to the plot synopsis of the novel is relatively much lower than that of source readers (30/31). This is obviously a result of the literal translation and the non-capitalization of the feminist novum (in our case, the

word play), which has shifted target readers' attention to different aspects in the same text fragment in such a way as to allow for a plurality of interpretations.

Women on the Edge of Time: *Co-mothers*

Twenty-eight target readers stated that they recognised the instances of neologism in *Women on the Edge of Time*. However, instead of focussing on the text fragment, six readers seem to have focussed on the plot synopsis of the novel since, as a response, they chose to write about concepts related to the strangeness of the speculative world mentioned in the plot synopsis of the novel and not about instances of neologism. The following are some defamiliarising concepts the target readers thought might be considered as instances of neologism: artificial womb, telepathic communication, nomination of parents, to be charged in raising children, family and parents. They thus "missed" the wordplay.

Artificial Womb

Dogukan

> "*Yapay Rahim*: Toplum yapısının değişmesi dolayısıyla yeni doğan ihtiyaçlar çerçevesinde tasarlanmış bir aygıt olarak düşünüyorum. Anne rahmine olan ihtiyacı ortadan kaldırdığı için genetik ile ilgili yüksek bir teknoloji ürünü olduğu izlenimi bırakıyor aklımda."

> "Artificial Womb: I conceive of artificial womb as a device designed due to the needs rising from the change in social structure. For eliminating the need for mother womb, the concept of artificial womb makes me think it might be a high-tech genetic product."

178

The same reader thought also that the concept of *telepathic communication* could be considered a neologism.

Telepathic Communication

<u>Dogukan</u>

> *"Telepatik İletişim*: Kişilerin söz veya hareketlere ihtiyaç durmadan karşısındaki kişi ile doğrudan beyinden beyne bir iletişim kurması yöntemi gibi göründü. Böyle bir metodun iletişim verimliliğini artıracağını da düşündürttü."

> "Telepathic Communication: It appears to be a method of communication from one mind to another without recourse to any verbal and gestural exchange. This method also made me think that telepathic communication can increase the efficiency of the communication."

Nomination and to be charged in raising children

<u>Questionnaire 5</u>

> "atanmak" (ebeveyn olarak) –vazife için görevlendirilmek,yollanmak.
>
> "to be nominated to parent" – to be assigned with the mission of parenting.

<u>Atalay Y.</u>

> "Ebeveyn sözcüğünden atamaların yapıldığının bahsedilmesiyle sanki bir kurumdan sözedilmesiyle yeni bir anlam kazandırılmıştır."

> " 'Nomination' of people who will be parenting bringsto mind that parenting is conceived here as a kind of institution."

Questionnaire 10

"Çocuğa bakmakla görevli kişiler."

"People in charge of raising children."

Family and Parents

Merve Y.

"Baba ve anne kelimelerine bana göre olan anlamlarının dışında bir anlam yüklenmiş. Bu pasajda baba ve anneler sadece ebeveyn olarak görülmektedir. Bana göre ise bir anne ve baba ancak birbirlerini sevdikleri zaman çocuklarına iyi şekilde yaklaşıp onu büyütebilirler. Bu metinde ise aşk olmadığı halde ve üstelik çocukları da kendi öz çocukları olmadığı halde bir üçlü kurulmuştur."

"I think that the words "father" and "mother" are attributed new meanings. In the passage above, fathers and mothers are just seen as parents. From my perspective, a mother and a father can raise their children well only if they love each other. In this text, a group of three assumes the role of parents in the absence of love and biological connection with children."

All these target readers were much focussed on the strangeness of the speculative world rather than the strangeness of the language. One reader stated that *aşk anlaşmazlıkları (love misunderstandings)* can be considered a neologism. Four readers stated that *yatak arkadaşı* (*sweet friend*) could be considered a neologism and most of the readers (18 readers) stated that the word *partner* could be considered a neologism. Those who recognised the word *partner* as a neologism stated that this concept is meaningful since the book deals with a new family structure and partnership system:

Lale E.

"Kitabın sosyal siteminde "ortak" kavramı günümüzdekinden daha farklı. Kitap bu ortak sitemini (çocuklara annelik-babalık yapan 3 kadın veya erkek konusunu) anlattığı için bu sözcüğün çok önemli olduğunu düşünüyorum."

"In the new social system depicted in the novel, the concept of "partner" is different from its conventional usage. I think that "partner" is a key concept since the book deals with this partnership system, a group of three (men or women) parenting children."

Onur O.

"Kadınla erkek beraber olmamaktadır o yüzden böylesi yeni bir aile yapısına yeni bir kelime uygulanması normal."

"In this futuristic society, there is no sexual intercourse between men and women and it's normal to use a neologism to refer to this new family structure."

Genco G.

"Ortaklar kelimesi günümüzdeki ebeveyn kavramının farklı bir yansıması. Bugün kullanılan anlamıyla ortak kelimesi ebeveynliği çok kapsamasa da hikâye de önerilen yeni aile kavramı ile yeniden oluşturulmuş olabilir."

"The word partner is a different term referring to the concept of parent. Partner, as it is used in the novel must be different from its present-day usage because today, the word partner is not used interchangeably with the word parent. Thus, the word parent can be reinvented according to the new concept of family proposed in the novel."

However, the original neologism was *co-mother*. It was translated into Turkish as *ortak (partner)*, and so some Turkish readers, logically, express criticism of this new concept of family as a kind of business "partnership." They thus misinterpret the futuristic "Mettapoisett" as an "insensitive" society, which is not very compatible with the plot of the novel. Although biological maternity does not exist in Mettapoisett, the concept of maternity as a shared responsibility is still there, in the language of Mettapoisett and in

the people who share the responsibility of raising children and are called *co-mothers* regardless of their biological sex.

From my perspective, Turkish readers' ethical judgements of the parenting system in Mettapoisett depends to a great extent on the use of word *partner* in the Turkish translation that completely suppressed the concept of maternity and *co-mother* from the world and language of Mettapoisett. Thus, a device that foregrounds "social and technological revolution in motherhood" in the source text is transformed through translation into another device that foregrounds "parenting as a kind of business partnership." This change of foregrounding through translation seems to have caused some target readers not to be "empathically" involved in the Other world depicted in the text. One of the female target readers stated that she found the world of Mettapoisett "egalitarian". However, others criticize the "insensitivity" and "professionalism" emphasized by the word *ortak* (*partner*).

A female reader, for example, draws attention to the "egalitarian" world of Mettapoisett:

Nuran B.

"Eşitlikçi anlatım var. Kadın da taşımayacak. Çocuklar yapay rahimde labratuvarda gelişecek."

"There is an egalitarian conception of parenting. Children are not conceived in women's wombs, but laboratories."

The following are some examples from responses of readers who are critical of the "insensitivity" emphasized by the word *ortak* (*partner*) that also evokes a kind of "business partnership."

Barış B.

"ortaklar - çocukları yetiştirmeyi bir "meslek" olarak görürsek, iş ortakları gibi,

aslında var olan "ebeveyn" kavramına yakın, ancak duygusuzlugu vurguluyor."

"Partners- If we consider child-raising as a "profession", partner sounds like a

business partner. It is close to the conventional concept of parent, but it

emphasizes insensitivity."

Murat A.

"Ortaklar: Çocuk sahibi olmanın ya da aile kurmanın duygusallıktan çıkıp

profesyonel şirketlere dönüştüğünü ifade ediyor."

"Partners: It is expressed that children and family are not parts of our emotional

lives anymore because they turned into kinds of professional corporations."

Nur M.

Yapılan uygulama aile kavramına yeni bir anlam yüklüyor. Çekirdek aile tanımı değişiyor. Aşk, aile gibi kavramları çocuklardan ayırıyor. Çocuklar bir eve sonradan bakılmak üzere alınan bir canlı konumuna sokuluyor. Şu anda insanların evlerine bakmak üzere aldıkları hayvanların ya da bitkilerin yerini çocuklar alıyor. Bunun da çocukların aşk ve evlilik sorunlarından bağımsız olarak yetişmeleri için yapıldığı savunuluyor.

The system of partnership changes the definition of the concept of nuclear family and attributes it a new meaning by conceiving children separately from love and family. Children are represented as living beings that are brought home to be taken care of so they seem to have replaced pets and plants modern people take care of in their home. It is also maintained that this system aims for children not to be affected by love and marriage problems while growing up.

The above statements show that the choice of the word *ortak* in Turkish translation

caused some target readers to have less empathy for the fictional world of Mettapoisett.

We could thus argue that translation sometimes serves to reduce or suppress target

readers' empathy and sympathy with the language and culture of the Other represented in the source text.

As Suzanne Keen (2007, p. 93) points out, there are many elements that have been supposed to contribute to readers' empathy. Foregrounding devices (stylistic distortion and parallelism) are among these elements affecting readers' empathetic relationship with texts. Keen's focal point being "narrative empathy" with fictional characters in source texts, my focal point here is the recreation of an empathetic experience through translation. It is obvious that the word *ortak* defamiliarised Turkish readers, but not in the same way the word *co-mother* defamiliarised the source readers.

While eighteen target readers considered the word *partner* a neologism, all the source readers (31 readers) stated that *co-mothers* and *coms* are instances of neologism and the great majority of these source readers (29) found this neologism strongly related to the plot synopsis of the novel. Compared to the target readers, the source readers had a higher ability to recognise instances of neologism: thirteen source readers stated that the word *sweet friend* can be considered a neologism, sevensource readers stated that the word *love misunderstandings* can be considered a neologism; and three source readers stated that charactonyms like "Luciente", "Bee" and "Jackrabbit" can be considered neologisms. We will focus here on the reception of the word *co-mother* as the main foregrounding device in the text fragment. None of the source readers mentioned "insensitivity" in the futuristic world of Mettapoisett. The use of the word *co-mother* in the text fragment obviously caused them to have more empathy for Mettapoisett's new parenting system that turns "motherhood" into a "collective" responsibility.

In the light of the word *co-mother*, some readers like Bradley Leonard considered Mettapoisett's new parenting system as "team work":

Bradley L.

"Comothers: members of a team assigned to raise a child."

Some readers like Anna B. suggested that this concept extends motherly instinct to males:

Anna B.

Comothers/Coms = parents. It is an interesting neologism because it implies that both male and female can be mothers. This essentially can imply that both male and female can have the motherly instinct and perform the role of a nurturing parent (most often linked to the role of the mother), regardless of sex and gender. (...)"

Some readers like Christine Y. drew attention to "gender egalitarian" character of Mettapoisett's new parenting system:

Christine Y.

"The whole parenting system has been reworked, supposedly to create gender

equality, so that comothers play key roles and the biological father is not

necessarily involved in parenting."

Some readers like Jannah H. perceived the word *co-mother* as Mettapoisett's reversal of "patriarchy":

Jannah H.

Fatherhood is obsolete. That would be one way to take down the patriarchy which literally means rule by fathers. The word "mother" may not be entirely obsolete, but it survives in the word "comother" which also reflects the new

social development of collective parenting having replaced individual biological parenting.

Most readers grasped the centrality of the concept of "co-mother" that is loaded with new meaning in Mettapoisett.

Joffre R.

"comothers... It seems, since Luciente doesn't recognize the term father, that all parents in Mattapoisette are called mothers. Coms is perhaps another, playing off of moms."

Lucy N.

"Comother: someone who is a joint mother with someone else."

Marie T.

"Comother. Not just one mother but various that mother together. Shared power and responsibility not directly related to a traditional mother-child bond. No initial 9-month bonding in womb."

Source readers also related the concept of *co-mother* to Mettapoisett's "ideology".

Christel K.

"They seem to be key concepts in the society's ideology and its mechanism of bringing up children."

One of the source readers considered the use of the word *co-mother* as indicative of a complete "revolution" in the parenting system:

Lisa H.

"It reflects a complete revolution in the parenting system."

Another source readers stated that the concept of *co-mother* emphasises "the complete cultural divide between Connie and Luciente and drew attention to the importance of the writer's avoidance of the concept of "father" while depicting the parenting system in Mettapoisett."

Lucy N.

"Emphasises the complete cultural divide between Connie and Luciente.. concept of fatherhood may be important theme of book? "Comother" concept avoids father."

Most source readers grasped the centrality of the concept of "co-mother" that is loaded with a new meaning in Mettapoisett, and these readers also focussed on the reasons behind the writer's avoidance of the word "father." Compared to the target readers, source readers were much more receptive of Mettapoisett's reversal of "patriarchy" and the restructuring of a "gender egalitarian" system. Some of them even considered "co-motherhood" as "team work" and an extension of "motherly feeling." There were also some who stated that they found this new parenting system "ideological" and "revolutionary." In sum, through the translation of the word co-mother as *ortak (partner)*, Turkish readers missed an important feminist aspect of a linguistic *novum* that emphasizes the reversal of patriarchy in the source version of the futuristic society of Mettapoisett and the restructuring of a "gender egalitarian" system. They could not see the centrality of the concept of "co-mother" or focus on the reasons behind the writer's avoidance of the word "father." Instead, they saw the "insensitive" character of this futuristic society and showed less empathy for this new world..

The Female Man

While the vast majority of the source readers (29 readers) were able to recognise the instances of word play in the original text fragment, almost half the target readers (14 readers) couldn't recognise the instances of word play in the translated text fragment. While all the source readers recognised charactonyms as instances of word play, just a few target readers (5 readers) who have a certain knowledge of foreign languages or were attentive to the repetition of the affix –issa at the end of each charactonym were able to recognise the instances of word play as charactonyms.

As a response to this question, 2 target readers chose to comment on the strangeness of the speculative world rather than commenting on the instances of word play in the text fragment.

Strangeness of the Speculative World

Atalay Y.

"Kadınların egemen olduğu toplum: eşitlik yok, feminizm: kadın erkek eşitliği

"A female-dominated society: there is no equality in any real sense, it's based on feminism, which is the equality of women and men."

Nuran B.

"egemenlik kadına geçmiş."

"The women hold the power."

Nine target readers focussed on the implied meanings behind the words used in the description of the characters. They recognised as instances of word play words and sentences that refer to characters' sexuality, age, and personal attitudes.

Sexuality

Questionnaire 1

"Evet. 'Benim küçük sevgilim.' Cinsel bir birliktelik yaşamak kastediyor olabilir."

Yes. 'His Little Girl.' It can refer to sexual intercourse."

Age

Questionnaire 4

"Saccarissa'ya yaramaz sıfatı yüklendiğinde küçük olduğunu düşünmüştüm. Ama 45 miş."

"When I've read about Saccarissa who is described as naughty, I thought she might be young, but I've read further that she is 45."

Personal Attitudes

Alaattin T.

"Oh ne muhteşemsin ile kişisel ilişkilerindeki tavrına atıf + herkesin bildiği nedenlerle ile geçmişte yaptıklarına atıf +kırkbeşinde ile yaşına atıf böylelikle hepsi anlam içeren sözler içeriyor."

"Oh, you're so wonderful!": reference to her interpersonal behaviour," for obvious reasons": reference to her past behaviours, "forty-five: reference to her age. Thus, all these words are meaningful."

Two target readers were critical of the use of some words, which they thought suppress the fluency of the text fragment. Only five target readers recognized that the instances of word play are related to the charactonyms. One of the readers who stated that the

instances of word play consist of the repetition of the affix –issa thought this was just a formal device that reminded him of diminutive forms used to address a person:

Afşin E.

> "Kişilere seslenme veya yakinlik belirtme eklerinin ya da kalıplarının roman konusuyla çok bağlantılı olduğunu sanmıyorum."

> "I don't think diminutive forms used to address a person or to convey the degree of familiarity with the addressed person might be much related to the plot of the novel."

The other reader who recognised the meaningful charactonyms did not relate it to the plot of the novel by saying that:

Lale E.

> "Romanın geri kalan kimsini bilmediğim için, bir tek verilen bolüme ve kitabın özetine bakınca bir bağlantı göremedim."
> "As I have no idea about the overall context of the novel, I cannot relate this to the novel just looking at the excerpt and summary plot."

Another reader who recognised the meaningful charactonyms thought these charactonyms reflect an outsider's perspective of our present day society:

Barış B.
> "Günümüz toplumundaki kadınlar klişe kişilik şablonlarına oturtuluyor. Dünya dışından, kadınların egemen olduğu bir gezegenden gelen gözlemcinin gözlemlerini yansıtıyor."

> "Women in our present day society are represented stereotypically. This reflects the observations of an outsider who comes from another planet which is female-dominated."

Like this target reader, most of the source readers think that these charactonyms that stereotypically represent women in our present day society cannot be compatible with the feminist perspectives of the narrator Joanna:

Andre C.

> "These word plays do not convey the existence or non-existence of a female-dominated society. They merely demonstrate the standardization of female names. This could be the case in a male-dominated society."

Sterling T.

> "Joanna is apparently mocking the women present by naming them with their traits. At least, I assume that's what she's doing. I don't know what that has to do with a visitor from a female-dominated future society. Such catty characterizations do not seem particularly "feminist" to me."

Lucy N.

> "The feminist narrator is putting all the women into boxes signified by their names.."

Emily J.

> This excerpt does not demonstrate any overt female dominance in society; there are a few mentions of how some of the women make more money than their husbands, but this (at least from today's perspective) does not indicate an entirely female-dominant society. The fact that there are only women at the party doesn't indicate female dominance either, just simply segregation. Furthermore, nothing that the narrator says is particularly "feminist," and finally, the names of the women being indicative of their personalities is mysterious—it is unclear if the women were given these as nicknames once they had formed their place in society, or if they were given names and then grew to become those personages (indicating that an exterior authority influenced their social development and thus dominated them in some form). Perhaps with more context, the excerpt would more strongly reflect the synopsis.

Desmond F.

> The narrator is a feminist while the alien is a female-supremacist. The alien is critical of Earth; the narrator is defending Earth. Yet in this passage, and with the word play, it appears that the narrator is being very critical of the women at the party. This is a contradiction. The implication is that perhaps the views of the feminist are changing as they travel from Earth to Whileaway and back. Perhaps the female-dominated society is not so convincing to the feminist. Or perhaps she is just as critical of Earth as the alien is. My own idea that somehow the feminist human would defend Earth`s women, if not Earth`s society, is probably influencing this analysis. It may be totally consistent with the characters in the novel that this criticism through word play is occurring. I just do not think it would be consistent with feminist theory.

Although the above source readers think that charactonyms used in the text fragment cannot be compatible with the feminist perspectives of the narrator, there is no doubt that charactonyms here play a major role for making the readers think of the coherence of the various discourse structures in the novel. All these statements above give us an idea of the discussion value of foregrounding devices. Since Turkish readers do not have access to the meaning of these charactonyms, they cannot discuss the coherence of the various discourse structures in the novel, as the source readers do. Probably, as a result of the incompatibility of charactonyms with the feminist perspectives of the narrator and the complexity of the discourse structures, some source readers (6 readers)

found the perspectives in this text fragment difficult to analyse and stated that they need more contextual information to comment on it:

Jannah H.

> It's hard to say because I haven't read more than the beginning of this novel so far. The plot synopsis given here doesn't provide enough information to relate the character names to the plot. Unless this is how 20th-century social life with its unfeminist conventions looks to a time traveler from the future where such social conventions are obsolete?

Charactonyms puzzled the source readers by making them think about the overall context of the novel. With the exception of Lale Eskicioglu, who recognised charactonyms in the text fragment, all other target readers stated they need more contextual information to comment on these charactonyms' relationship to narrative perspectives in the novel. Contrary to the source readers only a few target readers felt that this word play allowed them to comment on the feminist narrator's critical perspective on present day society:

Merve Y.

> "Özette romanın başkahramanının bir gezgin olduğundan ve kişileri eleştirel bir bakış açısıyla incelediğinden bahsedilmiştir. Pasajda da başkahramanın bir balodaki kadınların hayatları hakkında ki düşünceler yer almıştır. Bu düşünceler ise çeşitli söz oyunlarıyla anlatım güçlendirilerek anlatılmıştır."

> "In the plot synopsis, it is mentioned that the main character is a traveller who sees the present world critically. In the excerpt, the main character conveys her impressions of people she meets at a party. To reinforce her expression, the main character uses various puns."

Nur M.

> "Joanna da "ne kadar iğrenç oyunu" nu oynuyor. Kendi feminist yaklaşımlarını arkadaşının eleştirel yaklaşımlarına uydurarak ortamı gözlemliyor. Romanın özetindeki kişiliğe uygun bir tavır sergiliyor."

> "Joanna also plays "a game of ain't-it-awful". She observes the setting from her feminist perspective combined with her friend's critical approach. She displays an attitude compatible with her character described in the plot synopsis."

One of the male readers made a rather "marginal" comment by distinguishing between Joanna's "egalitarian" feminism and Janet's female-dominant society, which he thinks suppresses gender equality:

Atalay Y.

> Feminizm ve kadınların üstünlüğünü savunmak aynı kavramlar değildir. Joanna'nın katıldığı partide yaptığı yorumlar kadınların beğenmediği yönlerini eleştirerek onları aşağılamaktadır. Kocasından daha çok para kazanan kadın hakkındaki yorum onun iğrençliği şeklindedir. Maddi yönden güçlü cinsler karşı cinsten üstündür. (capitalist sistemlerde böyledir). Joanna eşitliği bozduğu için hemcinsini aşağılayarak eşitliği savunmaktadır aslında. Ve Joanna'nın savunduğu feminism de eşitlikçi feminizmdir. Ve romanda; eşitliğin olmadığı kadınların egemen olduğu bir toplumdan gelen janet ile eşitliği savunan joannanın burada karşılaştırılması ve karıştırılmaması gerekmektedir.

> "Feminism and the vindication of women's superiority have to be distinguished from one another. In the novel, Joanna makes ironic and critical comments on the aspects she didn't like in the women she met at the party. By her comments about the woman who makes more money than her husband, she attempts to show how disgusting this type of woman is. In capitalist systems, the one who makes more money is superior to the other. By degrading the woman who makes more money than her husband, Joanna, defends, at bottom, gender equality. Thus, Joanna's feminism is an egalitarian feminism. So, we should be able to distinguish between Janet coming from a non-egalitarian, female-dominated society and Joanna who defends gender equality.

Among source readers, no one distinguished between Joanna's "egalitarian" feminism and Janet's female-dominant society, as the above target reader did. Most of the source

readers (15 readers) were able to grasp the narrator's critical perspective on our present day society, which she expresses through the use of charactonyms. The following are some examples from the source readers' responses on the narrator's use of neologistic charactonyms as a critical device:

<u>Alternative</u>

> The author uses linguistic roots to suggest these women are meant to be the way they behave as a matter of fate, subscribing to the Aristotelian notion that 'things are what they are named.' She describes weaknesses in character from the feminist's perspective and develops names to clearly associate the character flaw with the individual. It lacks subtlety, but is effective. One doesn't need to be a linguistics major to understand the purpose.

<u>Bradley L.</u>

> "The fact that the name of each of the characters refers to that person's defining characteristic is an implicit criticism of contemporary society. It suggests that these women are one-dimensional and that women in general, in the author's opinion, allow themselves to be defined by several negative characteristics."

<u>Carol B.</u>

> This novel is a critique of what life looks like on Earth, in the 1970s, when women were beginning to espouse new gender roles (the moneymaker, etc) as well as holding on to old ones (the homemaker, the mistress etc). The text shows how women tend to fill one of these roles only and are easily categorised. The irony here is that women pigeonhole themselves and each other in these various roles, which happens in both layers of the story since the extra-terrestrial narrator is also female. Presumably, the narrator will then compare this to a world where women can be many things at once.

<u>Jim H.</u>

> Sounds like the novel is probably critical of the repression which women often experience in societies dominated by stupid, brash, and asshole males. These names are rather telling as they come off rather satirically, in the context of the potential criticism which would emanate from Janet. (Sounds like fantastic

material with which she could criticize this pretty polarized society. These women sound pretty poorly-off; emotionally, mentally, and spiritually speaking.

More than the half of the source readers (16/31) found charactonyms strongly related to the plot synopsis of the novel while just two (2/32) target readers were able to relate charactonyms to the plot synopsis of the novel.

The results of both questionnaires show that the source readers are highly receptive of the role of charactonyms in characterization and they tend to discuss these charactonyms' coherence with the narrative and feminist perspectives of the novel while the target readers' focus shifts to a range of other topics such as characters' age, sexuality and personal traits. Most important, Turkish readers who understand the stereotyped charactonyms are still not able to discuss the coherence and compatibility of the various layers of discourse in the novel. The target readers thus focus on the micro-textual details (like fluency of the text fragment, the use of some words in correct place in the sentence, descriptive explanations of characters' personal traits etc.) and the strangeness of the speculative world (a female-dominant society) more than the narrative structure that is rendered more complex by the author's use of a series of charactonyms. Since charactonyms in the source text are used to emphasise the differences of perspective between the feminist narrator, visitor and stereotyped women in our present day society, they function as feminist *nova*.

All the responses above show what a significant role the translation of charactonyms can assume in the readers' comprehension and discussion of narrative complexity and coherence of a feminist speculative text. Overall, the translation of foregrounding devices is able to shape and transform readers' responses to feminist speculative texts. On the other hand, how editors and translators of these texts respond to these foregrounding devices is worth discussing as well. Which factors underly

editors' and translators' responses to foregrounding devices? I will seek answers to this question within the framework of a series of interviews I realised with Turkish agents involved in the editing and translation of feminist speculative fiction.

A Critical Analysis of the Discourses of Turkish Agents Involved in the Editing and Translation of Feminist Speculative Fiction

Translation: A Secondary, Amateurish and Unprofessional Activity?

Throughout this thesis, I mentioned that foregrounding is a device that can affect readers' responses to and aesthetic appreciation of literary texts. Foregrounding's immense impact on literary reception has also been emphasised by some other scholars like Willie Van Peer (1986) :

> "On the one hand, the material presence of certain foregrounding devices will guide the reader in his interpretation and evaluation of the text; on the other hand, the reader will look for such devices to satisfy his aesthetic needs in reading a literary text" (p. 20).

As Willie Van Peer (1986) points out above, foregrounding plays a significant role in guiding the reader in his interpretation. However, when it depends on translation, the role of guiding the reader is assumed by a mediator, the translator who might sometimes respond differently to foregrounding devices s/he perceives in a text. In other terms, the translator, by using, misusing and neglecting the source text's foregrounding can sometimes create a totally or partially different foregrounding in the target language. At this point, we can question the reasons why translators might respond differently to foregrounding devices, and transform the source text's foregrounding in the target language. I will seek answers to these questions by basing on the data I gathered

through a series of interviews I conducted with Turkish agents involved in the editing and translation of the feminist speculative fiction books under consideration. The data provided by these interviews will also help me seek answers for a number of related questions inspired by John Clute's distinction between "strangeness of the world" and "strangeness of the mode of telling":

For Turkish translators who do not have an established tradition of speculative fiction, could the novum be the strangeness of the world more than the strangeness of the mode of telling. What exactly was the novum for the Turkish translator? Can these two nova (strangeness of the world and strangeness of the mode of telling) be isolated from each other? The interviews I conducted with Tuncay Birkan (the editor of *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*), Sevinç Altınçekiç (the co-translator of *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*), and Çiçek Öztek (the translator of *Dişi Adam*) show that they all adopt different approaches to strange worlds and modes of telling in these texts.

The editor of *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*, Tuncay Birkan considers the strangeness of the world as a generic attribute of novels of this type:

"The strangeness of the world is unavoidable in the novels of this genre" (Birkan, 2009).

However, through his preface to the Turkish translation of this novel, Birkan emphasizes that this novel is also strange in terms of its language.

"By writing a preface to this novel, I wanted to emphasize that this novel is also strange in terms of its language." (Birkan, 2009).

Tuncay Birkan's above statement shows that as an editor, he is aware of the importance of distinguishing between the strangeness of the world and the strangeness of the mode of telling. Tuncay Birkan also adds that translators must pay attention to the use of estranging effects at correct places. Birkan's editorial suggestion consists in limiting the use of estranging effects in translation to the source text author's estranging devices because a totally strange translation would not make sense to the reader:

> "You can create an estrangement effect only if you translate the other parts of the book fluently. Otherwise, offering to the reader a totally strange translation, which you claim to be a literal translation of the source text, is nothing but an excuse for your linguistic incapability" (Birkan, 2009).

By basing on his own statements, we could say that Tuncay Birkan seems to be highly attentive and sensitive to the translation of foregrounding devices used in feminist speculative texts. At this point, we could investigate whether the translator of the book, Füsun Tülek had the same awareness of foregrounding devices, as did the editor, Tuncay Birkan. When I tried to direct the same questions towards Füsun Tülek, she rejected my on-line interview request for the following reason:

> "These kinds of questions have to be directed towards those who have been full-time working and earning a living as a professional translator."

> "Bu sorular profesyonel bir çevirmene sorulacak sorular. Çevirmenlik işinde tam zamanlı çalışan, bunu sürekli yapan ve bundan ekmeğini kazananlara yönelik sorularınız."

To give a biographical/professional note on Füsun Tülek who made the above statement, she is mainly a scholar of archaeology who is also involved in translation as

an additional activity. Obviously, Tülek considers translation not just an additional, but also a "secondary" activity. Tülek's rejection to be interviewed for the above-mentioned reason inevitably prompts me to think of the negative image of the profession of translation as a secondary, amateurish and unprofessional activity. Since I think that any translator, even those who are free-lancers are expected to have some comments to make on their own translation experience, I found Füsun Tülek's avoiding any comments on her translation of Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* particularly interesting. Tülek could simply make some short comments on the challenges of translating such a linguistically experimental book, but she chose to stay silent instead. On the other hand, the editor of the same book, Tuncay Birkan had many words to say on both the strangeness of the world and the strangeness of the mode of telling used in the book and its Turkish translation.

For a further enquiry into the reasons behind this difference of perspectives and comments between the editor and the translator of the same book, a set of interrelated questions would be asked: do Translators such as Füsun Tülek who do not consider translation as a professional activity really have nothing to say on their translated works? Is a microscopic look at a translation and translation-related problems just possible only if you are professionally involved in this activity, as put forth above by Füsun Tülek? Given the editor, Tuncay Birkan's multiple and detailed comments on *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*, would this silence on the part of the translator, Füsun Tülek, be a consequence of a lack of an editor-translator collaboration or communication?

Editor-Translator Collaboration

At this point, I would like to discuss the extent to which an editor-translator collaboration was used in the context of the translations I analyse within the framework of this thesis. Interestingly, all the agents involved in the editing and translation of the feminist speculative books under consideration confirmed that they cannot speak of an editor-translator collaboration in their editing and translation process. The following is Tuncay Birkan's response to my question about whether an editor-translator collaboration was used in the editing and translation process of *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın* :

> Regarding the editor-translator collaboration, I learned about the uses of such collaboration very lately. In the past, translations were handed to publishing house, and then edited and come out. I learned how this working method is dysfunctional over the years. Then, I became an editor who began to call translators to come to see what I have been doing with their translations. However, I haven't met the translator of this book. The editing of this book cannot be said to be based on a collaborative work. As one of the founders of ÇEVBİR, as you know, in the following years, I saw the importance of an editor-translator collaboration, and I used it (Birkan, 2009).

Although Tuncay Birkan says that he further saw the importance of an editor-translator collaboration, and used it, his above statement clarifies that this kind of collaboration was not used in the editing and translation process of *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*. No need to mention how problematic it would be for the overall coherence of a translation when the editor and the translator do not discuss the specific devices used in a translated text. Although the translator and the editor can focus on the same devices foregrounded in a text, each of them might propose different solutions to the translation of these devices depending on his/her own understanding of them. However, a fruitful editor-translator collaboration would help to maintain the lexical consistency and uniformity of

a translation by bridging the gaps between the editor's and the translator's possible differences of focus and emphasis.

As I have mentioned earlier, the other translators of the books in my corpus also confirmed the lack of contact with their editors. The co-translator of *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*, Sevinç Altınçekiç's following statement shows that in 1990s, the concept of "editorship" was still not established in Turkey, and at the time, some books, as in the case of *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*, were published without having been edited:

> "There was no intervention in our translation. Actually, at the time, there was no concept of "editorship." We have not worked with an editor" (Altınçekiç, 2009).

The temporal delay in the development of the concept of "editorship" in Turkey, as has been referred above by Sevinç Altınçekiç, may be considered to have a negative impact on the quality of some translations, which were published in that period. Although it is not possible to argue that every editorial intervention ends up improving the quality of a text, a more thorough analysis of a corpus of edited and non-edited translations could help us better understand the role played by an editor in the publishing process. Like Altınçekiç, another translator, Çiçek Öztek states that she never physically encountered the editor of her translation, *Dişi Adam*. Öztek also adds that she has no idea if her translation underwent any editorial changes :

> "I am not aware [whether my translation underwent any editorial changes.] I delivered my translation, just wishing it to be published whenever it may be. I did not think of looking at possible changes my translation might undergo" (Öztek, 2009).

Çiçek Öztek's communication with the editors of the books she translated previously is not any better than this. For instance, the editor of *Küvette Bulunan Günce*, Osman Yener calls her on the phone just once to give a couple of tiny suggestions regarding her usage of slang-like expressions:

> Almost no changes have been made to the first two books I translated. For instance, *Küvette Bulunan Günce* has been revised by the editor at the time, Osman Yener, to whom I talked over the phone just once. In our phone conversation, Yener told me that he made no considerable changes I should take a look, and he just changed a couple of vulgar, slang-like expressions I used in some parts by arguing that they would not be well received by Turkish reader, if left unchanged (Öztek, 2009).

All the above statements show that at the time when the books in my corpus were translated, we cannot speak of collaboration, but a real lack of communication between editors and translators in Turkey. This situation necessarily hinders the possibility of creating effective collective solutions to the problems encountered in the translation of feminist speculative books, which have been marked by a linguistically experimental language. In other terms, translators are deprived of an editorial guidance while the only editor, Tuncay Birkan is almost alone in his efforts to transpose the book's linguistically estranging language into the target language. Obviously, in the translation process of all the books under consideration, there is no exchange of opinions on how foregrounding devices can be translated into the target language. Although an editor is aware of the importance of foregrounding devices, s/he also needs the help of a translator to refocus on certain devices which might have slipped his/her attention. In today's publishing industry, translation is no longer considered an individual's work, but a team work. It is worth studying whether the Turkish publishing industry renewed its working style by keeping up with the current developments in this sector. However, it is for certain that editor-translator communication in Turkey was problematic for so long that this

situation must definitively have a huge impact not only on the quality of the translations produced in this period, but also on readers' responses to these texts. Editor-translator collaboration becomes more important when one or both of these sides are not experienced enough to handle textual difficulties. In our case, all the feminist speculative texts under consideration were translated at an early stage of their translators' career.

The Role of the Level of Experience in Handling Textual Difficulties

The co-translator of *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*, Sevinç Altınçekiç states that this book is the first translation experience for her as well as the other co-translator of the book, Özcan Kabakçıoğlu. As for the translator of *Dişi Adam*, Çiçek Öztek, she states that this is the third book she has translated. Öztek also points out that "*The Female Man* differs from the other two books she has translated by being the more modern and unorthodox one." The editor of *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*, Tuncay Birkan states that although not first, this book is the second or the third book he has edited. Although the translator of the same book, Füsun Tülek did not directly answer this question, through a bibliographical research, I found out that that is the second book she has translated. Thus, obviously, none of these agents involved in the translation and editing of the feminist speculative texts under consideration, had a high level of experience at the moment they had to deal with many subtleties and complexities inherent in these texts.

Although the exact correlation between the level of experience and the quality of a translation requires further investigation and testing; at this point, it would not be unrealistic to argue that the lack of experience makes it tougher for the translator and the editor to properly analyse and find creative translation solutions for specific textual

features such as foregrounding devices. From my perspective, a fruitful editor-translator collaboration can help both editors and translators compensate their lack of experience. On the other hand, in the lack of both editor-translator collaboration and experience, translators can be driven into solitude in their struggle with the text and its language. When translators find themselves in a situation where they must take all the crucial decisions in the translation process alone, they can mainly focus their attention on a particular set of textual devices, which they think would affect the publishability of their work. Most of the time, the translation of slang and obscene language seems to be of primary importance to translators who are somehow concerned about the publishability of their work and the possible censorship challenges they might face. However, when translators perceive slang and obscene language as the main foregrounding devices; other foregrounding devices in the same text risk being neglected.

Translators' Main Focus: Slang, Obscene and Vulgar Language

The translators of the feminist speculative texts whom I interviewed state that they were challenged by the slang and obscene language in these books. Obviously, slang and obscene language were perceived by these translators as the main problematic in the translation of the feminist speculative books under consideration. In other terms, what the translators retained from these books as the main translation challenge was the usage of slang and obscene language. Sevinç Altınçekiç makes the following comment on the obscene language used in *The Handmaid's Tale*:

> For instance, there were some obscene words in the book. We reflected on how to translate these words. We could not soften these words in translation because the author used them this way in her book. To be honest, we were a little bit preoccupied when we thought this book can be considered as an obscene publication if someone realises all these words, but the book has been published,

as it is translated, without undergoing any editorial changes and criticism (Altınçekiç, 2009).

The above statement shows that Altınçekiç and the other co-translator, Özcan Kabakçıoğlu had to painstakingly think about how to translate obscene language in the book. Sevinç Altınçekiç also states that what she did not remember any other linguistically estranging aspects in the novel except the usage of obscene language:

> "I do not remember about the strangeness of the language, but while translating obscenity, we tried to transpose the strangeness of the language" (Altınçekiç, 2009).

Like Sevinç Altınçekiç, Çiçek Öztek also seems to consider the usage of slang language in *The Female Man* as the linguistically most interesting aspect of the novel:

> As for the slang part, since the editor of *Küvette Bulunan Günce* has already warned me about and intervened in the use of slang in my translation, I thought what I should do with *Dişi Adam*. If I translated all these slang parts as "Oh, shit!", all the linguistic features of the book would be suppressed. Given that the publisher of this book, Ayrıntı has been publishing underground literature, I thought they would not hesitate to publish this book even if I translate all these slang parts, and thus, I did not stop myself from translating them. I thought I could go over my translation if I was asked to soften some expressions. But, to be honest, I did not meet the editor, and after the publication, I did not check what has been changed in my translation (Öztek, 2009).

Besides the usage of slang language in *The Female Man*, Çiçek Öztek remembers about a particular passage, which contains very vulgar language:

> "For example, there was a part, which had been written in capitals, and contained very vulgar language. Since sentences were choppy, you had to guess what might have been said in the rest of a sentence. I remember I translated these parts by either guessing or inventing the rest of a sentence." (Öztek, 2009).

The above statements show that the translators of feminist speculative works under consideration have focussed their attention mainly on the foregrounding devices such as

slang, obscene and vulgar language. Obviously, lexical creativities such as puns and neologisms did not attract the translators' attention, as much as the just mentioned devices did. In this case, we can speak of the existence of a hierarchy of foregrounding devices for the translators of feminist speculative texts. This hierarchical representation of foregrounding devices in the translators' minds seems to have caused them not to give sufficient attention to other foregrounding devices, which may be at least of equal importance to the novels' ideology. For example, when I asked Sevinç Altınçekiç whether the abundance of the puns in the novel grabbed her attention, she could not remember about it, and she just made some general comments on what kind of strategies she uses today in translating puns. When I asked the same question to Çiçek Öztek, she made the following comment:

> "I remember I literally translated some parts, and then, went over them and changed them liberally because if I left them so, they would make no sense to Turkish readers" (Öztek, 2009).

Çiçek Öztek's above comment is evidently too short, and does not contain any clues on her perception of the feminist or ideological character of the puns in the novel. At this point, we could ask what should be done to increase translators' awareness of a wide range of foregrounding devices in a novel. From my perspective, detailed research on the book to be translated and its author would be extremely useful in every stage of translation process (pre-translation, translation, and post-translation.) However, all the editing and translating agents whom I interviewed frankly told me that they have not carried out detailed prior research on the feminist speculative works they translated. Both translators, Sevinç Altınçekiç and Çiçek Öztek agreed that the lack of

technological and especially Internet-based research opportunities at the time was a big disadvantage to them.

Difficulties of Research Due to the Lack of Technological Resources

The lack of technological opportunities at the time is obviously another factor, which has complicated the translators' interaction with the feminist speculative books' content and formal features. The editor Tuncay Birkan states that he looked at what else Marge Piercy had written, but he had not carried out a detailed research on the book and its author. As for Sevinç Altınçekiç, she draws attention to the difficulties she and the other co-translator experienced due to the lack of Internet-based research opportunities at the time:

> "At the time, we did not have such an opportunity. There was no Internet. I do not remember if we did research, but we had an image of the book in mind, and I do not remember exactly how this image was shaped" (Altınçekiç, 2009).

The above statement shows that Sevinç Altınçekiç recognises the role of a pre-translation research in shaping translators' images of the works to be translated. Besides providing translators with an image of the source text, prior research can also give translators a better understanding of the source text author and his/her literary style. For example, when I asked Çiçek Öztek if she would do any changes on her translation today, she replied as follows:

"I certainly would. I would still make some changes on it if it was handed to me after I started to work as an editor at Ayrıntı. For example, today, I have the opportunity to use Google. Is this writer Canadian?" (Öztek, 2009)

Çiçek Öztek's statement above shows that she has become more effective in research through the development of web-based facilities such as the Google search engine. Another striking part of the above statement is that Öztek's question on the writer Joanna Russ's nationality. Quite surprisingly, Çiçek Öztek believed that Joanna Russ is a Canadian writer. When I told her that Joanna Russ is an American writer, Öztek herself drew attention to some problems, which may have occurred in her translation because of her insufficient knowledge of the author and her literary style:

> For example, this woman might have used such slang if she is from the state of Arizona in the USA. However, I was unaware of all the possibilities of this kind when I translated this book with an English-Turkish Redhouse Dictionary, an English-English Webster Dictionary and a few encyclopaedias at hand. When I translate now, I use ten to fifteen encyclopaedias and the most important; I read hundreds of blogs and on-line forums on Google. Sometimes, an expression I was searching for might be used by one of two young people who have been chatting in an on-line forum and thus, I understand what that expression means. Briefly, I may have translated *Dişi Adam* a little bit literally (Öztek, 2009)

The above statement shows also how progressively Çiçek Öztek adapted herself to rapidly changing and growing technologies, and began to make optimum use of web-based research facilities in her translation process. As Öztek clearly states above, gone are the times when translators used to consult just dictionaries and encyclopaedias in the translation process. Today, not just search engines such as Google, but also on-line forums and blogs seem to be useful resources for translators. No need to mention how positively web-based research facilities might have affected the quality of later translations. However, during the time when the feminist speculative works under consideration were translated, the editors and translators of these books were deprived

of the well-developed, technological resources, which, if they were used, would contribute to improve the quality of these translations remarkably. For example, Internet presents a diverse array of articles and essays on the lexical creativities used in the feminist speculative works under consideration. There is no doubt that editors and translators who choose to carry out prior research, start their translation project with a tremendous asset, compared to those who do no such research in the translation process. Although the editing and translating agents whom I interviewed were unaware of each other's answers to my questions, I was able to discern some convergent patterns among their answers such as their lack of editor-translator collaboration, experience, multifocal translation perspective, and web-based research opportunities. Another common trait in the discourse of these editing and translating agents is that they all relate the insufficient reader attention to their work to external factors.

Some Possible External Factors

A Limited Reading Audience

The editor Tuncay Birkan draws attention to a dichotomy between readers of literature and readers of political works:

> "Readers of literature are not so interested in utopian and political works while readers of social sciences barely read literature. I think that this dichotomy also plays a role in the reception of these kinds of books" (Birkan, 2009).

Birkan's statement shows that he places *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın* into a category between "utopian novel" and "literary novel." At another point of our conversation, Birkan states that he believes "the utopian side of this book escaped the eye of readers of utopia." Obviously, according to Tuncay Birkan, it is this utopian side, which would

enlarge the book's reading audience. Although the utopian side of this novel is really very interesting, it is not the only neither the most dominant aspect of this book. This book has a strong feminist perspective and language as well. Although Tuncay Birkan did not avoid considering the book "a totally feminist utopia", he did not comment on this feminist aspect's possible negative or positive role on the reception. On the other hand, Çiçek Öztek states that this feminist aspect does not attract any attention in Turkey:

> Yes, I think that what has been called "women's literature" or "feminism" does not attract any attention. In Turkey, there is no target audience for this. For instance, women have been reading novels copiously for centuries, from the inception of the novel. Although the biggest target audience consists of women, even women themselves do not read things that could be considered "women's literature", and they do not want to read how they were depicted in these books. So, if you look at the list of best-sellers in the past two hundred years, you see that "women read, men write (Öztek, 2009).

Çiçek Öztek first placed *Dişi Adam* into the category of "women's literature" or "feminist literature", but then she corrected herself by saying that it would be more relevant to place this book into the category of "lesbian literature."

> "Perhaps, this book may be placed into the category of lesbian literature. I think in Turkey, there are just a few hundred people who follow gay/lesbian literature. That is to say, this is a very limited readership" (Öztek, 2009).

In any case, Çiçek Öztek believed that "feminist" and "lesbian" aspects of *Dişi Adam* were the major factors underlying the insufficient attention to this work. As for Sevinç Altınçekiç , she draws attention to marketing and timing issues as the major factors which may have caused the insufficient attention to her translation

Marketing and Timing of the Book

Sevinç Altınçekiç argues that *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* was not promoted as much as necessary:

> I think at the time, the book was not promoted as much as necessary. Actually, it would be very fitting if this book was re-edited in the period we live in today. The other books of Margaret Atwood have also been translated and published by different publishing houses in Turkey, but they did not attract much attention, either. This book dated 1992, could mean much to us in today's context. Thus, it has to be re-edited in this period. We were not living in such a world in 1992, but I think if this book is re-edited now, it definitely becomes one of the best-sellers in Turkey. Of course, the final decision is up to the publishers (Altınçekiç 2009).

The above statement is very interesting since it also contains some comments on the book's timing. Altınçekiç obviously thinks that *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*, if it was published or re-edited today, would be more meaningful for Turkish readers. Although she does not say it explicitly, Altınçekiç seems to believe that this book would probably attract more attention in a political climate marked by some concerns on women's liberties. Timing can really be important, but it is certainly not everything. From my perspective, the political content of *The Handmaid's Tale* is strong and striking enough to warrant attention in any period of time. In fact, it wouldn't be exaggerating to consider *The Handmaid's Tale* a "timeless" book. As for Altınçekiç's other argument on the lack of promotion, I could say that such an argument cannot account for the lack of Turkish readers' interest in a book because, as it is known, just a few books and authors are promoted extensively by the publishers in Turkey. In other words, this book cannot be said to be exposed to unfair competition in the market since almost any other book gets the same treatment from the publishers and published without promotion. All the editing and translating agents drew attention to external factors, which they thought, might have caused the readers' insufficient attention to their work. What about internal

factors? Did these editing and translating agents really love these feminist speculative books they dealt with?

To Love or Not to Love: Is That the Question?

Editing and translation is not always a love affair. However, Tuncay Birkan states that he edited *The Woman on the Edge of Time* with a love:

> "Yes, I did it with a love. Books to be translated and edited are generally handed to us as jobs of work. So, we cannot always translate or edit everything with the same love and enthusiasm, but I remember I really loved that one" (Birkan, 2009).

The above statement shows that most of the time, editors and translators in Turkey are not given the opportunity to select the books to be published, and the books are handed to them as jobs of work. The case of the other two translators I interviewed does not make an exception. Thus obviously, none of these translators have translated the feminist speculative works under consideration by their own choice. By an analogy, this situation is similar to an "arranged marriage", which could still end up with falling in love. When I asked Sevinç Altınçekiç how she felt about this book, she replied as follows:

> "I liked this book because it concerns women. This is a science fictional world, which seemingly can be created in the real world. It is so easy to create such a world in the real life. I think my ex-husband liked the book as well. While trying to find a title, you are getting into the book so deeply" (Altınçekiç, 2009).

As should be evident from the above statement, what Altınçekiç liked in this book was the choice of a theme concerning lives of women as well as the book's fictional world's vraisemblance. When translators are rather impressed by a speculative world's vraisemblance rather than its strangeness, it must be tough for them to transpose to the target language the book's estranging aspects. However, to love or to like a book, to establish an active relationship with it, and to develop some positive attitudes towards it is of course much better than feeling negative about that book. When I interviewed Çiçek Öztek, I realised that she feels extremely uncomfortable and resistant to the lesbian content of the book she translated. Öztek is also courageous enough to confess that she did not love *The Female Man* at all. The following is Öztek's statement on why she was not so impressed by *The Female Man*:

> I am not deeply impressed by this book. I do not remember much about it now, but when I was translating it, I thought the writer was very eccentric, lunatic and marginal. Although I do not completely agree on the existence of a category of women's literature, I think that if we had to make such a classification, this book would be fitting into this category. So, this book extensively deals with the status of women and womanhood. I remember that it also deals with lesbianism. I am personally not deeply interested by this book. When I later began to work for Ayrıntı, I saw that it was one of the worst selling boks (Öztek, 2009).

Çiçek Öztek's above statement shows that she does not have empathy for the lesbian aspects of *The Female Man*. At another point of our conversation, Öztek also points out that "even women themselves do not read things that could be considered "women's literature", and they do not want to read how they were depicted in these books." All these statements show that Çiçek Öztek does not ethically approve the world depicted in *The Female Man* because although female-dominant, it is finally a lesbian world. Öztek also admits that this novel was very different from those she has ever read. Although she neither loved nor established a close relationship with the book and its content, it is obvious that Çiçek Öztek was defamiliarised by the lesbian aspects of the book. In other

words, Öztek is well aware of the strangeness of the world depicted in the novel. All these statements make me think that sometimes translators may love a novel without even realising what is strange in it while some other translators may dislike a novel, but realise what is strange in it. For a further investigation of the translators' real perception of the estranging aspects in the feminist speculative novels under consideration, I asked them what was really strange about the novel they translated: the depicted world, mode of telling, or both?

What is Strange About It?

As I have already mentioned, Tuncay Birkan states that the strangeness of the world is unavoidable in the novels of this genre, and by writing a preface to this novel, he wanted to emphasize that this novel is also strange in terms of its language. The following is Sevinç Altınçekiç's comment on the strangeness of *The Handmaid's Tale*:

> Not the linguistic aspects, but the plot was strange. Actually, even the plot was not too strange to me. Turkish women as any other woman can experience things similar to those that have been told in this plot. As Turkish women, we are not totally unfamiliar to the meaning of "cariye", which the word "handmaid" implies. We are not unfamiliar to the use of women in a way similar to the animals kept for breeding. So, that is not a totally strange world (Altınçekiç, 2009).

As should be evident from the above statement, Altınçekiç finds neither the linguistic aspects nor the plot totally strange. Sevinç Altınçekiç keeps giving further explanations on why she was not defamiliarised by the novel's world and language:

> It is not a world we are totally unfamiliar to. What is strange there is that the plot is set in the US. For example, if the plot was set in an Arabic country, it would not been as strange to us as it is now. I do not remember about the strangeness of the language, but while translating obscenity, we tried to transpose the strangeness of the language (Altınçekiç, 2009).

As the above statement shows, for Sevinç Altınçekiç, the only estranging aspect in *The Handmaid's Tale* is the setting of the novel. Although Altınçekiç says that the plot is set in the US, it is not true because the plot of the novel is actually set in the futuristic society of Gilead. It is quite interesting that Altınçekiç has this erroneous perception of the novel's setting, which she claims to be the most estranging aspect of the novel. Altınçekiç 's vague recollections about the world and the setting in *The Handmaid's Tale* and her inability to remember linguistic strangeness in the novel except the usage of obscene language show that as a translator, she did not penetrate deep into the novel. As for Çiçek Öztek, she states that she was defamiliarised by both the strangeness of the world and language of *The Female Man*, which she avoided domesticating in translation:

> I remember I did not have in mind to make the novel's world look like Turkey. I did not think of using local expressions, idioms that evoke dialogues among two Turkish people. In order to create a strange world, I preserved what was strange in the novel, and since the language of the novel conveys the strangeness of that world very successfully, I did not attempt to domesticate or familiarise it. Some books might use a very radical strategy like familiarisation, but I have not used it here (Öztek, 2009).

Çiçek Öztek 's awareness of the strangeness of the language can be thought to have shaped her strategies at every level of her translation. However, this is not the case since Öztek left untranslated a bunch of female charactonyms, which, if they were translated, would certainly defamiliarise Turkish readers. When I asked her why she left these proper nouns untranslated, Çiçek Öztek replied as follows:

> I did not think of changing proper nouns. For example, which Turkish equivalents would you suggest for them? Every book to translate comes to us with its own system and problematic, and make you ask a series of questions on how much you would intervene in, how much you would be liberal with it. As for the translation of proper names into Turkish, this is usually done in children's literature, not in adult literature. That is an unwritten law. If I retranslate this book, I leave proper nouns untranslated again. So, I am against the translation of proper nouns (Öztek, 2009).

The above statement shows that the translator, Öztek is conditioned by the cliché that the translation of proper nouns is to be avoided except in children's literature. It is interesting that Öztek denies the prominent role the translation of proper nouns would play in defamiliarising the target readers. As the results of my reading test reveal, the target readers who are vis-a-vis untranslated charactonyms cannot have access to the meanings behind these charactonyms on their own interpretive efforts. However, Çiçek Öztek points out that she was defamiliarised by some other linguistic aspects of the book:

> "There were some other difficulties I faced when I was translating this book. For example, in some parts, there were some fragmented forms of speech which were difficult to understand. The syntactic structure was very different" (Öztek, 2009).

The above statement makes me think that that there might be different levels of defamiliarisation for translators. More precisely, a translator who is defamiliarised by certain aspects in the source text may not be defamiliarised by the other aspects in the same text, which are in fact as estranging as the others. Or, as in the case of Çiçek Öztek, although defamiliarised by certain aspects in the source text, translators may still not be translating them by fear of falling into the trap of domestication. Therefore, it is very important to deconstruct the clichés on translators' minds. When it comes to the translation of feminist speculative texts, in which defamiliarising elements are used extensively at different textual levels, it is worth investigating how translators approach these defamiliarising elements and the problems related to their translation. For example, if the translator believes that proper nouns are to be translated only in

children's literature, it would not be difficult to understand why all the proper nouns in that text are left untranslated.

Briefly, there are multiple factors affecting the translation of feminist speculative texts. As the example of Çiçek Öztek illustrates very well, when translators have some pre-conceived and prejudged categories such as "translation rules" or "translation laws" in mind, they may have difficulties adjusting their translating behaviour according to the specific needs of a text. In consequence, translators' choices play a major role in how readers' respond to these texts. In fact, as another statement by Çiçek Öztek shows, translators' choices may be affected not just by the image of translation, but also by the image of translator in the translator's mind.

The Translator' Self Erasure

When I asked Çiçek Öztek why she did not use footnotes in her translation, she replied as follows:

> It is dangerous to inundate a novel with footnotes. You can use footnotes to a certain extent. If you decide to use footnotes, you have to use them for the whole book, and that is a very radical decision. If you use a footnote in a specific section, you cannot leave the other parts without footnotes. You cannot fill up every part with footnotes, either. Otherwise, the translator becomes very visible. It is not important to read what the translator has done. To my mind, it is more important for the reader to read a book without realising the presence of the translator (Öztek, 2009).

The above statement shows that Öztek conceives of the translator as a largely invisible figure. This conception of Öztek also may have played a role in her choice of leaving the female charactonyms untranslated. All the editing and translating agents whom I interviewed give pretty much the same importance to the matters such as fluency, emotional effects, and syntactical choices. However, they each have a very different

understanding of and relationship with the feminist speculative texts they translated. There are obviously many factors, which have affected these translators' choices. Before making a clear and concise summary of all these factors, I will also mention the two other factors, which make translators lose control over their own translation.

The Translator's Workload and the Translator's Linguistic Competence

I asked all the editing and translating agents I interviewed if they dealt with other books while translating the feminist speculative works under consideration. Tuncay Birkan and Sevinç Altınçekiç told me that they just worked on a single book before moving on to the next book. However, Çiçek Öztek stated that during the time she translated *The Female Man*, she was so overwhelmed with other works such as her master's thesis and her part-time job at Insan Haklari Vakfı (Human Right Association). Çiçek Öztek's following statement explains why she felt "so tired" while translating *The Female Man*:

> "I was not working on another book, but I was dealing with three different things at the same time: my translation, my thesis and my job. For this reason, I remember this book took so much time and made me feel so tired" (Öztek, 2009).

The above statement must make us think of the possible role of a translator's workload could play on his/her translation performance. When a translator feels so tired while translating a book, it would not be realistic to expect that s/he realises and translates all the foregrounding devices in a text.

Another factor which could hinder the translation of foregrounding devices is the translator's insufficient linguistic competence. Sevinç Altınçekiç told me that since

219

his co-translator's usage of Turkish was better than her, they mostly adopted his suggestions in translation. To give a biographical note on Sevinç Altınçekiç, she is a translator who was born and has spent a greater part of her school years in Germany. This situation can be a reason, which makes her feel less at ease with the Turkish language. In a collective translation, if one of the translators feels more comfortable and competent with the language use, s/he may take the lead and contribute more to translation decisions. However, one should never forget that when the linguistic levels of the two co-translators are so different from one another, for the one who is linguistically more competent, it would be labour intensive and time consuming to compensate the other co-translator's weaknesses. Therefore, I think that it would be difficult and almost impossible to recreate all the foregrounding devices in a text when there is a huge difference among two co-translators' linguistic levels. Finally, all the main findings of this thesis, including the findings of this sub-section are reviewed and summarised in the following conclusion.

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I conducted a comparative reading test on a group of Turkish and English-speaking readers to explore how the translation of feminist nova reshapes and differentiates target readers' reception of the author's and characters' perspectives from that of source readers. This comparative reading test is inspired by empirical/cognitive research by several literary scholars such as Willie van Peer (1986), David S. Miall & Don Kuiken (1994), Jameljan Frank Hakemulder (2004) who have examined how linguistic distortions and parallelisms affect readers' responses to texts. However, while

all these scholars investigate foregrounding's possible effects on readers, under headings such as strinkingness, importance, discussion value, and reading time, I provide more "descriptive" accounts of readers' responses to foregrounding devices.

My comparative reading test that consists of open-ended questions more than Likert type rating questions, allowed me to provide a more "descriptive' account of patterns of responses to linguistic nova in feminist speculative texts. From my perspective, foregrounding has the capacity to put readers into interaction with the text and help them reflect on the problematic aspects of the text. In this sense, foregrounding contains the entire molecular structure of the feminist speculative novel. How the reader responds to linguistic nova can be closely related to the reader's overall response to the novel.

The translator as a cognitive subject is also expected to recognise and translate linguistic nova. However, the translator's encounter with linguistic nova does not always end up with the translator translating linguistic nova with the same defamiliarising effect as in the source context. I have mentioned earlier how translators might use foregrounding for ideological or literary manipulation. Evidently, foregrounding can be transferred to the target context through the filter of translation and maybe with a new foregrounding. The best way to learn about how translation recreates foregrounding in the target context is to compare, through an empirical analysis, how source readers receive linguistic nova in the source text and how target readers receive linguistic nova in target texts. The specification of convergent and divergent patterns of responses can provide a "descriptive" account of source and target readers' *transformational associations* of linguistic *nova* and the role of translation in the formation of these *transformational associations*.

Translation and reception of linguistic nova in feminist speculative fiction are thus the central topic of this research. But I did more than simply examine and compare source and target texts. I was also engaged in a complex act of translation as I produced English versions of the Turkish readers', editors' and translators' responses to my questions. I also participated in the literary reading test I carried out with my informants within the framework of this thesis. While translating Turkish readers' responses into English, I observed how much less detailed and focused their readings of the texts were, and how diverse.. Apparently, the target readers in my experimental group had a more partial and fragmented reception of the text fragments than the source readers. Evaluating the results of the literary reading test confirmed the hypothesis that the non-translation, or mis-translation, or neglect of foregrounded neologisms in the target texts would have an important impact on the readers' understanding of the texts. This was just an instinct at the outset of my research which was gradually confirmed.

The literary reading test provided me with plenty of data and findings regarding the role and reception of linguistic *nova* and their translation in establishing different understandings of the text for source and target readers. However, I would like to underline that I do not aim to make any generalizations about source and target readers' reception of feminist speculative fiction here. I simply show, through a small-scale empirical study (an experimental sample of 31 source readers and 32 target readers), how linguistic *nova* and their translation can be effective in generating patterns of response to specific works of feminist speculative fiction. While the literary reading test is a small-scale empirical study, a kind of a pilot project, it offers a number of valuable perspectives on how linguistic nova and their translation affect source and target readers' responses to feminist speculative fiction differently. In general, the translated

texts, which ignore, neglect, or somehow undermine the power of the neologistic wordplay of the source text also seriously undermine readers' understanding and appreciation of the target text and its coherence.

The literary reading test provided significant data allowing me to compare the target and source readers' responses to text fragments from the three novels in my corpus. I will now summarise the main findings by focussing on the different source and target readers' responses to the text fragments and drawing attention to translation strategies that played a major role in causing these differences.

The Handmaid's Tale

The inability to grasp the linguistic novum's referentiality and creativity

The target readers' responses to the translated text fragment from *The Handmaid's Tale* show that even if the translator translates a linguistic novum literally, thus eliding the wordplay, target readers can still reach the "metaphorical/symbolic" content of the linguistic novum by deconstructing other foregrounding devices used in the same context. For instance, some target readers can recognize the use of pen as a 'phallic symbol' in the text, but they do not see the reference to Freud's pyshoanalytic concept of "penis envy." Thus, although target readers can reach some metaphorical/symbolic meanings related to the linguistic novum, which are absent from the translation, they have no idea about the referentiality and creativity inscribed in the linguistic novum. The target readers are unable to relate this metaphorical/symbolic meanings to the author's stylistic experimentation. On the other hand, all the source readers are able to grasp the referentiality and creativity inscribed in the linguistic novum.

The inability to grasp the author's and fictional characters' ideology

The linguistic novum is not a formal device that merely indicates linguistic creativity. Foregrounding devices also function as textual indicators of fictional characters and play a significant role in readers' reception of a writer's modes of characterization. The example of *The Handmaid's Tale* shows that a linguistic novum can also serve to enhance the readers' perception of the author's ideology and fictional characters' personal traits.

The literal translation of the feminist word play "Pen is Envy" in *The Handmaid's Tale* seems to hinder target readers' perception of certain characters' feminism. Contrary to Turkish readers who did not comment on feminist perspectives in the text fragment, the source readers made plenty of comments not just on the author, but also on her characters' personal traits and ideology. In other words, with the guidance provided by foregrounding devices or linguistic nova, the source readers were more focussed on the ideology of the author, the narrator and the characters. The source readers definitely had a better understanding of feminist undertones in Atwood's female characters.

Women on the Edge of Time

Readers' focus shifting to the strangeness of the speculative world

In Marge Piercy's book, the target readers were much more focussed on the strangeness of the speculative world than on the strangeness of the language. This made me think of

John Clute's distinction between "strangeness of the world" and "strangeness of the mode of telling." Obviously, strategies employed in the translation of feminist nova played a significant role in shifting Turkish readers's focus from the mode of telling to the strangeness of the world.

The target readers' decreasing empathy for the new futuristic worlds

The example of *Women on the Edge of Time* shows that foregrounding devices (stylistic distortion and parallelism) are among the elements that affect readers' empathetic relationship with texts. Since the original neologism *co-mother* was translated into Turkish as *ortak (partner)*, Turkish readers were critical of how this new concept reformulated the family as a kind of business "partnership." We could argue that translation here can sometimes serve to reduce or suppress target readers' empathy and sympathy with the language and culture of the Other represented in the source text.

None of the source readers mentioned the "insensitivity" of the futuristic world of Mettapoisett, which was an important aspect of target readers' responses.. The use of the word *co-mother* in the text fragment obviously caused them to have more empathy for Mettapoisett's new parenting system that turns "motherhood" into a "collective" responsibility. Most of the source readers grasped the centrality of the concept of "mother" that is loaded with a new meaning in Mettapoisett and these readers also focussed on the reasons behind the writer's avoidance of the word "father." Compared to the target readers, source readers were much more receptive of Mettapoisett's reversal of "patriarchy" and restructuring of a "gender egalitarian" system. Some of them even considered "co-motherhood" as "team work" and an extension of "motherly

feeling." Among the source readers, there were also some who found this new parenting system "ideological" and "revolutionary."

Briefly, through the translation of the word co-mother as *ortak (partner)*, Turkish readers missed an important feminist aspect of a linguistic novum that emphasizes the futuristic society of Mettapoisett's reversal of "patriarchy" and restructuring of a "gender egalitarian" system. They could not grasp the centrality of the concept of "mother" that is loaded with a new meaning in Mettapoisett, and they could not focus on the reasons behind the writer's avoidance of the word "father." Instead, they focussed on the "insensitive" character of this futuristic society and showed far less empathy for this new world..

The Female Man

Inability to grasp and discuss the narrative complexity and coherence

The results of both questionnaires show that the source readers are highly receptive to the role of charactonyms in characterization and tend to discuss their coherence with the narrative and feminist perspectives of the novel. Target readers, on the other hand, shift their focus to a range of other aspects in the text fragment. They cannot engage with the charactonyms.

Most importantly, even Turkish readers who seem to understand the stereotyped charactonyms were not able to discuss the coherence and compatibility of the various layers of discourse in the novel. In other words, the target readers focus more on the micro-textual details (like fluency of the text fragment, the use of some words in correct place in the sentence, descriptive explanations on characters' personal traits etc.) and the strangeness of the speculative world (a female-dominant society) than on the narrative

structure that is supported by the author's use of a series of charactonyms. Since charactonyms in the source text are used to emphasise the different perspectives of the feminist narrator, the visitor and the stereotyped women in present day society, they function as feminist nova. Target readers' responses show what a significant role the translation of charactonyms can play in the readers' comprehension and discussion of narrative complexity and coherence of a feminist speculative text.

In conclusion, the translation of foregrounding devices or linguistic *nova* seems to be a major factor differentiating target and source text readers' understanding of and therefore responses to the defamiliarising and innovative worlds depicted in feminist speculative texts. Translated literally as in Kalem kıskançlıktır, translated with a new foregrounding as in the example of the word *partner* in *Women on the Edge of Time*, or left untranslated as in the example of the charactonyms in *The Female Man*, linguistic *nova* can cause target readers to read in a way that negatively affects their overall reception of the defamiliarising and innovative world depicted in these works.

Within the framework of this thesis, I also investigated factors, which might have affected feminist speculative translators' perception of foregrounding devices. The conception of translation as a secondary, amateurish and unprofessional activity is one of these factors. Another factor is the lack of a fruitful editor-translator collaboration. Besides this, the lack of experience can be considered one of the factors, which make it tougher for the translator to handle textual subtleties and complexities such as foregrounding devices. As the translators' replies to my interview questions significantly demonstrate, we can speak of the existence of a hierarchy of foregrounding devices for the translators of feminist speculative texts. This hierarchical representation of foregrounding devices in the translators' minds seems to have caused them not to

give sufficient attention to other foregrounding devices, which may be at least of equal importance to the novel's ideology. Some technological constraints can also block translators' path to penetrating deep into the novel's content and formal devices.

Translators tend to relate the insufficient attention shown to their work to external factors such as the smallness of the target audience, and the marketing and the timing of the book. However, internal factors, which might have affected their translation strategies, are more numerous. Of the two feminist speculative translators I interviewed, one even admitted that she felt uncomfortable and resistant to the lesbian content and language of the book. However, to love a book does not always generate the most effective strategies in the translation of that book. As the translators' replies to my interview significantly demonstrate, sometimes translators may love a novel without even realising what is strange in it while some other translators may dislike a novel, but realise what is strange in it. For a further investigation of the translators' real perception of the estranging aspects in the feminist speculative novels under consideration, I asked them what was really strange about the novel they translated: the depicted world, mode of telling, or both?

Every translator has a different approach to the strangeness of the world and language in these novels. Obviously, awareness of the strangeness of the novel's world and language does not always end up with using the most effective translation strategies, either. When translators have in mind some pre-conceived and prejudged categories such as "translation rules" or "translation laws", they may have difficulties adjusting their translating behaviour according to the specific needs of a text. Translators' choices may be affected not just by the image of translation, but also by the image of translator in their mind. For instance, although defamiliarised by estranging

aspects used at the different levels of the source text, a translator may avoid using certain strategies for fear of becoming visible. The translators' workload and linguistic competence are also among factors which might have affected translators' approach to foregrounding elements and the problematic related to their translation. Briefly, there is a multiplicity of the factors, which played a role in the translation of the feminist speculative texts. Translators' approaches to these texts and the strangeness in these texts are not univocal, and much more complex than imagined.

APPENDIX I

Readers's Responses to the Literary Reading Test

Turkish Readers' Responses

The Handmaid's Tale

1. Have you ever read *the Handmaid's Tale?*

   Yes (3), No (29).

2. Do you recognize the foregrounded word play in the text fragment above? Yes or No?

   Yes (26), No (6).

3. If yes, please write out this word play below and explain what it means to you.

26 readers stated that they recognised the word play in the text fragment.

One of the readers recognised *damizlik* (*handmaid*) as a word play.

Damızlık (Handmaid)

Questionnaire 5

> "Evet. Damızlık. İnekler ve hayvanlar için kullanılan "damızlık" herşeyden
>
> yoksun bırakılıp kuluçka makinası olarak kullanılan kadınlar için kullanılmış.

> "Yes, "Damızlık." (Animal kept for breeding). While damizlik refers to
>
> "animals kept for breeding", it refers here to "women" who are deprived of all
>
> their rights and are just being used for reproduction.

Only 5 readers found out that the word *kalem* (*pen*) that is used in the text fragment

evokes *penis*.

Pen-Penis

Questionnaire 2

"Penis'i kalem olarak belirtilmiş."

"Pen refers here to penis."

Questionnaire 6

"Kalem – cinsel organ"

"Pen- sexual organ"

Questionnaire 8

"Kalem- penis. "

"Pen-Penis"

Damla

"Kalem kelimesinin, özgürlüğü ve erkek cinsel organını da çağrıştırdığını
düşündüm."

"The word pen seems to refer to liberty and male sexual organ."

Atalay Y.

"Kalem sözcüğü burada ima yönünden canlılık ifadesinin kullanılması
sebebiyle penisi hatırlatmaktadır."

"Metaphorically attributed an animate character, the pen evokes the penis
here."

7 readers found out that the word play in the text might be related to the words *kalem (pen)* and *kiskanclik* (*envy*).

Pen and Envy

<u>Alp E.</u>

"Kalem kıskançlıktır. Cansız bir varlık üzerinden insana mahsus bir durumu ifade ediyor."

"Pen is envy. It describes an object by attributing a human sentiment to it."

<u>Questionnaire 10</u>

"Kalem kıskançlıktır. Kalemle kalemin yaptığı eylemi kastediyor. Yazmak kıskanmaktır."

"Pen is envy. What is meant by the pen is the act realized by the pen. To write is to envy."

<u>Genco G.</u>

"Kalem ve kıskançlık. Lydia Teyze'nin kıskandığı sadece bir kalem değil, aynı zamanda o kalemin sembolize ettiği güç ve mevkii de olsa gerek."
"Pen and envy. What Aunt Lydia is seemingly envious of is not just the pen, but also the power and the hierarchy, which the pen represents."

<u>Nur M.</u>

" 'Kalem kıskançlıktır.' " Kalem burada özgürlüğü ifade ediyor, erkeğin gücünü, kadının aczini, kendini ifade etmeye duyulan özlemi, insan olmaya

duyulan özlemi, başkaldırıyı, sahiplenme özlemini, belki de kaleme sahip olunursa özgürce komutana da sahip olunabileceği düşüncesini."

" 'Pen is envy.' " Pen here symbolizes freedom, male power, female weakness, aspiration for self-expression and a human life, rebellion, craving for possession and maybe the idea that "if you have the pen, you can also have the freedom to choose your commander."

Oya K.

"Kalem ve kıskançlık. Kalemle sözcük oyunu yapılarak onu bir yazma aracı dagil de ondan korkulacak ve kıskanılacak bir araç olarak kullanılmış."

"Pen and envy, Here, pen is not used as a writing object, but something to be scared and envious of."

Özden E.

"Kalem ve kıskançlık. Özette belirtilen iletişim araçlarından yoksun olmanın ne demek olduğunu anlatmaya çalışmak için kullanılmış."

"Pen and envy. These two words are used to show the implications of being deprived of the means of communication, as stated in the plot synopsis."

Saduman D.

"Kıskançlık kelimesinde kelime oyunu var. Kalemle kıskançlık."

"Pen and envy."

Envy

Just one of the readers stated that the word play in the text fragment can be related to the concept "envy."

Baris Bilgen

"Güç ve kıskançlık sözcükleri üzerindeki vurgu. "Güç arzusu, gücü kıskanmak" kavramını çağrıştırıyor."

"There is an emphasis on the words: power and envy. It evokes 'desire for power' in me and 'envy of power'."

12 readers related the word play just to the word *pen* and mentioned a number of concepts they thought the word *pen* could be associated with: "child, danger, liberty (commanders' liberty), commanders' verbal communication, and prohibitions.

Pen

Questionnaire 1.1

"Kalem sözcüğüdür kalem sözcüğü orda çocuğu ifade etmektedir."

"Pen refers here to the child."

Questionnaire 3

"Kalemin canlı olması, sözcük içermesi.

The attribute of an animate character to the pen and the fact that the pen contains words."

Questionnaire 4

"Sanki kalemle kastedilen tehlike gibi."

"It seems that the pen refers to a danger."

Questionnaire 7

"Içerdiği sözcükler kalemin ne yaptıkları aslında."

"The words which the pen contain refer to the function of the pen."

Questionnaire 9

"Kalem- kelimesini özgürlük anlamında kullanmış."

"Pen refers to liberty."

Questionnaire 1

"Kalem komutanların özgürlüğü olabilir."

"Pen can refer to the commanders' freedom."

Questionnaire

"Kalemin insana benzetilmesi."

"Attribuing a human character to the pen."

Aslı E.

"Kalem komutanlarin sozlu iletisimini ifade ediyor olabilir."

"Pen can refer here to of the commanders' verbal communication."

Burak T.

"Kalem, yasakları ifade ediyor. Pen refers to "prohibitions.""

Merve Y.

Parmaklarimin arasindaki kalem duyusal, neredeyse canli, gucunu hissedebiliyorum, icerdigi sozcuklerin gucunu… Bir kalem, insan gözünde sadece bir kalem olarak kalabilecekken ona farklı bir açıdan bakıp bunu ifade ederken de bu açıya gore farklı sözcükler yan yana getirilmiş. Bu kelimelerin oyunu sayesinde kalemin gücü daha iyi hissedilebilir bence. Kelime oyunlarından hoşlandığım için bana gore ifade de mükemmeliği arttırmıştır bu oyunlar.

The pen between my fingers is sensuous, alive almost, I can feel its power... Taken from a different perspective and described by a series of words that reflect this perspective, pen becomes more than an ordinary object. In my opinion, through this word play, the power represented by the pen can be perceived better. As I like playful language, I think that this word play improves stylistic proficiency.

Onur O.

"Kalemin canlı olması. Aslında burada kalem insanın içindeki duyguları belirten bir araçtır ama arada atlama yapılıp misyon direkt kaleme yüklenmiştir sanki o bireyden bağımsızmışçasına."

"Here, the pen is given an animate character. The pen is actually a tool used for writing on (?) about? human feelings, but here the pen seems to represent a power on its own as if it is isolated from humans."

Nuran B.

"Kalem. Komutan gibi okuyabilmek ama kadın olarak."

"The pen. To be able to read like the commander, but as a woman."

How related is this word play to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly related, unrelated or slightly related?

22 readers found the word play strongly related to the plot synopsis of the novel.

2 readers found the word play slightly related to the plot synopsis of the novel.

2 readers found the word play unrelated to the plot synopsis of the novel.

6 readers who couldn't recognise the word play left this question unanswered.

Please explain.

Damızlık (Handmaid)

Questionnaire 5

"Bu kavram üzerine gidiyor tahminimce konu. "

"I think the novel can be based on this concept."

Pen-Penis

Questionnaire 2

"Burada doğurgan olmayan kadınların (teyze) nin ayrı bir kıskançlığı var. Ve diğer kadınları üreme için kullanılmasından dolayı da erkeğin penise sahip olmasının kıskançlığı da var."

"Here, aunts who are not reproductive are envious of reproductive women as well as of men who have a penis."

Questionnaire 8

"Bağlantılı çünkü kadın ve erkek üzerinden anlatılmış."

"Strongly related because it refers to power differentials between men and women."

Damla

"Damızlık kadınların yazılı iletişim olanaklarından yoksun bırakıldığı bir toplumda kalem: özgürlüğü çağrıştırır.(bence). Erkeklik organı da gücü çağrıştırdığı için, bu tür bir toplumda erkeklerin kıskanılması çok normal bir duygu olmalı."

"To me, in a society in which women are deprived of written communication, the pen evokes liberty. And the male sexual organ evoking the power, it must be normal that men are envied in such a society."

Atalay Y.

Erkek egemen toplumuda cinsel ayrışmaların yaratacağı farklılıklar açısından ve romanın kurgusu bakımından oldukça bağlantılıdır. Öte yandan buradaki kalem gerçekten de bir kalem olabilir. Bu tartışmaya açıktır. Yalnız bu kalemin gerçekten bir kalem olabilmesi için gelecekte komutanların bu kalemle ne işi olabilir sorusunun cevabını bilmem gerekir. Yazarın da adından anladığım kadarıyla yazar bir kadındır. Kadın bir yazar neden hemcinslerini hikayesinde alt bir sınıfa dahil eder. Yazar ya bir feminist ya da bir militarist veya bu roman bir distopyadır.

It is strongly related because it is characteristic of the consequences of a change in power relations between the sexes. Pen can be used here in a literal sense. That's controversial. If pen is used here in a literal sense, the novel must include some more clues on the commanders' use of the pen. As far as I understand from her name, the writer is a woman. Why does a female writer refer to women as a subclass in her novel? The writer should be either a feminist or a militarist, or this is a dystopian novel.

Pen and Envy

Alp E.

"Kıskançlık mülkiyet ilişkisi ve bunun üzerinden çocuk sahibi olmanın ve o çocuğu sahiplenmenin kıskançlık ve mülkiyet açısından olumsuzlanması."

"What is dealt with here is the relationship between envy, possession and having children. So, parents being possessive of their children could create negative feelings such as envy."

Questionnaire 10

"Kızlar sadece üremek için bir araçtır ve onlar yazmaya ya da konuşmaya başlarsa onlar amaç sahibi oldukları için araç olmayacaklar."

"Handmaids just serve as objects of reproduction and if they start writing or speaking, they will have objectives and they won't serve as objects anymore."

Genco G.

"Damızlık kızlar döneminde kadınların iletişim hakları ellerinden alınıyor. İletişim hakkı sadece erkeklere özgü ve bir nevi gücün simgesi haline gelmiş. Dolayısıyla Lydia'nın kalemi kıskanması onların mahrum olduğu haklara özlemini işaret ediyor."

"Handmaids are deprived of the rights and means of communication, over which men have a monopoly. The use of the means of communication seems to have turned into a kind of representation of power. Lydia is envious of the pen because she aspires for the rights she is deprived of."

<u>Nur M.</u>

"Romanı okumadım ama özetinde verilen mesaj daha sonraki alıntıyla bire bir

örtüşüyor. Bir kadının yaşadıklarına olan isyanını bir kaleme bağlayarak

anlatması romanın özetiyle bire bir uyumlu."

"I haven't read the novel, but the message given in the summary plot totally

overlaps with the text fragment. A woman's narration of her rebellion against

what she experiences is perfectly consistent with the plot synopsis of the novel."

<u>Oya K.</u>

Çünkü burada kalem bir güç simgesi olarak görülmüş. Buradaki kızlar her türlü
yazılı ya da sözlü iletişimden uzak tutularak öğrenme yetenekleri ve imkanları
ellerinden alınarak bilinçlenmeleri engellenmiştir.Böylece bilginin gücünü kendi
ellerinde tutarak amaçları doğrultusunda kullanabilecekleri bilinçsiz bireyler
ortaya çıkarmaya çalışmışlardır.

"Here, the pen represents power. The handmaids are stopped from regaining

consciousness by being deprived of verbal and written communication. Thus,

those who control the power of knowledge seem to have tried to create

unconscious individuals they could use for their own purposes."

<u>Ozden E.</u>

"Özette kadınların damızlık olarak yetiştirildiğinden ve iletişim araçlarından

mahrum bırakıldıklarından bahsediliyor. Burda da en basit iletişim araçlarından

kaleme duyulan özlem ve kıskançlık konu ediliyor…"

"The plot summary deals with women being used for reproductive purposes and

deprived of the means of communication. In the same parallel, the excerpt deals

with the desire for and the envy of the pen, which is one of the basic

communication tools..."

Saduman D.

"Yazılı iletişim yasak edildiğine gore kalemde güçlü kıskanılacak birşey diye anlıyorum."

"To my understanding, since written communication is prohibited, the pen turns into something to be envious of.

Envy

Baris B.

"Kadınların sadece damızlık olarak kullanıldığı ve güçsüz bırakıldığı bir ortamdaki kadınların çeşitli alanlarda güç arayışını yansıtıyor olabilir."

"In a society in which women are used just for reproductive purposes and rendered weak, it can reflect women's search for power in different fields."

Pen

Questionnaire 1.1

"Konu zaten onların üzerine kurulmuştur."

"The story is already based on this."

Questionnaire 4

"Damızlık kızlara verilen öğüt bağlamında mantıklı geliyor."

"It is compatible with the advice given to the handmaids."

Questionnaire 7

"Kalemin içerdiği sözcükler olmaz. Kalemin yazdıkları vardır.."

"The pen cannot contain words, it just serves to write.'

Questionnaire 9

"Merkez kızların tutulduğu yer. Komutan özgür. Kızlar değil. Bu yüzden kıskanılıyor."

"The centre is where handmaids are kept. The commander is free, girls are not, Therefore, the commander is envied."

Questionnaire 1

"Çünkü özgür olmayan kesimi kadınlar oluşturuyor."

"Because women are not free."

Aslı E.

"Kızlar sözlü ve yazılı iletişimden mahrumlar ancak bir şekilde iletişim kurma isteği içindeler ancak bunun kötü bir şey oldugu anlatiliyor onlara."

"Deprived of all means of verbal and written communication, girls need to somehow communicate, but they are told that this is a bad thing."

Burak T.

"Kalemi kıskanıyor çünkü kullanması hatta dokunması bile yasak olduğu için. She envies the pen because the pen is something she cannot use, or even touch."

<u>Merve Y.</u>

"Yukarıda ki özette kadınların sadece doğurganlıklarından yararlanıldığı onların okuma yazma gibi özgürlüklerinin olmadığından bahsedilirken alttaki pasajda bir kadının kalem üzerine söyledikleri ve yapmak istedikleriyle aslında yazmayı ne kadar istediği göze çarpmaktadır."

"According to the above plot synopsis, women are just used for reproductive purposes and are deprived of verbal and written expression freedom. In the same parallel, the text fragment attracts attention to the link between a woman's comments on a pen and her strong desire to write."

<u>Nuran B.</u>

"Kalem insanı tüm dünya insanlarıyla buluşturur (okuma-yazma,düşünce gücünü aktarabilme)"
"The pen (reading, writing and expression of opinions) is a bridge among people in the world."

<u>Onur O.</u>

"Kadınların ezildiği bir toplumda duygularını ifade edebilmeleri tehlikelidir. Bu yüzden bu misyon kaleme yüklenmiştir."

"In a society in which women are oppressed, it is dangerous for women to express their feelings. The pen represents the power women are deprived of."

Woman of the Edge of Time

1. Have you ever read *Woman of the Edge of Time*?
   Yes 0, No 32.

2. Do you recognize the foregrounded neologisms (new words or existing words with a new meaning) in the text fragment above? Yes or No
   Yes 28, No 4.

3. If yes, please write out these neologisms below and explain what they mean to you.

When asked to write out neologisms in the text fragment, some readers wrote out not the instances of neologism, but some science fictional concepts peculiar to the defamiliarising world depicted in the plot synopsis.

For example, the reader named Dogukan thought that the concept of *artificial womb* could be considered as neologism.

Strangeness of the Speculative World

Artificial Womb

Dogukan

> "*Yapay Rahim*: Toplum yapısının değişmesi dolayısıyla yeni doğan ihtiyaçlar çerçevesinde tasarlanmış bir aygıt olarak düşünüyorum. Anne rahmine olan ihtiyacı ortadan kaldırdığı için genetik ile ilgili yüksek bir teknoloji ürünü olduğu izlenimi bırakıyor aklımda."

> "Artificial Womb: I conceive of artificial womb as a device designed due to needs arising from the changes in social structures. For eliminating the need for

a mother womb, the concept of artificial womb makes me think it might be a high-tech genetic product."

The same reader thought also that the concept of *telepathic communication* could be considered a neologism.

Telepathic Communication

Dogukan

> *"Telepatik İletişim*: Kişilerin söz veya hareketlere ihtiyaç durmadan karşısındaki kişi ile doğrudan beyinden beyne bir iletişim kurması yöntemi gibi göründü. Böyle bir metodun iletişim verimliliğini artıracağını da düşündürttü."

> "Telepathic Communication: It appears to be a method of communicating from one mind to another without recourse to any verbal and gestural exchange. This method also makes me think that telepathic communication can increase the efficiency of communication."

Dogukan was not the only reader who looked for neologisms outside the text fragment. There were some other readers who picked up defamiliarizing concepts in the plot synopsis as neologisms. For example, 3 readers stated that the concepts such as "to be nominated to parent" and "to be in charge of raising children" might be considered neologisms.

Nomination and to be charged in raising children

Questionnaire 5

> "atanmak" (ebeveyn olarak) –vazife için görevlendirilmek,yollanmak.

"to be nominated to parent" – to be assigned with the mission of parenting.

<u>Atalay Y.</u>

"Ebeveyn sözcüğünden atamaların yapıldığının bahsedilmesiyle sanki bir kurumdan sözedilmesiyle yeni bir anlam kazandırılmıştır."

" 'Nomination' of people who will be parenting brings to mind that parenting is conceived here as a kind of institution."

<u>Questionnaire 10</u>

"Çocuğa bakmakla görevli kişiler."

"People in charge of raising children."

3 readers stated that the concepts of *family* and *parents* can be considered as instances of neologism. Thus, obviously all these readers were very focussed on the strangeness of the speculative world rather than the strangeness of the language.

Family and Parents

<u>Dogukan</u>

"*Ebeveyn*: Bu kavramda bildik anlamı dışında artık bir vazifeyi ifade eder olarak kullanılmış, ortada bir görevlendirme olduğu için devlet aygıtının bu görevi seçtiği kişilere dayattığı izlenimini yarattı."

"Parents: This term that also seems be used unconventional can be related to a kind of responsibility, which I think might be assigned to some people by the government."

Burak T.

"Aile ve ebeveyn. Aile, bireyin birey olmasını sağlayacak durumları oluşturmaktan ziyade bireyi topluma adapte etmek -ki bu adaptasyon zora dayanır- için organize edilmiş bir kurum. Ebeveynler ise ebeveynlerdir bana göre. Gen aktarımını bir tarafa koyarsak yakın arkadaşlık ilişkisidir."

"Family and parents. Family is an institution that consists of adapting (by force) the individual to the society. The individuality of the individual is not cared for in family. On the other hand, if we let alone genetic transfer, parents are like close friends to children."

Merve Y.

Baba ve anne kelimelerine bana gore olan anlamların dışında bir anlam yüklenmiş. Bu pasajda baba ve anneler sadece ebeveyn olarak görülmektedir. Bana gore ise bir anne ve baba ancak birbirlerini sevdikleri zaman çocuklarına iyi şekilde yaklaşıp onu büyütebilirler. Bu metinde ise aşk olmadığı halde ve üstelik çocuklarıda kendi öz çocukları olmadğı halde bir üçlü kurulmuştur.

I think that the words "father" and "mother" are attributed new meanings. In the passage above, fathers and mothers are just seen as parents. From my perspective, a mother and a father can raise their children well only if they love each other. In this text, a group of three assumes the role of parents in the absence of love and biological connection with children.

One of the readers stated that *erkek ebeveyn* (*male parent*) can be considered a neologism.

Male Parent

Nur M.

"Erkek ebeveyn; baba sözcüğünün yerine kullanılan tanım."

"Male parent : a word used to refer to father."

Another reader stated that *ask anlasmazliklari (love misunderstandings)* can be considered as neologism.

Aşk anlaşmazlıkları (love misunderstandings)

Questionnaire 6

  Aşk anlaşmazlıkları

  Love misunderstandings

4 readers stated that *yatak arkadasi* (*sweet friend*) could be considered as neologism:

Yatak arkadaşı (bed friend)

Aslı E.

     "Yatak arkadaşı-aşık"

     "bed friend-lover"

Questionnaire 1

     "Yatak arkadaşı: Buradaki yatak arkadaşının anlamı sanırım cinsel ilişkiye girdiği insan demek."

     "Bed friends: I think "bed friend" refers here to "sexual partner.""

Questionnaire 5

     " 'Yatak arkadaşları'- aynı yatağı paylaştıklarımız."

     "Bed friends- Those with whom we share the bed.'

"Yatak arkadaşları – karı-koca"

"Bed friends- wife and husband."

Ortak (*Partner)*

Most of the readers (18 readers) stated that the word *partner* could be considered as neologism:

Nur M.

"Ortaklar; sevgili ya da eş kavramının ortaklığa dönüşmesi."

"Partner: the concept of lover or spouse transformed into a business partner."

Genco G.

"Ortak-partner"

Questionnaire

"Ortaklar sözcüğü yeni bir anlam yüklenmiş. Ebeveyn yerine geçmiş olduğunu düşünüyorum."

"The word 'partner' is loaded with a new meaning. I think the word "partners" replaces here 'parents'."

Armağan T.

"Ortaklar sözcüğü ebeveynlik isinde birlikte çalışan kişiler anlamına geliyor."

The word "partner" refers to people who associate in the business of parenthood."

Questionnaire 2

"Ortaklar anne olarak belirtiliyor. Partners refer to mothers."

Barış B.

"ortaklar - çocukları yetiştirmeyi bir "meslek" olarak görürsek, iş ortakları gibi, aslında var olan "ebeveyn" kavramına yakın, ancak duygusuzlugu vurguluyor."

"Partners- If we consider child-raising as a "profession", partner sounds like a business partner, but it's close to the conventional concept of parent and emphasizes insensitivity."

Damla

"Ortaklar genellikle bir is icin bir araya gelen, bu ise maddi ya da manevi yatirim yapan bir grup insandir ama burada paylasilan is: ebeveynlik."

"Partners usually refer to people who are associated with one another in an action and invest efforts and money in this action, but here, partner refers to a common responsibility."

Lale E.

Ortak – cocuklari buyutmek icin gorevlendirilmis kadin ya da erkekler.

Partners: Men or women who are charged with raising children.

Nuran B.

"Ortaklar, şimdiye dek ortak dendimi yatağı paylaşılandı. Anlatılan zamanda yatak paylaşımı ortaklıkta yok. Yapay labratuvar düzeni var."

"Partners: While partners refer to people who are sexually involved, in the futuristic world of this novel, sexual involvement is not a part of partnership. In this novel, there are laboratories and artificial methods of procreation."

Afşin E.

"Ortak: Benim için bir ameli birlikte yapan ve bunun sonuçlarını bölüşenlerin her biri demek, romanda ise yapay üretilen çocukları büyüten yetişkinlerin her biri…"

"Partner: What partner means to me is "one associate with another in an action whose consequences are shared by group members", but in the novel, it means "one of the adults who raise artificially procreated children..."

Alaattin T.

"Ortaklar kelimesi ebebeyn kişilere atfen kullanılıyor.."

"The word "partner" is used to refer to parents.."

Questionnaire 3

"Ortaklar – anneler"

"Partners- mothers"

Questionnaire 4

"Ortak normalde iş arkadaşı olarak düşünülür ama burada anne olarak

kullanılmış."

"Partner usually refers to business associates, but here, it refers to mothers."

Oya K.

"Kadınlara ortaklar anlamı yüklenmiş."

"Women are called partners."

Ozden E.

"Ortaklar çocuğu yetiştirmekte kullanılan rastgele seçilmiş üçlü grup."

"Partners: A group of three chosen randomly to raise children."

Saduman D.

"Ortaklar yani çocukların ebeveynleri."

"Partners refer to people who are parenting children."

Onur O.

"Ortak: diğer anneler. Zaten metinde de belirtilmiş."

"Partners: Other mothers, as is already referred to in the plot synopsis."

Murat Atasoy

"Ortaklar: Çocuk sahibi olmanın ya da aile kurmanın duygusallıktan çıkıp

profesyonel şirketlere dönüştüğünü ifade ediyor."

"Partners: It is expressed that children and family are not parts of our emotional lives anymore because they turned into professional corporations."

How related are these neologisms to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly related, unrelated or slightly related? Strongly related

4 readers who couldn't recognise the word play left this question unanswered.

1 reader was able to recognise the word play, but she left this question unanswered.

20 readers found the instances of word play strongly related to the plot synopsis of the novel.

3 readers found the instances of word play slightly related to the plot synopsis of the novel.

4 readers found the instances of word play unrelated to the plot synopsis of the novel.

Please explain.

Strangeness of the Speculative World

Dogukan

Yapay rahim tanımında da belirttiğim üzere sistemin ihtiyaçlarının değiştiğini vurgulamak adına bir simge görevi görüyor yapay rahim. Bu manada kitabın ana ekseninin yeni toplum düzeni üzerinden bir çözümleme yapmak olduğunu varsayarsak kavram önemli bir işlev görmekte. Ebeveyn tanımı ise aşin olduğumuz bir kavramı ters yüz ederek, alışık olduğumuz değerlere doğrudan bir dokundurma yapıyor. Yeni toplum düzeni üzerine okuyucuyu düşüdürdüğü ve bunu sarsıcı bir yolla yaptığı için kitabın amacıyla doğrudan bağlantılı görünüyor. Telepatik iletişim ise bize konuyla bağlantılı herhangi bir şey söylemiyor, sadece farklı bir iletişim yöntemi olarak görünüyor. Özet kısmına baktığımıza bu kavram çıkarılıp da yerine başka bir iletişim tekniği veya günümüzdeki hali konsa bile konuda bir değişiklik olmuyor. O nedenle yakından bağlantılı bulmadım.

As I indicated in my definition of the concept of the artificial womb, artificial womb serves here as a symbol emphasizing the change in the social system. In this sense, if we assume that this book is based on an analysis of the new social order, the concept of the artificial womb fulfills here an important function. The concept of parents, as it is used in this context, subverts our traditional concept

of parenthood and looks at our traditional family values critically. As this concept, in a very vigorous manner, makes the reader reflect on a new social order it seems to be directly related to the purpose of this novel. Telepathic communication doesn't tell us anything about the theme of the novel; it is just a different method of communication. When we look at the novel's plot summary, we realize that even if this concept is totally removed or replaced by any other communication method, for instance, the one used by our present-day society, it doesn't affect the theme of the novel. For this reason, I think that the concept of telepathic communication is not related to the novel.

Atalay Y.

Çünkü romanda kurulan cinsiyet bakımından eşitlikçi bir toplumun devamlılığını sağlayan bir sistem olarak ebeynlikten bahsedilmiştir. Ve yapılan aşk evliliklerinde bağımlılıktan doğan eşitlik karşı cinslerde bozulmuştur. Maddi yönden kim zayıf ise karşı cinse boyun eğer. Romanda ki evebeynlikte, eşitlikçi sistemin bozulmaması için herşey rastgele ve atama yoluyla bağımlılığı ortadan kaldıracak unsurlar kullanılmıştır.

In this novel, parenting is dealt with as a system that insures the continuity of a sexually egalitarian society. In love marriages, if one of the spouses is financially less secure, he or she is dependent on the other and this suppresses the equality between them. The novel depicts a parenting system that consists in a random selection of people who would be parenting. In this parenting system, all the factors that could cause dependence are suppressed in such a way as to keep equality between the sexes.

Questionnaire 10

"Üremeyle ilgili yapaylıktan bahsediyor. Bu sözcük sadece bunun bir kısmını

ifade ediyor."

"The excerpt deals with an artificial (re?)production system and this word

partially refers to this system."

Burak T.

"Ebeveyn kavramı bir nevi bakıcılık ya da öğreten kişi olarak tanımlanmış ve

aile kurumu dağıtılmış yerine ortaklaşa ilgi göstermeye dönüştürülmüş.

Connie'nin şaşırması normal. Sanırım hikâye de bu tip şaşkınlıklar üzerinden gidiyor."

"The concept of parent is defined here as a kind of "caretaker" or "teacher." The social institution of family is replaced by a system of parenting in which both partners equally share the responsibility of children. It's very normal that Connie is astonished by this new system of parenting. I guess the novel is possibly based on these sorts of astonishing transformations."

Merve Y.

"Özet metinde laboratuvarda tasarlanmış yapay rahimde büyütülmüş bir bebeğin ona sadece ebeveynlik yapacak kişilere verilmesinden bahsediyor. Pasajdada böyle yetişen bir çocuğun aşk ilintisi olmayan anne ve babasının ebeveyninin neden bu şekilde oldukları konusunda arkadaşıyla yaptığı konuşma var."

"According to the plot synopsis, after being conceived in the laboratories and raised to viability in artificial wombs, babies are given to people who would be parenting them. In the text fragment, a person who, without being involved in a romantic relationship, is parenting such a child explains this parenting system to a friend."

Yatak arkadasi (bed friend, sweet friend in the novel)

Aslı E.

"Aşık olunan kişilerle beraber oluyorlar ancak onlarla aile kuramıyorlar."

"They have a relationship with people with whom they are in love, but they can't start a family with them."

"Günümüz dünyasında ebeveynler genelde çocuğun biyolojik anne babası, ama burada "yatak arkadaşı" diye özellikle belirtilmesi gelecekteki mattapoisettdeki durumun günümüzden tamamen farklı olduğunu gösteriyor."

"In the present world, parents are generally biological parents, but here, the specific use of the term "bed friend" shows that this situation is different in the futuristic society of Mattapoisett."

Questionnaire 5

"Sadece ifade amaçli, konunun içeriğine uydurulmaya çalışılmış."

"These are just used for stylistic purposes compatible with the topic of the novel."

Questionnaire 7

"Ebeveynlerden bahsediliyor. Bu yüzden yatak ilişkisi kullanmış olabilir ama bu parçada önemli olan bu değil."

"The text deals with parents. This is why a bed relationship theme could be used here, but it is not essential to the plot of the novel."

Ortak (Partner)

Afşin E.

"Roman yapay yolla üretilen çocukların rastgele atanan yetişkinlerce büyütülmesini konu aldığı için, bu yetişkinlerin adlandırılması önemli bir tanımlama…"

"Since the novel recounts the raising of artificially procreated children by randomly nominated adults, it is important to use a word to designate these adults."

Alaattin T.

"Seçilen kişilerin ebebeyn olarak atanmasını açıklamış, sonra da kişiler arasındaki konuşmada bu seçilmiş ve görevlendirilmiş kişilere atfen ortaklar kelimesi kullanılmış…"

"In the plot synopsis, there is an explanation of how people are nominated to be parents. In the dialog between characters in the text fragment, the word "partner" is used to refer to these nominated people.."

Questionnaire 3

"Konuyla tamamen alakasız."

"It's unrelated to the topic of the novel."

Questionnaire 4

"Aile bir işleyiş gibi olduğundan anneye ortak denilmesi mantıklı olabiliyor."

"As the family depicted here looks like an organisation, it can make sense to refer to "mother" as "partner.""

Questionnaire

"Ortak, ebeveyn yerine kullanilmis."

"Partners" replaces here "parents."

Armağan T.

"Özetten algıladığım ana tema, çocukları birlikte yetiştiren kimselerin kendi aralarında sevgi iliksisi olmadığıdır. Kahramanlara "ortaklar" veya baksa bir tek kelimelik ad koymak, sık tekrarlanacağı için bir gereklilik gibi duruyor."

"As far as I can infer from the plot synopsis, the main plot consists of the lack of love among people who collectively raise children. Since the word "partner" will occur in the novel frequently, it seems to be necessary to name characters as "partners" or give them another one-word name."

Barış B.

"Çocuk doğurmanın ve yetiştirmenin tamamen duygulardan soyutlanmış bir olgu olmasıyla bağlantılı."

"It's related to the fact that in this futuristic world, having and raising children is completely isolated from feelings."

Damla

"Ortaklar genellikle bir iş için bir araya gelen, bu işe maddi ya da manevi yatırım yapan bir grup insandır ama burada paylaşılan is: ebeveynlik."

"Partners usually refer to people who are associated with one another in an action and invest efforts and money in this action, but here, partner refers to a common responsibility."

Genco G.

"Ortaklar kelimesi günümüzdeki ebeveyn kavramının farklı bir yansıması. Bugün kullanılan anlamıyla ortak kelimesi ebeveynliği çok kapsamasa da hikayede önerilen yeni aile kavramı ile yeniden oluşturulmuş olabilir."

The word partner is a different term referring to the concept of parent. Partner, as it is used in the novel, must be different from its present-day usage because today, the word partner is not used interchangeably with the word parent. Thus, the word parent can be reinvented according to the new concept of family proposed in the novel.

Lale E.

"Kitabın sosyal siteminde "ortak" kavramı günümüzdekinden daha farklı. Kitap bu ortak sitemini (çocuklara annelik-babalık yapan 3 kadın veya erkek konusunu) anlattığı için bu sözcüğün çok önemli olduğunu düşünüyorum."

"In the new social system depicted in the novel, the concept of "partner" is different from its conventional usage. I think that "partner" is a key concept since the book deals with this partnership system, a group of three (men or women) parenting children."

Murat A.

"O toplumun duygulardan uzak, makineleşmiş havasını tek sözcük gayet iyi özetliyor. Ayni zamanda kadın ve erkeğin cinsiyet özelliklerinin törpülendiğini ve bir tur robotlaşma halinde olduklarını anlatıyor."

"This only word summarizes very well how unemotional and mechanical the nature of the depicted society is. It is also mentioned that women's and men's sexual characters are changed and are being automatated."

Nuran Becerikli

"Eşitlikçi anlatım var. Kadın da taşımayacak. Yapay rahimde labratuvarda gelişecek."

"There is an egalitarian concept of parenting. Children are not conceived in women's wombs, but in laboratories."

Nur M.

"Yapılan uygulama aile kavramına yeni bir anlam yüklüyor. Çekirdek aile tanımı değişiyor. Aşk, aile gibi kavramları çocuklardan ayırıyor. Çocuklar bir eve sonradan bakılmak üzere alınan bir canlı konumuna sokuluyor. Şu anda insanların evlerine bakmak üzere aldıkları hayvanların ya da bitkilerin yerini çocuklar alıyor. Bunun da çocukların aşk ve evlilik sorunlarından bağımsız olarak yetişmeleri için yapıldığı savunuluyor."

The system of partnership changes the definition of the concept of nuclear family and attributes a new meaning to it by conceiving children separately from love and family. Children are represented as living beings that are brought home to be taken care of. They seem to have replaced pets and plants that modern people take care of in their home. It is also maintained that this system aims for children not to be affected by love and marriage problems while growing up.

Özden E.

"Özette belirtilen rastgele seçilen üç kişinin yetiştirdiği çocuklardan birisin yetiştiricisi olan bir kadın diğer iki kişi için ortaklar diyor. Ve bir "yatak arkadaşlıkları"nın olmadığını söylüyor. Rastgelelik bu şekilde vurgulanıyor…"

"The summary plot defines partners as a group of three that consists of a woman and two other people in charge of raising children. To emphasise the randomness of the selection of these people, it is also mentioned that the people in this group are not "bed friends.""

Saduman D.

"Kendi anne babaları olmuyor, atanmış ebeveynleri var."

"Children do not have biological, but nominated parents."

Onur O.

"Kadınla erkek beraber olmamaktadır o yüzden böylesi yeni bir aile yapısına

yeni bir kelime uygulanması normal."

"In this futuristic society, there is no sexual intercourse between men and

women and it's normal to use a neologism to refer to this new family structure."

The Female Man

Questions

1. Have you ever read *Female Man*?
   Yes 0, No 32.
2. Do you recognize the instances of word play in the text fragment above?
   Yes 18, No 14.

14 participants were not able to recognise the instances of word play.

3. If yes, please write out all instances of word play below and explain what they
   mean to you.

As a response to this question, two readers chose to comment on the strangeness of the

speculative world rather than commenting on the instances of word play in the text

fragment.

Strangeness of the Speculative World

Atalay Y.

"Kadınların egemen olduğu toplum: eşitlik yok, feminism: kadın erkek eşitliği

"*In a* female-dominated society: there is no equality in a real sense; it is based on feminism, which is the equality of women and men."

Nuran B.

"egemenlik kadına geçmiş."

"The women hold the power."

The affixe -issa

Afşin E.

"Kadın isimlerinin sonuna gelen –issa, -ssa ekleriyle daha dişil ya da yakinli-sevimlilik anlamı verilmesi. Rusça da Olga'ya Olinka, Yanya'ya Yanushka denmesi gibi (Yanyacık, Yanyacığım gibi)."

"Female first names are more feminized, familiarized or made cuter by the addition of –issa, -ssa affixes to the end. It reminds me of Russian diminutives (Olinka for Olga, Yanushka for Yanya (like Yanyacık, Yanyacığım in Turkish)."

Alp E.

"Kadınların isimlerinin tamamı kişisel özelliklerine uyan ya da onları çağrıştıran anlamlar içeren Latince ve Yunanca sıfatlardan türetilmiş."

"All the charactonyms are produced by the addition of Latin and Greek adjectives, which reflect the characters' personal traits."

Questionnaire 2

"Var. Isimler. Bu isimler sanki takma isim olarak yazılmış. Bütün hepsinin sonında "issa" ile bitiyor."

"Yes, charactonyms. Charactonyms sound like nicknames. They all end with "issa".

Baris B.

"Özel isimlerin gönderme yaptığı kavramlar."

"The concept to which charactonyms refer."

Lale E.

"Kadınların isimleri huylarını veya ilgi sahalarını anlatan isimler. Örneğin Travaille çalışmak demektir, Travaillissa'nin tek yaptığı çalışmak."

"The names that are characteristic of women's attitudes and fields of interest. For instance, travaille means "to work" and Travaillissa does nothing but work."

The Implied meanings behind Words Used in the Description of the Characters

9 readers focussed on the implied meanings behind word used in the description of the characters.

Alaattin T.

"Oh ne muhteşemsin ile kişisel ilişkilerindeki tavrına atıf + herkesin bildiği nedenlerle ile geçmişte yaptıklarına atıf +kırkbeşinde ile yaşına atıf böylelikle hepsi anlam içeren sözler içeriyor."

"Oh, you're so wonderful!": reference to her interpersonal behaviour," for obvious reasons": reference to her past behaviours, "forty-five: reference to her age. Thus, all these words are meaningful."

Questionnaire 1

"Evet. 'Benim küçük sevgilim.' Cinsel bir birliktelik yaşamak kastediliyor olabilir."

Yes. 'His Little Girl.' It can refer to sexual intercourse."

Questionnaire 4

"Saccharissa'ya yaramaz sıfatı yüklendiğinde küçük olduğunu düşünmüştüm. Ama 45 miş."

"When I've read about Saccarissa who is described as naughty, I thought she might be young, but I've read further that she is 45."

Questionnaire 6

"Ne –kadar –iğrenç"

" a game of ain't-it-awful"

Questionnaire 10

"gülümsemesi rahatsız etmez" "herkesin bildiği nedenlerle".

"so that her smile will not spoil for obvious reasons."

Damla

"Ya o standart "Oh, ne muhtesemsin!" cumlesiyle bu gece ortamda tuhaf bir sekilde eksikligini hissettiren Dulcississa nerede?'' Bu cümle benim için ikiyüzlülüğü ifade ediyor.

"And Dulcisissa, whose standard line, "Oh, you're so wonderful!" is missing from the air tonight?)" This sentence evokes hypocrisy for me.

Merve Y.

"Lucrissa, alnındaki kırışıklıklara bakılırsa kocasından daha çok kazanıyor; Saccharissa, ev sahibiyle barın arkasından Benim Küçük Sevgilim oyununun bir raundunu oynuyor. Bu iki cümle özellikle gözüme çarpan cümleler oldu. Çünkü bir şeyi bir direkt olarak söylemek vardır bir de lafı dolandırıp kelimelerle oynayıp daha hoş şekilde anlatmak vardır. Böyle oyunların hazzı bende her zaman daha fazladır."

"Lucrissa, whose strained forehead shows that she's making more money than her husband. Saccharissa who is playing a round of His Little Girl across the bar with the host. These two sentences attracted my attention because indirect expression that consists in playing with words always gives me more pleasure than direct expression."

Nur M.

"Ne kadar iğrenç oyunu; İnsanlar hakkında dedikodu yapmak, katılanları eleştirmek, partiyi eleştirmek. Benim küçük sevgilim oyunu; Aşk oyunları sergileyip dikkat çekmek, mutluyuz mesajı vermek."

"a game of ain't-it-awful: This word play is used to criticize the party and the party people who are gossiping about other people. A round of His Little Girl: This word play is used to depict a game that consists in attracting others' attention by seeming to be in love just to give a happy look."

<u>Oya K.</u>

1-alnindaki kirisikliklara bakilirsa kocasindan daha cok kazaniyor
2-ne-kadar -iğrenç
3-simdi sakin sakin kanapede oturuyor, bu nedenle gülümsemesi rahatsız etmez
4- ev sahibiyle barin arkasindan Benim Kucuk Sevgilim oyununun bir raundunu oynuyor...

Yorum 1- Bana göre lucrissa hayatı kocasından daha fazla ciddiye aldığı için olsa gerek sıkıntıların verdiği kırışıklıklar onda daha fazla..

Yorum 2- Kendi hayatlarında olan şeyleri görmezden gelip başkalarının hayatını bu ölçülerle kendilerine malzeme yapan insanlar
3- Yorum yok.
Yorum 4-Burada ise üstü kapalı bir şekilde Saccharissa ev sahibi ile olan yakınlığı diyelim.

1. whose strained forehead shows that she's making more money than her husband

Response 1. To my mind, Lucrissa has a strained forehead because she takes life and the difficulties of life more seriously than her husband.

2. ain't-it-awful

Respose 2. People who judge others' lives rather than looking at what's happening in their own life.

3. Now sitting very still on the couch so that her smile will not spoil

No comment...

4. is playing a round of His Little Girl across the bar with the host.

Response 4. Let's say that implicitly this refers to Saccharissa's intimate relationship with the host.

Two readers were critical of the problems in language use:

Problems in Language Use

Questionnaire 7

"oh, ne muhteşem cümlesiyle bu gece ortamda tuhaf bir şekilde eksikliğini hissettiren"- sanki adam cümleyi söylemiş de gitmiş. Halbuki hiç gelmemiş.

" 'Oh, you're so wonderful!' is missing from the air tonight'. It seems as if the person who formulates this sentence is physically present there, but actually this person is not there."

Questionnaire 9

"Çenesini açmak, round yanlış yerlerde. Anlaşılıyor ama paragraf akışını bozuyor."

"The words "cenesini açmak" and "round" are not used in the correct place in the sentence. Although you can still infer meaning, the incorrect use of these words suppresses the fluency of the paragraph."

How related are these instances of word play to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly related, unrelated or slightly related?

14 participants couldn't recognise the instances of word play.

1 participant left this question unanswered.

8 participants found the instances of word play strongly related to the plot synopsis of the novel.

4 participants found the instances of word play unrelated to the plot synopsis of the novel.

5 participants found the instances of word play slightly related to the plot synopsis of the novel.

Please explain.

Strangeness of the Speculative World

Atalay Y.

>
> Feminizm ve kadınların üstünlüğünü savunmak aynı kavramlar değildir. Joanna'nın katıldığı partide yaptığı yorumlar kadınların beğenmediği yönlerini eleştirerek onları aşağılamaktadır. Kocasından daha çok para kazanan kadın hakkındaki yorum onun iğrençliği şeklindedir. Maddi yönden güçlü cinsler karşı cinsten üstündür. (capitalist sistemlerde böyledir). Joanna eşitliği bozduğu için hemcinsini aşağılayarak eşitliği savunmaktadır aslında. Ve Joanna'nın savunduğu feminism de eşitlikçi feminizmdir. Ve romanda; eşitliğin olmadığı kadınların egemen olduğu bir toplumdan gelen janet ile eşitliği savunan joannanın burada karşılaştırılması ve karıştırılmaması gerekmektedir.
>
> Feminism and the vindication of women's superiority have to be distinguished from one another. In the novel, Joanna responds ironically and makes critical comments on the aspects she didn't like of the women she met at the party. By her comment on the woman who makes more money than her husband, she attempts to show how disgusting this type of woman is. In capitalist systems, the one who makes more money is superior to the other. By degrading the woman who makes more money than her husband, Joanna, defends, at bottom, gender equality. Thus, Joanna's feminism is an egalitarian feminism. So, we should be able to distinguish between Janet coming from a non-egalitarian, female-dominated society and Joanna who defends gender equality.

Nuran B.

>
> "Söz sahibi kadınlar, iş sahibi aynı zamanda, erkeğin halini kadınlar almış."
>
> "Women are powerful and professionally active like men."

The affix -issa

<u>Afşin E.</u>

"Kişilere seslenme veya yakinlik belirtme eklerinin ya da kalıplarının roman

konusuyla çok bağlantılı olduğunu sanmıyorum."

"I don't think diminutive forms used to address a person or to convey the degree

of familiarity with the addressed person might be much related to the plot of the

novel."

<u>Alp E.</u>

Bütün bu superior modda kullanılmış sıfatlardan türetilmiş isimler dişil haldeki kelimelerdir. Zaten soyut kavramlar antik dillerde çok büyük oranda dişil kelimelerdir. Kadın hâkimiyetine iyiden iyiye vurgu yapmak için böyle kulanılmış olabilir. Ya da abartı yoluyla bu güç imgesinin arkasındaki güçsüzlük ortaya konmuş olabilir.

All these charactonyms are produced by feminine nouns. Abstract concepts in ancient languages generally consist of feminine nouns. Charactonyms derived from feminine nouns can be used to consciously emphasize the female domination. Or the choice of these charactonyms can be aiming to create an effect of exaggeration to show how weak women are despite their seeming power.

<u>Questionnaire 2</u>

"Burada isimlerin bir anlamı olduğunu düşünüyorum. Arkasından gelen sadece

bir issa bir takı olarak kullanılmış."

"I think charactonyms that are used here have a meaning. "Issa" seems to be

used as an affix."

<u>Barış B.</u>

"Günümüz toplumundaki kadınlar klişe kişilik şablonlarına oturtuluyor. Dünya dışından, kadınların egemen olduğu bir gezegenden gelen gözlemcinin gözlemlerini yansıtıyor."

"Women in our present day society are represented stereotypically. This reflects the observations of an outsider that comes from another planet which is female-dominated."

Problems in Language Use

<u>Questionnaire 7</u>

"Baloda olan ve olmayanlardan bahsediyor. Ama olmamasının eksikliğini yanlış ifade etmiş.."

"The excerpt deals with the people who attended and did not attend the party. However, those who are absent from the party are mistakenly shown as though they are present and speaking."

<u>Questionnaire 9</u>

"Yanlış kelime kullanmış."

"The wrong choice of word."

The Implied meanings behind Words Used in the Description of the Characters

Alaattin T.

Evet. Az bağlantılı ama yine de bağlantılı. Kadınların egemen olduğu dünya ile bugünün dünyası arasındaki kadın davranışları ilişkisi. Toplum içindeki davranışların yargısı sorunu. Fazla degil, bir deginme (herkesin bildigi nedenlerle) (tabii ben öyle düşündüm eger kitabı okusa idim daha net olurdu cevabım).

"Here, there is a comparison of female behaviours in a female dominated world with those in today's society. This is just a critique of social behaviours. Just an allusion (for obvious reasons) Of course, that's my interpretation. My answer would be clearer if I read the whole book."

Questionnaire 1

"Kadınların bakış açı anlatılırken cinsellikleri ve cinsel hayatları ele aliniyor."

"Women's perspectives are dealt with through their sexuality and sexual lives."

Damla

"Kadınların bulunduğu ortamın ne kadar yapmacık olduğunu, çoğunun rol yaptığını ve bunun farkında oldukları halde hayatlarını rol yaparak nasıl da devam ettirdiklerini ve ne kadar sığ olduklarını anlatan bir cümle..."

"This sentence expresses how artificial and superficial are these women who sustain their lives faking most of time and never give up faking although they are conscious about it..."

Merve Y.

"Özette romanın başkahramanının bir gezgin olduğundan ve kişileri eleştirel bir bakış açısıyla incelediğinden bahsedilmiştir. Pasajda da başkahramanın bir balodaki kadınların hayatları hakkında ki düşünceler yer almıştır. Bu düşünceler ise çeşitli söz oyunlarıyla anlatım güçlendirilerek anlatılmıştır."

"In the plot synopsis, it is mentioned that the main character is a traveller who sees the present world and its people critically. In the excerpt, the main character conveys her impressions of people she meets at a party. To reinforce her expression, the main character uses various puns."

Nur Malkoc

"Joanna da "ne kadar iğrenç oyunu" nu oynuyor. Kendi feminist yaklaşımlarını arkadaşının eleştirel yaklaşımlarına uydurarak ortamı gözlemliyor. Romanın özetindeki kişiliğe uygun bir tavır sergiliyor."
"Joanna also plays "a game of ain't-it-awful". She observes the setting from her feminist perspective combined with her friend's critical approach. She displays an attitude compatible with her character as described in the plot synopsis."

Oya K.

"Burada sözcük oyunları kullanılarak kişiler hakkında biraz da dokundurarak yaşamları ve kişilikleri hakkında yorum yapılmış."

"The puns used here contain critical comments on the characters' lives and personalities."

English Speaking Readers' Responses

The Handmaid's Tale

1. Have you ever read *the Handmaid's Tale?*
   Yes (10) No (21)

2. Do you recognize the foregrounded word play in the text fragment above? Yes or No? Yes.
   Yes (28), No (3)

Interestingly, all of the three readers who couldn't recognise the word play in this text fragment have translation studies as educational background.

3. If yes, please write out this word play below and explain what it means to you.

When asked to write out the word play in the text fragment, one of the source text readers interestingly chose to give a thematic content of the text.

Thematic Content of the Text

Rizwan H.

"Clearly a take on gender equality, sex, male/female power dynamics, etc."

Another reader stated that *pen* as a personified concept can be considered as a word play.

Pen as a Personified Concept

Andrew C.

"Well the lady keeps personifying the pen. She makes it more than just a pen. That's about it though."

Another reader who is a high school student and thus, a less experienced reader compared to the others stated that *envy* can be considered as a word play.

Envy

Lachlan W.

Maybe. *Envy*.

The narrator craves the freedoms granted only to men (commander), more

specifically the right to communicate.

25 source readers found out that penis envy can be considered as a word play.

Penis Envy

Alternative

"There is a reference to Freud's phrase 'penis envy' in Atwood's use of the motto

'Pen is Envy.' Freud speculated that all women were envious of the external male

reproductive physiology, that by its external nature suggested there was 'more'

than the 'internal' female reproductive physiology, and thereby is 'better.'"

Andre C.

"Penis envy (this means the desire to have a penis)"

Anna B.

Pen is Envy" = Penis Envy. It means that women are envious of men because men
have a penis and women do not. The penis in this context represents more than just
the part of a human body. It is the freedom, the power, the agressiveness that men
are allowed have and express whereas women have traditionally been conditioned
to stay away from these qualities/behaviour. The concept comes from Freudian
theory in which he posited that girls in their sexual developmental stage become
envious of boys because they realize they do not have a penis and all the privileges
that the penis seems to bring to boys. These privileges are significant in that they
are culturally produced; they are produced by the society. Girls according to this
theory are viewed as envious, secondary, deficient, and, in general, inferior to
boys.

Anna Grace

In this excerpt, Aunt Lydia explains how "Pen is Envy" echoing Freudian theories of "Penis Envy," whereby women are meant to feel jealous of men because their penis gives them power to have control over others (most significantly, women). The Handmaid envies the Commander's pen or "penis" because he is able to be free, whereas she is forced into servitude and labour.

Bradley L.

Pen is Envy" is an allusion to the Freudian notion of "penis envy" which refers to the moment in a girl's development when she realizes that she does not have a penis. The penis, like the pen in Atwood's example, represents a systemic exclusion of women in roles of power. In other words, having a penis, like having a pen in the narrative, is synonymous with having access to power.

Christine Y.

"Pen is Envy ,penis envy, psychoanalytic term referring to the moment in a

girl's development when she realizes she does not have a penis and subsequent

desire for male attributes."

Carol B.

" 'Pen is Envy' (l.2) is a play on "Penis Envy". What it means to me: The author

seems to be playing with psychological (Freudian) theories of women expressing

"penis envy", female jealousy of the male reproductive organ, turning it into a

trope for the male appropriation of other means of (literary, epistolary, etc)

creation in the story, and women's jealousy of it."

Christel K.

"A play on the expression "penis envy".

Desmond F.

The pen is a phallic symbol. The phrase "Pen is Envy" is a split version of the term "penis envy." It has a double meaning; it is a "double entendre." The narrator is experiencing this feeling. It is conflated in the third sentence with sexual desire for the Commander. There seems to be some contradiction between the Center motto, which is obviously sexual to the reader, and the intentions of the Center (but I would need more context to confirm that). There is definitely tension between the word play, the nature of the story (reducing women to unfree, illiterate sexual objects), the descriptive language used by the author and the reader`s own, contemporary reaction to the text.

Emily J.

I envy the Commander his pen." The word play is about the "Commander's pen" – referring to both the writing instrument and his penis. The handmaids are in a subordinate position in society because they are fertile women and are meant to serve no other purpose than to reproduce; they are denied the power to communicate. The Commander, however, has power because he is allowed to write and the fact that he is a man automatically gives him authority over the women.

Jannah H.

"Pen is Envy'. The Freudian term "penis envy" sort of leaps off the page because it's so familiar. The use of capitalization in the phrase makes the reading "Penis Envy" all the more obvious. Freud thought girls feel inferior because they lack a penis, and envy boys who in turn feel superior because of it. It has been one of the principal psychological methods of maintaining the patriarchy by convincing women to submit to male power on a subconscious level. In this case, Atwood is writing specifically about a society of men whose resurgent patriarchy has taken all power and autonomy away from women. This power includes the freedom to use the written word, symbolized by the pen. The narrator of The Handmaid's Tale is conscious of the power inherent in the control of words, symbolized by the pen, and the nexus of verbal power with phallic power. She imagines by stealing the patriarch's pen she can take his control over life for herself.

Jim H.

I think so – The 'Pen(is) Envy" and the talk about the pen/penis of the commander. It sounds like we have a bit of a rebellious feminist on our hands, who is tired of being under someone else's control, and would like to take the power (in the form of the pen) away from the Commander. I think that this 'feminist' as I'll call her, rejects Aunt Lydia and her 'Pen is Envy' warning as a tool of the Commander to

continue (what I consider to be, from what I can garner from the limited information here) the disrespectful and inhumane subjugation of the 'handmaids`.

Joffre R.

"yes... pen is envy - penis envy... it just suggests the concept of penis envy."

Lisa H.

"Pen is Envy". This is a play on the (somewhat outdated) Freudian notion of

Penis Envy -- a bone of contention with every feminist. (joke)"

Lucy N.

"Pen is Envy: penis envy."

"Freudian theory that women want penises... symbol of power etc."

Melanie A.

"Pen is Envy – penis envy. In this novel the men are dominant, so it is natural

for the women to have penis envy."

Paul S.

"This word play is "Pen is Envy". To me, this refers to Freud's notion of "penis

envy", according to which a female desires to possess a penis for herself."

Philip M.

"Freudian "penis envy" is about women wanting to be men. But in this case,

perhaps the spinster aunts in their burlap dresses don't want to be men, they just

crave a penis in their bodies. They want to "steal" the penis, not from the

Commander, but from the handmaidens."

Rachel C.

"I think that the word play is between the pen being a dual sign of power and envy to the narrator. She views the pen as a kind of metaphor of the Commander with his power that she envies."

Stephanie H.

"No… But if I had to guess, it would be the inferred comparison of the pen to the male anatomy."

Sterling T.

"Pen is Envy = penis envy. A Freudian concept (parody here?) stating that women supposedly envy men their penises, a symbol of male dominance and power. This is compounded by envying the Commander's pen, which suggests both his power to sign orders and commands, as well as a phallic symbol."

Steven D.

"Pen is Envy" is a pun on "Penis envy," a Freudian concept that girls develop an envy of boys' sexual organs. This infers envy by women of the man's (then) dominant role in domestic and social affairs."

Marie T.

"I'll guess that it's Pen is Envy… what does this mean to me? Well it's a motto that suppose to warn them away from such objects… Perhaps envy has been identified as an unpleasant feeling and so being envious of something or someone is not something that you want to be feeling… leads to frustration and

dissatisfaction with life. Pen is envy, love is envy, freedom is envy… so stay

away from them because wanting them will only lead to your own suffering."

Tia C.

"Pen is Envy = Penis Envy – the women are envious of the man's power and the

pen is phallic representing the penis."

Tina J.

"Pen is Envy. This is from Sigmund Freud's theory that women as a gender suffer

from "Penis Envy" (wishing to become men in a psychological sense) and this is

the cause of the discontent between the genders."

How related is this word play to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly related,

unrelated or slightly related?

Strongly related (30), Slightly related (1)

Please explain.

Global Meaning of the Text

Rizwan H.

Maybe this is a simplistic explanation, but: The Commander has the pen, and
the handmaids of Gilead need the pen to reproduce. The Commander's pen, and
the requirement for the power of the words it contains, is the only thing
preventing them from having an entirely self-sustaining, female world, but
because of this dependence on the pen, this gives the Commander a kind of
power over the handmaids.

Pen as a Personified Object

<u>Andrew M. C.</u>

"The synopsis and excerpt are pretty coherent with each other. It makes sense with the synopsis. I wouldn't know how to explain that further, though."

Envy

<u>Lachlan W.</u>

> "the word play was related to the narrator envying the power held by men to communicate, which was also addressed in the synopsis."

Penis Envy

<u>Alternative</u>

> "Atwood's novel confronts the male dominance of most Earth cultures by focusing exclusively on the reproductive functions of the genders and taking that focus to an extreme end through this speculative novel. The word play is clearly intended to show the author's belief that there is a link between the power of language as a tool for control, and the power of gender. It also suggests a subtle ignorance on the part of the exploited in this speculative society, an ignorance perpetuated by the education system."

<u>Andre C.</u>

> "In this novel, women hold a secondary or even trinary status in society as men are valued more highly than women, and some women are even valued more highly than *other* women."

Anna B.

The Commander to whom the Handmaids are assigned is the one individual with the power and authority. It is his decisions that have an effect on the Handmaids' lives. Handmaids are subordinate to Aunts, and Aunts are subordinate to the Commander. In the most simplistic observation, one can discern the hierarchy and easily observe that the power – the control and the decision-making – rests with the Commander who is physically different from Aunts and Handmaids. In this case, his penis could represent all the privileges that he disposes of and the power to decide on the lives of others. Even though, Aunts and Handmaids are also physically different – in that Handmaids have ovaries and Aunts do not – their difference is not as fundamental as the one between the male and the female. Ultimately, the male is the one who has the final say.

Anna Grace

"As far as I know, the novel details the struggle between the sexes at this period in time. Women had few rights, whereas men were able to do as they pleased."

Bradley L.

"The commander has access to a pen, simply because he is a commander. It is a symbol of power. The handmaid's admission that she would like to steal the commander's pen is tantamount to saying that she would like to be powerful."

Christine Y.

"the characters appear to be highly schematized, i.e. types rather than individuals, similar to Freud's male/female theorizing."

Carol B.

Fertile women here are forbidden any creative impetus, only allowed to nurture men's creation. The author also turns this into a trope for the male domination of literary writing over the centuries. The irony is emphasized by the fact that these women are called "hand-maids" (the word used in the novel's title), which seems to express a longing to grasp something, their envy for the pen.

Christel K.

"It would be important in defining the women's mentality, and therefore

defining their position vis-a-vis men, in the story line. It would also stick in the

reader's mind particularly well."

Desmond F.

If the narrator is being 1) de-educated: the pen is the way to resist this process and regain some humanity; 2) desexualized (turned into a reproduction machine): the pen is a sexual object, a phallic symbol that stirs desire 3) disempowered: the pen, as man, is in control, so wanting it, especially the Commander`s, is to want power, status. Therefore, the motto is both a rule of terror upheld by the Center against women and a statement of what women feel as a result. It is deeply relevant to the plot.

Emily J.

"The "pen" is a symbol of power representing the power to communicate (which

is held by infertile women – the "aunts"); the penis is a symbol of power

because the society of women (aunts and handmaids) is organized around

serving men (specifically, commanders)."

Jannah H.

First of all, women's reproductive freedom has been denied them and taken control of by an élite class of powerful patriarchal men. These men have imposed a tyrannical régime to ensure that only their penises will determine reproduction. At the same time, to keep women subjugated, they enforce ignorance upon the women, so that being denied reading and writing, they will lack the knowledge to rise up and overthrow their oppressors. The close linkage of these symbols of the reproductive power and verbal power that the régime is built on, the penis and the pen, is brought out by Atwood's wordplay linking the two.

Jim H.

"It seems like the word play here is important to what could be a central

character (the feminist, who speaks in the first person), and likely the plot,

though the synopsis seems to be more background than explanation."

Joffre R.

"The world of the novel seems to be a male dominated society. Women are not

even allowed to communicate. You must have a penis to use a pen."

Lisa H.

It is important because:
- The handmaids are denied power; they are deprived of the ability to communicate either verbally or in writing and are even discouraged from wanting to do this. So, the pen symbolizes the penis and is the repository of power, and is consequently the object of envy of any intelligent handmaid, i.e., "I envy the Commander his pen. It's one more thing I would like to steal".
- From Freud's point of view, power is equated with the penis because men have traditionally been the more powerful of the two sexes. Many would argue that, even in a liberal democratic Western society, there is still an imbalance in power because, for one, women are not equally represented in every possible employment sector. So, I imagine that this book addresses the traditional inequalities by examining the dominant precepts of power theories, including Freud's which states that women wish they had a penis so they would be able to exert more power;
- Of course, feminist theory is all about empowering women and demonstrating that power can be wielded independently of genitalia.

Lucy N.

"Offred (and all the women) are disenfranchised. The penis symbolises power

and autonomy. It also stands for sexual dominance, something reserved only for

the men of Gilead."

Melanie A.

"I don't remember all the details of the novel, but I feel like something very

dramatic happens at the end, and maybe penis envy has a pivotal role in it."

Paul S.

"There is possible allusion to penis envy in Aunt Lydia who may be exercising a

patriarchal role, symbolizing a desire for a penis, in controlling other women."

Philip M.

"I thought the use of the biological word, "ovaries" was jarring. So, I imagine

this book is going to get down to business."

Rachel C.

"Well, she ties the entire thing together: Pen to power, pen to envy and finally

the Commander to the pen and what it represents."

Stephanie H.

"The themes of the novel are around gender, power, reproduction and virility."

Sterling T.

"Aunt Lydia is the most powerful of the Aunts, who are the most powerful

women. But not as powerful as the men (with their penises)."

Steven D.

"The novel is about a society in which certain men have attained complete

domination to the point where fertile women are nothing more than sex slaves.

The male's exclusive right to use the written word is a metaphor for his sexual power."

Marie T.

"Well the whole novel talks about freedom really. And the pen and written word have always been associated with freedom. Writing is a very powerful way to transmit thoughts, ideas, emotions, feelings to other human beings across time and space. Of course someone without this power would envy it. It goes to show how important education really is. How do you keep a minority population docile? Deny them of any mode of communication so they cannot revolt."

Tia C.

"The men have control of the roles of women in this world and the women are envious of this control."

Tina J.

Margaret Atwood is a feminist writer who explores the possibilities of science in social control and the effects the male-dominated scientific world could have on the "real" society. In A Handmaid's Tale she looks at what may happen if infertility became pandemic and how the male patriarchal society may seek to control women in order to control the population and genetic descent of humanity. The envy of the handmaid narrating signifies the envy and lack of control the handmaid has over her education, her abilities and her future. Pen is Envy literally in this case means her desire to write and express herself, but metaphorically means the desire for freedom of expression, of will and of life.

Woman on the Edge of Time

Questions

1. Have you ever read *Woman of the Edge of Time*?
   No (30) Yes (1)

2. Do you recognize the foregrounded neologisms (new words or existing words with a new meaning) in the text fragment above? Yes or No? Yes. 31
3. If yes, please write out these neologisms below and explain what they mean to you.

Strangeness of the Speculative World

Lindsay G.

> "Parenting system – used here as a technical term for child rearing, but makes no reference to the union between parents or their relationship with each other. It focuses on the relationship with the child."

13 English speaking readers stated that the word *sweet friend* can be considered a neologism.

Sweet Friends

Alternative

"sweet friends = sexual partners"

Anna B.

> "Sweet friends = lovers, individuals who engage in intimate relations."

Bradley L.

> "Sweet friends: people that are romantically involved with one another."

Christine Y.

> "Sweet friends—romantically involved friends."

Chrystel K.

"Sweet friends = romantically involved."

Jim H.

"Sweet friends – i.e. lovers"

Joffre R.

"Do you count 'sweet friends' as a neologism? people who are romantically involved."

Lindsay G.

"Sweet friends – a term used for a couple in love in this context, but here it has a negative connotation."

Melanie A.

"Sweet friends" – People who are romantically involved.

Rizwan H.

" "sweet friends" and "misunderstandings" (though the latter two might just be a way of restating or explaining the similar concepts of "lovers" and "lover's quarrels."

Sterling T.

sweet friends - lesbian lovers (?)

Steven D.

Sweet friends - lovers

Tina J.

Sweet friends = lovers, sexual or romantic partners.

7 English speaking readers stated that the word *love misunderstandings* can be considered a neologism.

Love Misunderstandings

Bradley L.

"Love misunderstandings: problems or disagreements that arise between persons that are in a romantic relationship with one another."

Christine Y.

"Love misunderstandings—disputes between lovers"

Chrystel K.

"Love misunderstandings = lovers' quarrels, splitting up"

Desmond F.

"Love misunderstandings: issues that arise when a child`s parents have genuine feelings for each other; atypical occurrence in this future."

Jim H.

"Love misunderstandings (as a phrase) – Interesting non-normative term for
relationship breakdowns."

Lindsay G.

"Love misunderstandings – the issues that arise between couples in love. Here
they are simply a factor hindering child production and development."

Rizwan H.

"sweet friends" and "misunderstandings" (though the latter two might just be a
way of restating or explaining the similar concepts of "lovers" and "lover's
quarrels."

Male Parent

Desmond F.

"Male parent: synonym for Dad, except needed to express this meaning in the
novel`s future."

3 readers stated that charactonyms like "Luciente", "Bee" and "Jackrabbit" can be
considered a neologism.

Charactonyms like "Luciente", "Bee" and "Jackrabbit"

Rachel C.

"I'm sure that the "Bee" and "Jackrabbit" are also neologisms, but I can't figure
their meaning without further excerpts."

Rizwan H.

"Bee, Jackrabbit"

Marie T.

"Her name, "Luciente"…. There's a word that it reminds me of… very close to that name though I can't pinpoint it… "lucient"? "lucience"?   oh yes… "lucid"!!! Between conciousness and unconsciousness kind of… confused a little. And I suppose they use animal names because they don't have biological parents to name them. To give them a name that is more meaningful."

Co-mothers, Coms

Alternative

"comothers, coms = parents"

Andre C.

"Comothers (mothers who share the responsibility of rearing a given child)"

Andrew C.

"Well the word 'comothers' – If I had to guess I'd say that since it said groups of 3 are chosen, comothers meant 2 females and 1 male."

Anna B.

"Comothers/Coms = parents"

"It is an interesting neologism because it implies that both male and female can be mothers. This essentially can imply that both male and female can have the

motherly instinct and perform the role of a nurturing parent (most often linked to the role of the mother), regardless of sex and gender. But, this is possible because of the new reproduction method which is taken outside of the human body and into the laboratory. This move means that male and female no longer perform the traditional human roles in reproduction: male who provides the semen, and the female who has the ovaries and then carries the foetus. The prefix 'co' suggests a relationship of equality, but also, interestingly, does not limit the number of parents."

Anna Grace

"Comothers: This would be two mothers together, in charge of parenting the children generated in laboratories. One would assume the third "parent" would be male."

"Coms: This is possibly a short form for "comothers.""

Bradley L.

"Comothers: members of a team assigned to raise a child."

Christine Y.

"Comothers (shortened to coms)—two women who share the job of mothering"

Carol B.

"Comothers (l. 4 and 6), Coms (l.7), To an extent: "male parent" (l.3)

What they mean to me: There is no longer a nuclear family setting so parents are co-parents functioning in groups of three. If there are 2 mothers, they will be comothers.

The author uses the prefix "co" from the latin "cum", meaning with, present in today's languages (esp. French) in words like "co-author" (co-auteur) or "coed" (coeducational) etc. These words today usually apply to jobs, not to parenthood, or other statuses in the family. Thus the author makes parenting sound just like any other job, which could be done by a number of people together.

"My coms": very funny neologism, shortened form of comothers."

Christel K.

"Comothers or coms = people functioning as parents."

Desmond F.

"Comother: one of two or more mothers or female parents of children in this future

Coms: short form of comothers; related to contemporary short form "mom," of which there are sometimes two today as well. Also, there is a vague sexual connotation with this word that may be accidental or incidental."

Emily J.

"Comothers" and "coms" (short form for "comothers"; like "mom" is to "mother").

"Because the reproductive practices involve groups of three, the three individuals are co-parents (presumably these groups consist of one man and two women, for there to be "comothers" specifically)."

Jannah H.

Comothers and the abbreviation "coms." New words had to be invented for the new types of social relations imagined in the future. Collective parenting is separated from biological parenting—therefore a continuance of old terms for traditional parenting would impede the adoption of the new parenting arrangements. This passage shows how language is tied to social developments, both depending on them and in turn influencing them. The traditional words for parenting have been forgotten in this society, which is why Luciente tries to look up the word "father" in a glossary of obsolete words. Since the word "father" itself has been forgotten, a word that linguists consider in the core vocabulary of any language, this implies how radical the new social changes are: Fatherhood is obsolete. That would be one way to take down the patriarchy which literally means rule by fathers. The word "mother" may not be entirely obsolete, but it survives in the word "comother" which also reflects the new social development of collective parenting having replaced individual biological parenting. The colloquial use of the abbreviated form "coms" implies that this development is already well inegrated into society and has become commonplace, something people now take for granted.

Jim H.

"Comothers – Groups of people selected to raise children."

Joffre R.

"comothers... It seems, since Luciente doesn't recognize the term father, that all

parents in Mattapoisette are called mothers. coms is perhaps another, playing

off of moms."

Lachlan W.

"Comothers ,coms - random people selected to parent a child together."

Lisa H.

"Comothers. It sounds like it is the name used to describe what we call

"parent"."

Lucy N.

"Comother: someone who is a joint mother with someone else."

Melanie A.

"Comothers"/"Coms" – Set of people chosen to raise a child who are not
biologically related to the child."

Nicole P.

"Comothers – two mothers in lieu of a father and a mother."

"Coms – short form for comothers"

Paul S.

"These neologisms are "comothers" and "coms". I'm afraid they do not have
meaning for me."

Philip M.

"Comothers are the 2 females in the pairing. I suppose that there are also
probably cofathers."

Rachel C.

"Comothers- two or more women together caring for a child. The shortened
version would be the "coms.""

Rizwan H.

"I'm not sure what they mean, but the neologisms seem to be:

Comothers, Bee, Jackrabbit, and maybe even "sweet friends" and

"misunderstandings" (though the latter two might just be a way of restating or

explaining the similar concepts of "lovers" and "lover's quarrels."

Stephanie H.

"Coms is short for co-mothers, or co-moms."

Sterling T.

"comothers - two women in the parenting triad

coms - (?) short for comothers?"

Steven D.

"Comothers - members of the randomly-selected group of three persons who

parent a child."

Susan A.

"comother – two women raising the same child without the child knowing which

one is his biological mother."

Marie T.

"Comother. Not just one mother but various that mother together. Shared power

and responsibility not directly related to a traditional mother-child bond. No

initial 9-month bonding in womb."

Tia C.

"Comothers – women who work together to birth and raise a child – one of the mothers may be the romantic interest and the other may be the physical birth mother."

Tina J.

"Comother = a group of people selected to raise a child, not the biological parent.

Coms = a pluralised foreshortening of the word Comother."

How related are these neologisms to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly related, unrelated or slightly related?

Strongly related 29, Slightly Related 1, Unrelated 1

Please explain.

Co-mothers, Coms

Lindsay G.

(love misunderstandings, parenting system)

"They set the mood for the novel. They provide important imagery and create an unknown and intriguing world for the readers."

<u>Alternative</u>

"They address the author's use of 'parenting by committee' or parenting without biological sexual connection in order to overcome gender bias in maintaining a gender-equal society."

<u>Andre C.</u>

"The idea of having a 'co' association means a cooperative arrangement. It does not necessarily speak to the romantic or unromantic nature of the association, only the shared responsibility."

<u>Andrew C.</u>

"They're probably used all over – Just like the book '<u>Brave New World</u>' by Aldous Huxley."

<u>Anna B.</u>

In the futuristic, fictional society, 'Comothers' is the term that replaces the concept of 'parents' in the present society. Since the books seems to be about a society that has transformed the reproduction process from a physical one to a controlled, laboratory process, then, the roles that humans are supposed to perfom in the futuristic society need to be called a new, different name. 'Comothers' is a label that fulfills this need. 'Sweet friends' is a euphemism for physical, amourous relations which have become secondary and no longer essential in the reproduction process. Hence, the sexual act has lost its primordial, fundamental function and is now serving as a secondary activity without the original meaning and consequences.

<u>Anna Grace</u>

"Since the novel is about randomly selected groups of three (including two "comothers" and a "father") who raise children conceived in laboratories, the

neologisms are extremely related because it is these new words that are the terms used to define the individuals that live in this society."

Bradley L.

"The three neologisms are integral to the plot synopsis in that the futuristic society created is defined largely by this new approach to family and to childrearing and this is the terminology that accompanies it."

Christine Y.

"The whole parenting system has been reworked, supposedly to create gender equality, so that comothers play key roles and the biological father is not necessarily involved in parenting."

Carol B.

In the word "coms", the novel's multi-layered irony turns in on itself. The shortened form makes this a word used to mean "communications" in the modern world, or "company" - "dot com" in Internet language, thus highlighting the modernity of the novel, its sci-fi aspect. Another word to which it harks back is "commies" or "communists", or even "commune", showing the link between the family organisation in the novel and certain types of family organisations in communist settings (adults and children living separately etc.). Finally, the stylistic form of "my coms", is akin to a form like "my folks", which suggests that despite all the attempts to destroy the nuclear family in the novel, children still mention them in a similar way as today.

Christel K.

"They seem to be key concepts in the society's ideology and its mechanism of bringing up children."

Desmond F.

“They are essentially terminology invented to provide verisimilitude to the

future detailed in the novel. If society was structured this way, these new terms

would have been created. It contributes to the temporal contrast aspect as well.”

Emily J.

“The neologisms above are directly related to the reproductive concepts and

practices inherent in the future society, forming one of the crucial elements of

the storyline.”

Jannah H.

I said "strongly related" because of how society is said to be built on families, so
that when the nature of families has been radically changed, the nature of society
itself will undergo radical changes. The radicalness of these changes is indicated
first by the obsolescence of fathers, such that the word "father" itself has been
forgotten the way people in the present day are unfamiliar with terms like, say,
"seneschal" from medieval feudalism, as an example of another obsolete social
order. The term "comother" had to be invented for the new practice of parenting
by collectivity, and the everyday use of its abbreviation "coms" shows how well
this change has been accepted by people of the future; it has become ordinary
and unremarkable.

Jim H.

“They seem to be integral in maintaining the futuristic society and it’s child-

raising process.”

Joffre R.

“I suppose they are used to point out the strangeness, foreignness of

Mattapoisette.”

Lachlan W.

"As members of communities die, random groups of three (male or female) that

are seldom romantically involved, are selected to parent." These are the

comothers as described in the synopsis."

Lisa H.

"It reflects a complete revolution in the parenting system."

Lucy N.

"Emphasises the complete cultural divide between Connie and Luciente..

concept of fatherhood may be important theme of book? "Comother" concept

avoids father."

Melanie A.

"These neologisms are in all likelihood a key aspect of the novel."

Nicole P.

"The word comothers is slightly related to the synopsis because it reveals an

idea of egalitarian society in which there would be no difference between male

and female gender-specific roles. The word comother acts as a substitute for this

stereotype."

Paul S.

"Comothers" contains "mothers" and the synopsis talks about people selected to

"parent", which is what mothers do."

Philip M.

"If you have 3 people, then yeah, I imagine coparents are a huge part of the novel, and deserve a new word. Or neologism if you will. And you probably will."

Rachel C.

"The neologisms seem to launch the reader into the societal system of the book."

Rizwan H.

"I don't think I get this one as well as the first one (and maybe I didn't even get the first one)."

Sterling T.

"This helps clarify the emotional relationship between the three individuals in the parenting triad described."

Steven D.

"The use of new terminology reinforces the idea of a complete redesign of parenting roles and gender relationships. The adoption of softer terminology--"sweet" and "mother" (instead of "father")--implies an attempt to create a gentler and less competitive environment."

Susan A.

"The neologism "comother" serves to illustrate the unusual society the people of Mattapoisette live in."

Marie T.

> "Well the whole story revolves around this method of parenting."

Tia C.

> "I think this term "comothers" would be significant as it is probably central to
> the main conflict where the "mothers" are involved in "love misunderstandings"
> with the man/male parent and/or the offspring."

Tina J.

> "Not read the book."

The Female Man

Questions

1. Have you ever read *Female Man*?

2. Do you recognize the instances of word play in the text fragment above?

   Yes 29, No 2.

3. If yes, please write out all instances of word play below and explain what they
   mean to you.

29 readers stated that charactonyms in the text fragment can be considered as instances
of word play.

Charactonyms

Alternative

> Each of the names are strongly associated with Latin/Greek language roots
> associated strongly with each character's dominant behavioural attribute:

Sposissa – sposa –spouse –one who marries
Eglantissa – I can't figure this one out
Aphrodissa – aphrodisiakos – related to love or desire (hence the make-up of false eyelashes)
Clarissa – claritas – her clarity of vision causes her to prefer death over life (my speculation)
Lucrissa – lucre – abundance
Lamentissa-lament – regret
Travailissa – travail – torture
Saccharissa – excessively sweet
Amicissa – amicable – peacemaker
Ludicrissa – deriving of derision – would never be invited anywhere of social significance
Amphibissa – amphibian-like – clearly 'ugly' visually
Domicissa – home or dominated – she's home, where she is more comfortable
Dulcisissa – dolce – sweet – always being complimentary

Andre C.

Aphrodissa (aphrodite), Eglantissa (Elegant), Lamentissa (Lament), Travailissa (Travail or Work), Ludicrissa (Ludicrous), Amicissa (Amicable), Amphibissa (Amphibian), Domicissa (Domicile).

Andrew C.

The author uses 'issa' at the end of every girls' name. And the first part of the girls' names usually describes the personality (or lack of) of the girl. I thought it was funny that the only chick with a normal name – 'Clarissa' – was going to kill herself.

Anna B.

Sposissa = word play on the word 'spouse'; she's been divorced three times.
Eglantissa = not sure about the meaning of this one
Aphrodissa = word play on the goddess of love and beauty, Aphrodite.
Clarissa = clarity, the one who sees clearly, knows the truth (that is potentially destructive and she therefore kills herself) – only my guess
Lucrissa = word play on the word 'lucrative'
Travailissa = word play on the French word 'travailler' (travailleur, travail)= to work, worker

Lamentissa = word play on the word 'to lament', to express sorrow
Saccharissa = saccharin = sugar, therefore, word play together with the word 'naughty' meaning something fun but 'bad for you'; tastes good, but it's deceiving because it's not good for you.
Amicissa= word play on the word 'amicable', friendly
Ludicrissa= word play on 'ludicrous', ridiculous, laughable; but that doesn't go together with the author's description of 'plain' (it's more a contradiction). If someone is ludicrous, that person is eccentric, foolish, someone who others laugh at, but that person is not plain.
Amphibissa = amphibian - someone primitive, not developed enough
Dulcisissa = dulce, in Spanish, 'sweet'. Word play on the word sweet, someone who only talks about nice things and avoids the reality or to say the truth, be honest.
Domicissa = word play on the word 'domicile', home, residence. The opposite of public; therefore she only speaks in private and not in public.

Anna Grace

Sposissa: This probably means a woman who is often a spouse. She was "three times divorced."
Eglantissa: This could either mean she is an elegant woman or looks like an eglantine rose, due to the allusion that she "thinks only of clothes."
Aphrodissa: This quite obviously relates to Aphrodite the Greek goddess of love and beauty.
Clarissa: A tragic heroine from an old English language novel. She is melancholy the whole novel and thus, in this case, would want to commit suicide.
Lucrissa: She is so-named because she is involved in a very lucrative business, judging by the fact that she is able to make more money than her husband and can win many hands of the fictional game "ain't-it-awful."
Lamentissa: Comes from the word "lament," which means to be upset or to despair over—in this case, losing to Lucrissa.
Travailissa: Comes from the verb "Travailler," in French, which means to work.
Saccharissa: Comes from Saccharine, meaning sweet and sugary. She wants to be "his little girl."
Amicissa: She is a good sport because she is presumably amicable and friendly with everyone.
Ludicrissa: Comes from Ludicrous, which means absurd or ridiculous. She was not invited because she is odd.
Amphibissa: This either comes from Amphibian, meaning frog, or meaning that she has two (perhaps opposing) traits or qualities.
Domicissa: Coming from Domestic, this means she is tame and obedient (probably to men).
Dulcisissa: Coming from the Italian word for Sweet, she is so because she compliments others and generally has a sweet nature.

Bradley L.

Each of the names mentioned by Joanna in the synopsis reveals a character trait about the person herself. Sposissa is three times divorced, so her name is a play on the word "spouse", perhaps suggesting she is somewhat serially monogamous. Eglantissa plays on the word "elegant"; Lamentissa, from "lament", feels sorry for herself; Travailissa, from "travail", is a workaholic. Amicissa is a play on the word "friend". The list goes on.

Christine Y.

The women's names
Sposissa   spouse
Eglantissa   eglantine (flower)
Aphrodissa   aphrodite (Greek goddess)
Lucrissa   lucrative
Clarissa   clarion ,clarity (sees into the future)
Lamentissa   lament
Travailissa   travail (work)
Saccharissa   saccharin (sugar substitute_
Amicissa   ami
Ludicrissa   ludicrous
Amphibissa   amphibian
Domicissa   domestic
Dulcisissa   sweet

Carol B.

All the women's first names are variations on the name Clarissa, made up of the suffix "issa" and a Latin or Romance prefix expressing their main attribute.

Sposissa: spouse+issa : she has had many spouses
Eglantissa: églantine (flower) or Elegant+issa: only preoccupied with her elegance
Aphrodissa: Aphrodite+issa Goddess of love (love is blind?, female eros)
Lucrissa: Lucre +issa (only thinks about money)
Travailissa: Travail (Labour) +issa(only thinks about work)
Lamentissa: Lament+issa (is always lamenting sth)
Saccharissa: Saccharine+issa (sugar-coats everything, charms everyone)
Amicissa: Amici/Ami+issa (is friendly, too friendly? with everyone)
Ludicrissa Ludicrous+issa (looks ridiculous)
Amphibissa: Amphibian+issa (either looks like an amphibian, i.e. is ugly as a turtle, or acts like one, meaning she spies on everyone, but the context is missing)
Domicissa: Domici+issa (domus+issa: a submissive housewife)
Dulcisissa: Dulci+issa (like Saccharissa, is soft (dulcis) with everyone

Christel K.

Sposissa: related to "esposa, esposo" (Sp.) word related to "wife", "husband" hence the multiple marriages
Eglantissa: from "elegant"?
Aphrodissa: with the same root as "Aphrodite", "aphrodisiac", hence sexual love
Clarissa: not sure, but it seems to indicate "clear", perhaps "seeing clearly", clairvoyant??
Lucrissa: the root of "lucrative", hence "liking money"
Lamentissa: from "lament", hence the "woe-is-me" attitude
Travailissa: from "travail" (Fr.), i.e. "work", hence hard-working, work-oriented
Saccharissa: related to "saccharine", hence "artificially sweet"
Amicissa: related to "amiga, amigo" (Sp.) (in Latin amicus, amica, I imagine) , or "amicable", hence "friendly"
Ludicrissa: related to "ludicrous", hence ridiculous
Amphibissa: related to "amphibian", amphibology", probably bisexual?
Domicissa: from "domestic", hence home-loving, out of place outside her home
Dulcissa: from "dulce" (Sp.) meaning "sweet"

Desmond F.

 Some of them; I am not able to decipher some of the proper names.

The ones I recognize are:
Sposissa: could have something to do with spouses ("spos") being thrice divorced
Aphrodissa: from Aphrodite, the Greek goddess or heroine of something related to beauty, wearing false eyelashes
Lamentissa: from "lament," a mournful discourse, complaining
Travailissa: from "travail," French for work, working all the time
Saccharissa: related to "saccharine," a sugar substitute, which does not seem to make sense here
Amicissa: related to "amicable," friendly, being labelled the "Good Sport."
Ludicrissa: related to "ludique," French for clownish, but is not invited because she is plain; this is confusing
Amphibissa: related to "amphibian," for obvious reasons…
Domicissa: related to "domicile," French for home, staying at home all the time
Ducisissa: related to "dulcet," musical term for some likely euphonic tones

That they all end in "issa" is obviously a generic feminization that serves to show

the similarities between them, while each beginning of the name shows a

characteristic or personality trait that makes them different.

306

Emily J.

Presumably all the names of the women are instances of word play. The ones I can explain are the following:
Sposissa → derived from "spouse" → relates to the fact she has been divorced three times
Eglantissa → "Elegant" → because "she thinks only of clothes" (looking elegant)
Aphrodissa → "Aphrodite" → Goddess of love, beauty
Lucrissa → "Lucrative" → money-making
Lamentissa → "Lament" → "engaged in a game of ain't-it-awful"
Travailissa → "Travail" (French "work") → "Who usually only works"
Amicissa → "amici" (friend) → because she is a "Good Sport"
Amphibissa → perhaps the "obvious reasons" includes the fact that she looks like (or is) a frog?
Dulcisissa → "dulce" (sweet) → has a kind personality

Jannah H.

The women's names all end in –issa, a feminine ending with an old-fashioned feel too it, deriving from feminine names in Latin. The suggestion is of 1) old-fashioned concepts of women's roles and femininity; 2) a stifling uniformity implying that they all conform to the same social conventions. The names are derived from common nouns in Latin, much as characters in Restoration comedy or Dickensian fiction are named with English common nouns or adjectives describing their personalities.
Sposissa (spouse) – keeps getting divorced and remarried
Eglantissa (eglantine=a type of rose, maybe also referencing the Prioress Madame Eglantine from the Canterbury Tales) – only cares about fashion
Aphrodissa (Aphrodite) – too much makeup
Clarissa (clear) – suicidal… as though that will "clear" her problems away
Lucrissa (lucre) – all about making money
Lamentissa (lament) – a complainer
Travailissa (from French travaille) – a worker
Saccharissa (saccharum=sugar) – a flirt
Amicissa (amica=friend) – tries to be agreeable
Ludicrissa (ludicrous) – ridiculed by the others for being too plain, as though her being at their party would be thought ludicrous
Amphibissa (amphibia) – maybe her looks are being compared to a toad
Domicissa (home) – stays at home, therefore has no public speaking role
Dulcisissa (dulcis=sweet) – tries to be pleasant

<u>Jim H.</u>

All the women's names are word play which illuminate their personalities (or at
least their external, seemingly oppressed personalities). I.e.
Spossisa – Not quite sure – Spouse-issa?
Eglantissa – Elegance-obsessed.
Aphrodissa – (absurd) caricature of one who seeks erotic attention
Lucrissa – "lucrative' woman who only cares about money, judging by her
strained-ness.
Lamentissa – Lamenting one
Travailissa – My knowledge of English fails me here, not sure on what Travail
means, but sounds like she only works.
Saccharissa is probably a sweet woman (saccharin), but I don't know what His
Little Girl is. (I'd assume she's another caricature, probably overly sweet with
whoever the host is)
Amicissa the Good Sport is amicable.
Ludicrissa – Ludicrous – Either she is ludicrous some negative manner (like
most of these unfortunate women) or she is a rebel and therefore not invited to
the party.
Amphibissa – Amphibious, snake-like? Probably likes to get involved with
others' lovers?
Domicissa – Home-obsessed, repressed, doesn't talk.
Dulcissa – Sweet one, uber friendly.

<u>Joffre R.</u>

the names of course. Spossisa, presumably from spouse. Eglantisa, presumably
from elegant, as eglantine doesn't seem to make as much sense. Aphrodissa
from Aphrodite. Lucrissa from lucre. Interesting that Clarissa, presumably
from clare, clear will commit suicide. One wouldn't think twice about that name
without the others. Lamentissa from lament. Travailissa from travail. I am not
sure about Saccharissa. It's from saccharine, I suppose, but I'm not sure why.
Amicissa from amicable. Ludicrissa from ludicris, I suppose. Amphibissa...
because   she   looks   amphibian?   I'm   not   sure   about
domicissa. domestic? dominated? Dulcisissa... soft or sweet, I guess.

<u>Lindsay G.</u>

I suppose the proper names used are a form of word play.

Aphrodissa, Amphibissa, Dulcisissa

The root of all these names have underlying connotations (Aphrodite,
amphibian, dulce) which help define the character.

Lisa H.

Sposissa, Eglantissa, Aphrodissa etc…in short, all the names. They are made up

of a Latinate root plus the suffix "issa". The root describes the character trait that

points to the woman's personality or defining features or behaviour. They seem

to be caricatures of both male and female traits (exaggerated).

Lucy N.

Eglantissa: something to do with roses..
Aphrodissa: aphrodisiac.. love, romance, sex..
Lamentissa: lament... sadness, melodramatic
Travailissa: le travail: French for work.
Saccharissa: saccharine: sickly sweet, sentimental
Amicissa: from Latin for friend..
Ludicrissa: ludicrous, laughable, would be out of place in this situation.
Amphibissa: amphibious... land/water.. is she bisexual? Haha I don't know..
Domicissa: domestic.. housewife.. submissive and quiet.
Dulcisissa: sweet

Melanie A.

"Too many to mention, but from what I can tell, each female name stems from a

latin word which describes her personality. For example, Travailissa who works

too much, and Lucrissa whose job is quite lucrative."

Nicole P.

"All of the names of the characters refer to some aspect of their personality or

associations. Ex: Sposissa – spouse, she's been a spouse many times. Ex2:

Dulcissa – dulce refers to sweet, she seems to be a caring individual."

"Saccharissa is a sweet young thang, travaillisia travails or works a lot,

Lucrissa's job is lucrative, Eglantissa is elegant, Aphrodissa is such a hottie,

Lamentissa laments, What's Amhibissa's deal? Dulcisissa is so sweet."

Rachel C.

"The word play is the addition of "issa" to the names. The names also tend to

lend description to the characters. For example, Eglantissa looks very similar to

Elegant-issa and she is obsessed with clothes."

Rizwan H.

"All the names seem to be instances of word play, with each name suggesting an

attribute or defining characteristic of that person."

Stephanie H.

Many of the names relate to the attributes of the character as described by the narrator.
Sposissa, has many spouses
Aphrodissa, seems to be under the influence of an approdisiac
Lamentissa is lamenting
Travailissa, who "travails" at her work
Saccharissa – who is artificially sweet
Amicissa, is amicable
Amphibissa maybe can't leave the water
Domicissa seems more comfortable at home

Sterling T.

Most of the names suggest the qualities described:
Sposissa - spouse
Eglantissa - elegant
Aphrodissa - sensual, seductive, Aphrodite, aphrodisiac
Clarissa - I'm not sure - word suggests "clarity" - Clarissa in Richardson's

famous novel dies, but I don't think she commits suicide
　Lucrissa - lucre, money
　Lamentissa - lament, of course
　Travailissa - travail, work
　Saccharissa - saccharine, sweet , sugary (why naughty? why forty-five?
older?)
　Amicissa - amicable, friendly
　Ludicrissa - ludicrous (?) laughable because plain? - that seems harsh
　Amphibissa - amphibian (?) - frog-like (?) too ugly to attend(?)
　Domicissa - domicile, homebody
　Dulcisissa - dulcet, sweet , dolce

Steven D.

Yes. All of the women's names (presumably the narrator's nicknames for them)
are emblematic.
Sposissa - espoused
Eglantissa - elegant
Aphrodissa - sexual (from Aphrodite)
Clarissa - not sure how "clear" relates to suicide unless it implies that the society
is so bleak that the one who sees it most clearly is consequently in despair
Lucrissa - with money (lucre)
Lamentissa - mourning
Travailissa - working
Saccharissa - false sweetness
Amicissa - friendly
Ludicrissa - invoking ridicule
Amphibissa - drinks too much
Domicissa - domestic
Dulcisissa – sweet

Susan A.

"The names of all the women in this text fragment (Travaillissa, Lamentissa,

Dulcisissa, etc.) are indicative of their personalities."

Marie T.

All their names end in –issa and the first part says something about their

personality? Travail = work, lament = complaining, sacch = having to do with

sugar, ami = friend, ludic = ludicrist?, amphi = between, domi = domesticated,

domicile?

<u>Tia C.</u>

All of the female names end in "issa." Also the first parts of the names seem to be telling of the type of character each person is.

Aphrodissa = Aphrodisiac, sexually attractive, into her beauty and pleasing men (false eyelashes)
Amphibissa = Amphibian – can go in and out of water
Dulcissa – sweet and mild
Domicissa = obeys her man
Ludicissa = humorous, funny
Travail – work
Lament – sorrow and grief
Sacchrine – artificially sweet

<u>Tina J.</u>

This could refer to the names of the characters which give characterizations as

well as Names.

How related are these instances of word play to the plot synopsis of the novel? Strongly

related, unrelated or slightly related?

Strongly related 16, slightly related 8, unrelated 2, and cannot guess 3.

Please explain.

5 source readers think that the charactonyms that stereotypically represent women in

our present day society cannot be compatible with the feminist perspectives of the

narrator Joanna:

Imcompability of the Charactonyms with the Feminist Narrator's Perspectives

Andre C.

"These word plays do not convey the existence or non-existence of a female-dominated society. They merely demonstrate the standardization of female names. This could be the case in a male-dominated society."

Sterling T.

"Joanna is apparently mocking the women present by naming them with their traits. At least, I assume that's what she's doing. I don't know what that has to do with a visitor from a female-dominated future society. Such catty characterizations do not seem particularly "feminist" to me."

Lucy N.

"The feminist narrator is putting all the women into boxes signified by their names.."

Emily J.

This excerpt does not demonstrate the overt female dominance in society; there are a few mentions of how some of the women make more money than their husbands, but this (at least from today's perspective) does not indicate an entirely female-dominant society. The fact that there are only women at the party doesn't indicate female dominance either, just simply segregation. Furthermore, nothing that the narrator says is particularly "feminist," and finally, the names of the women being indicative of their personalities is mysterious—it is unclear if the women were given these as nicknames once they had formed their place in society, or if they were given names and then grew to become those personages (indicating that an exterior authority influenced their social development and thus dominated them in some form). Perhaps with more context, the excerpt would more strongly reflect the synopsis.

Desmond F.

> The narrator is a feminist while the alien is a female-supremacist. The alien is critical of Earth; the narrator is defending Earth. Yet in this passage, and with the word play, it appears that the narrator is being very critical of the women at the party. This is a contradiction. The implication is that perhaps the views of the feminist are changing as they travel from Earth to Whileaway and back. Perhaps the female-dominated society is not so convincing to the feminist. Or perhaps she is just as critical of Earth as the alien is. My own idea that somehow the feminist human would defend Earth`s women, if not Earth`s society, is probably influencing this analysis. It may be totally consistent with the characters in the novel that this criticism through word play is occurring. I just do not think it would be consistent with feminist theory.

Most of the source readers (15 readers) were able to grasp the narrator's critical perspective of our present day society, enhanced by the use of charactonyms.

The Narrator's Critical Perspective of the Present Day Society

Alternative

> The author uses linguistic roots to suggest these women are meant to be the way they behave as a matter of fate, subscribing to the Aristotilian notion that 'things are what they are named.' She describes weaknesses in character from the feminist's perspective and develops names to clearly associate the character flaw with the individual. It lacks subtlety, but is effective. One doesn't need to be a linguistics major to understand the purpose.

Bradley L.

> "The fact that the names of each of the characters refers to that person's defining
>
> characteristic is an implicit criticism of contemporary society. It suggests that
>
> these women are one-dimensional and that women in general, in the author's
>
> opinion, allow themselves to be defined by several negative characteristics."

Carol B.

> This novel is a critique of what life looks like on Earth, in the 1970s, when women were beginning to espouse new gender roles (the moneymaker, etc) as well as holding on to old ones (the homemaker, the mistress etc). The text shows

how women tend to fill one of these roles only and are easily categorised as such. The irony here is that women pigeonhole themselves and each other in these various roles, which happens in both layers of the story since the extra-terrestrial narrator is also female. Presumably, the narrator will then compare this to a world where women can be many things at once.

Christel K.

"This is probably a succinct way to indicate the essential qualities of each

character, a type of shorthand to help the reader remember their characteristics."

Jim H.

Sounds like the novel is probably critical of the repression which women often experience in societies dominated by stupid, brash, and asshole males. These names are rather telling as they come off rather satirically, in the context of the potential criticism which would emanate from Janet. (Sounds like fantastic material with which she could criticize this pretty polarized society. These women sound pretty poorly-off; emotionally, mentally, and spiritually speaking.)

Melanie A.

"If the names give the reader insight into the type of character, it would

contribute quite a bit to the ambiance of the novel."

Nicole P.

"The synopsis details how each of the women in the novel is thought of by the

main character, Joanna. By including this word play on their names, it confirms

her perceptions of the other characters she is meeting."

Rachel C.

"Well, all of the women's names end in "issa" as I said before and the narrator is

telling us exactly how much she knows of each woman."

Rizwan H.

"Strongly related, but only in the sense that these are Joanna's observations of the women, and the observations correspond with what is suggested by their names."

Tia C.

"They show that women are labelled for their characteristics…that each women has an expected role to fill."

Joffre R.

"It seems that Joanna is telling Janet that these people are types that you can meet at any party."

Lindsay G.

"They allow the reader to better imagine and understand the character. They provide a means of character development."

Steven D.

"Playfully giving the women stereotypical natures, constitutes, in itself, a statement on gender roles.

Andrew C.

"Well the whole novel probably relies on such word plays (like the girls' names) to prove its points and metaphors and all that. She uses a first person narrative (as far as I've seen) and relies on the reader to 'read between the lines' to get anything out of the story that's more than a first person narrative. I think."

Philip M.

> "The narrator shows how women in our society can be so catty and are always
>
> sizing each other up, giving each other snotty nicknames. Case in Point."

Some source readers (6 readers) found the perspectives in this text fragment difficult to

analyse and stated that they need more contextual information to comment on it:

The Readers who need More Contextual Information

Susan A.

> "Not knowing what the plot is, it is hard to say exactly how the characters'
>
> names are related to it; however, they seem to indicate that the story has the
>
> quality of a myth or fairy tale."

Tina J.

> Not read the book.

Anna B.

> The synopsis is too short and does not provide enough detail to give the reader
> the main idea of the book. It seems the synopsis is incomplete and also unclear. I
> am not sure whether the book is about the present society viewed through the
> ideas of the character from Whileaway or vice versa, about the futuristic society
> Whileaway viewed by a character from the present society.

Christine Y.

> "The names are no doubt significant, but it's not clear from the fragment—eg.
>
> why do all the names end with -issa? Why do certain names have French roots
>
> (Travailissa)? Will the actions of each character match her name? Or are these
>
> nicknames given to the women by Johanna? It's not obvious to me."

<u>Jannah H.</u>

"It's hard to say because I haven't read more than the beginning of this novel so far. The plot synopsis given here doesn't provide enough information to relate the character names to the plot. Unless this is how 20th-century social life with its unfeminist conventions looks to a time traveler from the future where such social conventions are obsolete?"

<u>Lisa Hannaford</u> "This one is less obvious."

APPENDIX II

Biographical Information on the Editors and Translators

Tuncay Birkan

He graduated from Boğaziçi University's Department of English language and literature in 1991. After having worked as an editor at Ayrıntı publishing house between 1992-1996, he worked exclusively as a translator for a long time. Birkan who has been working as an editor at Metis since the early 2004, has translated around forty, and edited hundreds of books in social sciences and humanities. He also has written some articles that were published in journals such as *Birikim* ve *Toplum* and *Bilim*. Tuncay Birkan is one of the founders, and the current chairman of Literary Translators Society's (ÇEVBİR) executive board.

Sevinç Altınçekiç

She was born in İstanbul in 1964. She received her primary and secondary school education in Germany. After she graduated from İstanbul University's Department of English language and literature in 1987, she engaged in translation and has translated books and articles of a wide variety of genres. The following is the list of her translations:

A Selection of Her Translations

Postmodernizm ve Sol (2007), Noam Chomsky, Michael Albert, Edward S. Herman, Bgst Yayınları.

Cinsellik ve Sınıf Mücadelesi (2006). Reimut Reiche. Gri Tasarım. November 2006.

Irak Dünya Mahkemesi Nihai İstanbul Oturumu 23-27 June 2005, Metis Yayınları, June 2006.

Büyük İskender'in Ayak İzlerinde Yunanistan'dan Asya'ya Yolculuk, Michael Wood, *Us Yayıncılık, April 2006.*

Ölmeden Önce Görmeniz Gereken Unutulmaz Yerler, Steve Davey, Marc Schlossman*, Us Yayıncılık, November 2005.*

Ölmeden Önce Yapılması Gereken Unutulmaz Şeyler, Steve Watkins, Clare Jones, Us Yayıncılık, November 2005.

Binbir Kitap: Mahmood Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim (2005)* (of the English original)

Umar Yayıncılık: *Büyük İskender, In the Footsteps of Alexander The Great, Michael Wood (2005)* (of the English original).

National Geographic: Fransa Gezi Rehberi, France Touristic Guide, Doğuş İletişim A.Ş. (2000) (of the English original)

Bassam Tibi, *Boğaz'ın İki Yakası, Aufbruch am Bosphorus (2000)* (of the German original) *Doğan Kitapçılık*

Şerif Yenen, *Anadolu Destanı, The Turkish Odyssey* (of the English original), co-translated with Özcan Kabakçıoğlu.

Arthur Koestler, *Mizah Yaratma Eylemi (1997)* (of the English original) (İris Yayıncılık), co-translated with Özcan Kabakçıoğlu.

Margaret Atwood, *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü, A Handmaid's Tale (1992)* (of the English original), *Afa Yayınları*, co-translated with Özcan Kabakçıoğlu.

Kuram Magazine: *Member of Board of Publishing (Some Examples)*

A. Clancier – G.E. Clancier, *Yazar ile Çözümleyici Arasında Bir Viyana Söyleşisi: Yazının İşlevleri*, (of the English original).

Bruno Bettelheim, *Masal – Mit, İyimserlik – Kötümserlik, Fairy Tale Versus Myth, Optimism Versus Pessimism* (of the English original).

Anthony Storr, *Kişilik Bütünlüğü, The Integrity of the Personality* (of the English original).

Klaus Peter Müller, *Çeviride Ekin Aktarımı, Modern ve Postmodern Seçenekler, Transferring Culture in Translations, Modern and Postmodern Options* (of the English original).

Ursula K. Le Guin, *Anlatı Üzerine Bir Kaç Düşünce* (of the English original).

Özcan Kabakçıoğlu

He's born in Balıkesir in 1964. He's graduated from the Department Of English Language and Literature in 1986. During his undergraduate studies, he started a theatre company with the support of Akşit Göktürk. This company has then expanded and functioned as a theatre club within the Department of Arts. Özcan Kabakçıoğlu has then elected in the editorial board of the magazine Kuram, which was published by Yurdanur Salman. Kabakcioglu worked as a translator and chief editor for this magazine for five years. The following is a selection of his translations: Margaret Atwood'dan *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü* (Sevinç Kabakçıoğlu ile, 1992); Arthur Koestler's Mizah Yaratma Eylemi (with Sevinç Kabakçıoğlu 1997); Şerif Yenen's *Anadolu Destanı* (with Sevinç Kabakçıoğlu, 1998); Klasik Cinayet Hikayeleri (2000); National Geographic: Gezi Rehberi (2000).

Çiçek Öztek

Çiçek Öztek is an electrical engineer. She worked 3 years at Ayrıntı Publishing House (between 2001-2004), and was responsible of all non-fiction books, "Ağır Kitaplar", "Lacivert Kitaplar", "Sanat ve Kuram" series and books in Spanish. She has edited 10 books and translated one book for Ayrıntı. Çiçek Öztek has also a two year freelance editor experience with Is Kultur and Dost publishing houses. So far, Çiçek Öztek has worked as a translator for Metis, Ayrıntı, İletişim and Dost publishing houses and for UNICEF. Öztek has been currently translating articles for various magazines such as Newsweek, İstanbul Biennal and İstanbul Modern.

Publications

Translated the following books:

Tanık: Bir Arayışın Hikayesi (Witness: Story of a Search) (2006), Yapı Kredi Publishing House.

Bakhtin, M.M. (2003) *Rabelais ve Dünyası* (Rabelais and His World), Ayrıntı Publishing House.

Ritter, S. (2002). *Irak'a Savaş: Bush Yönetiminin Bilmenizi İstemediği Gerçekler* (War on Iraq), Metis Publishing House.

Russ, J. (1999). *Dişi Adam* (The Female Man), Ayrıntı Publishing House.

Chesterton, G.K. (1998) *Apollon'un Gözü* (The Eye of Apollon), Dost Publishing House.

Lem, S. (1998) *Küvette Bulunan Günce* (Diary Found in a Bathtub), İletişim Publishing House.

Sokak Çocukları (1998) (Street Children: A Project Guide), UNICEF.

Currently working on the following books:

Lieske, T. *Dünya,* Alef.

Updike, J. *Tavşan Yeniden* (Rabbit Redux), Alef.

Goytisolo, J. *Yalnız Kuşun Erdemlri* (Las virtudes del pajaro solitario*), Alef.*

Benedetti, M. *Bir Köşesi Kırık İlkbahar* (Primavera con una esquina rota), Alef.

Born, N. *Die Falschung* (Sahtekârlık), Alef.

Maron, M *Hüzünlü Hayvan* (Animal Triste), Alef.

Thompson, D. *Ayurvedik Kuşak Diyeti* (Ayurvedic Zone Diet), Paloma.

Fries, J. *Çocuğunuza İyi Bakın* (Taking Care of Your Child), Paloma.

Çağdaş Feministlerle Sanat Söyleşileri (Interviews with Contemporary Feminists on Art)

Amargi Publishing.

Füsun Tülek

Füsun Tülek is a marine archaeologist from the University of Kocaeli. She is the writer of:

Efsuncu Orpheus (1998). İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat.

The following are the references of the two literary books, which have been translated by Füsun Tülek:

Zamyatin, Y. (1988), *Biz*, İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Piercy, M. (1992), *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

APPENDIX III

Interviews with The Editor and Translators

Tuncay Birkan

> Öncelikle editörlük deneyiminizden, nasıl editör olmaya karar verdiğinizden başlayabilir
> miyiz?

1990 yıllarında başladım. Aslında çok ciddi bir kararla olmadı, genelde rastlantıyla oluyor bu işler. Çeviri yapıyordum ve o sıralar bu işi becerebileceğimi gösteren birkaç tiyatro eseri çevirmiştim. Aynı zamanda, Eagleton ve Jameson hakkında bir tez yazıyordum. Ayrıntı yayınlarından, çevirisi çok kötü olan, kimsenin düzeltmek istemediği, *Edebiyat Kuramı* diye bir eser geldi elime. Onu yaptıktan sonra da yayınevinden teklif aldım. Zaten ben normal bir iş yerine girip çalışmak istemiyordum, kültür ve kitaplarla ilgili bir iş yapmak istiyordum. Kapitalist düzenin hüküm sürmediği bir alana girmek istiyordum ki onun da doğru olmadığını zamanla gördüm. Ayrıntı yayınlarında başladım. 92-94 yılları arasında bayağı bir kitabın seçimini ve redaksiyonunu ben yaptım. Hem kuramsal hem edebiyat kitapları seçtim. Daha sonra, 96 yılında, bir daha asla bu işe geri dönmeyeceğim diyerek, neredeyse yeminler ederek Ayvalık'a kaçtım. Ve sadece çeviri yaptım 96-2004 yılında. Kaçışımın nedeni, çok kötü çevirileri yeniden yapmam zorunda olmamdı. Döndüğümde sen yapmazsın falan dediler ama yine girdik bir şekilde. Kaçınılmaz olarak redaksiyon yapıyorsunuz ama gerçek editörlük olduğunu düşündüğüm şeyler yaptım.

> Gelelim benim incelediğim, Marge Piercy'nin, Türkçeye *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*

başlığıyla çevrilen eserine. Bu kitabı edite etmeye nasıl karar verdiniz?

Karar vermedim, öyle bir iş vardı, elime geldi. Benden önce yapılmış bir seçimdi. Normal, rutin bir işti.

Ne kadar süre aldı edisyon süreciniz?

Hiç hatırlamıyorum ama epey bir süre aldı. Üzerinden 17 sene geçti o arada, 160 kitabın redaksiyonunu yaptım. O yüzden, hatırlamamamın doğal karşılanacağını umuyorum.

Bu kitabın edisyon sürecinde başka kitaplar üzerinde de çalıştınız mı?

Genelde orada bir kitap oluyor, o kitap bitince öbürüne geçiliyordu.

Bu kitap ilk edite ettiğiniz kitaplardan biri miydi?

Evet. İlk olmasa da ikinci ya da üçüncü diyebilirim.

Peki, daha önce benzer türde kitaplar edite etmiş miydiniz? Öncelikle bu kitabın türünü nasıl tanımlarsınız?

Ben feminist bir ütopya diye düşünmüştüm o zamanlar. Tam feminist ütopya denilebilecek türde bir kitabın redaksiyonunu çok ta yaptığım da söylenemez aslında ama epey edebiyat kitabı redaksiyonu yaptım. Benim eşim, Aslı Biçen edebiyat çevirmeni. Onun çevirdiği epey bir kitabın redaksiyonunu yapmıştım. Ben de aslında edebiyat ta çevirmek istiyordum ama onun benden daha iyi yaptığını düşünerek edebiyat alanını ona bırakıp kendim sosyal bilim çevirilerine yöneldim ama ondan edindiğim epey bir tecrübe vardır ama.

Çevirmeninizin çevirisine ne kadar müdahale ettiğinizi öğrenmek istiyorum.

Ona dair konuşmanın çok anlamlı olduğunu düşünmüyorum, hatırlamıyorum. Ancak müdahale

ettiğimde, daha çok söz dizimine müdahale ederim. Özellikle çevirmenlerin Türkçe söz dizimini kurmak konusunda zaafları var. Bir yanlış anlama, İngilizce deyimlerin kullanımını anlamama, düz anlamlarıyla çevirme gibi sorunlar oluyor. İkincisi de söz dizimsel sorunlar çok oluyor.

İncelediğim kitaba baktığımda, yazdığınız bir önsöz var ve bu önsözde yeniden yaratılan bazı sözcüklerden ve bu sözcüklere önerilen karşılıklardan bahsediyorsunuz. Bir de, "Bir kusurumuz varsa affola" seklinde bitiriyorsunuz bu önsözü. Neden böyle bir önsöz yazma gereği duydunuz?

Kitabın çok garip karşılanacağını düşündüm. Tam da demin anlattığım şeyle ilintili. Ben kitapların Türkçe duygusuna çok önem veririm ama bazı kitaplar zaten kendi dilleriyle oynarlar. İnsanların bunun bir beceriksizlik değil de, doğrudan doğruya yazarın tercihinin Türkçede bir muadilinin yaratılmaya çalışıldığını anlamalarını istedim. O yüzden, yazdım bu önsözü. Yani yazar, İngilizcede de garip karşılanacak şeyler, epey terimler, kavramlar ürettiği için, ben ve çevirmen de, Türkçede benzer, uyduruk şeyler yaratmak istedik.

O halde, çevirmenle işbirliği içinde çalıştınız.

İşbirliği derken, ben çevirmenle işbirliği yapmanın yararlarını çok sonraları öğrendim. Yani, çeviri yayınevine gelir, edite edilir, sonra da basılırdı. Bunun ne kadar yanlış bir şey olduğunu yıllar geçtikçe öğrendim. Çevirmenleri çağırıp ne yaptığımı görür olmalarını ister hale geldim. Ama bu arkadaşı tanımıyorum. Orada etkileşimli bir çalışma olduğu söylenemez. Ama sonraki yıllarda, ben bildiğiniz gibi ÇEVBİR'i de ilk kuran insanlardan olduğum için, bunun ne kadar önemli olduğunu anladık ve uyguladık ta.

Peki, herhangi bir araştırmanız oldu mu edite edeceğiniz kitapla ilgili?

Neler yazmış, nasıl bir yazar falan diye oldu ama öyle çok kapsamlı bir araştırma yapmadım.

Sizce, bu romanın en belirgin özelliği, "çeviriye de mutlaka yansımalı" diye düşündüğünüz özelliği ne idi? Dilin yabancılığı mı dünyanın yabancılığı mı aktarmaktı sizin için esas olan?

Dünyanın yabancılığı bu tür romanlarda kaçınılmaz bir şey de. Dilsel olarak yabancı olduğunu da yazdığım önsözle vurgulamak istedim. Bazı insanlar kendi Türkçe cümle kurma yeteneksizliklerini, ben burada yazarın bilmem nesini vermeye çalıştım diye yansıtmaya çalışıyorlar. Ben aksine, bire bir asla olmadan, cümlelerin Türkçede nasıl söylenmesi gerekiyorsa öyle söylenmesi gerektiğini, ancak ondan sonra, diğer yabancılaştırıcı öğelerin anlamlı olacağını düşünüyorum. Çevrilen yapıtın akıcılığı da benim için önemli. Ancak bunu sağladıktan sonra oradaki yabancılığı verebilirsiniz. Yoksa bire bir çevirmeye çalıştım falan demek, o zaten mazeret.

Peki, çevrilemez, ya da "çevrilse bile okura yeterince anlam ifade etmez" diye düşündüğünüz dilsel oyunlarla karşılaştınız mı?

Sanırım vardı ama hatırlamıyorum doğrusunu söylemek gerekirse.

Peki, bu kitabı yeniden ele alacak olsanız, yapmak istediğiniz başka değişiklikler olur mu?

Eminim olur. Daha önce edisyonunu yaptığım *Edebiyat Kuramı* başlıklı eserin ikinci baskısını yaptığı sırada o kadar değişiklik yaptım ki yani o kitabın çevirmeni haline geldim. Bunda da o boyutta olmasa da yine yapacağım değişiklikler olur.

Peki, edite ettiğiniz romanın yeterince ilgi gördüğünü düşünüyor musunuz?

O zamanlar bir iki yazı çıkmıştı ama Türkiye'de bu kadar ilgi beklememek gerektiğini düşünüyorum.

Bir iki yazı çıkmıştı ama çevirisiyle ilgili değil sanırım.

Hemen hemen hiçbir kitabın çevirisiyle ilgili yazı çıkmaz. Orada bir beklentiye girmenin bir manası olmadığını düşünüyorum.

Peki, yeterince ilgi görmemesini neye bağlıyorsunuz? Türk okurunun bu türe olan ilgisizliğinden kaynaklanabilir mi?

Tabii biraz ilgi meselesi de var. Gerçi sonradan ütopyaya ilişkin özel bir ilgi oluştu ama bu kitabın da ütopya içerdiği gözlerden kaçtı galiba. Bir iki yerde konuşulduğunu hatırlıyorum. Biz Ayrıntı'da ütopya da yayımlamıştık. Onlar da belli ölçülerde ilgi gördü ama bu kitabın kurgusal olması nedeniyle ütopik yönü gözden kaçtı. Türkiye'de maalesef böyle bir ayrışma olduğunu düşünüyorum. Edebiyat okurları, çok ütopya ve siyasetle ilgili değil. Siyaset ve sosyal bilim okurları neredeyse hiç edebiyat okumuyor. Bunun da, böylesi kitapların alımlanmasında etkili olduğunu düşünüyorum.

İlginç bir nokta gerçekten de. Onun dışında, yıllar önce çevirdiğiniz bu kitap sizde nasıl bir iz/izlenim bıraktı?

Hoş bir kitaptı. Okunmasında fayda var diye düşünüyorum.

Hoş bir kitap dediniz, severek mi cevirdiniz?

Severek çevirdim. Bu işler genelde iş olarak geliyor insanın önüne. Her zaman her şeyi aynı sevgi ve heyecanla yapamıyorsunuz ama bunu epey sevmiştim, onu hatırlıyorum.

Peki, genel stratejinizi tekrar özetlemenizi istesem. Sözcük oyunlarının çevirisi ve

yabancılaştırıcı etkisi üzerinde durdunuz.

Evet, sözcük oyunlarının o yabancılığını çevirebilmek için akıcılığı sağlamak, kullanılan dili Türkçeye yaklaştırmak gerekiyor. Edebiyat zaten ne kadar yaklaştırırsa o kadar iyi. Dünyanın yabancılığını, dilsel düzlemde okuru yadırgatmayarak, okuru yadırgatmayı tam da yadırganması gereken yerlerde yaparak sağlamalı.

Sevinç Altınçekiç

Çevirmenlik mesleğine nasıl başladınız ve şimdiye kadar ne tür eserler çevirdiniz?

Ben İngiliz filolojisi mezunuyum. İlk çevirimi on beş yaşında yaptım. Ben o zaman Almanya'da yaşıyordum. Türk romanları okuyordum. Bir dört beş sayfa Kerime Nadir çevirim vardır benim. Almancaya, Almanlar okusun diye çevirdiğim. Hangi kitap olduğunu hatırlamıyorum ama deneme amaçlı. İlk çeviri denemem odur. Ondan sonra filolojiyi bitirdikten sonra, çeviri yapma ihtiyacı kendiliğinden gelişti, okuduğum bir şeyi paylaşma ihtiyacı seklinde, böyle bir duyguyla yola çıktım.

Genel çeviri stratejinizden bahseder misiniz?

Tabii ben roman da çevirdim, az sayıda da olsa. Atwood'un kitabı ilk çevirdiğim roman. Ondan sonra da romana çok uzun bir süre ara verdim. Şimdi yeni bir roman çeviriyorum. Daha çok sosyal bilim, tarih, gezi kitapları, Müslümanlıkla ilgili kitaplar cevirdim. Strateji olarak benim dikkat ettiğim, yazarın dilini verebilmek. Yazarın dili, bazen Türkçeyi zorlayabiliyor ama ben birazcık ta zorlaması gerektiğine inanıyorum. Çünkü yazarın da bir biçemi, bir stili var, onun yansıması lazım. Buna dikkat etmeye çalışıyorum. Tabii, anlam da önemli. Yabancı dilde okuduğunuz kitabın aynı hissi Türkçede de vermesi önemli. Pratik olarak söyle bir şey var. Ben hızlı çeviririm. Çok ta hızlı değil ama kitabı ben baştan sona okumam. Önceden okursam,

sıkılabilirim aynı şeyi bir kez daha anlatmaktan. O yüzden, çeviri yaparken, ben de sonunda ne olacağını bilmeden, heyecanla kitabı okumuş olurum. O yüzden de benim aslında ilk çevirim biraz taslak gibi olur ama üzerinden sonra çok geçerim, epey bir değişiklik yaparım.

Bu kitabı çevirmeye nasıl karar verdiniz?

Bu kitap bize geldi. Eski kocamla (Özcan Kabakçıoğlu) ile beraber çevirdim. Mezun olmuştuk, kitap bulup çevirelim istiyoruz. Cağaloğlu'ndaki yayıncıları dolaşmaya başladık. Afa'ya girdik, onlar da, "bir kitabımız var bir denemesini yapar mısınız?" dediler. Baktık hoşumuza gitti ama teklif onlardan geldi.

Ne kadar sürede çevirdiniz?

Bir iki sene sürdu. Benim çevirdiğim kitaplar öyledir, uzun sürer. Hızlı çeviriyorum diyorum ama yine de uzun sürer. Zaman lazım bana, çok sıkışmamam gerekiyor.

Ortak çeviri yaparken ne gibi bir iş bölümü içinde oldunuz?

Ortak çeviri yapmanın ekstra zorlukları değil, kolaylıkları oldu. Biz karı kocaydık o dönemde. Metni bölüştürdük, sonra da birbirimizin çevirisini okuduk, dilimizi birbirine uydurmaya çalıştık. Türkçe dil kullanımı daha iyi olduğu için, onun önerileri ağır basmıştır. Mesela kitabın başlığını o seçti. Cariye mi desek falan diye düşündük ama cariye deyince de direkt Osmanlılara gönderme yapmış oluyorsunuz. Kitapta kadınlar damızlık olarak kullanıldıkları için, kitabın özünü yansıtacak bir başlık vermeye çalıştık. Biraz fazla açtık olayı ama öyle diyiverdik. Başta biraz karşı çıkmıştım ama tuttu, yayınevi de beğendi.

Aynı anda başka kitap çevirileri üzerinde de çalıştınız mı?

Yalnızca o kitap üzerinde çalıştık.

Bu kitap, çeviri serüveninizde, ilk çevirdiğiniz kitaplardan biri miydi?

Bu benim için de, Özcan Bey için de ilk kitaptı.

Editörünüz çevirinize ne kadar müdahale etti?

Hayır etmedi. O dönemde, editörlük kavramı diye bir şey yoktu zaten. Editörle çalışmamız söz konusu olmadı. Mesela orada müstehcen ifadeler var. Onları nasıl çevirelim, açık açık söyleyelim mi diye düşündük ama yumuşatmanın da anlamı yoktu çünkü kitapta öyle geçiyordu. Sonradan, biri görür de müstehcen kitap diye nitelendiriverir diye kaygılanmadık ta değil. Ama kitap olduğu gibi yayımlandı, ne editoryal bir müdahale oldu ne de başka eleştiri gelmedi.

Romanı çeviri sürecinde karşılaştığınız zorluklar oldu mu? Buna karşılık, ne gibi çözüm önerileri getirdiniz?

İşte bahsettiğim müstehcenlik olayı, kitabın başlığı. Onun dışında aslında pek fazla bir şeyde hatırlamıyorum.

Sizce, çevirdiğiniz romanın en belirgin özelliği ne idi?

İlk yaptığım çeviri olması, onu zaten başlı başına özel kılıyor. Bu kitapta, başka bir şey var. Buket Uzuner Atwood'un çok büyük bir hayranıydı. Bizim kitabı çevirdiğimizi öğrendi ve bizlerle temasa geçti. Bu kitapla ilgili olarak *Cumhuriyet Kitap*'ta eleştiri yazdı. Bu yazının çeviriyle ilgisi yoktu ama çeviri nedeniyle ortaya çıktığı için, benim için de özel. Mesela o zamanlar BRT diye belediyenin bir televizyonu vardı, orada benim bir programa katılmamı sağladı, kitap hakkında konuşmam için. Ertesi gün BRT kapandı ve o program hiç yayımlanmadı. Buket Uzuner ile iletişime geçirmiş oldu bu kitap bizi. Çok seviyorum onu. Bu nedenle özel, bu kitap.

Bu kitap, resmettiği distopik dünyayla pek çok tezde ele alindi. Sizce, nasıl bir dünyaydı orada resmedilen, distopik sayılabilecek bir dünya mıydı?

Oldukça karamsar bir dünya ele alınan. Ben o açıdan aslında oldukça etkilendim de. Bir kadının yaşayabilecekleri şeyler konu ediliyor. Yazar feminist olduğu için de, kadınların ne kadar hassas olduklarını gösteriyor. Tüm iktidar ilişkileri kadınlar üzerinden yürütülür. Burada da

aynı şekilde. O yüzden bence distopik tanımına uyuyor ama sonunda da bir umut ışığı var. Kitabın sonu açık, her şey olabilir. İsteyen istediği yöne çekebilir.

Çevireceğiniz kitap ve kitabın yazarıyla ilgili ön araştırma yaptınız mı?

O zaman öyle bir imkânımız yoktu. Araştırma yapıp yapmadık mı hatırlamıyorum ama kafamızda genel bir imge vardı ama onu nasıl elde ettik tam hatırlamıyorum şimdi.

Her şeyden önce bir okur olarak, çevirdiğiniz kitabı sevdiniz mi? Bu kitap, sizde ne gibi bir iz ya da izlenim bıraktı?

Ben sevdim. Özellikle kadınları da ilgilendirdiği için. Science fiction olan bu dünyanın gerçekte yaratılması da mümkün görünüyor. Çok kolay bir şekilde yaratılabilir böyle bir dünya. Bence eski eşim de sevmiştir çevirirken. Başlığını bulmaya çalışırken o kadar içine giriyorsunuz ki kitabın.

Romandaki dilsel oyunların çokluğu dikkatinizi çekti mi? Bu oyunları çevirirken, hangi noktalara önem verdiniz?

O zaman nasıl hissettiğimi hatırlamıyorum ama şimdi nasıl hissettiğimi anlatabilirim. Şu an sözcük oyunlarını çevirirken, Türkçede karşılığı varsa onu kullanmaya çalışıyorum ama çok ta yerel olmaması gerekiyor. Yani Amerikalı bir kadının yaşadığı şeyi Van'daki bir Türk kadını yaşamış gibi de veremem. Evrensellik varsa kullanırsınız ama anlamını vermeye çalışırım. Bazen de illa ki o şeyi vermeniz gerekiyor çünkü diğer şeylerle çok iç içe geçmiş oluyor. O zaman da Turkce'yi zorlamış oluyorsunuz ama o zorlamayı da artık kabul etmek gerek. Çünkü kullanılan sözcük oyunu Türkçede pek bir anlam ifade etmese de, yine de kullanılması gerekir.

Çevrilemez ya da çevrilse bile okura yeterince anlam ifade etmez diye düşündüğünüz dilsel oyunlarla karşılaştınız mı?

Yani orada kullanılan ifade sadece anlam açısından önemliyse anlamını veririm ama kullanılan

ifadenin arasında sözcükler de lazım oluyor. Onu da mümkün olduğunca açarak vermek gerekiyor.

Çeviride bazı dip notlar kullanmışsınız. Sizin fikriniz miydi?

Evet. Editör yoktu zaten.

Çevirmen olarak başlıca amacınız ne idi? (Örn. Okura akıcı bir metin sunmak sizin için ne kadar önemliydi?)

En önemli şey, akıcı bir metin sunmak. Roman sonuçta. Akıcı olmak zorunda. Yapacak başka hiçbir şey yok. Başarılı olduk mu, o kadarını bilmiyorum ama.

Sizce önemli olan, çevirdiğiniz romandaki dünyanın yabancılığı mı yoksa dilin yabancılığını mı okura aktarmaktı? Bu konuda bir tercihiniz oldu mu?

Dilsel şeyler açısından değil de, olay açısından. Aslında, çok ta yabancı gelmedi bana olay. Türk kadınının, her kadının yaşayabileceği şeyler. Handmaid'in içerdiği o cariye anlamına, Türk kadını olarak, hiç te yabancı değiliz zaten. Kadının damızlık olarak kullanılmasına da yabancı değiliz. Öyle çok yabancı bir dünya değil.

Ama kadının damızlık olarak kullanımı biraz daha yadırgatıcı değil mi?

Evet. O dünyada sadece kadınlar damızlık olarak kullanıldığı için. Zevk falan diye bir şey kalmamış zaten. Orada amaç soyunu sürdürmek olduğu için, o çok çok daha farklı tabii ama dediğim gibi, bizim çok ta yabancı olmadığımız bir olay. Ama oradaki yabancılık, öykünün Amerika'da geçiyor olması. Yani bu bir Arap ülkesinde geçebilirdi mesela, o zaman o kadar yadırgatıcı olmazdı. Dilin yabancılığını tam hatırlamıyorum ama sanırım o müstehcen kısımları çevirirken, dilin yabancılığını vermeye çalıştık.

Bu kitabın çevirisini yeniden ele alacak olsanız, ne gibi değişiklikler yaparsınız?

Herhalde olur diye tahmin ediyorum, on yedi yıl geçti üzerinden. Sanırım daha çok dilsel ifadelerde, böyle değil de şöyle yapayım şeklinde olur. Onun dışında, o önemli gördüğümüz

seçimlerin değişeceğini sanmıyorum.

Çevirdiğiniz romanın yeterince ilgi gördüğünü düşünüyor musunuz?

Tek baskıda kaldı.

Bu kitabın okurlarca yeterince ilgi görmemesini neye bağlıyorsunuz?

Bence o zaman o yeterince tanıtılmadı. Aslında şu dönemde, cesaret edilip te yeniden ele alınsa iyi olur. Margaret Atwood'un başka çevirileri de çıktı diğer yayınevlerinden. Onlar da öyle pek ilgi görmedi. 92'de yayımlanan bu kitap, asıl şimdi, günümüzde geçerli olabilecek bir kitap. Yani şu dönemde bunun tekrar yayımlanması gerekir. 92'de böyle bir dünyada yaşamıyorduk ama şimdi Türkiye'de mutlaka satılır bu kitap diye düşünüyorum. Yine de, yayıncılar bilir.

Çiçek Öztek

Çevirmenlik mesleğine nasıl başladınız ve şimdiye kadar ne tür eserler çevirdiniz?

Ben aslında mühendislik eğitimi aldım. Sonra İngiltere'ye gitmiştim orada mastır yapmak için. Fakat mühendislikten yavaş yavaş saparak başka okumalar yapmaya, çevirerek o metinleri çalışmaya ve İngilizce çalışmaya başladım İngiltere'de. İngilizce biliyordum bir şekilde, ODTÜ İngilizcesi, mühendis İngilizcesi. Orada sosyal bilim metinleri okudum. Mesela Baudrillard'in üç tane makalesini çevirdim. O metinleri çevirerek üzerlerinde çalıştım. Baudrillard'in Körfez Savaşı öncesi ve sonrası yazdığı üç makale. Onlar belki Türkiye'ye dönünce yayımlanır diye düşündüm ama illa yayımlansın diye de çevirmedim. Türkiye'ye dönünce sosyolojide mastır yapmaya başladım. O zaman bu benim için bir geçim kaynağı da olabilir, bir kitap çevirerek başlayayım diye düşündüm. Ticari çeviriler de yapıyordum ama bir tane kitap çevireyim dedim. 96-97 senesine denk geliyor sanırım. İlk çevirdiğim kitap Stanislav Lem'in *Küvette Bulunan Günce*'si. O kitabı aldım ve yayımlanması ayrı, büyük bir zevk oldu. O zamana kadar bir sürü çeviri yaptığım düşünülecek olursa. Daha sonra, Dost yayınevine *Apollon'un Gözü* diye bir

kitap çevirdim. 19 yy. İngiliz yazarı Chesterton'dan. *Dişi Adam* da üçüncü çevirdiğim kitap. O sırada sosyolojide mastır yaparken part-time İnsan Hakları Vakfı'nda da çalışmaya başlamıştım. Bu kitabı çevirmem için de tez hocam Necmi Erdoğan Ayrıntı yayınları ile aracı oldu. Aslında bu teklife hayır demem gerekirdi çünkü o dönemde hem tez yazıyordum hem de İnsan Hakları Vakfı'nda İngilizce bültenleri Türkçeye çeviriyordum. *Türk Romanı'nda Hizmetçiler ve Efendiler* başlıklı bir tez yazmıştım. Tezimde de Türkçe romanlardan bölümler kullanıyordum. İncelediğim on-on beş romanın pasajlarını İngilizceye çevirmem gerekiyordu. Çok aşırı bir yükleme oldu aslında. Bu kitabı da onların arasında, gece üçe dörde kadar oturup çevirdiğimi hatırlıyorum.

Aynı anda başka kitap çevirileri üzerinde de çalıştınız mı?

İkinci bir kitap yoktu ama aynı anda üç şeyle uğraşıyordum. Çevirimle, tezimle ve işimle. O yüzden o kitabın beni çok yorduğunu, çok fazla zaman aldığını falan hatırlıyorum.

Daha önce benzer türde kitaplar çevirdiniz mi?

Evet. İki tane edebiyat eseri çevirmiştim. Bu üçüncüsü. Bu kitabın diğer ikisinden farkı, içlerinde en çağdaş ve farklısı olmasıydı.

Ne kadar sürede çevirdiniz?

Bütün o sıkışıklığa rağmen sanırım dört beş ay içinde çevirmiştim.

Editörünüz çevirinize ne kadar müdahale etti?

Ondan hiç haberim olmadı doğrusu. Teslim ettim, ne zaman nasıl basılırsa basılsın gibi. Yapılan değişiklikleri göreyim gibi bir düşüncem olmadı. Çevirdiğim diğer iki kitapta da hemen hemen hiçbir değişiklik yapılmamıştı. *Küvette Bulunan Günce*'de mesela. O zaman, Osman Yener idi editör. Onunla mesela sadece bir kez telefonda konuşmuştuk. Görmen gereken bir değişiklik yok, yalnızca bir kaç yerde argo sayılabilecek, sert kelimeler kullanmışsın diyerek, onları değiştirdi. Türk okuru bunları kaldıramaz demişti. Onda yine o kadar argo yoktu *Dişi*

Adam'a göre. *Dişi Adam*'da çok argo var ve Türkiye'ye biraz yabancı bir argo.

Kitabın sizi en çok etkileyen yönü, o argo kısmı mıydı?

Bir nevi öyle. Orada bir dizi kadın var ve hepsi çok orijinal, renkli tipler. Hepsinin konuşması, dili farklı. Aslında biraz çevirmesi zor bir kitaptı. Argo kısmına gelince, öteki çevirdiğim kitapta öyle bir uyarı, müdahale alınca bunda da ne yapsam diye düşündüm ama *Dişi Adam* öyle bir kitaptı ki, tüm o kısımları bastan sonra, "Allah kahretsin" falan diye çevirsem kitabın tüm dilsel özelliği gidecekti. Ayrıca Ayrıntı biraz daha *underground* edebiyat falan yayınlıyor, böyle bir çekincesi olamaz diye düşündüm ve kendimi geri tutmadım. Bunları yumuşat deseler, bir daha üzerinden geçilir diye düşünmüştüm. Ama editörle tanışmadım açıkçası ve yayınladıktan sonra da bakmadım ne kadarı değişmiş diye.

Çevireceğiniz kitap ve kitabın yazarıyla ilgili ön araştırma yaptınız mı?

Yazarla ilgili hiçbir araştırma yapmadık. Bunu, daha sonraki çevirilerimde yaptım. Mesela Chesterton çevirirken, daha önceki çevirim olmasına rağmen, Chesterton'in zaten diğer bütün eserlerini okumuş, onunla ilgili okumalar yapmıştım ama bu kitapla ilgili öyle bir okuma yapmadım.

Çevireceğiniz kitabı baştan sona okur musunuz?

Ben baştan sonra okurum, sonra çevirmeye koyulurum. Çoğu kitapta böyle yaparım ama mesela Yapı Kredi Yayınları'ndan çıkan *Tanık* diye bir kitap cevirdim. O biyografi niteliğinde, tarihsel bir anlatıydı. Onu mesela doğrudan çevirmeye başladım. 550 sayfalık bir kitaptı. Ama edebiyat eserlerinde genel dile hâkim olabilmek için, yazarın ne söylemek isteğini bilebilmek için bir bütün olarak kitabı okumak gerekiyor.

Yaptığınız eserler sadece edebiyat yapıtlarıyla sınırlı değil anladığım kadarıyla.

Evet. Sonra non-fiction da çevirdim. Bir tane Bakhtin kitabı çevirdim mesela, Ayrıntı da çalışırken. Onun da tamamını okumamıştım mesela. *Rablais ve Dünyası*. O da kallavi bir eserdi,

genel olarak Bakthin'in ne söylediğini biliyordum. Tezimde de kullanmıştım.

> Her şeyden önce bir okur olarak, çevirdiğiniz kitabı sevdiniz mi? Bu kitap, sizde ne gibi bir iz ya da izlenim bıraktı?

Yani çok derin bir iz bırakmadı o kitap bende. Mesela şu an pek bir şey hatırlamıyorum ama çevirirken çok sıra dişi, biraz çılgın, uçuk kaçık bir yazar olduğunu düşündüm. Her ne kadar kadın edebiyatı sınıflandırması tanımına çok katılmasam da, böyle bir sınıflandırma olacaksa, bu kitabın o tanıma gireceğini düşünüyorum. Yani kadınlık durumundan çok söz ediliyordu. Lezbiyenlik falan vardı hatırladığım kadarıyla. Çok derin bir iz bırakmadı bende. Ben daha sonra Ayrıntı'da çalışmaya başladım. Ayrıntı'nın da en az satan kitaplarından biri oldu.

> Evet, o halde sırası gelmişken, bu kitabın yeterince ilgi görmemesini neye bağlıyorsunuz diye de sorayım.

İşte, kadın edebiyatı, feminizm denen şeyin ben hiç ilgi çekmediğini düşünüyorum. Türkiye'de bunun kitlesi yok. Mesela, kadınlar çok roman okuyorlar. Eski yüzyıllardan bu yana, romanın ilk çıkışından bu yana. En büyük okur kitlesi kadınlar aslında ama onlar da böyle kadın edebiyatı sayılabilecek bir şeyi okumuyorlar. Kendileri hakkında o gibi ifadeleri görmek istemiyorlar. Yani son iki yüz yılda en çok satanlara falan baksanız, "kadınlar okuyor, erkekler yazıyor" gibi bir durum var maalesef. Şiirde böyle, romanda böyle. Mesela çok güçlü kadın romancılar var ama onlar da kendilerini ben kadın edebiyatı yapıyorum diye koymuyorlar ortaya. Bu lezbiyen edebiyatı kategorisine oturtulabilir belki. Türkiye'de gay/lezbiyen edebiyatını belki birkaç yüz kişi takip ediyordur. Yani çok sinirli bir okur kitlesi. Bazı kadınlar kendilerini kadın edebiyatı yazarı olarak tanımlıyorlar ama mesela iki üç ay önce Almudena Grandes gelmişti buraya, onu herkes ısrarla kadın edebiyatı kategorisine koymak isterken, o ben öyle bir kategoriyi kabul etmiyorum, ben feminist değilim, ben roman yazıyorum sadece ve erkekler ile kadınları kapsayan genel edebiyat ailesi içinde anılmak istiyorum demişti.

Tekrar romana dönecek olursam, romandaki dilsel oyunların çokluğu dikkatinizi çekti mi? Bu oyunları çevirirken, hangi noktalara önem verdiniz?

Bazı şeyleri doğrudan çevirdiğimi, sonra da geri dönüp çok özgürce değiştirdiğimi hatırlıyorum. Çünkü onları öyle bıraksaydım Türk okuru hiçbir şey anlamayacaktı.

Mesela özel isimleri, çevirmeden olduğu gibi bırakmışsınız bu özel bir tercih miydi?

Bunları değiştirmeyi düşünmedim. Mesela ne olabilirdi. Her kitap kendi sistemiyle, sorunlarıyla geliyor. Mesela burada ne kadar müdahale edilecek, burada ne kadar serbest olunacak gibi bir dizi soru soruyorsunuz. Mesela isimlerin Türkçeleştirilmesi daha çok çocuk kitaplarında yapılıyor, büyükler için yazılmış olan kitaplarda yapılmıyor. Yazılı olmayan bir kural bu. Şu anda bu kitabı çevirsem özel isimleri yine bırakırım. Ona karşıyım yani. Bu kitabı çevirirken zorlandığım başka şeyler vardı. Kimi yerde parça, kesik kesik konuşma pasajları vardı. O konuşmaların İngilizcesini anlamak ta çok zordu. Cümle yapısı mesela çok farklıydı.

Postmodern denilebilir mi?

Denilebilir evet. Daha önce okuduğum kitaplara benzemeyen bir yönü vardı.

Bu kitabın çevirisini yeniden ele alacak olsanız, ne gibi değişiklikler yaparsınız?

Kesin yaparım. Ayrıntı'da editörken önüme gelse, yine yapardım. Şu an Google var mesela. Bu kadın Kanadalı değil mi?

Amerikalı.

Mesela bu kadın Amerika'nın Arizona eyaletinden çıktığın için o tarz bir argo kullanmış olabilir. Ama tabi ben bunları hiç farkında olmadan, elimde bir İngilizce-Türkçe Redhouse sözlüğü, bir İngilizce-İngilizce Webster ve bir iki tane ansiklopedi ile çeviri yaptım. Şu anda ben on, on beş sözlükle çalışıyorum. Hepsinden önemlisi Google'da yüzlerce blog okuyorum, iki üç kişinin sohbet ettiği forumlara giriyorum. Aradığım ifadeyi, sohbet odasındaki o iki gençten biri kullanmış oluyor mesela, ben de böylelikle o ifadenin neyi kastettiğini anlamış

oluyorum. Ben *Dişi Adam*'ı biraz literally çevirmiş olabilirim yani.

Özel isim çevirisi konusunda dipnot kullanmayı düşündünüz mü?

Simdi romanı dipnotlara boğmak tehlikeli. Dipnotları belli bir ölçüde tutabilirsin. Bunu uygulayacaksan tüm kitapta uygulaman gerekiyor ki o zamanda çok radikal bir şey yapmış oluyorsun. Bir yere koy, obur yere koyma olmaz. Her yeri dipnotlara boğmak ta olmaz. O zaman çevirmen çok görünür oluyor. Çevirmenin ben böyle yaptım demesi hiç bir önem taşımıyor. Okurun onu orada bir çevirmen olduğunu fark etmeden okuması daha önemli bence.

Peki, son olarak, sizce önemli olan, çevirdiğiniz romandaki dünyanın yabancılığı mı yoksa dilin yabancılığını mı okura aktarmaktı? Bu konuda bir tercihiniz oldu mu?

Bu dünyayı Türkiye'ye benzeteyim diye bir düşüncem olmadığını hatırlıyorum. İki Türk'ün konuşmasını anımsatan yerel ifadeler, deyimler kullanmayı düşünmedim. Yabancı bir şey yaratmak için onu olduğu gibi saklayayım diye düşündüm ve o dil o dünyayı çok güzel anlattığı için onu evcilleştirmeye, yerelleştirmeye çalışmadım. Bazı kitaplarda çok radikal bir kararla yerelleştirme yapılıyor mesela. Ben burada onu yapmadım.

Yani öyle çevirmek cesaret isterdi ama ben yine öyle çevirdim diyeceğiniz bir kısım oldu mu?

Mesela böyle büyük harflerle yazılan, yine çok küfürlü bir kısım vardı, konuşmalar yarıda kesildiği için geri kalanını tahmin etmek gerekiyordu. Oralarda mesela biraz tahmin ederek ve uydurmaya çalışarak çevirdiğimi hatırlıyorum ama bu çok radikal bir şey değil tabii, o sorunu aşmaya yönelik bir strateji. Ulysses çevirisinde çevirmen radikal kararlar almış mesela. Onu inceleme şansım olmadı ama. Bazı yerlerde Denizli şivesi gibi, yerel şivelere başvurmuş mesela. Orijinal dilin yansıttığı yerelliği Türkiye'deki yerellikle yansıtmak bu da epey sorunlu bir şey. Zaten herhalde bu da çeviri teorisinde tartışılan konulardan biridir. Bu bence epey sorunlu bir şey.

English Translation of Interviews

Tuncay Birkan

Can we first talk about your editorial experience and how you decided to be an editor?

I started my editing career in 1990s. Actually, it was not the result of a totally conscious decision, but a coincidence, as it generally happens. I was already working as a translator at the time, I had translated a couple of drama book, which has proved my translatorial competence. On the other hand, I was writing a thesis on Eagleton and Jameson. Ayrıntı Publishing House handed me a book entitled *Edebiyat Kurami* (Literary Theory), a poorly translated book which no one was willing to edit. After I edited that book, I was offered an editing position at the publishing house. I never wanted to hold a normal office job, but something related to culture and books. I wanted to avoid entering a field which is dominated by capitalist rules, but I saw over time that it was not true for the publishing sector. So, I started my editing career at Ayrıntı Publishing House. Between the years 92-94, I did the selection and the revision of plenty of books. To be published, I selected both theoretical and literary books. Then, in 1996, almost swearing to quit this job forever, I escaped to Ayvalık. Between the years 1996-2004, I just translated books. The reason why I escaped was because I had to almost retranslate books that have been very poor in terms of their quality. Following my return from Ayvalik, some people thought I would never re-enter this field, but I somehow found myself back into it. As an editor, you inevitably make revisions on books, but I generally did, which I considered real editing.

How did you decide to edit Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* translated into

Turkish under the title: *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın.*

It was not my decision and was just handed to me as a job of work. The publishing house had already chosen this book to publish. It was an ordinary, routine job.

How long did it take to edit this book?

I do not remember exactly, but it took quite a long time. It was 17 years ago and during this time, I edited a hundred sixty books. Therefore, I think it is normal not to remember about it.

While editing this book, did you work on other books as well?

This publishing house was usually handing me another book after my editing process is completed.

Was this book one of the first books you have edited?

Although not first, I can say that it was the second or the third.

Have you edited other books in similar genres before? How do you describe the genre to which this book belongs to?

At the time, I thought it is a feminist utopia. I cannot tell that I have already translated another book that could be considered a totally feminist utopia, but I have edited quite a few literary books. My wife Aslı Biçen is a literary translator. I edited many books she has translated. I actually wanted to translate literature too, but by considering that my wife does it better than I do, I concentrated on social sciences texts. However, I gained considerable experience through my wife.

I would like to know how much you intervened in this book as an editor?

I do not think it would be meaningful to talk about it because I do not remember about it. However, when I intervene, I usually aim to improve syntactical choices. In particular, translators have weaknesses to reformulate their sentences accordingly to Turkish syntax. First, translators misunderstand or do not understand the usage of English idioms, and they end up translating literally. Secondly, translators very often cause syntactical problems in translation.

> You have written a preface to Marge Piercy's *Women on the Edge of Time*. In this Preface, you talk about some neologisms and the proposed equivalents, and for some untranslated neologisms, you "beg readers' pardon." Why did you need to write such a preface?

I thought this book could be met strange. It is related to what I just told you. I always care about translations' ability to reflect source texts' emotions into Turkish, but some source texts play with their own language. I wanted Turkish readers to understand that some choices in this book are not the results of the translator's incompetence, but they are directly related to our efforts to create Turkish equivalents for authorial choices. On this purpose, I needed to write that Preface.

> Well, might it be said that you have worked in collaboration with the translator?

Regarding the editor-translator collaboration, I learned about the uses of such collaboration very lately. In the past, translations were handed to publishing house, and then edited and come out. I learned how this working system is dysfunctional over years. Then, I became an editor who began to call translators to come to see what I have been doing with their translations. However, I haven't met the translator of this book. The editing of this book cannot be said to be based on a collaborative work. As one of the founders of ÇEVBİR, as you know, in the following years, I saw the importance of an editor-translator collaboration, and I used it.

Did you do any pre-research on the book?

I looked at what else she has written, but I haven't carried out a detailed research.

What was this book's most characteristic trait, which you thought it must be absolutely transposed into the target language? What was your priority: translating the strangeness of the language or the strangeness of the world?

The strangeness of the world is unavoidable in the novels of this genre. By writing a preface to this novel, I wanted to emphasize that this novel is also strange in terms of its language. Some translators attribute to the author their incapability of turning a phrase and they keep saying: "Here, I wanted to give a specific feature of the author's style." To the contrary, I think that estranging features can be meaningful when all the other sentences are translated into Turkish, as they must be, without any recourse to literal translation. I also care about the fluency of the translation. You can create an estrangement effect only if you translate the other parts of the book fluently. Otherwise, offering to the reader a totally strange translation, which you claim to be a literal translation of the source text is nothing but an excuse for your linguistic incapability.

While editing this book, have you come across instances of word play, which you thought it would be "untranslatable", or "unmeaningful" to the target reader even when it is translated"?

I think there were, but to be honest, I do not remember about it.

If you had to re-edit this book, would you do some other changes on it?

I am sure I would. For instance, when I re-edited the second edition of *Edebiyat Kurami*, I did remarkable changes on this book so in a sense, I can be considered to have retranslated it. I

think I wouldn't do as many changes on this book as I did on the other, but I would certainly do some changes.

Do you think this novel attracted sufficient public attention?

At the time, one or two reviews of this book have been published, but I think in Turkey, we are supposed not to expect more attention.

I think these reviews were not on the translation of the book. Am I right?

You couldn't find almost any reviews on translations. So, I think it would be unrealistic to expect a review of a translation.

What is the reason behind the lack of public attention to this book? Can Turkish readers' indifference towards this genre be an explication for this lack of response?

Yes, we can definitely speak of readers' lack of interest. Although a special readerly interest in utopia has generated lately, I think the utopian side of this book escaped the eye of readers of utopia. I remember that this book has been referred to in a few literary meetings. Ayrıntı publishing house where I was working at the time has published other utopian books as well, and all of them, to a certain extent, grabbed public attention. Since this is a fictional work, its utopian side seems to have escaped the eye of readers of utopia. Unfortunately, there is such a dichotomy in Turkey: Readers of literature are not so interested in utopian and political works while readers of social sciences barely read literature. I think that this dichotomy also plays a role in the reception of this kind of books.

That's really an interesting point. I would like to learn about your impressions of this book?

344

It was a lovely book. I think it's worth reading.

You said you found this book lovely. So, did you edit it with a love?

Yes, I did it with a love. Books to be translated and edited are generally handed to us as jobs of work. So, we cannot always translate or edit everything with the same love and enthusiasm, but I remember I really loved that one.

Lastly, may I ask you to summarise your translating strategy. You mentioned word play and their estranging effects.

Yes, in order to reproduce the source text word play's estranging effect in target language, you should first establish the fluency in translation and get the book's language closer into Turkish. Literature should get the reader closer to the target language as much as it can. To enable the reader to perceive the strangeness of the world, you should create estranging effects, not at a general linguistic level, but at correct places.

Sevinç Altınçekiç

Can we first talk about your translating experience and how you decided to be a translator?

I studied English philology at university and did my first translation when I was fifteen. At time, I was living in Germany and reading Turkish novels. I translated four, five pages from a book of Kerime Nadir into German to allow the Germans to read it. I don't remember about the title of the book, but it is the first translation attempt by me. Then, after graduating from philology department, the need to translate naturally expressed itself in my desire to share with readers things I have read. So, this emotion led me to translate.

Can you please talk about your general translation strategy?

Of course. I translated novels too, although just a few. Atwood's book is the second novel I have translated. Following the translation of this novel, I haven't translated novels for quite a long time. I am currently working on the translation of a novel. I mostly translated books related to the topics such as social sciences, history, travel and Islam. My main translating strategy consists in recreating the writer's language in the target language. Sometimes, the writer's language can push the limits of Turkish through translation, but I think that it is supposed to be like that. Because every single writer has a style, which should be transposed into the target language. I am trying to pay attention to this aspect. The meaning is certainly important, too. A book you read in a foreign language must create the same emotions in Turkish. That's a practical point. I translate fast, not very fast, but I don't read the whole book before I start translating it. I can get bored if I read the whole book in advance, and then, re-read it during the translation process. Thus, while translating, I might also read the book curiously, without knowing what is going to happen at the end. Therefore, the first version of my translations always looks like a draft, but I go over it many times, and change it significantly.

How did you decide to translate this book?

This book was handed to us. I co-translated it with my ex-husband (Özcan Kabakçıoğlu). We were new graduates who wanted to find a book to translate, and we began to visit publishers around Cagologlu. When we went to Afa publishing house, they told us they had book to translate and requested a trial translation. We took a look at the book and liked it, but it was choice made by the publishing house.

How long did it take to translate this book?

It took one or two years. It always takes long for me to translate a book. I have just said that I

translate fast, but it still takes long. I need a large amount of time and not to face tight deadlines.

How did you collaborate with the co-translator of this book? Was it difficult or easy to co-translate?

To co-translate this book did not make the translation process more difficult, but easier. We were a married couple at the time. We divided the text into two, and after the translation is completed, we read the parts translated by one another and made some adjustments to establish the overall linguistic coherence. Since his usage of Turkish was better than mine, we mostly adopted his suggestions. For instance, he chose the title of the book. We hesitated to translate "handmaid" as "cariye", but we gave up translating it this way by thinking that this term would be a direct reference to the Ottomans. Since women in the book are used similarly to the animals kept for breeding, we agreed on that title, which we thought it would reflect the novel's gist the best. We obviously made the title more explicit in Turkish, but this was a choice. Actually, I was against that choice in the beginning, but then, we adopted it, and everyone, including the publishing house, liked it.

While you were translating this book, did you work on other books as well?

No, we just worked on this book.

Was it the first translation in your translating career?

Yes, it was the first for both of us.

How much did your editor intervene in your translation?

There was no intervention in our translation. Actually, at the time, there was no concept of "editorship." We have not worked with an editor. For instance, there were some obscene words in the book. We reflected on how to translate these words. We could not soften these words in

translation because the author used them this way in her book. To be honest, we were a little bit preoccupied when we thought this book can be considered as an obscene publication if someone realises all these words, but the book has been published, as it is translated, without undergoing any editorial changes and criticism.

Did you face any challenges in your translation process? What kind of solutions did you propose to prevail over them?

I have already mentioned challenges like the translation of obscenity and the title. Apart from these, I do not remember so much about it.

What was the most characteristic trait of the novel you have translated?

The fact that it was my first translation makes it special on its own. There is another thing. The writer, Buket Uzuner was a big fan of Margaret Atwood. When she learned that we were translating this book, she got in touch with us. She wrote a review on this book at *Cumhuriyet Kitap*. Although this review was not on the translation of this book, it was written right after our translation has been published so this aspect makes this review special to me, too. At the time, there was a tv channel owned by İstanbul metropolitan municipality, BRT. Buket Uzuner helped me to take a part in a TV show in this channel to discuss about the book. The following day, this channel has been closed and that show has never been screened. In brief, this book played a role in putting us in touch with Buket Uzener whom I like very much. That is why this book is special to me.

This book and the dystopian world it depicts have been dealt with in many theses. What do you think of the world depicted in this novel? Do you find it dystopian as well?

This book deals with a quite pessimistic world. Actually, I was highly impressed by this aspect of the book. The subject turns around things a woman can experience. Since the writer is a feminist, she demonstrates the female sensibility. Power differentials are always to the

disadvantage of women. That is the same in the novel. In this sense, this novel displays a dystopian aspect, but there is a hope at the end. This is an open-ended novel so it can be concluded in many different ways and everyone can interpret it the way he or she wants.

Did you do any pre-research on the writer and the book?

At the time, we did not have such an opportunity. There was no Internet. I do not remember if we did a research, but we had an image of the book in mind, and I do not remember exactly how this image was shaped.

Did you love this book? What kind of impression did you get from this book?

I liked this book because it concerns women. This is a science fictional world, which seemingly can be created in the real world. It is so easy to create such a world in the real life. I think my ex-husband liked the book as well. While trying to find a title, you are getting into the book so deeply.

Did the abundance of world play in the novel grab your attention? Which aspects did you take into account while translating these world plays?

I do not remember how I felt about it at the time, but I can tell you how I feel about it now. When I translate word play, I try to use the Turkish equivalent if there is one, but this equivalent is supposed not to be so local. That is to say, I cannot get a Turkish woman from Van talk the same way as an American woman. You can use the equivalent if it depends on a universal usage, if not; I try to paraphrase the overall meaning. Sometimes, you have no choice other than translating the word play since it is tied up into other components. In this case, you inevitably push the limits of Turkish, and this is an acceptable situation because however unmeaningful to the reader, that word play has to be translated in some way or another.

While translating this book, have you come across instances of word play, which thought it would be "untranslatable", or "unmeaninful to the target reader even when it

is translated"?

If the meaning of the word play is important, I just give the meaning. Sometimes when the word play is tied to other words in an expression, you need to translate the words too, and make it more explicit as much as possible.

I see that you used end notes in your translation. Was it your opinion to use them?
Yes. We did not have an editor.

What was your primary goal as a translator? For example, how important was it for you to give the Turkish reader a fluent text?
The most important thing is to give the target reader a fluent text. It is a novel and it has to be fluent. You cannot translate in another way. However, I am not sure if we were able to achieve this goal.

What was your priority: translating the strangeness of the language or the strangeness of the world?

Not the linguistic aspects, but the plot was strange. Actually, even the plot was not too strange to me. Turkish women as any other woman can experience things similar to those that have been told in this plot. As Turkish women, we are not totally unfamiliar to the meaning of "cariye", which the word "handmaid" implies. We are not unfamiliar to the use of women in a way similar to the animals kept for breeding. So, that is not a totally strange world.

Is the use of women in a way similar to the animals kept for breeding not strange to you?
Yes, it is. It is just because in that world, women are used in a way similar to the animals kept for breeding. There was no sexual pleasure in that world. Sexual relationships were just for reproductive purposes. But, as I have just said, it is not a world we are totally unfamiliar to.

What is strange there is that the plot is set in the US. For example, if the plot was set in an Arabic country, it would not been as strange to us as it is now. I do not remember about the strangeness of the language, but while translating obscenity, we tried to transpose the strangeness of the language.

If you had to re-translate this book, would you do some other changes on it?

I think I would. We translated this book seventeen years ago. I think I would make some stylistic changes like the choice of some different equivalents. Apart from this, I do not think we would change the other parts, which appeared important to us.

Do you think this novel attracted sufficient public attention?

It had just one printing.

What is the reason behind the lack of public attention to this book?

I think at the time, the book was not promoted as much as necessary. Actually, it would be very fitting if this book was re-edited in the period we live in today. The other books of Margaret Atwood have also been translated and published by different publishing houses in Turkey, but they did not attract much attention, either. This book dated 1992, could mean much to us in today's context. Thus, it has to be re-edited in this period. We were not living in such a world in 1992, but I think if this book is re-edited now, it definitely becomes one of the best-sellers in Turkey. Of course, the final decision is up to the publishers.

Çiçek Öztek

Can we first talk about your translating experience and how you decided to be a translator?

I had actually been trained to be an engineer. After my BA, I went to England for my master's studies, and there, I began to edge away the field of engineering by directing myself to read and translate different texts, and improve my English. I already spoke English, but an engineering English learned at the METU. In England, I have read social sciences texts and translated the three articles of Baudrillard. I worked on these texts while translating them. Threee articles, which Baudrillard has written in the pre- and post-Gulf War periods. I thought this translation may be published after I return to Turkey, I but I have not done it specifically for publishing purposes. Following my return to Turkey, I began to do master's in sociology, and then, I decided to translate a book in order to engage in translation, which I thought it would provide me with a means of living. At the time, I was doing commercial translations, but I also had in mind to translate a whole book. I think my first translation dates back to the years 96-97. My first translation is called *Kuvette Bulunan Gunce*, the translation of Stanislav Lem's *Memoirs Found in a Bathtub*. Given that I had translated many other texts up to that time, it was truly an immense pleasure for me to see a translation of mine to have finally published. Then, I translated, for Dost Publishing House, a book called *Apollon'un Gozu*, a translation of *Eye of Apollo* by Chesterton, a 19th century English writer. As for *Dişi Adam*, it is the third book I have translated. At the time, I was an MA student who started to work part time for Insan Haklari Vakfı (Human Right Association). My thesis supervisor, Necmi Erdogan commended me to Ayrıntı Publishing House for the translation of this book. Actually, I had to reject this offer because at the time, I was not just writing my thesis, but also translating into English the Turkish bulletins of Insan Haklari Vakfi where I was working. In my MA thesis in which I deal with the topic of "Servants and Masters in Turkish Novel", I used many fragments from ten to fifteen Turkish novels under analysis, and I translated all these fragments into English. I was unbelievably overwhelmed. I remember that apart from the time I spent for all these other

things I was involved in, it occurred to me to work till 3 or 4 at night to complete the translation of this book.

How long were you translating this book, did you work on other books as well?
I was not working on another book, but I was dealing with three different things at the same time: my translation, my thesis and my job. For this reason, I remember this book took so much time and made me feel so tired.

Before you translate this book, have you translated other books of similar genre?
Yes, before I translate this book, I have already translated two other novels. That is my third translation. This book differs from the other two by being the more modern and unorthodox one.

How long did it take to translate this book?
Although I was so overwhelmed, I think I completed it in four, five months.

How much did your editor intervene in your translation?
I am not aware of this. I delivered my translation, just wishing it to be published whenever it may be. I did not think of looking at possible changes my translation might undergo. Almost any changes have been made to the first two books I translated. For instance, *Küvette Bulunan Günce* has been revised by the editor at the time, Osman Yener, to whom I talked over the phone just once. In our phone conversation, Yener told me that he made no considerable changes I should take a look, and he just changed a couple of vulgar, slang-like expressions I used in some parts by arguing that they would not be well received by Turkish reader, if left unchanged. Moreover, that book contained just a few slang words compared to *Dişi Adam*, which is enormously rich in slang, a slang that is a little bit unfamiliar to Turkish readers.

The aspect you found the most interesting in this book was that slang part?

A kind of. This novel features an assortment of female characters who are all so original and colourful. All these female characters have a different use of language. Actually, this book was a little bit difficult to translate. As for the slang part, since the editor of *Kuvette Bulunan Gunce* has already warned me about and intervened in the use of slang in my translation, I thought what I should do with *Dişi Adam*. If I translated all these slang parts as "Oh, shit!", all the linguistic features of the book would be suppressed. Given that the publisher of this book, Ayrıntı has been publishing underground literature, I thought they would not hesitate to publish this book even if I translate all these slang parts, and thus, I did not stop myself from translating them. I thought I could go over my translation if I was asked to soften some expressions. But, to be honest, I did not meet the editor, and after the publication, I did not check what has been changed in my translation.

Did you do any pre-research on the book and the author?

I have not done any pre-research for this book, but I did it for the other books I translated later. For instance, when I was translating Chesterton, although it was a previous translation, I had already read the other works by Chesterton, but I have not read anything about this book before I translate it.

Before you translate a book, do you read it to the very end?

Yes, I do, and then I set out to translate it. I actually read to the very end of most of the books I translate, just with a few exceptions. For example, I translated a book entitled *Tanik*, which has been published from Yapi Kredi Publishing House. It was a historical narrative, which has a biographical aspect. So, I directly started to translate it before I read the whole book. It was a 550 page book. However, in literary works, a reading of the whole book is necessary in order to master the novel's language and the author's intended meaning.

As far as I understand, your translations are not limited just to literary works.

Yes, I translated non-fiction as well. For instance, when I was working at Ayrıntı, I translated a book by Bakhtin: *Rablais ve Dunyasi*. I have not read to the very end of that book, either. That was a huge work, but I was already familiar to Bakthinian theory since I have already used it in my thesis.

Did you love this book? What kind of impression did you get from this book?

I am not deeply impressed by this book. I do not remember much about it now, but when I was translating it, I thought the writer was very eccentric, lunatic and marginal. Although I do not completely agree on the existence of a category of women's literature, I think that if we had to make such a classification, this book would be fitting into this category. So, this book extensively deals with the status of women and womanhood. I remember that it also deals with lesbianism. I am personally not deeply interested by this book. When I later began to work for Ayrıntı, I saw that it was one of the worst selling books.

Ok, at this point, I can ask you about the reason behind the lack of public attention to this book.

Yes, I think that what has been called "women's literature" or "feminism" does not attract any attention. In Turkey, there is no target audience for this. For instance, women have been copiously reading novels for centuries, from the inception of the novel. Although the biggest target audience consists of women, even women themselves do not read things that could be considered "women's literature", and they do not want to read how they were depicted in these books. So, if you look at the list of best-sellers in the past two hundred years, you see that "women read, men write." Unfortunately, that is the case, and the same is true for poetry and fiction. For instance, there are very prominent woman novelists who do not consider themselves as writers of women's literature. Perhaps, this book may be placed into the category of lesbian

literature. I think in Turkey, there are just a few hundred people who follow gay/lesbian literature. That is to say, this is a very limited reading audience. Although some women consider themselves as writers of women's literature, there are some who do not. For instance, the writer, Almudena Grandes has been in Turkey two, three months ago, and while most people continuously tend to place her into the category of women's literature, she underlined that she does not recognise such a category, and she is not feminist, but just a writer who wants to be cited under the general umbrella of literature that appeals to both women and men.

If I go back to the book, did the abundance of word play in the book grab your attention? What strategy did you use in translating these instances of word play?

I remember I literally translated some parts, and then, went over them and changed them liberally because if I left them so, they would make no sense to Turkish readers.

For example, you left proper nouns untranslated. Was it a specific choice of yours?

I did not think of changing proper nouns. For example, which Turkish equivalents would you suggest for them? Every book to translate comes to us with its own system and problematic, and make you ask a series of questions on how much you would intervene in, how much you would be liberal with it. As for the translation of proper names into Turkish, this is usually done in children's literature, not in adult literature. That is an unwritten law. If I retranslate this book, I leave proper nouns untranslated again. So, I am against the translation of proper nouns. There were some other difficulties I faced when I was translating this book. For example, in some parts, there were some fragmented forms of speech which were difficult to understand. Syntactic structure was very different.

So, can this novel be considered "postmodern"?

Yes, it can. This novel was very different from those I have ever read.

If you had to re-translate this book, would you do some other changes on it?

I certainly would. I would still make some changes on it if it was handed to me after I started to work as an editor at Ayrıntı. For example, today, I have the opportunity to use Google. Is this writer Canadian?

No, she is American.

For example, this woman might be used such slang if she is from the state of Arizona in the USA. However, I was unaware of all the possibilities of this kind when I translated this book with an English-Turkish Redhouse Dictionary, an English-English Webster Dictionary and a few encyclopaedias at hand. When I translate now, I use ten to fifteen encyclopedias and the most important; I read hundreds of blogs and on-line forums on Google. Sometimes, an expression I was searching for, might have used by one of two young people who have been chatting in an on-line forum and thus, I understand what that expression means. Briefly, I may have translated *Dişi Adam* a little bit literally.

Did you think of using end notes for proper names you left untranslated?

It is dangerous to inundate a novel with end notes. You can use end notes to a certain extent. If you decide to use end notes, you have to use them for the whole book, and that is a very radical decision. If you use an end note for a part, you cannot leave the other part without end note. You cannot overwhelm every part with end notes, either. Otherwise, the translator becomes very visible. It is not important to read what the translator has done. To my mind, it is more important for the reader to read a book without realising the presence of the translator.

What was your priority: translating the strangeness of the language or the strangeness of the world?

I remember I did not have in mind to make the novel's world look like Turkey. I did not think

of using local expressions, idioms that evoke dialogues among two Turkish people. In order to create a strange world, I preserved what was strange in the novel, and since the language of the novel conveys the strangeness of that world very successfully, I did not attempt to domesticate or familiarise it. Some books might use a very radical strategy like familiarisation, but I have not use it here.

Is there any part in your translation, which you thought it would be very courageous to translate it that way, but you have translated it that way anyhow?

For example, there was a part, which has been written in capitals, and contained very vulgar language. Since sentences were choppy, you had to guess what might have been said in the rest of a sentence. I remember I translated these parts by either guessing or inventing the rest of a sentence. However, that is not a radical decision, but just a problem-solving strategy. For example, I know that the Turkish translator of *Ulysses* has taken radical decisions in his translation. I did not have the chance to take a look at that translation. I know that in some parts, this translator has used local language like Denizli dialect. However, it is very problematic to replace the domestic aspect of the original language by that of the Turkish language. I am sure it must be one of the most debated issues among translation scholars. I think that is a very problematic issue.

APPENDIX IV

Short Bibliography of Women's Speculative Fiction Translated into Turkish

Bradley, Marion Zimmer

1. Bradley, M. Z. (2006). *Avalon'un Sisleri.* İstanbul: Ithaki.

2. Bradley, M. Z.(2006). *Atlantis'in Çöküşü.* İstanbul: Ithaki.

3. Bradley, M. Z.(2000). *Meşe ağacındaki tutsak.* İstanbul: Ithaki.

4. Bradley, M. Z. (1999). *Avalon'un Sisleri.* İstanbul: Ithaki.

5. Bradley, M. Z. (1999-2001). *Atlantis'in Çöküşü.* İstanbul: Ithaki.

Brackett, Leigh
Brackett, L.(1971?). *Uzayda İsyan*. İstanbul: Okat.

Fairbairns, Zoe
Fairbairns, Z. (2007). *Kadınlar Kulesi*. Trans. Ünver Alibey. Everest Yayınları.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins
Gilman, C. P. (2007). *Kadınlar Ülkesi*. İstanbul: Otonom

Le Guin, Ursula

1. Le Guin, U. (2009). *Dünyanın Doğum Günü* (2th edition). İstanbul: Metis.

2. Le Guin, U. (2009). *Marifetler*. İstanbul: Metis.

3. Le Guin, U. (2009). *Öteki Rüzgâr*. İstanbul: Metis.

4. Le Guin, U. (2009). *Kadınlar, rüyalar, ejderhalar* (4th edition). İstanbul: Metis.

5. Le Guin, U. (2009). *Dört Yavru* (3th edition). İstanbul: Günışığı Kitaplığı.

6. Le Guin, U. (2009). *Güçler* (1th edition). İstanbul: Metis.

7. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Kentte Tek Başına*. İstanbul: Günışığı Kitaplığı.

8. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Yerdeniz Büyücüsü*. İstanbul: Metis.

9. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Sesler*. İstanbul: Metis.

10. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Dünyaya Orman Denir*. İstanbul: Metis.

11. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Yeni Arkadaş*. İstanbul: Günışığı Kitaplığı.

12. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Tehanu*. İstanbul: Metis.

13. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Dört Yavru* (2th edition). İstanbul: Günışığı Kitaplığı.

14. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Yuvaya Dönüş*. İstanbul: Günışığı Kitaplığı.

15. Le Guin, U. (2008). *Yerdeniz Öyküleri*. İstanbul: Metis.

16. Le Guin, U. (2007). *İçdeniz Balıkçısı*. İstanbul: Metis.

17. Le Guin, U. (2006). *Marifetler*. İstanbul: Metis.

18. Le Guin, U. (2006). *Kadınlar, rüyalar, ejderhalar*. İstanbul: Metis.

19. Le Guin, U. (2006). *Atuan Mezarları*. İstanbul: Metis.

20. Le Guin, U. (2006). *Yerdeniz Büyücüsü*. İstanbul: Metis.

21. Le Guin, U. (2005). *Mülksüzler*. İstanbul: Metis.

22. Le Guin, U. (2004). *Öteki Rüzgâr*. İstanbul: Metis.

23. Le Guin, U.(2004). *Bağışlamanın Dört Yolu*. İstanbul: Metis.

24. Le Guin, U.(2004). *Her yerden çok uzakta*. İstanbul: İmge.

25. Le Guin, U. (2004). *Yanılsamalar Kenti*. İstanbul: İmge.

26. Le Guin, U.(2003). *Dünyaya Orman Denir*. İstanbul: Metis.

27. Le Guin, U. (2003). *Mülksüzler*. İstanbul: Metis.

28. Le Guin, U. (2003). *Tehanu.* İstanbul: Metis.

29. Le Guin, U.(2002). *Kadınlar, rüyalar, ejderhalar.* İstanbul: Metis.

30. Le Guin, U.(2002). *Hep Yuvaya Dönmek.* İstanbul: Metis.

31. Le Guin, U.2001). *Yerdeniz Öyküleri*. İstanbul: Metis.

32. Le Guin, U.(2001). *Bağışlamanın Dört Yolu*. İstanbul: Metis.

33. Le Guin, U. (2000). *Tehanu.* İstanbul: Metis.

34. Le Guin, U. (1999). *Mülksüzler*. İstanbul: Metis.

35. Le Guin, U. (1999). *Kadınlar, rüyalar, ejderhalar*. İstanbul: Metis.

36. Le Guin, U. (1999). *Kadınlar, rüyalar, ejderhalar.* İstanbul: Metis.

37. Le Guin, U.(1999). *Atuan Mezarları.* İstanbul: Metis.

38. Le Guin, U. (1999). *En Uzak Sahil.* İstanbul: Metis.

39. Le Guin, U. (1994). *Hayaller Şehri.* İstanbul: İmge.

40. Le Guin, U. (1993). *Karanlığın Sol Eli.* İstanbul: Metis.

McCaffrey, Anne

McCaffrey, A. (1999). *Ejder şarkısı*. İstanbul: Ithaki.

McCaffrey, A. (1999). *Ejder uçuşu*. İstanbul: Ithaki.

McCaffrey, A.(1999). *Ejder arayışı*. İstanbul: Ithaki.

Sakhawat Hossain, Begum Rokeya

Sakhawat Hossain, B. R. (2007). *Sultana'nın Rüyası ve Padmarag*. İstanbul: Versus Kitap.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Primary References

Atwood, M. (1985). *Damızlık Kızın Öyküsü*, Sevinç Altınçekiç & Özcan Kabakçıoğlu (Trans.). Afa Yayınları.

Atwood, M. (1985). *The Handmaid's Tale*. Seal Books.

Piercy, M. (1992). *Zamanın Kıyısındaki Kadın*. Füsun Tülek (Trans.). Ayrıntı.

Piercy, M. (1976). *Woman on the Edge of Time*. Fawcettt Crest.

Russ, J. (2001). *Dişi Adam*. Çiçek Öztek (Trans.). Ayrıntı.

Russ, J. (2000). *The Female Man*. Beacon Press. originally written in 1970 and first published in 1975.

Secondary References

Ahmed, S. (2002). 'This Other and Other Others'. *Economy and Society* 31(4). Routledge. pp.558- 572.

Altınçekiç, S. (2009). "Personal Interview". Nil Özçelik. August. 2009.

Arrojo, R. (1994). "Fidelity and the Gendered Translation". *TTR*. vol. 7. n° 2. 2e semestre 1994. pp. 147-163.

Atwood, M. (2002). *Negotiating With the Dead: A Writer on Writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Atwood. M. (2005). "Writing Oryx and Crake".*Writing with Intent: Essays, Reviews, Personal Prose 1983-2005*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers. pp. 284-286.

Bainsbridge, W. (1982). "Women in Science Fiction". *Sex Roles*. pp. 1081- 1093.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ballard, J.G. (1996). *A User's Guide to Millenium*. London: Harper Collins.

Barnes, M. E. (1975). *Linguistics and Languages in Science Fiction-Fantasy*. Arno Press.

Barr, Marleen S. (1992) *Feminist Fabulation: Space/Postmodern Fiction,* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
Birkan, T. (2009). Personal Interview. Nil Özçelik. August. 2009.

Boase-Beir, J. (2006). *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. Saint Jerome.

Braidotti, R. (2003). "Cyberteratologies: Female Monsters Negotiate the Other's Participation in Humanity's Far Future". *Envisionning the Future: Science Fiction and the Next Millenium,* (ed. Marleen Barr). pp. 146-169.

Broderick, D. (1994) *Reading by Starlight: Postmodern Science Fiction*. Florence. KY. USA: Routledge.

Buddenbaum, J. M. & Novak K. B. (2001). *Applied Communication Research*. Blackwell.

Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Caron, C. (2003). "Translating Trek: Rewriting an American Icon in a Francophone Context". *The Journal of American Culture* 26 (3). 329–355.

Chamarette, J. (2007). "Flesh, Folds and Texturality: Thinking Visual Ellipsis via Merleau-Ponty, Hél☐ne Cixous and Robert Frank". *Paragraph* 30: 2, pp. 34-49.

Cixous, H. (1999). "The Laugh of the Medusa", Trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen. *Literary Debate: Texts and Contexts*. (ed. Denis Hollier & Jeffrey Mehlman). pp. 410-42, originally published: 1975.

Clute, J. (1995). *The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*. "Martin's Griffin". p. 424.

Cornier Magali, M. (2003). "Freedom Reconsidered: Margaret Atwood's The *Handmaid's Tale*", *Women in Literature: Reading Through the Lens of Gender*. Eds. Jerilyn Fisher and Ellen S. Silber). Greenwood.

Cortiel, J. (1999). *Demand My Writing: Joanna Russ/Feminism/Science Fiction.* Liverpool: Liverpool UP.

Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity. (2002). Eds. G. Weiss and R. Wodak. London: Palgrave, pp. 85–109.

Culler, J. (1989). *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism After Structuralism*. Routledge. Originally published: Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1982.

Daly, M. (1990). *Gyn/ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Beacon Press.

Davis Logan, A. M. (2002). "The Future in Feminism: Reading Strategies for Feminist Theory and Science Fiction". unpublished PhD thesis submitted to Luisiana State University (exists on-line: http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-0417102-074443/unrestricted/Rogan_dis.pdf).

De Beaugrande, R. (1989). "Toward the empirical study of literature: A synoptic sketch of a new 'society'". *Poetics* 18 (1989). pp. 7-27.

De Bolt, J. & Pfeiffer, J. (1981). "The Modern Period: 1938-1980", *Anatomy of Wonder: A Critical Guide to Science Fiction*, Eds. Neil Barron. New York & London: Bowker.

De Lauretis, T. (1980). "Signs of Wa/onder", *The Technological Imagination*. Eds. Teresa de Lauretis et al. Madison: Coda Press. pp. 159-174.

Del Rey, L. (1975). "The war of the sexes", *Analog,* 95(6), pp. 166-170.

Delany¸ S. R. (1990). "An Interview with Samuel R. Delany: *on Triton* and Other Matters". *Science Fiction Studies.* No. 52, Vol. 17. November.

Derrida, J. (2001). *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Boss. Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1991). "Choreographies", *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*. Ed. Peggy Kamuf. New York: Columbia UP, pp. 441-456.

Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. Alan Bass. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Derrida, J. (1979). "Living on: Border Lines", Deconstruction and Criticism, Ed. Harold Bloom et all. London: Routledge & Paul Kegan. pp. 75-176.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dickson, G. R. (1988). "Conventions". *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction.* Ed. James Gunn. Viking.

Duru, O. (1991). "Bilim-kurgu, Dili ve Çevirisi Üzerine". *Metis Çeviri*. 199. Kış. Sayı: 14. interviewees: Orhan Duru, Levent Molla Mustafaoglu, Müfit Özdeş, Bülent Somay, Metis. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Ed. Keith Brown.Vol. 4. Oxford: Elsevier. pp. 546–551.

Enkvist, N. E. (1988). "Styles as Parameters in Text Strategy". *The Taming of the Text*. Ed. Willie van Peer, Routledge.

Fitting, P. (1985). "New Roles for Men in Recent Utopian Fiction". *Science Fiction Studies*. Vol. 12. pp. 157-183.

Gilliam K. R. (1988). *Sexuality and Setting: Modes of Characterization in Selected Novels by Joanna Russ*. unpublished MA Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Texas Tech University.

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Harvard University Press.

Gouanvic, J. M. (2001). "Ethos, Ethics and Translation: Toward a Community of Destinies". *The Translator*. vol. VII. n° 2. numéro spécial "The Return to Ethics". Dir. Anthony Pym, Manchester. U. K. St. Jerome Publishing. pp. 203-212.

Gouanvic, J. M. (2007). "Homology in Translation: Ernest Hemingway Translated into the Interwar French Culture". *Similarity and Difference in Translation*. Eds. Stefano Arduini. Robert Hodgson Jr. American Bible Society. pp. 359-366.

Güney, M. (2007). *Başka Dünyalar Mümkün: Bilimkurgu. Siberpunk ve Siyaset*. Varlık.

Gürçağlar, Ş. (2008) *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey: 1923 – 1960*. Rodopi.

Hakemulder, J. F. (2004). "Foregrounding and Its Effect on Readers' Perception". *Discourse Processes* 38. pp. 193–218.

Halliday, M. (1971). "Linguistic function and literary style: An inquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*". *Literary style: A symposium,* Ed. S. Chatman. London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Hamon, P. (1984). *Texte et Ideologie*. PUF.

Haraway, D. (1991). "The Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century". *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1988). "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective". *Feminist Studies*. Vol. 14. No. 3. (Autumn, 1988). pp. 575-599.

Harding, S. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. New York: Ithaca. Cornell University Press.

Hatch, R. B. (1993) "Bleich, David", *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Appications, Scholars, Terms*, (ed. Irene Rima Makaryk), University of Toronto Press, pp. 255-256.

Havránek, B. (1964). "The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language". *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*. Ed. P.L. Garvin. Washington. DC: Georgetown University Press.

Holt, M. J. (1982). "Joanna Russ". *Science Fiction Writers: Critical Studies of the Major Authors from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Present Day*. Ed. E. F. Bleiler Scribner. pp. 483-490.

Holub, R. C. (1984). *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. London & New York: Methuen.

Hougron, A. (2000). "Conclusion: Vers une sociologie de la science-fiction? ", *Science-fiction*

et Societe. PUF.

Irigaray, L. (2004). *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*. Trans. Carolyn Burke & Gillian C. Gill. London & New York: Continuum.

Irigaray, L. (1993). "A Chance for Life: Limits to the Concept of Neuter and the Universal in Science and Other Disciplines", *Sexes and Geneologies*, Trans. Gillian Gill. New York: Columbia University Press. originally published in 1987.

Irigaray, L. (1991). "The Bodily Encounter with the Mother". Trans. David Macey. *The Irigaray Reader.* Ed. Margaret Whitford. Cambridge. Mass: Blackwell. pp. 34–46.

Irigaray, L. (1981). "This Sex Which is Not One" *New French Feminisms*, Eds. E. Marks and I Courtivron. New York: Schocken.

Iser, W. (2002). "Interaction Between Text and Reader" *The Book History Reader*, Eds. David Finkelstein, Alistair McCleery. Routledge. pp. 291-296.

Iser, W. (1980). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimor: John Hopkins University Press. orginally published in 1978.

Iser, W. (1974). *The Implied Reader*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Jakobson, R. (1987). *Language in literature*. Eds. K. Pomorska & S. Rudy. Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.

Jauss, R. H. (1974). "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory". Trans. Elizabeth Benzinger. *New Directions in Literary History*. Ed. Ralph Cohen. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. pp.11-41.

Jenkins, H. & Tulloch, J. (1995). *Science Fiction Audiences: Doctor Who, Star Trek, and Their Fans.* Routledge.

Jenkins, H. (1992). *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Keen, S. (2007). *Empathy and the Novel*. Oxford University Press.

Keller, E. F. (1985). *Reflections on Science and Gender*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Kendall, G. (2007). "What Is Critical Discourse Analysis?", Ruth Wodak in Conversation With Gavin Kendall [38 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung ,Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 8(2). Art. 29. http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-29-e.htm.

King, B. (1984). *Women of the Future: The Female Main Character in Science Fiction*. The Scarecrow Press. Inc.

Klages, M. (2006). *Literary theory: a guide for the perplexed*, Continuum International

Publishing Group.

Kristeva, J. (1986). "Women's Time" Trans. Alice Jardine & Harry Blake. *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1984). Revolution in Poetic Language. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1980). "Oscillation Between Power and Denial". Eds. E. Marks & I. de Courtivron. *New French Feminisms*. Amherst. University of Massachusetts Press.

Krueger, J. (1968). "Language and Techniques of Communication as Theme or Tool in SF". *Linguistics* 39. pp. 68-86.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Larbalestier, Justine (2002) *Battle of Sexes in Science Fiction*, Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Laviosa, S. (1998). "Core patterns of lexical use in a comparable corpus of English narrative prose". *Meta* XLIII: 4, pp. 557-570.

Le Guin, U. (1989a). *Dancing at the Edge of the World: Thoughts on Words, Women, Places*. Grove Press.

Le Guin, U. (1989b). "Up to Earth". *Women's Review of Books*. 9.

Le Guin, U. (1979) *The Language of the Night*, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Leech G. N. & Short M. H. (1981). *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.

Leech, G.N. (1969) *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. Longman.

Leech, G. N. (1965). '"This Bread I Break" – Language and Interpretation'. *Review of English Literature* 6. pp. 66–75.

Lefanu, S. (1988). *In the Chinks of the World Machine: Feminism and Science Fiction*, London: Women's Press.

Li, J. & Shuhua X. (2003). "Foregrounding as a Criterion for Translation Criticism. *Babel*. Volume 49. Number 4. pp. 302-309.

Lotbinière-Harwood, de S. (1991). *Rebelle et Infid□le/The Body Bilingual*. Montréal: Les éditions du Remue-ménage.

Loudermilk, K. A (2004). *Fictional Feminism: How American Bestsellers Affect the Movement for Women's Equality* Routledge.

Lundwall, S. J. (1971). *Science Fiction: What It's All About*. New York: Ace Books.

Lupoff, R. A (1988). "New Wave" *The New Encyclopedia of Science fiction*, Ed. James Gunn. Viking.

Martin-Asensio, G. (2000). *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles: A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective*. Sheffield Academic Press.

Martin-Asensio, G. (1999). "Foregrounding and its Relevance for Interpretation and Translation, with Acts 27 as a Case Study". *Translating the Bible: Problems and Prospects*, Eds. Stanley E. Porter and Richard S. Hess. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. pp. 189-223.

McCaffery, L. (1990). *Across the Wounded Galaxies*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

McMillan, J. B. (1972). "Of Matters Lexicographical". American Speech. Fall/Winter72. Vol. 47 Issue 3/4. pp. 261-265.

Melzer, P. (2006). *Alien Constructions: Science Fiction and Feminist Thought*. University of Texas Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The Visible and the Invisible*, Ed. Claude Lefort. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Miall, D. S. & Kuiken, D. (1995). "Feeling and the three phases of literary response". *Empirical approaches to literature*. Ed. G. Rusch, Siegen: LUMIS-Publications, pp. 282-290.

Miall, D. S.& Kuiken, D. (1994). "Foregrounding, defamiliarization, and affect: Response to literary stories". *Poetics* 22. pp. 389-407.

Moi, T. (2002). *Sexual/Textual Politics*. Routledge.

Mossop, B. (1996). "The Image of Translation in Science Fiction & Astronomy". *The Translator.* Vol. 2, No: 1. pp. 1-26.

Mukařovsky¸ J. (2000). "Standard Language and Poetic Language". *The Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*. Eds. Lucy Burke, Tony Crowley, Alan Girvin. Routledge, pp. 225-231.

Parrinder, P. (1980). *Science Fiction: Its Criticism and Teaching*. London and New York: Methuen.

Patai, D. (1983). "Beyond Defensiveness: Feminist Research Strategies". *Women and Utopia*. Eds. Marleen Barr and Nicholas Dr. Smith. University Press of America. pp. 148-169.

Pfaelzer, J. (1988). "The Changing of the Avant Garde: The Feminist Utopia", *Science Fiction Studies*. Vol. 15. pp. 282-294.

Pym, A. (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Saint Jerome.

Pym, A. (1995). "Lives of Henri Albert, Nietzschean Translator", *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*. Eds. Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová and Barbara Moser-Mercer. John Benjamins.

Öztek, C. (2009). Personal Interview. Nil Özçelik. August. 2009.

Rabkin, E. S. (1981). "Science Fiction Women Before Liberation". Female Futures: A Critical Anthology. Ed. Marleen Barr. Bowling Green State University Popular Press. pp. 9-25.

Rabkin, E. S. & Scholes, R. (1977). *Science Fiction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, R. (1993). *A New Species: Gender and Science in Science Fiction*. Urbana. University of Illinois Press. pp.4-6.

Roberts, R. (1990). "Post-Modernism and Feminist Science Fiction". *Science Fiction Studies*. Vol. 17. pp. 136-152.

Roemer, K. (2003). *Utopian Audiences: How Readers Locate Nowhere*. University of Massachusetts Press.

Rogow, R. (1991). *Futurespeak.* New York: Paragon House.

Rosenblatt, L. (1986). "The Aesthetic Transaction". *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. Vol. 20. No.4, 20th Anniversary Issue. pp. 122-128.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The Reader, The Text, The Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosinsky, N. M. (1984). *Feminist Futures: Contemporary Women's Speculative Fiction*. UMI Research Press.

Russ, J. (1983). *How to Suppress Women's Writing*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Sargent, P. (1988). "Women*" The New Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* (1988), Ed. James Gunn. Viking. pp. 510.

Schiebinger, L. (1989). *The Mind Has No Sex? Women In The Origins of Modern Science*. Harvard University Press.

Schüssler, E. (1992). *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*, Fiorenza: Beacon Press.

Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in Translation: Culture and Identity and the Politics of Transmission.* London & New York: Routledge.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics. A resource book for students*. London. New York: Routledge.

Spender, D. (1980). *Man Made Language*. Routledge.

Spivak, G. (2005). "Translating into English". *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation.* Eds. Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 93-110.

Spivak, G. (2000). "The Politics of Translation". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. Routledge. pp. 397-416.

Stacy, R. H. (1977). *Defamiliarization in Language and Literature.* Syracuse University Press.

Suvin, D. (1979). *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction*. Yale University Press.

Suvin, D. (1972). "On the Poetics of the Science Fiction Genre". *College English*. 34. December, 1972.

Teslenko, T. (2003). *Feminist Utopian Novels of the 1970s: Joanna Russ and Dorothy Bryant.* Florence. KY. USA: Routledge.

Todorov, T. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin - Dialogical Principle*. Trans. W. Godzich. Manchester University Press.

Tolan, F. (2007). *Margaret Atwood: Fiction and Feminism*. Rodopi Editions.

Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Westview Press.

Tymoczko, M. (1995). "The Metonymics of Translating Marginalized Texts". *Comparative Literature*. 47:1 (1995: Winter). pp 11-24.

Urdan, T. C. (2005). *Statistics in Plain English*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. Publishers.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). "Discourse and Manipulation". *Discourse & Society*. Vol 17 (2). London: Sage. pp. 359-383.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). "The Discourse-Knowledge Interface". Eds. Gilbert Weiss & Ruth Wodak. *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan. pp. 85-109.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). "Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity" *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Eds. Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998a). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London : Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998b). "Opinions and Ideologies in the Press". *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Eds. Allan Bell and Peter Garrett. Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1995a) "Discourse analysis as ideology analysis", *Language and Peace* (ed. Anita L. Wenden, A. and Christina Schaffner), Harwood Academic Pub. pp. 17-33.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995b). "Ideological discourse analysis". New Courant (English Dept, University of Helsinki). 4 (1995). Special issue *Interdisciplinary approaches to Discourse Analysis.* Eds. Eija Ventola and Anna Solin). pp. 135-161.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1979). "Relevance Assignment in Discourse Comprehension". *Discourse Processes*, pp. 113-126.

Van Peer, W. (1986). *Stylistics and Psychology: Investigations of Foregrounding*, Croom Helm.

Venuti, L. (1991). "Genealogies of Translation Theory: Schleiermacher". *TTR*. vol. 4. n° 2. 1991. pp. 125-150.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.

Verdonk, P. (1986). "Poetic Artifice and Literary Stylistics". *Linguistics and the study of literature*. Ed. Theo d'Haen, Costerus, new ser., v. 53. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Von Flotow, L. (2005). "Tracing the Context of Translation: The Example of Gender". *Gender, Sex and Translation: Manipulation of Identities*, Ed. Jose Santaemilia. Manchester: St. Jerome. pp. 39-51.

Von Flotow, L. (2000). "Translation Effects: How Beauvoir Talks About Sex in English". *Contingent Loves. Simone de Beauvoir and Sexuality*. Ed. Melanie Hawthorne. Virginia: Richmond University Press. pp. 13-33.

Weir, A. (1996). *Sacrificial Logics: Feminist Theory and the Critique of Identity*. London.

Wittig, M. (1992). "The Point of View". *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1975). *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*: New York. originally published: 1792.

Zingier, S.; Van Peer W. and Hakemulder J. F. (2007). "Complexity and Foregrounding: In the Eye of the Beholder?. *Poetics Today*. 28:4 (Winter 2007). pp. 653-682.

Electronic Sources

Annas, P. J. (1978). "New Worlds, New Words: Androgyny in Feminist Science Fiction", *Science Fiction Studies*. No 15, Vol. 5. Part 2. July.
 http://www.depauw.edu/sfs/backissues/15/annas15art.htm

Atwood, M. (2003). "Orwell and Me". *The Guardian*. June 16th.
Http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2003/jun/16/georgeorwell.artsfeatures

Byrne, P. "Orhan Pamuk: A Novelist Where the Currents Cross"
http://www.swans.com/library/art12/pbyrne07.html

Clute, J. http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue317/excess.html

Delany, S. (1990) "On Triton and Other Matters: An Interview with Samuel Delany". *Science Fiction Studies*. No: 52. Volume17. Part 3. November.
http://www.depauw.edu/sfs/interviews/delany52interview.htm

Elgin, S. H."Láadan: The Constructed Language in Native Tongue"
http://www.sfwa.org/members/elgin/laadan.html

Halman, T. S. *An Overview of Turkish Literature*, Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey Genaral Directorate of Libraries and Publications.
http://www.tedaproject.com/TR/Genel/dg.ashx?BELGEANAH=248999&DIL=1&DOSYAISIM=talat.pdf.

Hollinger, V. (1993). "A New Alliance of Postmodernism and Feminist Speculative Fiction: Barr's Feminist Fabulation", *Science Fiction Studies*, No. 60, Vol. 20, Part 2, July.
http://www.depauw.edu/SFs/reviews_pages/r60.htm#K60

Iplikci, M. "Bilimkurgu ve Kadin: Yeni Bin Yilda Bilimkurgunun Kadin Yazinindaki Yeri"
http://www.milliyet.com.tr/ozel/kitap/utopya/muge.html

Isma, S. "Interview with Emily Pohl-Weary, *Between The Lines*
http://www.btlbooks.com/Links/merril__interview.htm

Jenkins, H. (2006) "Can One Be A Fan of High Art?", July 26, *The Official Weblog of Henry Jenkins*.
http://www.henryjenkins.org/2006/07/can_one_be_a_fan_of_high_art.html

Piercy, M. The Author's Web Site.
http://www.margepiercy.com/interviews/faqs.htm#5

Schellenberg, J. "Reviews of Feminist SF", *Challenging Destiny: Science Fiction and Fantasy Reviews*.

http://www.challengingdestiny.com/reviews/feminist1.htm

Schwartz, S. (1982) "Women and Science fiction". *The New York Times*, May 2th.
http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9A02E3D61638F931A35756C0A964948260

Somay, B."Müstecaplıoğlu'nun Yerli Büyüleri"
http://www.bilimkurgu2000.com/makaleler/Mak51.asp

The Nobel Prize in Literature 2006: Orhan Pamuk's bio-bibliography
http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2006/bio-bibl.html