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Animated Film as an Eloquent Body: Seth Boyden’s An Object at Rest as Mattertext

Erratum

In the article published in Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences, volume sixteen, issue 1/2, special issue on “Literature and Environment,” with the citation information “Ağın, Başak. (2018). Animated Film as an Eloquent Body: Seth Boyden’s An Object at Rest as Mattertext, Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences, 16 (1/2), 27-46,” culled from the author’s PhD dissertation, the author noticed a conceptual error, which also recurred in the aforementioned dissertation. The author apologizes to the readers for the mistake that appears in both her article (the first link below) and her PhD dissertation (the second link below). In this paper, additional explanations and corrections are reported to remedy the erratic conceptual reference in the article and the confusion caused by the dissertation.
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Erratum

What follows involves a correction to my article, “Ağın, Başak. (2018). Animated Film as an Eloquent Body: Seth Boyden’s An Object at Rest as Mattertext, Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences, 16 (1/2), 27-46,” culled from my PhD dissertation, in which a similar error recurred. I believe this erratum will not only remedy the mistake in both my article and my PhD dissertation but also serve the purpose of an expansion to the concept of “mattertext.”

In both texts, the article and the dissertation, the concept of “mattertext” has been mistakenly attributed to Serenella Iovino and Serpil Oppermann. The term actually belongs to me, while Iovino and Oppermann are the coiners of the term “storied matter,” which holds a crucial place in their theorization of “material ecocriticism.” Both storied matter and material ecocriticism have played significant roles in my ongoing development of “mattertext.” In fact, I coined the term “mattertext” at first only to make the term closer to Donna Haraway’s and Bruno Latour’s use of “naturecultures,” the reference to and a detailed explanation of which can be viewed in my PhD dissertation. Just as Haraway and Latour consider nature and culture inseparable, I, following Iovino and Oppermann’s view, believe that textuality and materiality are always already enmeshed. To me, if the term “naturecultures” denotes the inherent link between nature and culture, bringing together matter and text requires considering and handling them as a single body, too. This is how I came to think of “mattertext” with no blank or no hyphen, and it explains the very first reason why I preferred to use “mattertext” instead of “storied matter.”

The more I thought and worked on “mattertext,” the more I shaped the concept in ways that are other than Iovino and Oppermann’s explorations concerning the story-telling potentials of matter. The second difference emerged through such process. In my understanding, the term “mattertext” also denotes the inseparability of the material and the textual, but it does not necessarily tell stories. This means that, in my view of mattertext, Iovino and Oppermann’s underlying implication of a ‘human reader’ for the stories of matter is not a critical element, though it might involve this. Just like Iovino and Oppermann, I also strongly acknowledge the feminist contributions to the material turn and view “mattertext” as the fruit of this new ontology, cemented by the cumulative efforts of scholars from feminist, posthumanist, and new materialist grounds. But here lies another difference of “mattertext” from “storied matter.” My recent work on mattertext (forthcoming in Technologies of Feminist Speculative Fiction: Gender, Artificial Life, Reproduction, edited by Sherryl Vint and Sumeyra Buran) derives a greater deal of energy from the work of earlier generation of feminist scholars. Conceived this way, mattertext bears stronger links to Hélène Cixous’s Medusa metaphor, écriture feminine, body, and materiality.

Based on these premises, the textual aspect of my conceptualization of mattertext implies a broader scope than narrativity. Indeed, mattertext can be viewed as an agentic tool that triggers change on the body, just as our carbon footprints, ‘written’ on the atmosphere, or a viral code that is inscribed into the DNA. Such inscription does not essentially activate the involvement of a human form of existence. Nor does it require the literal or metaphorical interpretations of a human agent. In fact, the human is only one of the many catalyzers at work in enacting both matter and text. As a result, although constructed on similar patterns of thought, mattertext follows a different path than Iovino and Oppermann’s conceptual formation of “storied matter,” which focuses more on the narrativity of the material, thus building inevitable links between literature and the environment. This means that “storied
matter” might have more symbolic or at least literary implications than my use of mattertext, which aims to go beyond narrativity. If mattertext is to signify anything, then it connotes oneness and growth towards a more inclusive posthuman ontology, in which textuality is not equated with narrative potentials of matter alone but hints at the agential powers of text, along with matter. Mattertext is, as all posthuman bodies and texts are, in a constant flux of becoming. Similar to Haraway’s cyborg, it is a blend of myth and reality, and is always in the making.

In brief, although my PhD dissertation, and subsequent to it, the aforementioned article both refer to Iovino and Oppermann as the source of the concept of “mattertext,” they have never used this term. Their concept “storied matter” is used to indicate the narrative capacities of matter. On the other hand, the term “mattertext” is mine, and although it started as a revision of Iovino and Oppermann’s concept, it has come to differ slightly throughout the years and is likely to develop further in the future.