*Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları Dergisi*
*Journal of Translation Studies*
Sayı/Number 32 (2022 Bahar / Spring), 1-23
Gönderme tarihi / Received: 01.05.2022
Kabul tarihi / Accepted: 19.06.2022
DOI: http://10.37599/ceviri.1111808

# Feminist Translation Activism: Reframing the Narratives of Gender Equality in Turkey through Citationality[1]

**Feminist Çeviri Aktivizmi: Türkiye'de Cinsiyet Eşitliği Anlatılarının Alıntısallık Üzerinden Yeniden Çerçevelendirilmesi**

Research/Araştırma

**Güliz Akçasoy*, Müge Işıklar Koçak****

*Res. Asst., Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, School of Foreign Languages, Department of Translation and Interpreting, akcasoyguliz@gmail.com, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-1421-4523

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Müge Işıklar Koçak, Dokuz Eylül University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Translation and Interpreting, muge_isiklar@yahoo.com, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-7010-8653

**ABSTRACT**

The feminist movement that flourished in the 1980s in Turkey was widely influenced by the Western second-wave feminism of the 1960s and 1970s. As a matter of this influence, translations/translators played an essential role in importing feminist epistemes mostly from the Western context into Turkish. Women's Circle's translations and the translated articles that were published in periodicals such as *Yazko Somut the 4th Page* catalyzed the dissemination of feminist ideas that would enable the transformation of hegemonic notions of women's rights, gender roles and gender equality that were prevalent in the society at the time. However, aside from full-text translations, feminist activists often opted for more implicit ways of cross-cultural exchanges by making citations from foreign sources in the indigenous texts that they wrote for a local readership in Turkey. This study aims to problematize the translated citations embedded in indigenous feminist texts published in the 1980s from Mona Baker's socio-narrative perspective (2006a), disclosing that feminist activists contested and reframed the hegemonic narratives on women and gender roles in Turkey by bringing in subversive counter-narratives, elaborated by prominent feminists, through these translated citations in a much more covert yet no less effective way than full-text translations. In this regard we examine Fatmagül Berktay's article

[1] This article presents only a small fragment of the PhD thesis that is being conducted by Güliz Akçasoy under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Müge Işıklar Koçak at Dokuz Eylül University.

"Eşitliğin Ötesine…" (1985) that was published in the heyday of the new feminism in Turkey, contesting the long-established notion of gender equality through the translated citations it makes use of. Regarding citations as a mode of "translation activism" (Baker, 2006b; Tymoczko, 2010), we argue that these citational chains are shaped by and shape in turn the feminist positionality of the translator/writer to the past narratives and the newly emerging feminist narratives in Turkey.

**Keywords**: translation activism, citationality, narrative theory, (re)framing, the feminist movement in Turkey

**ÖZET**

Türkiye'de 1980'lerde filizlenmiş olan feminist hareket Batı toplumlarında 1960'larda ve 1970'lerde yaşanan ikinci-dalga feminist hareketten büyük ölçüde etkilenmiştir. Bu etkinin bir gereği olarak çeviriler ve çevirmenler feminist *epistem*elerin çoğunlukla Batıdan Türkiye bağlamına aktarılmasında büyük rol oynamıştır. Kadın Çevresi'nin çevirileri ve *Yazko Somut 4. Sayfa* gibi süreli yayınlarda yayımlanan çeviri makaleler feminist fikirlerin yayılımını sağlamıştır ki bu da Türkiye'de kadın hakları ve toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri hakkında var olan hegemonik anlayışları dönüştürmeye yaramıştır. Tam metin çevirilerin yanı sıra, feminist aktivistler kültürlerarası alışverişin daha örtük bir yolu olarak Türkiyeli okurlar için yazdıkları telif metinlerde yabancı kaynaklardan alıntılar yapmayı sıkça tercih etmişlerdir. Bu çalışma 1980'lerde üretilen Türkçe feminist metinlere yerleştirilmiş alıntıları Mona Baker'in sosyal anlatı kuramı (2006a) çerçevesinde sorunsallaştırmayı hedeflemektedir. Araştırma göstermektedir ki feminist aktivistler Batı'nın önemli feministleri tarafından oluşturulan devrimci karşı-anlatılar aracılığıyla Türkiye'deki kadına ve toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine dair hegemonik anlatıları tam metin çevirilerden daha örtük fakat onlar kadar etkili bir şekilde yeniden çerçevelemiştir. Bu bağamda Fatmagül Berktay'ın Türkiye'de yeni feminizmin en hararetli günlerinde yazılmış olan "Eşitliğin Ötesine…" (1985) adlı makalesini inceleyeceğiz ve uzun süredir var olan cinsiyet eşitliği anlatısına söz konusu makalede yapılan çeviri alıntılar üzerinden nasıl meydan okunduğunu göstereceğiz. Birer "çeviri aktivizmi" (Baker, 2006b; Tymoczko, 2010) yöntemi olarak çeviri alıntıların, söz konusu çevirmenlerin/yazarların hegemonik anlatılara ve yeni yeşermekte olan feminist anlatılara yönelik politik konumları tarafından şekillendiğini ve karşılığında bu konumları da bizzat şekillendirdiğini tartışacağız.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** çeviri aktivizmi, alıntısallık, anlatı kuramı, yeniden çerçeveleme, Türkiye'de feminist hareket

## 1. Introduction

Translation has always been the part and parcel of feminist politics. Luise von Flotow states that "the past forty years of the women's movement, feminist politics, and feminist scholarship have been strongly affected by translation: not only in English-speaking countries but all over the world" (2012, p. 128). Yet, in the introductory chapter to their seminal collection *Feminist Translation Studies: Local and Transnational Perspectives*, Olga Castro and Emek Ergun draw attention to a lack of emphasis in feminist translation scholarship on the "critical role of translation in the trans/formation of feminist politics" (2017, p. 2). However, the future of feminism is

marked as lying in translation, since feminist translation as "a form of cross-border activism" can serve as a "tool and model of cross-border dialogue, resistance, solidarity and activism in pursuit of justice and equality for all" (Castro & Ergun, 2017, p. 1).

In the same vein, this article is motivated by Castro and Ergun's call for putting the "F word" into the discussion (2017, p. 3) and delves into a thorough examination of the role of translation/translators in the cross-cultural travel of feminist epistemes and transfiguration of local feminist politics. In addition to Castro's and Ergun's collection, two more collections published in the last couple of years offer valuable insights into feminist translation studies: *Translating Women* (2017) edited by Luise von Flotow and Farzaneh Farahzad, and *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Activism* (2020). However, studies included in these collections do not necessarily focus on the role of translated feminist theory in forming and shaping the local narratives in Turkey. Another collection *The Routledge Handbook of Translation, Feminism and Gender* (2020) by von Flotow and Hala Kamal and the most recent one *New Perspectives on Gender and Translation* (2022) by Eleonora Federici and Jose Santaemilia offers various insights into the impact of translational exchanges on the local context, however they are not exclusive to the Turkish context or do not incorporate translated citationality into the discussion. Our present study aims to compensate for this lack. To this end, we will particularly focus on the formation of feminist theory in Turkey, following the socio-narrative framework of Mona Baker as laid out in *Translation and Conflict* (2006a). And the framing activities in this respect will be construed as translation activism, as discussed by Baker (2006b; 2013) and Maria Tymoczko (2010).

This article is also motivated by a local call, as laid out by Ergun in her article "Translational Beginnings and Origin/izing Stories: (Re)Writing the History of the Contemporary Feminist Movement in Turkey", where she problematizes the relation between feminist activism and translation in the Turkish context. According to Ergun, the originizing story of the feminist movement in Turkey is "eliminatory and exclusionary" towards translation (2017, p. 50). Although Women's Circle publishing group translated "subversive theories, knowledges, and concepts that have helped expand the epistemological, political, and historical repositories of feminism" in the 1980s, feminist activists, each assuming active roles in the formation of feminist movement in the country, did not recognize, or simply denied, the role and impact of translations in this formation (Ergun, 2017, pp. 50-51). Instead, they contextualized translation as an "uncreative copy", evoking the century-old hegemonic dichotomy of "original versus translation", to "secure the originality – hence identity – of the Turkish feminist movement" (Ergun, 2017, p. 51). The underlying cause of this unsympathetic attitude was the assumption that "translational citationality and intertextuality" of the Turkish feminist politics would contaminate the authenticity of the movement (Ergun, 2017, p. 49).

To our knowledge, the last couple of years has also shown an increase in the academic interest in activist translations in Turkey. The translation activism was acknowledged from the scope of feminist and LGBTI+ movements. While some focus

on Women's Circle translations as a form of activism through paratextual analysis (Bozkurt, 2020), the others address online activism on feminist websites (Saki Demirel and Tarakçıoğlu, 2019). As for LGBTI+ activism, studies examined the translational practices of *Kaos GL Magazine* (Alan, 2021) and *LGBTI News Turkey* (Duraner, 2021). Of all these studies only Duraner's research adopts a narrative approach to her object of inquiry. What distinguishes our study from these studies, however, is that we set out to problematize the tansformative role of translated citationality, disregarded in the originizing stories of Turkish feminism, from a narrative perspective, and make an in-depth analysis of the cited/translated material in consideration of their impact on feminist political movement in Turkey, which is, to our knowledge, a first not just in the field of feminist translation studies but also in the general field of translation studies.

Akçasoy's doctoral research has so far revealed that the indigenous texts published by feminist activists in political journals and magazines in the 1980s are loaded with translational citations made mostly from Western feminist texts, which signals the close, inescapable and perpetual dependency of feminist activism on translations in Turkey. In consideration of the fact that feminist activists did not want to make further room for translations and opted for indigenous writing instead with a view to finding an original voice for themselves in their feminist pursuits (Ergun, 2017, p. 50), we argue that translated citations embedded in indigenous texts during and after that period manifested a paradox per se, which was the emergence of translation in the guise of citationality (quotations) in indigenous writing. This conflicting situation of feminist activists in relation to translation needs close scrutiny. To this end, in this study, we will exclusively focus on the translated quotations made by Fatmagül Berktay, as a socialist radical feminist/academician herself, in her article "Eşitliğin Ötesine…" [Beyond Equality][2] (1985), which will certainly signal the bigger picture of citational patterns in feminist activist translations.

## 2. Narrative Approach, Translation Activism, and Citationality

Activist translations can be understood as counter-movements that initiate social transformation (Tymoczko & Gentzler, 2002; Tymoczko, 2010; Baker, 2006b, 2013). In her edited collection *Translation, Resistance, Activism* (2010), Tymoczko states that translational activism has contributed among others to "shifts in cultural values (involving both indigenous values and foreign importations)" (2010, p. 229). She argues that "mobilized translators often become founders of discursivity, not merely by importing new cultural discourses in their translations but also by initiating discourses through the representations in their translations" (2010, p. 231). Therefore, an activist must "initiate action, change direction, construct new goals, articulate new values, and

[2] All translations are our own unless otherwise stated.

seeks new paths" in the target context so that their resistance to social and political injustices becomes meaningful (Tymoczko, 2010, p. viii).

Mona Baker positions translation as "an integral element of the revolutionary project" that forms cross-border solidarity to "effect change at home while conversing with others who are fighting similar battles elsewhere" (2016, p. 1). The socio-narrative approach Baker adopted in her seminal work *Translation and Conflict* illustrates the many ways in which translators can initiate social change by "(re)framing" narratives (2006a). Narratives are "public and personal 'stories' that we subscribe to and that guide our behaviour" (Baker, 2006a, p. 19). And framing, as an "active process of signification", is a way of activism for it produces "structures of anticipation that guide others' interpretation of events usually as a direct challenge to dominant interpretations of the same events in a given society" (Baker, 2006b, p. 156).

Borrowing the typology proposed by Somers and Gibson (1994), Baker groups narratives into four categories: ontological, public, conceptual and meta-narratives (2006a, p. 28). We will only mention three of them that are compatible with our purposes. Ontological narratives are "personal stories that we tell ourselves about our place in the world and our own personal history", such as autobiographies. Public narratives, on the other hand, are shared stories "elaborated by and circulating among social and institutional formations larger than the individual, such as family, religious or educational institution, the media, and the nation" (Baker, 2006a, p. 33). And conceptual narratives can be defined as "stories and explanations that scholars in any field elaborate themselves and others about their object of inquiry" such as Darwin's theory of natural selection (Baker, 2007, p. 39). And this present paper argues that Berktay's translational citations constitute both ontological and conceptual narratives that resist and subvert public narratives on women that were already in circulation in Turkey.

To examine the strategies that translators/authors take in regard to their activist translation projects, we will make use of two of Baker's theoretical concepts: framing by selective appropriation and repositioning of participants. Borrowing from Somers and Gibson (1994) and White (1988), Baker argues that narratives are framed through selective appropriation of textual material which is enabled by "patterns of omission and addition designed to suppress, accentuate or elaborate particular aspects of a narrative encoded in the source text or utterance, or aspects of the larger narrative(s) in which it is embedded" (2006a, p. 114). Selective appropriation can be deemed to be closely related to causal emplotment in terms of constructing narratives. Causal emplotment enables narrators to "weight" events in a way to produce different configurations in a narrative which in turn allows for different interpretations (Baker, 2006a, p. 67). And this weighting becomes manifest through "cumulative effect of relatively minor shifts" made during the translation process (Baker, 2006a, p. 70), which is certainly dovetailed with the selective strategies of the narrator, which are governed by the thematic threads they intend to weave (Baker, 2006a, p. 71). In addition to their thematic objectives, the narrator's "location in time and space" as

well as their "exposure to a particular set of public, conceptual and meta-narratives" also condition the framing of narratives (Baker, 2006a, p. 72). And all these factors are determined by "the values [they] subscribe to as individuals", which enable them to emphasize or de-emphasize certain elements while weaving their narratives (Baker, 2006a, p. 76). This, consequently, "repositions" the narrator in relation to other participants in any narrative, which in turn contests the dynamics of larger narratives (Baker, 2006a, p. 132).

In our case, Berktay's temperament as a socialist-radical feminist has a say in the thematic thread she aims to weave to subvert public narratives in Turkey, and in her selection of translated citations to be made. According to Baker, translators often take an active role and "initiate their own translation projects and actively select texts and volunteer for interpreting tasks that contribute to the elaboration of particular narratives" (2006a, p. 105). In the same vein, Berktay designates her own activist project by actively selecting and quoting from radical feminist frames crafted in Western narratives. Berktay's translation activism is mainly executed through citations that served to import new feminist epistemes into the Turkish feminist repertoire to subvert public narratives on women. Under the Republican regime, women and men were regarded as equals under the law and as shareholders of the public sphere. Yet, as we will presently show, the public sphere was allowed to women only when their public appearance was consistent with the conventional gender roles historically assigned to them, which only contributed to women's dilemmas of being split between private and public spheres. With translated citations, Berktay not only subverts this old narrative about women's place in society by importing the (re)framings of certain feminist figures from Western texts but also (re)positions both herself and these feminist figures within the very feminist narrative that was beginning to flourish at the time in Turkey.

In this regard, we will consider each one of the translated quotations as framing devices in their own rights, following Richard Baumann's typology of "interpretive frames" that include quotation, along with translation, as an "interpretive frame within which the messages being communicated are to be understood" (as cited in Ibrahim Muhawi, 2006, p. 366).[3] In his article "Towards a Folkloric Theory of Translation", Muhawi argues that "any alienating or foreignizing device which allows a translation to draw attention to itself would be considered part of its interpretive frame" (2006, p. 367). We will propose that quotations manifest their interpretive qualities by drawing attention to themselves because of certain indicators (quotation marks, references, phrases such as "X states that…", "according to X", etc.). This also resonates with the "sites of framing" such as images, captions, titles, and paratexts including footnotes,

[3] In his study, Muhawi adds "citations" in parenthesis to "quotation" when discussing Baumann's typology (2006, p. 367).

blurbs and prefaces (Baker, 2007, p. 160). To these we propose adding citations (quotations)[4] as sites of framing.

Gerard Genette, adopting a literary framework in *Palimpsests* (1997) uses the term "intertextuality" instead of citationality, which can also be quite helpful in understanding Berktay's citational strategies. Genette defines intertextuality as the "copresence" of two or several texts; or in other words "the actual presence of one text within another" (1997, pp. 1-2). He maps out the three basic practices of intertextuality as quoting, plagiarism and allusion:

> In its most explicit and literal form, it is the traditional practice of quoting (with quotation marks, with or without specific references). In another less explicit and canonical form, it is the practice of plagiarism (in Lautreamont, for instance), which is an undeclared but still literal borrowing. Again, in still less explicit and less literal guise, it is the practice of allusion: that is, an enunciation whose full meaning presupposes the perception of a relationship between it and another text, to which it necessarily refers by some inflections that would otherwise remain unintelligible (Genette, 1997, p. 2).

According to Michael Riffaterre, quotation must leave a "trace" in the text, which can be "linguistic (colon) or typographic (italic, an indication of the quoted extract) or semantic (statement that a citation will be made or the contextual distinction created by the citation)" (as cited in Kubilay Aktulum, 2000, p. 95). And the basic function of quoting is to have the authority of an earlier theoretician or author by citing his/her authorized words (Aktulum, 2000, p. 98). Our analysis will show that Berktay makes quotations by using all of these techniques and makes use of the authority quotations provide to disseminate radical feminist arguments. But before our textual analysis, we will briefly illustrate the narrative of gender equality as it was prevalent in Turkey before the 1980s.

## 3. Narratives of Gender Equality Before the 1980s in Turkey

In her seminal work *Halide Edip: Türk Modernleşmesi ve Feminizm* (2002), Ayşe Durakbaşa frames the Turkish Republican reforms of the 1920s and 30s as a modernization project which took over the Tanzimat reforms of the 19th century and combined them with a secular ambition. This reformative ambition, initiated by M. Kemal Atatürk, served as an anti-thesis against the conservative views of women prevalent in the society then, and aimed at upgrading the image and status of Turkish women in a way to promote the secular and democratic image of the newly established regime in the global forum (Durakbaşa, 2002, pp. 121-122). Within this modernizing perspective, women were given their right to equality in marriage, divorce, custody and inheritance, right to monogamy and testimony (1926), right to

[4] We use citationality to refer to the overall practice translators/authors are engaged in when writing an indigenous text, whereas quotation is used to refer to the specific information quoted in quotation marks or paraphrased in the indigenous text.

equal opportunities in education (1924), right to modern clothing (1925), and right to vote and stand for election (1930 and 1934, respectively). These rights offered an equal footing to men and women under the law.

However, Deniz Kandiyoti argues that women could be "emancipated" from their secondariness to men due to these rights, yet they were not "liberated" from conventional societal norms on women (1996, p. 78). Despite the efforts invested in gender equality and women's participation in social and working life, men were still deemed as the "breadwinners" in the family while women were still seen as responsible for housework and capable of working with their husband's consent (Osmanağaoğlu, 2015, p. 33), which signals the conservative and moralizing dispositions towards women. Kandiyoti describes the ideal image tailored then for women by the regime as "asexual comrades" to men (1989, p. 142). She argues that women were given the right to come out in the public zone as free individuals as men; yet it happened at the cost of a dissociation from their sexual identity, which was simply epitomized at the time with a masculine complexion, or otherwise, the coat-and-skirt dress uniformity (1989, p. 142). According to Nükhet Sirman, women were figured as "patriotic citizens" whose first and foremost mission was to serve their countries in every possible way (1989, p. 4).

Yet, as dissociated from their sexual identities in the public sphere, women still continued to be trapped in their conventional sex-based roles as mothers and wives in the private/domestic zone. This conspicuous segregation of women into gender norms was pinned down by Serpil Sancar in her evaluation that "while men were tasked to build a state, women were tasked to build a family" (2011, p. 77). In addition to their roles as wives to husbands and mothers to children, these women "were given another mission of vital importance which was to educate a nation" (Sirman, 1989, p. 4). So, women came out in the public sphere only in the legitimate domains that "best suit their femininity" such as teaching, caregiving and nursing (Bora, 2017, p. 751). Women who defied these predetermined norms were punished severely. In her seminal book *Kadınsız Inkilap* (2003), Yaprak Zihnioğlu lays out an elaborative account of the political ban imposed on Nezihe Muhittin and her fellow friends when they set out to found Women People's Party in 1923 and nominated Halide Edip as candidate for parliamentary elections (2003, p. 157).[5] Faced with such bold stances, the regime chastised these women by means of a subtle narrative that positioned them as "a bunch of spoiled, snobbish and parasitic elite minority asking for equality only to evade their responsibility of wifehood and motherhood" against "the solemn and spartan Anatolian woman who had endured hardships all along while ploughing the land and

[5] Turkish Women's Union, founded in place of Women People's Party in 1935 was later abolished due to the fact that union "proved to be inutile" since "women were given equal rights as men" (Zihnioğlu, 2003, p. 258).

mothering her children" (Bora, 2017, pp. 755-756).

This confinement of women into gendered boxes also pervaded the leftist-socialist movement in Turkey in the 1960s and 1970s. As Berktay recounts from her ontological narrative, women in the leftist movement were framed at the time as "intriguers who were inclined to go astray any moment", and thus, much more subject to "embourgeoisement" than men were, so much so that the buzzword "sister" [bacı] was adopted in order to guard men against the deceitfulness of women (1990, pp. 281-282). In a similar vein, women avoided make-up and vanity as bourgeois habits[6], and the movement had to advocate for family and monogamy as representing "the values of the public" to invalidate the allegations of "sexual collectivism" (1990, p. 282). Having been a socialist herself, Berktay declares that women were deemed and treated as "paragons", a sort of a display window for the movement (1990, p. 280). And Kader Çeşmecioğlu spells out the tendency in leftist organizations to use women as "assistants in logistics", even as "accomplices in aiding and abetting the criminals under the guise of a wife or mother" (2015, p. 15). The conspicuous tokenism in the leftist movement towards women did obviously draw on the gender norms and sexism prevalent in the society. In fact, women had to make much effort to overcome the impediments of "self-sacrifice" and "modesty" that were then inscribed as female virtues (2015, p. 15).

From this segregationist attitude, it does not take much to deduce that the modernization project exhibited a double standard on women by instrumentalizing them both at home and outside the home for the benefit of the new society. Women were expected to be as much competitive as men were in the public sphere. Yet, they were expected to align their new role in the public sphere with their femininity that was defined within the limits of the domestic/private sphere. Therefore, women could not reconcile their femininity and individualism without falling into dilemmas and making compromises to get out of those dilemmas. And these conflictions, as Sancar puts it, "always eclipsed the possibility of a genuine discussion on what exactly woman's rights were", and thus "the ideal of true gender equality could not infiltrate into the dominant narrative of equality in Turkey" (2011, p. 77).

In the post-coup political atmosphere in Turkey that was silenced with the imprisonment of male activists and the closure of political parties in the early 1980s, political conditions became favorable for a women's movement to take shape (Sirman, 1989; Tekeli, 1990; Arat, 2004). For Durakbaşa, post-1980 Turkey was different from the past for individualism was beginning to have an impact on society, and contrary to the notion of "collective liberation", individualistic tendencies encouraged women to take the floor and speak for themselves with a new discourse (2002, p. 17). Having spent the 1960s and 1970s struggling shoulder to shoulder with men in the left-wing

[6] Feminism was also framed as "bourgeois" in the left-wing discourse. The epitome of this attitude was *İlerici Kadınlar Derneği* [Progressive Women's Organization] (1975-1980) which labeled feminism as "reactionist bourgeois ideology", only serving capitalist purposes (Tekeli, 2017a, p. 390).

movement, women learned about what patriarchy is from Simone de Beauvoir, Kate Millett, Shulamith Firestone and August Bebel translations published by Payel Publishing during the period. Gülnur Savran named this period as "the fermentation years", in which women accumulated intellectual acumen "in private meetings at home, later through the feminist page in *Somut* and Women's Circle's publications" that was much needed for the development of a feminist movement (as cited in Koçali, 2002, p. 74). Women started gathering in the early days of the 1980s in consciousness-raising meetings at home from which was born the idea of publishing for feminist purposes. The first step was preparing a feminist page for *Yazko Somut* periodical, which was to be called "the 4th Page" (1983). This was followed by Women's Circle translations of Western feminist classics in between 1983 and 1986. *Yazko Somut the 4th Page* was the first feminist platform to publish full-text translations together with indigenous writing in Turkey. It was also the first feminist platform where feminists published indigenous articles that included citations from feminist classics. So, it can be suggested that this feminist page served as a platform where public narratives on women were being (re)framed.

## 4. The Case Study: Reframing of Gender Equality by Translated Citations

In her article "Eşitliğin Ötesine…", Fatmagül Berktay makes extensive quotations from the collection *The Rights and Wrongs of Women* (1976), edited by Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley. Berktay's main arguments in her article can be grouped into two broad themes: (1) women and men are not truly equal because women are confined in artificial constructs; and (2) women must defy the patriarchal framings they are exposed to find new ways of defining themselves. But before delving into the citations related to these themes, it needs to be pointed out that this collection was translated by Berktay in 1984 and it reveals salient examples of framing by selective appropriation.

Baker's framework proposes that translators can change the causal emplotment of the narrative they are translating by weighting the text in accordance with their selective appropriative strategies shaped by their thematic objectives (2006a, p. 69). In Berktay's translation, the title of the source text *The Rights and Wrongs of Women* becomes *Kadın ve Eşitlik* [Woman and Equality] (1984). In their introductory chapter to the collection, Mitchell and Oakley state their intention of producing an "anti-text" that aimed to challenge and even subvert the tenets of the feminist movement at the time, such as the obsession with sisterhood and the power of personal statements as well as rigidity towards criticism (1976, pp. 11-12). These factors justify the title "the rights and wrongs of women" as it signals the dilemmas women face between feminist ideals and femininity they are expected to assume in a patriarchal society. However, Berktay's choice of title for the translation cancels this frame of anti-textuality by replacing it with the frame of "equality", which only evokes the long-established public

narrative of "equality under the law" in Turkey that we briefly portrayed above. Since it does not offer any antagonistic standpoint to feminists in their fight for more rights, equality by itself has become inadequate in enlightening the paradoxical situation of women in a patriarchal society. This major difference between source and target texts becomes even more significant considering that Berktay also modified the table of contents of the collection by meticulously selecting 6 out of the 12 articles included in the ST. In her translator's note to the collection, Berktay justifies her selection as resulting from "publishing and marketing concerns" and "her intellectual dispositions" (1984, p. 11). The articles she chose to translate suggest that Berktay, as a socialist feminist activist herself, reframed the scope of the translated collection as "women's labor rights". In the same vein to her labeling and selective appropriation, Berktay also modified the causal emplotment of the collection in translation. She changed the places of articles in TT, repositioning Mitchell's article "Women and Equality" as the first and Margaret Walters' article "The Rights and Wrongs of Women" as the last article. The designation of the translated collection in this way, thus, enabled the foregrounding of the theme "equality" which did not yield much about the source text's contesting and subversive configuration.

Since feminist activists could not afford to publish anti-texts in the early 1980s because of the rudimentary status of feminist theory in Turkey[7], it can be suggested that Berktay's selective appropriation in translation served to condition and even instruct Turkish readers about debates on women and equality across the world. Yet, it can further be argued that activists/translators/authors might aspire to compound, enrich and consolidate the structure and texture of feminist literature not only through full-text translations but also through quotations made in indigenous writings. Baker's selective appropriation is quite telling to understand Berktay's citational endeavors since any citational choice is made consciously and deliberately by its very nature. And this makes citations perfect framing devices because the quoted material, as Bennett and Edelman put, "introduces new information (…) that promote critical thought" (as cited in Baker, 2006a, p. 75).

If regarded in this respect, Berktay's indigenous article "Eşitliğin Ötesine…" is quite interesting since it is heavily loaded with varied and extensive quotations from her own translated collection *Kadın ve Eşitlik*. It includes 3 long block quotations from Berktay's translated version of the collection, the two comes from Walters' article and the other is from Mitchell's article. Elsewhere in the article, Berktay continues to quote either directly or by paraphrasing from both articles. She quotes from Mitchell the parts where John Stuart Mill's approach to gender equality is problematized, and from Walters the parts where the standpoints of Mary Wollstonecraft, Harriet Martineau and Simone de Beauvoir are discussed. She quotes by paraphrasing 7 sentences from

[7] For a paratextual analysis of feminist theoretical texts that were translated during the 1960s and 1970s in Turkey, see Ayşenaz Postalcıoğlu's unpublished PhD Dissertation "Simone De Beauvoir in Turkey: (Her)Story of a Translational Journey" (2016); and Damla Göl's unpublished MA Thesis "Türkiye'de 1980 Dönemi Feminist Çeviri Hareketinin Kadın Çalışmaları Dizgesini Oluşturmadaki Rolü" (2015).

Mitchell with regard to Mill, and 10 sentences from Walters with regard to Wollstonecraft, and 4 sentences from Walters with regard to de Beauvoir and Martineau. She also quotes from other sources: 10 quotations by paraphrasing from Ann Foreman's book *Femininity as Alienation* (1977) and a long block quotation from Rosa Luxemburg's *Sevgiliye Mektuplar* (1984). Although these paraphrased sentences occasionally involve bits of direct quotations in the course of the narrative flow of Berktay's article, we consider them as paraphrases since they are merely summaries of their corresponding parts in the source texts.

Berktay follows the rules of quoting to a certain extent, occasionally giving references to the quotations in footnotes, and using quotation marks and free-standing blocks. However, after making a close reading of every source text she quotes from we noticed that she does not give proper reference to every single sentence she paraphrases from the source texts. Instead, she chooses to give reference to the source material once and then make paraphrases freely. Yet, it must be noted that not all indigenous articles including translated quotations that were published in feminist publications in the 1980s are as much occupied with quotations as Berktay's article is. This is what makes Berktay's text singular and worthy of examining. Yet, for space constraints, we will focus on a few selected translated quotations that will provide a coherent picture of the narrative layout of Berktay's article.

Berktay begins her indigenous article "Eşitliğin Ötesine…" by positioning herself against the general public narrative on gender equality by Mill's approach to the problem as it is framed in Mitchell's article. As if opening each layer of a spyglass at a time, readers would look, via Berktay's quotations, into the arguments of Mill, Wollstonecraft and de Beauvoir as they were reframed in Mitchell and Oakley's edited collection and transferred into the Turkish translation of the same collection.

In the article, Berktay's main suggestion is to "see the hidden part of the iceberg" to see the reasons for the lack of true gender equality (1985, p. 119). Although she does not pronounce it clearly, it appears that she purposefully quotes Mill intending to reframe the notion of "equality under the law" of the pre-1980 period as inadequate since it does not provide the analytical tools necessary for deconstructing the gender equality.

> Although at one moment [J. S. Mill] speculates that the reason why women are denied equal rights in society at large is because men must confine them to the home and the family, he does not pursue the implications of this insight and instead programmatically demands these rights. When it comes down to it, his equality is, quite realistically, equality under the law. (Mitchell, 1976, p. 394)

The first sentence is translated verbatim in Berktay's article. The last sentence, however, is paraphrased with regard to the overall argument in Mitchell's article:

> Söz konusu programsal taleplerin ise, kadın ile erkek arasındaki mevcut ilişkilerde belirleyici bir değişikliğe yol açacağı kanısında hiç değildir. (Berktay, 1985, p. 121)
>
> [Back translation: He does not believe at all that these programmatic demands will make a significant change in the forms of relationship between men and women]

After designating the general tone of her argument as such, Berktay continues by quoting from Walters to justify the failure of "equality under the law" in addressing the dilemmas of women. Walters produces an anti-text with the conceptual and ontological narratives of three feminists Wollstonecraft, Martineau, and de Beauvoir. Through their non-fiction work, semi-autobiographical novels, and letters, Walters portrays them as feminists who suffer from dilemmas:

> Each of these three writers suggests the problem of developing a consciousness of our own that is neither stereotyped femininity nor a secondhand masculinity. Each of them is trapped between the 'masculinity' and 'femininity' she tries so hard to disentangle. Each insists on her rights to equality with man – and finds, at some level, the poverty of that equality. Each suggests what a woman can achieve, and the price, in this society, she may pay for that achievement. (Walters, 1976, p. 307)

Berktay translated these sentences verbatim, properly following the rules of quotation such as giving reference to the source, placing quotation in a free-standing block, and omitting the quotation marks. The phrase "a consciousness of their own", a framing apparatus per se, reverberates the consciousness-raising meetings of the 1980s where women would gather to develop an understanding as to the pressing issues of femininity and masculinity norms prevalent in Turkish society. Ontological narratives shared in these meetings among women/feminists had already sparked a process of questioning gender equality. Yet, here, instead of referring to these meetings, Berktay seems to have intended to nail down a point of view by bringing credibility to her words by quoting the phrase "the poverty of that equality" from Walters who, as an ardent feminist, had already gone through the second-wave feminist era in Western societies. By forming a spyglass-like citational chain with Walters, Berktay is also given the access key to the intellectual repositories of three renowned feminists at one single stroke. The same applies to the phrase "second-hand masculinity" since Berktay's translation of the phrase calls out the narratives that required women to become asexualized to be allowed into the public zone.

Berktay continues to invest her framework with quotations that contest narratives about women's commitment to their gender roles. Walters' account of Wollstonecraft's insights into femininity is scattered throughout her article. We grouped them into a single body of text for the convenience of analysis:

> Femininity is something imposed on us by men; and the very concept is full of contradictions. […] [Women] are not expected to have real selves at all. […] All possibility of individuality is lost; 'all women are to be levelled, by meekness and docility, into one character of yielding softness and gentle compliance'. And with so much importance placed on externals, seeming is more important than being, and a woman must always playact at being a woman. […] Any woman who tries to escape

> this absurd trap and act like a human being runs the risk of being hunted out of society for being 'masculine'. (Walters, 1976, p. 316-317)

Berktay collects these scattered pieces into one single body of quotation and translates them literally into Turkish. Elsewhere, Walters' interpretation of *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* as a protest against "artificial femininity" (1976, p. 321; 1985, p. 122) is transferred verbatim into the Turkish text. Berktay directly quotes Wollstonecraft's insights, as recounted in Walters' text, that "sexual oppression of women is connected with larger social inequalities" (Walters, 1976, p. 319; Berktay, 1985, p. 122), signaling the need to reconfigure the asymmetrical relations between men and women which ends up with the latter's oppression. Berktay also quotes Wollstonecraft's emphasis on the need for "a general reorganization of society" if a "revolution in female manners" is to be made (Walters, 1976, p. 321; Berktay, 1985, p. 122).

Berktay further problematizes this corrupt system of gender roles by quoting from Foreman's treatise *Femininity as Alienation* (1977) on how the distinction of private and public spheres become gendered. Here is Foreman's analysis with certain parts omitted for the convenience of analysis:

> The liberal notion of freedom was the individual's freedom from interference, which Freud echoed in his gloomy fashion, was based on the division of society into the political realm of the state and the private realm of the individual. […] The political state recognized the rights of the individual man, the right to protection for himself and his property. The private realm was where the individual exercised his freedom. Marx criticized this liberal notion of freedom and society […] When Marx pointed out that such freedom was based on private property he failed to mention that a man's private property included his wife. So the right to private property meant in practice not just that the poor were exploited and excluded from the exercise of freedom; it also meant the subjugation of women. (Foreman, 1977, p. 67)

Berktay translates these remarks not literally but in a way that preserves the gist of the discussion performed by Foreman. She changes the places of the sentences to obtain a certain pace in the course of her narrative. Accordingly, with the transference of production to the public sphere and introduction of private property, a division emerged between private and public realms. Since a woman is deemed as the private property of her husband, the public sphere is identified with men whereas the private sphere becomes identified with women together with all the things men own. And this served as the precondition of women's subjugation. Berktay also translates by paraphrasing Foreman's arguments that "[f]reedom appeared much more at home in the privacy of the family than in this social world of hostile powers […]" and "[i]f the man's authority was constantly under threat in his social and business life at least it was secure here" (Foreman, 1977, p. 68; Berktay, 1985, p. 121). And in the except given above, it can be seen that Foreman reframes Sigmund Freud and Karl Marx in a

different context by making quotations from them. Berktay, on the other hand, omits these names from her quotation from Foreman. One reason might be that she might not have wanted to overcrowd her article that was already packed with names of foreign authors and texts. Another reason might be that she did not want to provoke a quarrel with other Turkish feminists by inserting names that were historically known for being disliked by feminists. So, Berktay breaks the reframing chain initiated by Foreman, yet she manages to fine-tune the feminist literature in Turkey by inserting Foreman's explication of gendered division of private and public spheres.

These arguments become even more impressive when they are juxtaposed with the excerpts from Wollstonecraft's ontological narratives that display the dilemmas she experienced herself. Here are the sentiments Wollstonecraft expressed in one of her love letters to G. Imlay:

> 'Why am I forced to struggle continually with my affection and feelings? … Why are those … the source of so much misery, when they seem to have been given to vivify my heart and extend my usefulness?' … 'Will you not endeavor to cherish all the affection you can for me!' (Walters, 1976, p. 326)
>
> 'Have I desires implanted in me only to make me miserable? Will I never be gratified? Shall I never be happy?' (Walters, 1976, p. 329)

Berktay translated these sentences without any change into Turkish. These statements mark Walters' article as an anti-text that touches on Wollstonecraft's sensibility as the anchor of her radicalism. Contrary to the general conviction of her as a liberal-bourgeois feminist, Walters reframes Wollstonecraft as a feminist problematizing her sensibilities to better understand patriarchal mechanisms. And the verbatim translation of Walters' framework in turn positions Berktay's article as an anti-text within the Turkish feminist narrative. Berktay translated Wollstonecraft's considerations because of her courage to call out the need to problematize emotions and their patriarchal configurations. By bringing a counter-frame from the Western context into the Turkish one, Berktay makes small revisions to the feminist narrative in Turkey.

In one of her articles published in *Yazko Somut the 4th page* in 1983, Şirin Tekeli had cited Wollstonecraft as a renowned feminist along with Flora Tristan, August Bebel and Alexandra Kollontai, and her feminist work *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* as "the first systematic declaration of women's rights" (2013, p. 142). Tekeli mentions these feminists coming from either liberal or socialist camps together with respect to their contributions to the feminist literature. Yet, Berktay, in accordance with her oppositional reframing agenda, compensates for what is missing in Tekeli's article and draws an unprecedented parallel between Wollstonecraft and socialist feminists by adding timely quotations from Luxemburg next to the quotations from Wollstonecraft. Berktay juxtaposes both feminists by drawing on the dilemmas they experience in their intimate relationships, which are manifest in their letters to their significant others. Just as Wollstonecraft asks G. Imlay to give her affection, Luxemburg is also asking for affection from Leo Jogisches and protesting his indifference towards her feelings and

to her position as a woman (Berktay, 1985, p. 123). No matter what political backgrounds these two women were coming from they both expressed their intimate desires. It is interesting that Berktay makes this convergence by quotations from a translated text *Sevgiliye Mektuplar* (1984). So, it can be suggested that Luxemburg was already introduced to the Turkish context as a socialist feminist who is both sensible and sensitive. Yet, Berktay's quotations reframed this image even further by emphasizing the intersectionality of both feminist positionality, i.e. how similarly Wollstonecraft and Luxemburg thought and behaved.

Berktay fine-tunes this reframing by juxtaposing Luxemburg with Walters' critical reframing of de Beauvoir. Walter reframes de Beauvoir as the "double" of Sartre, a mere copy of the man and thus incabaple of going through such feminine experiences as giving birth to a child (1976, 368). Berktay paraphrases these points by dramatizing de Beauvoir's admiration for Sartre. She says:

> Bu tutum, ikincilliğini kabullenip Sartre'ı "sevinçle izleyen" Simone de Beauvoir'ınkinden çok farklıdır. Belki de bu iki farklı tutumun temelinde, de Beauvoir'ın Sartre'ı kendi "eş"i (sureti) olarak görmesi; buna karşılık Luxemburg'un kendisini her yönüyle gerçekleştirme, bağımsız bir kişilik, bir "özne" olma hakkına ve olanağına sıkıca sarılması yatmaktadır. (Berktay, 1985, pp. 171-172)
>
> [Back translation: This attitude [of Luxemburg] is quite different than Simone de Beauvoir's who accepted her secondariness and watched Sartre enthusiastically. Perhaps, the reason for this discrepancy stems from the fact that de Beauvoir saw Sartre as her "double" (copy) whereas Luxemburg dedicated herself to the right and possibility of self-fulfillment and becoming a "subject", and independent person.]

By describing de Beauvoir as "accepting her secondariness" and "watching Sartre enthusiastically", which cannot be found in Walters' article, and describing Luxemburg as struggling to obtain her agency, Berktay reframes Luxemburg as a more competent and versatile feminist than de Beauvoir. Only against this frame can Luxemburg's feminist stance be highlighted. Since Berktay is a socialist feminist, her reframing of Luxemburg in juxtaposition to de Beauvoir and Wollstonecraft also helped challenge and reframe certain aspects of socialist feminism per se. Against the misery of a feminist who missed the chance of becoming liberated by denying her feminine side, socialist feminist appreciates her feminine side and asks her romantic partner to do so as well, and the feminine traits she embraces does not sabotage her endeavor to become an independent person. So, it can be suggested that Berktay, through the juxtapositions with de Beauvoir and Wollstonecraft as well, reframes socialist feminism by moving beyond the all-too-familiar agenda of socialist feminism including class struggle and division of labor, and adds elements to the formula such as the emotional struggles of women in the gendered arena of romantic relationships and the importance of a fully-fledged agency that does not exclude feminine experiences. This certainly puts a fresh complexion on Berktay's political agenda of redefining the

concepts of femininity and masculinity as it is expressed clearly in her article. Also, she reframes de Beauvoir's feminism under a different light than the general reception de Beauvoir received in Turkey, especially in *Yazko Somut the 4th Page,* which will be discussed in the following section.

In order to further support her argumentation above, Berktay further challenges de Beauvoir's feminist thought by quoting more from Walters. Closely reading her semi-autobiographic novels, Walters argues that de Beauvoir "has not confronted the deeper contradictions of women's psychological life" (1976, p. 377). Wollstonecraft, on the other hand, struggled all her life "to work and live like a man, but like a woman as well" and "refused to suppress one side of herself, though she found her refusal to compromise brought her pain and disillusion" (1976, p. 306). As per her selective appropriative strategy, Berktay reframes de Beauvoir in the way she is depicted above since it juxtaposes, and thus strengthens, the radical side of Wollstonecraft's feminist contemplations. She paraphrases a number of commentaries made by Walters about de Beauvoir in different parts of her text:

> As long as Sartre was her 'double', her other self, a child was probably a genuine impossibility. A child would have forced a completely different kind of relationship; inevitably it would have polarized them, divided the 'human' back into 'masculine' and 'feminine' elements. So, she discovers a whole series of reasons for not having a child. (Walters, 1976, p. 368)
>
> We see that she has spent a lifetime working out and on her relationship with one man, - but that relationship is an absence at the heart of her life story. (Walters, 1976, p. 369)
>
> De Beauvoir, like Martineau, made a powerful attack on the masculine ideology of femininity – but at the cost of adopting that ideology herself. (Walters, 1976, p. 377)
>
> Simone de Beauvoir özgürdür, ama Margaret Walters'ın dediği gibi, bu, çok önemli deneyim alanlarını reddettiği için mümkün olabilmektedir. Kendi yaşamı ve başarısı 'kadınlığın değerinin azaltılmasına' bağlıdır. Ve bu da yalnızca yapay bir klişeden kurtuluş değil, kendisinde gerçek olan bir şeylerin yitmesi anlamına gelmektedir. (Berktay 1985, p. 123)
>
> [Back translation: Simone de Beauvoir is liberated; yet, she is so by rejecting crucial experiences. Her life and achievements depend on her ability to 'reduce her femininity'. And this is not just emancipation from an artificial construct but also loss of something authentic in itself.]

It can be observed that "rejecting crucial experiences" addresses de Beauvoir's "reasons for not having a child" with Sartre. While the phrase "reduction of her femininity" refers to the "masculine ideology of femininity" which de Beauvoir ended up adopting herself, the phrase "loss of something authentic" alludes to her relationship with Sartre as "an absence at the heart of her life story". As Baker argues, weighting of a narrative can be achieved through "the choice of equivalents in translation" (2006a, p. 70). Berktay chose the words "rejection", "reduction", and "loss" that do not have direct equivalents in Walters' text and have much higher

resonances than Walters' words and phrasing to self-denial. So, she manages to shift the weighting in Walters' reframing of de Beauvoir into a bit more compact and reinforced one in her own framing.

Berktay translates Walters' arguments by paraphrasing them in the Turkish text to validate the conviction that a genuine and revolutionizing definition of woman and female manners cannot be possible if experiences such as marrying, giving birth, and mothering are rejected completely. Rejection does not yield radical consequences for women's emancipation and liberation. This might also be the reason why Berktay does not quote de Beauvoir as much and in the same way as she does Wollstonecraft. De Beauvoir's ontological and conceptual narratives do not align exactly with Berktay's activist concerns of reframing the very concept of radicalism and what it must signal for the new contemporary feminism. Berktay sees the possibility of a true revolution in recognition, and even celebration, of emotions and experiences, coded as feminine and secondary in a patriarchal framework.

Akçasoy's thesis research has so far revealed that de Beauvoir has been the most quoted feminist in *Yazko Somut the 4th Page*, which was the first feminist publication including translations in the 1980s. It covered full-text translations of de Beauvoir's interviews which did not reveal much personal information about her life, and a number of indigenous articles with quotations from her most reputed theoretical work, *Le Deuxieme Sexe* (1949). In *Yazko Somut the 4th Page*, de Beauvoir was framed as "an important feminist figure of French feminism" (2013, p. 187). However, as framing strategies in Walters' article have shown, foregrounding de Beauvoir's ontological narratives might cast a new light to her dilemmas and her feminist positionality in the face of these dilemmas. So, it can be suggested that by her selective appropriation of these ontological narratives in her indigenous article, Berktay manages to reposition herself vis-a-vis a feminist trend that was then framing de Beauvoir as a feminist legend based on her conceptual narratives. However, with the help of ontological narratives transported from Walters, Berktay could bring a different perspective to de Beauvoir's radicalism by foregrounding emotions and sensibility as sine qua non of a radical feminist argumentation and thus extend it to address the irreconcilable conflict between women's desires and societal expectations from women.

## 5. Conclusion

Our analysis of the translated citations from Wollstonecraft and de Beauvoir, as performed by Fatmagül Berktay, reveals that each quoted material operates as framing/interpretive device per se. Through these quotations, Berktay reframed the hegemonic narratives on women and gender roles in Turkey by offering subversive counter-narratives, elaborated by prominent feminists. The hegemonic narratives were picturing women as split between being as much competitive as men in the

public sphere and being as feminine as a woman should be. As a result of these conflicting situations, women could not synthesize their femininity with their individualism without having to make compromises. However, the message that was put across to readers through Berktay's quotations was that we must be able to see beyond what is given and establish a new order where women do not have to pay a price for transgressing the gender boundaries and exploring their own ontology, needs, and desires. Berktay conveys this message in her indigenous article by forming a causal emplotment through selective appropriation, as presented by Baker (2006a), of citations from source texts that were compatible with her political objectives. She quotes from an anti-text by Walters and backs her antagonistic stance through other quotations from Foreman and Luxemburg. She deconstructs the widely accepted images of Wollstonecraft, de Beauvoir and Martineau in Turkey by translating critical excerpts from Walters. And she continues to validate her argumentative layout by incorporating new elements as the division of private and public spheres by Foreman. She further reframes the dilemmas women experience, however enlightened and empowered they might (seem to) be, by translating the personal narrative of a socialist feminist, Luxemburg, in juxtaposition to the personal narrative of bourgeois feminist Wollstonecraft. Yet, Berktay also juxtaposes Luxemburg with de Beauvoir in order to disclose the latter's erasure of femininity and self while foregrounding the former's embrace of feminine experiences and struggling for an independent agency at the same time. With these strategically selected transactions, Berktay reframed not only the public narratives of gender equality but also the attitudes and assumptions that were pertaining to the feminist political discourse in Turkey and repositioned both the feminists she quotes from and herself vis-à-vis mainstream tendencies therein.

Berktay's heavy reliance on translated citations in her article, containing 4 bulky block quotations and 31 paraphrased sentences in only five pages, indicates that citational translation is one of Berktay's authorial strategies. She makes deliberate use of translated quotations from foreign and translated materials. This strategy might be stemming from two possible causes: (1) An academician herself, Berktay might have opted for citations by force of habit, or (2) given the intriguing title of her article (with "beyond" indicating uncharted territory), she might have sought after an authorizing intellectual foundation to provide a basis to her arguments that were nonmainstream at the time. In order for the newly-imported ideas to stick with Turkish recipients, Berktay might have wanted to make use of ideas that had been proposed, tested, and accepted by a different recipient group in a different context. An awareness of foreign epistemologies and the role of translations in disseminating them might have grown with the increasing number of translated books and collections on women and feminism. This translational activity extended over nearly four decades starting from the 1960s until the 1990s, and it might have eventually led feminist activists to develop a tendency towards quoting. Moreover, Turkish feminism is defined as a political movement that was widely influenced by Western feminisms (Kardam and Ecevit, 2002; Sancar, 2012; Tekeli, 2017b). Tekeli asserts that they were closely observing the feminist movement in its heyday in Western societies during the 1960s and 1970s

(2017b, p. 139). And they organized consciousness-raising meetings and feminist reading clubs in the 1980s where they shared feminist epistemologies with each other (Koçali, 2002, p. 74). Although they do not express it openly, it can be suggested that feminist activists at the time observed Western feminism through original texts. And later, as Akçasoy's thesis research has so far revealed, some of these feminist activists translated or participated in the translation of feminist theoretical texts into Turkish. A striking example for this is that Berktay makes quotations from her own translations, such as the feminist collection *Kadın ve Eşitlik* (1984). This fact is quite telling to pinpoint the intertwined and ever-changing positions of translatorship and authorship, i.e. one moment you are translating and the next you are writing. Berktay, as an activist translator, translated a collection and then made quotations in her indigenous article from both this collection and many others that she had not translated before. It can also be suggested that the way these feminist activists first became familiar with feminist theory must have shaped their feminist repertories out of foreign materials mostly, from which they would later obtain their authorization. What is even more interesting is that the translated citations embedded in indigenous texts enabled these feminists to intertwine foreign and local contexts within one single text, thus rebutting any rigid contextualization of their activism into dichotomic patterns (Western vs. local). Considering that Berktay's article was written in 1985, this intertwining of local and foreign contexts in one single text is a perfect foreshadowing for transnational and intersectional feminism[8] of the 1990s.

Lastly, our analysis and findings invalidate the exclusionary attitude towards translations by feminists that have participated in the documentary *İsyan-ı Nisvan* (2008), as argued by Ergun (2017), by showing that feminist activists did not cease but rather continued to translate from foreign sources in the form of citations in indigenous texts. Berktay's case reframes the widespread conviction that the 1980s' feminism advanced from translations to indigenous writing by showing that local feminist texts still relied on translations even in the form of translated citations. Moreover, Berktay's method of spyglass citation from her previous translation blurs the line between authorship and translatorship, which moves us even closer to challenging the dichotomic conceptualizations such as "original" vs. "translation as unoriginal copy", as proposed by Ergun (2017). However, we need to examine more examples of this kind to understand in what ways and to what degrees this line is defied even further.

[8] Intersectionality was first coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in the article "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics" (1989).

## References

Aktulum, K. (2000). *Metinlerarası ilişkiler*. Öteki Yayınevi.

Alan, C. (2021). Queer activism through translation in Turkey: The practices of Kaos GL magazine. In A. Ö. Tarakçıoğlu & E. Ersözlü (Eds.) *Synergy III: Challenges in translation* (pp. 259-275). Peter Lang Publishing.

Arat, Y. (2004). Türkiye'de modernleşme projesi ve kadınlar. In S. Bozdoğan & R. Kasaba (Eds.), *Türkiye'de modernleşme ve ulusal kimlik* (pp. 82-98). Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Baker, M. (2006a). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. Routledge.

Baker, M. (2006b). Translation and activism: Emerging patterns of narrative community. *The Massachusetts Review, 47*(3), 462–484. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25091111

Baker, M. (2007). Reframing conflict in translation. *Social Semiotics, 17*(2), 151-169. https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330701311454

Baker, M. (2013). Translation as an alternative space for political action. *Social Movement Studies, 12*(1), 23–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.685624

Baker, M. (2016). Beyond the spectacle: Translation and solidarity in contemporary protest movements. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Translating dissent: Voices from and with the Egyptian revolution* (pp. 1-18). Routledge.

Beauvoir, S. de (1949). Le deuxieme sexe. Gallimard.

Berktay, F. (1985). Eşitliğin ötesine…. *Yapıt, 9*, 119-124.

Berktay, F. (1990). Türkiye Solu'nun kadına bakışı: Değişen bir şey var mı?. In Ş. Tekeli (Ed.), *Kadın bakış açısından 1980'ler Türkiye'sinde kadın* (pp. 279-290). İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T. (2017). *Cereyanlar: Türkiye'de siyasi ideolojiler*. İletişim Yayınları.

Bozkurt, S. (2020). Translational replacement of feminist theory through translations in Turkey: An activist translation perspective. In J. Santaemilia Ruiz (Ed.), *Feminismo(s) y/en traducción Feminism(s) and/in Translation* (pp. 137-148). Editorial Comares.

Castro, O. & Emek E. (Eds.) (2017). *Feminist translation studies: Local and transnational perspectives*. Routledge.

Çeşmecioğlu, K. (Ed.) (2015). *Ateşe uçan pervaneler: Devrimci Yolcu Kadınlar Anlatıyor*. Kalkedon Yayıncılık.

Demirel, A. S. & Tarakcıoğlu, A. Ö. (2019). Feminist translation practices in Turkey: The case of the feminist websites 5 Harfliler and Çatlak Zemin. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 15*, 295–312. http:// 10.29000/rumelide.580614

Duraner, J. E. (2021). Translate to resist: An analysis on the role of activist translation/translators in the LGBTI+ movement in Turkey. *Translation and Interpreting Studies, 16*(2), 291–315. https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.19059.dur

Durakbaşa, A. (2002). *Halide Edip: Türk modernleşmesi ve feminizm*. İletişim Yayınları.

Ergun, E. (2017). Translational beginnings and origin/izing stories: (Re)writing the history of the contemporary feminist movement in Turkey. In L. von Flotow & F. Farahzad (Eds), *Translating women: Different voices and new horizons* (pp. 41-55). Routledge.

Federici, E. & Samtaemilia, J. (2022). *New perspectives on gender and translation: New voices for transnational dialogues*. Routledge.

Flotow, L. von (2012). Translating women: From recent histories and re-translations to "queerying" translation, and metramorphosis. *Quaderns, 19*, 127–139. https://raco.cat/index.php/QuadernsTraduccio/article/view/257030.

Flotow, L. von & Farahzad, F. (Eds.). (2017). *Translating women: Different voices and new horizons*. Routledge.

Flotow, L. Von & Kamal, H. (2020). *The Routledge handbook of translation, feminism and gender*. Routledge.

Foreman, A. (1977). *Femininity as alienation*. Pluto Press.

Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*. (C. Newman & C. Doubinsky, Trans.). University of Nebraska Press. (the original book was published in 1982).

Gould, R. R., & Tahmasebian, K. (Eds.) (2020). *The Routledge handbook of translation and activism*. Routledge.

Göl, D. (2015). Türkiye'de 1980 dönemi feminist çeviri hareketinin kadın çalışmaları dizgesini oluşturmadaki rolü [Unpublished MA Thesis]. İstanbul University.

Kandiyoti, D. (1989). Women and the Turkish state: Political actors or symbolic pawns?. In N. Yuval-Davis and F. Anthias (Eds.), *Women, nation and the state* (pp. 126-149). Macmillan.

Kandiyoti, D. (1996). *Cariyeler bacılar yuttaşlar*. Metis Yayınları.

Kardam, F. & Ecevit, Y. (2002). 1990'ların sonunda bir kadın iletişim kuruluşu: Uçan Süpürge. In A. Bora (Ed.) *90'larda Türkiye'de feminizm* (pp.87-108). İletişim Yayınları.

Koçali, F. (2002). Kadınlara mahsus Gazete Pazartesi. In A. Bora (Ed.) *90'larda Türkiye'de feminizm* (pp.73-86). İletişim Yayınları.

Luxemburg, R. (1984), *Sevgiliye mektuplar* (Nuran Yavuz, Trans.). Kaynak Yayınları.

Mitchell, J. & Oakley, A. (Eds.) (1976). *The rights and wrongs of women*. Penguin Books.

Mitchell, J.; Oakley, A. (1984), *Kadın ve eşitlik* (Fatmagül Berktay, Trans.). Kaynak Yayınları.

Muhawi, I. (2006). Towards a folkloristic theory of translation. In T. Hermans (Ed.) *Translating others* (pp. 365-379). St Jerome Publishing.

Osmanağaoğlu, H. (2015). *Feminizm kitabı: Osmanlı'dan 21. yüzyıla seçme metinler*. Dipnot Yayıncılık.

Postalcıoğlu, A. (2016). Simone De Beauvoir in Turkey: (Her)story of a translational journey. [Unpublished PhD Dissertation]. Universitat Rovira I Virgili.

Sancar, S. (2011). Türkiye'de kadın hareketinin politiği: Tarihsel bağlam, politik gündem ve özgürlükler. In S. Sancar (Ed.), *Birkaç arpa boyu…: 21. yüzyıla girerken Türkiye'de feminist çalışmalar* (pp. 61-117). Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Sirman, N. (1989). Feminism in Turkey: A short history. *New Perspectives on Turkey, 3*, 1-34. https://doi.org/10.15184/S0896634600000704

Somers, M.R., & Gibson, G. (1994). Reclaiming the Epistemological "Other": Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, (pp. 37–99). Basil Blackwell. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360901226_Margaret_Somers_in_Conversation_with_Daniel_Hirschman

Tekeli, Ş. (1990). 1980'ler Türkiye'sinde kadınlar. In Ş. Tekeli (Ed.), *1980'ler Türkiyesi'nde kadın bakış açısından kadınlar* (pp. 15-45). İletişim Yayınları.

Tekeli, Ş. (2013). 8 Mart ve yeni feminizm. In S. Ovadia & E. Doğu (Eds.) *Yazko somut 4. sayfa: İlk feminist yazılar.* Renas Yayıncılık.

Tekeli, Ş. (2017a). Kadınlar: Cumhuriyet'in sevilmeyen cinsi. In Ş. Tekeli (Ed.), *Feminizmi düşünmek* (pp. 373-401). Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Tekeli, Ş (2017b), Feminizm nedir, ne değildir?. In Ş. Tekeli (Ed.), *Feminizmi düşünmek* (pp. 131-140). Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Tymoczko, M. & Gentzler E. (2002). *Translation and power*. University of Massachusetts Press.

Tymoczko, M. (2010). *Translation, resistance, activism*. University of Massachusetts Press.

Walters, M. (1976). The rights and wrongs of women: Mary Wollstonecraft, Harriet Martineau, Simone de Beauvoir. In J. Mitchell, & A. Oakley (Eds.), *The Rights and Wrongs of Women* (pp. 304-378). Penguin Books.

White, H. (1988). The Content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation. *The American Historical Review*, *93*(4), 1007–1008. https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr/93.4.1007

Zihnioğlu, Y. (2003). *Kadınsız inkılap: Nezihe muhiddin, kadınlar halk fırkası, kadın birliği*. Metis Yayınları.