

First and Last Words: Paratextual Guardianship and the Gendered Canonization of *Frankenstein* in Turkish Reception¹

İlk ve Son Söz: Yanmetinsel Vesayet ve *Frankenstein*'ın Türkçe Alımlamasında Toplumsal Cinsiyet Temelli Kanonlaştırma

Araştırma/Research

Merve Sevtap SÜREN

Lect. Dr., İstanbul Technical University, School of Foreign Languages, ilginmerve@gmail.com, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-6888-391X

ABSTRACT

This article examines how a Turkish 'classics' edition can structure reception through peritextual design. Using the İletişim Klasikleri's 2019 edition of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* as a case study, it argues that this edition constructs an 'authority architecture': a sequenced threshold that allocates interpretive power, frames authorship, and produces canonicity. Methodologically, the article combines close reading with feminist critical discourse-analytic attention to voice allocation, epistemic stance (hedges, rumour markers, evaluative verdicts), and nomination/relational naming across the cover, author biography and chronology, Murat Belge's preface, and Walter Scott's afterword. The analysis shows that the cover's authority line (with Belge's preface and Scott's afterword) installs male, allographic voices as the first and last interpretive anchors, borrowing prestige to authorize 'proper' reading as part of classics-series value. While the peritexts appear to canonize Shelley, they simultaneously constrain her authorial authority by scripting her life through romance-tragedy and certification frames and by managing attribution politics through calibrated uncertainty. From a feminist perspective, the edition does not activate the interpretive resources made available by its own starting configuration (a woman author, a woman translator, and a reception history shaped by gendered doubt). I conceptualize

¹Bu makale, yazarın "Yeniden Yazımlarla Yeniden Yazılanlar: *Frankenstein*'da Yeniden Yazılan Metin, Yazar ve Çevirmen İmgeleri Üzerine Feminist Bir İnceleme" başlıklı doktora tezinde (İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2025) kullanılan İletişim Klasikleri (2019) baskısına ilişkin çevremetin incelemesinden hareketle hazırlanmış; tezdeki tartışma, farklı bir araştırma sorusu ve kavramsallaştırmayla yeniden kurgulanarak genişletilmiştir.

this pattern as paratextual guardianship and propose it as a portable analytic for tracking gendered canonization in classics publishing in Turkey and beyond.

Keywords: peritext, paratextual guardianship, canonization, feminist translation studies, *Frankenstein*

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, Türkiye’de ‘klasikler’ dizisi kapsamında yayımlanan bir eserin çevremetin tasarımı aracılığıyla okur alımlamasını nasıl yapılandırıldığını ve yönlendirdiğini incelemektedir. Mary Shelley’nin *Frankenstein* adlı eserinin İletişim Klasikleri serisinden çıkan 2019 tarihli baskısını vaka çalışması olarak ele alan makale, söz konusu baskının yorumlama yetkisini belirli seslere tahsis eden, yazar imgesini çerçeveleyen ve kanonlaştıran, ardışık biçimde kurgulanmış bir ‘otorite mimarisi’ inşa ettiğini savunmaktadır. Metodolojik olarak yakın okuma ve feminist eleştirel söylem çözümlemesi yöntemlerinin bir arada kullanıldığı çalışmada, kapak tasarımı, yazar biyografisi, kronoloji, Murat Belge’nin önsözü ve Walter Scott’ın sonsözü mercek altına alınmıştır. Bu kapsamda, çevremetin genelindeki ses dağılımı, epistemik duruş (çekinceler, söylenti işaretleri, değer biçen hükümler) ve adlandırma/ilişkisel adlandırma pratikleri izlenmiştir. Araştırma bulguları, kapağın otorite hattının erkek seslerini ilk ve son yorumlayıcı dayanaklar olarak konumlandığını; böylece ‘doğru okuma’yı klasikler dizisinin prestij ve değer üretim mantığı içinde konumlandığını ortaya koymaktadır. İncelenen çevremetlerin, bir yandan Shelley’yi kanonlaştırıyor gibi görünseler de, diğer yandan yazarın yaşamöyküsünü aşk-trajedi ve tescil/meşrulaştırma çerçeveleri içine hapsederek ve yazarlık atfına ilişkin tartışmaları ölçülü bir belirsizlik rejimiyle yöneterek yazar otoritesini eşzamanlı olarak kısıtladıkları görülmüştür. Feminist bir bakışla değerlendirildiğinde, incelenen baskının başlangıçtaki kendi kurucu bileşenlerinin (kadın bir yazar, kadın bir çevirmen ve toplumsal cinsiyetle örüntülenmiş bir alımlama geçmişi) sunduğu yorumlama imkânlarını ve eleştirel potansiyeli kullanmadığı anlaşılmaktadır. Makale, klasik eser yayıncılığındaki toplumsal cinsiyet temelli kanonlaştırma pratiğini tanımlamak üzere yanmetinsel vesayet kavramını önermekte ve bu kavramı literatürde yeni bir analiz aracı olarak sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: çevremetin, yanmetinsel vesayet, kanonlaştırma, feminist çeviri çalışmaları, *Frankenstein*

1. Introduction: Paratextual Authority and Reception

In the world of literary classics, new editions often arrive with an interpretive apparatus already in place. The paratext functions as a mechanism for structuring the reader’s encounter with a novel. As Genette (1997, p. 2) famously argues, the paratext is not a neutral border but a “threshold” and “a zone ... of transaction” that shapes how the text is received. Indeed, Genette, quoting Philippe Lejeune, describes the paratext as “a fringe of the printed text which in reality controls one’s whole reading of the text” (p. 2). In the 2019 second printing of the İletişim Klasikleri edition of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (Shelley, 2019), this controlling function is evident. The edition’s peritextual materials operate as a custodial apparatus at the threshold of the novel. They actively structure the reader’s orientation to *Frankenstein*, ostensibly to canonize the work for a Turkish audience, but in doing so they also discipline the image of its author. Thus, this article asks: how do the peritextual choices of a Turkish classics series distribute interpretive authority and produce a gendered author-image, and what kinds

of feminist reading possibilities are thereby enabled or foreclosed? This question should not be understood to imply that Turkish readers first encountered *Frankenstein* in the İletişim Klasikleri edition. Scholarship on the novel's Turkish circulation shows that *Frankenstein* had already entered Turkish literary culture through earlier mediations, including novelization, and later through multiple translational and retranslational trajectories. Altıntaş (2020) demonstrates that some of the earliest Turkish encounters with the story took shape through novelization rather than direct translation, while Ayhan (2022) situates the novel's Turkish afterlife within a broader network of translations, retranslations, and cultural mediation. Arslan's (2018) study of the 2017 plagiarism controversy further shows that *Frankenstein* has generated its own reception history and public debate in Turkey. The importance of the İletişim edition, then, lies not in introducing the work to Turkish readers for the first time, but in re-framing an already circulating text through the prestige economy and interpretive protocols of a contemporary classics series. The İletişim edition is, of course, only one among several Turkish retranslations of *Frankenstein*. For example, the 2021 Ötüken Neşriyat edition, translated by Gülsüm Canlı, includes a translator's foreword, a brief translator biography, and notes on the 1831 edition, indicating that threshold authority need not be distributed in exactly the same way across Turkish editions. The present article, however, remains focused on the specific authority architecture of the İletişim Klasikleri edition.

To address these questions, I offer a critical analysis of the İletişim (2019) edition's peritexts through the combined lenses of feminist translation studies and Genettean paratextual approach. My proposition is that the peritextual materials in this edition function as gatekeepers: they confer literary authority and context through esteemed male voices while simultaneously circumscribing Mary Shelley's author-function within a narrow, gendered frame. The notion of author-function, following Foucault, refers not to the author as a stable biographical origin but to the author-name as a discursive function: a name that classifies texts, establishes relations among them, and marks the status of a discourse within a culture (Foucault, 1998, pp. 210-211). In this edition, Shelley's author-function is constructed not autonomously, but under the guardianship of patriarchal authority figures who effectively speak *for* and *over* her at the book's thresholds. The male critical voices of Murat Belge (a prominent Turkish literary critic) and Sir Walter Scott (the celebrated Scottish author and contemporary of Shelley) occupy the edition's featured opening and closing positions of prestige-bearing commentary around the novel's text, even though the edition also includes a brief front-matter author bio and chronology that precede the preface. Meanwhile, these peritextual decisions repeatedly filter, and at times undermine, the very features most conducive to a more woman-centered or feminist interpretive space, most notably the presence of a female translator and the feminist stakes of Shelley's authorship. Conceptually, I contribute 'paratextual guardianship' as a name for how classics packaging allocates voice and expertise at the threshold, not only by what it includes, but by who is authorized to frame the text first and last, and under what gendered conditions 'the author' becomes credible.

İletişim Yayınları narrates its founding (1983) as taking place in the late phase of the post-12 September regime, motivated by the view that “civilianization” did not resolve a deeper democratization problem; its stated aim is to encourage autonomous thinking and freedom impulses through publishing that is explicitly non-didactic (“konuşmaktan çok konuşturan”) (İletişim Yayınları, n.d.). It also notes that the project was “named” by Murat Belge (İletişim Yayınları, n.d.). After the periodical-heavy years, it describes 1988/89 as a turning point, shifting toward more durable, long-term book/series publishing and an editorial style that frames “knowledge” through critical-analytic commentary rather than “dry data” (İletişim Yayınları, n.d.). Read against this institutional self-positioning, the 2019 *Frankenstein* edition can be read as a curated apparatus of mediation, an instrument of reception and canon management rather than a neutral container.

In this sense, ‘paratextual’ guardianship names the patterned allocation of interpretive authority in classics editions: legitimacy is routed through who is positioned to speak for the text at the threshold, in what order, and with what epistemic stance. In the İletişim Klasikleri *Frankenstein*, guardianship operates through four coupled moves: the nomination of prestige-bearing commentators as custodians of ‘proper’ reading; the sequencing that grants them first and last words; the biographical scripting that renders Shelley legible through romance-tragedy and adjacency to male endorsement; and the management of attribution politics through calibrated uncertainty. I trace these moves in the order a reader encounters them, from cover and front matter to preface and afterword, to show how the edition canonizes Shelley while simultaneously narrowing the feminist interpretive horizon it appears to invite.

2. Concept and Method: Paratextual Guardianship

The argument of this article sits at the intersection of three established conversations: (1) paratext as a theory of textual mediation and reception (Genette, 1997; Batchelor, 2018); (2) canonization as a cultural process that is never innocent, especially when it involves the packaging and consecration of classics (Bourdieu, 1996); and (3) feminist translation studies’ long-standing attention to how gender shapes the circulation of texts, authors, and interpretive authority (Simon, 1996; von Flotow, 1997; Castro & Ergun, 2017). Bringing these conversations into deliberate contact clarifies what is at stake in İletişim’s *Frankenstein* (2019) edition and why its peritexts are not simply ‘supplementary’ materials but a privileged site where the politics of authorship becomes visible. In the Turkish context, this case also speaks to a smaller but relevant body of scholarship on *Frankenstein*’s mediated circulation, translation history, and reception. Studies by Altıntaş (2020), Ayhan (2022), and Arslan (2018) show that the novel’s Turkish afterlife has already been shaped by novelization, retranslation, cultural mediation, and public controversy. While these studies do not focus on the İletişim edition’s paratextual architecture, they help situate the present case within the broader Turkish trajectory of the novel.

Paratext scholarship has emphasized, since Genette’s account of the paratext as a threshold and transactional zone (1997, pp. 1-2), that paratext does not merely

accompany a text but actively produces conditions of legibility and shapes interpretation. Genette's framework provides the foundation: paratexts (comprising *peritexts* inside the book and *epitexts* outside it) operate as threshold mechanisms that mediate the relations between text and reader, organizing attention and stabilizing a work's cultural identity. In classics publishing in particular, paratext is frequently mobilized as a pedagogy of reading because a series imprint signals a promise – 'this will be a proper classic edition' – and the prefatory and appended materials often function as a curriculum around the text. This is especially visible in the use of allographic prefaces (prefaces written by someone other than the author), which can serve as a seal of approval and orient the reader toward a preferred interpretive frame (Genette, 1997, pp. 263-264). Building on this, other peritextual elements such as author biographies, chronologies, and afterwords extend this guidance, often working to locate the text within specific literary traditions or ideological contexts. The reader is not simply offered the novel; the reader is trained into a specific mode of encountering it. This is why the peritext is so consequential: it is where the publisher's institutional authority becomes legible as interpretive guidance, and where the novel's "proper" reception is prefigured.

At the same time, canonization is never only about aesthetic value; it is also about the distribution of authority and the accumulation of cultural (and symbolic) capital; in other words, a process of consecration that determines which works and which readings become legitimate within a given literary field (Bourdieu, 1996, pp. 229-231). Classics series often perform canonization by attaching a work to established names, established genres of commentary, and established interpretive frames, thereby borrowing already-recognized authority to stabilize the work's status and meaning. This can be done through scholarly introductions, author biographies, 'historical reception' documents, and explanatory notes; that is, forms that look like neutral instruments of education but can also operate as mechanisms of symbolic control by naturalizing a hierarchy of voices and positioning the reader as an apprentice to expertise. In other words, canonization is frequently achieved through paratextual choices that feel familiar, even self-evident, within literary culture through the voice of the critic, the voice of the historian, the voice of the 'expert,' and the invocation of prestigious names that certify the work's importance.

This is where authorship, and specifically gendered authorship, becomes critical. Foucault's concept of the "author-function" clarifies how "the author" operates not as a stable origin of meaning but as a classificatory function: the author-name groups texts together, establishes relations among them, distinguishes them from other texts, and marks the status of a discourse within a given culture (Foucault, 1998, pp. 210-211). From a feminist perspective, however, the author-function has never operated as gender-neutral in practice: feminist criticism has long insisted that "authorship" is unevenly available as a position of authority, and that women's writing is more readily routed through interpretive frameworks that manage, explain, or domesticate the speaking subject (Miller, 1986). Historically, women's literary legitimacy has often been made to depend on external forms of authorization – above all, on narratives of propriety, modesty, and moral respectability that mark the woman writer as an

acceptable kind of public subject (Poovey, 1984, pp. 143-144; p. 160). At the same time, the modern mythology of 'genius' has repeatedly coded creativity and aesthetic authority as implicitly masculine, making women's authorship more contestable and more vulnerable to gatekeeping by consecrating institutions and prestige-bearing voices (Battersby, 1990). Even where women's authorship is formally recognized, then, the cultural labour of producing 'the woman author' can remain structurally mediated by patriarchal forms of legitimation, precisely the kind of mediation that paratexts are designed to perform.

Feminist translation studies sharpens these points by insisting that translation is not simply linguistic transfer but a form of cultural production and mediation conducted within gendered relations of power and institutional regimes that shape textual circulation and reception (Simon, 1996; von Flotow, 1997; Castro & Ergun, 2017). Building on feminist critiques of the gendering of translation discourse itself, where authority, originality, and legitimacy are unevenly distributed and often coded through masculinist metaphors, feminist translation scholarship emphasizes that translators and editors do not merely reproduce texts; they actively participate in rewriting reception conditions (Chamberlain, 1988; Lefevere, 1992; Simon, 1996). One of the field's most consistent insights is that this rewriting can be made visible through metatextual interventions (prefaces, footnotes, afterwords, translator's notes), or compelled into forms of invisibility that efface translation labour and help naturalize dominant ideologies as "transparent" reading (von Flotow, 1991, 1997; Venuti, 1995). Feminist translation practices in particular have treated paratext and commentary as a site of agency as translators have historically used prefaces, footnotes, and other metatexts to insist on women's voices, expose androcentric assumptions, and contest patriarchal norms in language and reception (Godard, 1989; Lotbinière-Harwood, 1991; von Flotow, 1991). In this sense, peritext can be a space of feminist counter-reading and reception politics, not only a mechanism of canonical discipline.

Against this background, 'paratextual guardianship' is offered as an analytic name for a recognizable cluster of practices: the arrangement of paratextual materials in ways that guard the reader's entry and exit, allocate interpretive authority, and manage which author-images become culturally legible and acceptable. Guardianship is not necessarily a conscious intention on the part of any single actor; it is often a structural effect of publishing conventions, prestige economies, and the ordinary habits through which classics are packaged and consecrated. Yet it still has consequences. It shapes who is authorized to speak first and last, which biographies and contexts are foregrounded, and which interpretive horizons are normalized as 'proper' reading, thereby participating in the production of the author-function itself as an institutional and classificatory outcome.

This article's intervention, then, is not to claim that the İletişim edition is uniquely problematic, but to show how a highly canonical text by a woman author can be canonized through a threshold apparatus that nonetheless remains patriarchally organized. The case is especially instructive because the edition begins from a configuration structurally conducive to a feminist horizon of reading: a woman author

(Mary Shelley), a woman translator (Serpil Çağlayan), and a novel whose reception history is deeply entangled with gendered assumptions about authorship and legitimacy. The question, therefore, is how those possibilities are activated, or neutralized, by the edition's peritextual architecture, given feminist translation studies' insistence that paratext can also function as a site of agency and counter-reading (von Flotow, 1997). By tracing how authority is distributed across the peritexts, I argue that the İletişim (2019) edition performs a double operation: it elevates *Frankenstein* as a classic while simultaneously narrowing Mary Shelley's author-function through gendered frames of certification, biography, and attribution. This is the paradox at the center of the analysis: canonization is achieved, but at the cost of a feminist horizon of reading that the edition is positioned to enable, yet ultimately does not.

Empirically, the analysis focuses on the edition's peritextual ensemble – the cover authority line, the author biography and chronology, Murat Belge's preface, Walter Scott's afterword, and the footnote attached to that afterword – read as a sequenced threshold architecture that structures entry into, and exit from, the translated novel. Methodologically, I combine close reading with a feminist critical discourse-analytic attention to how institutional voice produces authority and gendered author-images. Across the peritexts, I track (i) speaker position and paratextual placement (who frames the text, and when), (ii) epistemic staging (hedges, rumor markers, evaluative verdicts), and (iii) nomination and relational naming (how legitimacy is routed through biography, endorsement, and proximity to prestigious figures). This operational focus treats guardianship not as intention, but as a patterned effect of paratextual design. All page references to peritextual materials refer to the 2019 second printing of the İletişim Klasikleri edition. Because the front cover and the Author Biography section are unpaginated, citations to these materials use the relevant paratextual location rather than a page number.

3. Authority Architecture: First/Last Words

From the moment a potential reader encounters the İletişim (2019) edition, the book's authority architecture is staged at the threshold. Circulating under the İletişim Klasikleri imprint, the volume is presented not as a bare reprint but as a curated classics edition that supplies an authorized frame for reading. The first anchor point is what I call the 'cover authority line': alongside the title, author, and translator, the cover foregrounds "Murat Belge'nin Önsözü ve Walter Scott'ın Sonsözüyle"² (Shelley, 2019). This announcement scripts a frame of entry and exit: *Frankenstein* arrives bookended by two allographic voices, both male, one positioned as a contemporary Turkish critical authority (Belge, 2019), the other as a nineteenth-century literary authority (Scott, 2019). The point is not simply that supplementary materials exist, but that reception is to be guided, and effectively authorized, through these prestige-bearing commentators, as if the text requires custody to be legible as a classic. The cover therefore performs threshold work by pre-assigning interpretive roles to these paratexts: Genette (1997,

² "Murat Belge's preface and Walter Scott's afterword"

pp. 23-28; pp. 263-264) locates the cover within the publisher's peritext and treats allographic prefaces as presenting and recommending the text for readers. The same arrangement also performs consecrating work, since Bourdieu (1996, pp. 229-231) describes the value of the artwork as produced through a network of agents and acts of credit, including prefaces, critics, and other instances of consecration.

Notably, the cover also prints the translator's name, as "Çeviren Serpil Çağlayan", directly beneath the title. In a translation culture long structured by the norm of translator invisibility, this front cover naming can be read as a gesture toward acknowledging translation labour rather than treating it as transparent mediation (Venuti, 1995). It also resonates with feminist translation's emphasis on making the translator's agency and positionality legible, often through explicit forms of framing and commentary that refuse effacement (von Flotow, 1991, 1997). Yet the cover's promotional hierarchy still directs prestige upward towards the male names: Belge and Scott are foregrounded as value-adding authorities and function as the edition's primary symbolic capital within the "İletişim Klasikleri" apparatus. In other words, translator visibility is present, but it is structurally subordinated to a consecrating frame in which legitimacy is anchored in the authority of distinguished men.

Although the volume does open internally with an author bio and chronology, the cover's authority line frames Belge and Scott as the value-adding bookends of interpretation, effectively signaling where serious authority is expected to reside. In other words, in an edition where both the author and translator are women, the first and last words of the book's interpretive framing are spoken by two men. This sequencing matters because peritext does not merely accompany the text: it structures entry and exit, distributing interpretive roles in advance and shaping what counts as the proper horizon of reading. The design thereby reproduces a familiar patriarchal pattern in canon culture: a woman's work is introduced and validated through a male prologue and a male epilogue. In the terms developed in this article, this is paratextual guardianship in action as the classic is 'guarded' at both entrance and exit by prestige-bearing gatekeepers who implicitly claim the authority to contextualize and explain it.

Crucially, this arrangement performs canonizing work not as an innocent supplement but as a mode of consecration. Canonization often proceeds by attaching a work to already-legitimate names and genres of commentary, thereby borrowing symbolic capital to stabilize both status and meaning (Bourdieu, 1996, pp. 229-231). By invoking Walter Scott, the edition places *Frankenstein* in the orbit of nineteenth-century literary authority; by enlisting Murat Belge, it links the novel to contemporary Turkish critical authority, offering a present-day stamp of legitimacy. The peritext thus communicates a double (historical and contemporary) certification through male endorsement. The gendered stakes of this certification are central: rather than re-centering Mary Shelley's authorial voice, the framing relies on authority structures that have historically rendered women's authorship more contestable and more dependent on external legitimation (Poovey, 1984; Battersby, 1990). More precisely, the threshold participates in the edition's production of an author-function: it helps determine the status under which "Mary Shelley" circulates in this edition, since Foucault treats the

author-function as a principle through which certain discourses acquire a particular mode of existence, circulation, and functioning within society (Foucault, 1998, p. 211).

It is instructive, then, to consider alternatives that were available within the very repertoire feminist translation studies has long foregrounded. One possible route would have been to commission an introduction or afterword from the translator, Serpil Çağlayan, positioning her not only as the producer of the Turkish text but also as an interpretive agent able to foreground Shelley's gendered reception history and to propose a woman-centered horizon of reading. This possibility was not merely hypothetical. As an English Language and Literature graduate of Boğaziçi University and a translator with experience in literary translation, Çağlayan could plausibly have been positioned not only as the producer of the Turkish text but also as an interpretive voice at the threshold. Such translator commentary is precisely one of the metatextual practices through which feminist translators have historically asserted agency, made mediation visible, and contested androcentric interpretive defaults (von Flotow, 1991, 1997; Simon, 1996). Instead, the edition follows a more traditional pathway by installing a senior male critic as the primary 'first word' and a male historical authority as the last frame, thereby privileging the prestige of patriarchal critical authority as the most legitimate mode of consecration. The translator's role, while acknowledged on the front cover, is structurally narrowed to the translated text itself (and, where present, to localized interventions such as footnotes). The overall architecture thus keeps interpretive authority flowing from masculinized sources, setting the tone and boundaries through which Mary Shelley's text is invited to be read. While the cover's authority line elevates Belge and Scott as the edition's value-adding interpretive bookends, the reader's first internal encounter is the unsigned author bio and chronology. These front-matter materials install an author-script before Belge's longer prefatory pedagogy begins. I therefore proceed in the order the edition trains its reader: bio/chronology first, then Belge's preface, and finally Scott's afterword as the closing frame.

3.1 Author Biography: Romantic-Tragic Framing

The first internal peritext the reader encounters immediately after the cover's promise of authoritative bookends is the author bio (and its accompanying chronology), which scripts 'Mary Shelley' through relational lineage and romantic-tragic intelligibility before any extended critical commentary begins. As a peritextual component, the biography does not merely supply background information; it functions as threshold instruction, pre-organizing what kinds of questions the reader is likely to ask about 'Mary Shelley' before and during the novel. Strikingly, this author-script is already encoded in the heading itself, "MARY WOLLSTONECRAFT GODWIN SHELLEY", which identifies her through mother, father, and husband, foregrounding relational lineage as the primary axis of legibility before authorship enters the frame (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). This is a compact instance of guardianship by lineage: authorship is introduced through relational credentials (mother/father/husband), so legitimacy arrives as inherited and mediated rather than as autonomous intellectual agency.

The biography opens by anchoring Shelley's life in deprivation and bereavement: "Uzun ve zorlu bir doğumun ertesinde, yazar ve kadın hakları savunucusu annesi Mary Wollstonecraft, lohusa hummasından hayatını kaybetti"³ (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). Wollstonecraft is named as "a writer and advocate of women's rights," but the narrative quickly returns to loss as the organizing logic of the life story. This is a familiar motif in Shelley's cultural afterlives, yet its peritextual placement matters: it invites the reader to meet Shelley first through vulnerability and fate rather than through the intellectual questions and authorial decisions that structure *Frankenstein* (Poovey, 1984, pp. 114-142).

Importantly, the biography does include a brief gesture toward intellectual lineage: "Babası *Siyasi Adalet Üzerine Bir İnceleme*'nin (1793) yazarı William Godwin idi. Mary, ailesinin entelektüel çevresinde William Hazlitt, Charles Lamb, Samuel Taylor Coleridge gibi aydınların etrafında büyüdü"⁴ (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). But this operates less as an account of Shelley's intellectual formation than as a compact consecrating move, a quick alignment with already-recognized names that supplies symbolic capital without granting extended space to Shelley's own authorial agency or ideas. The narrative momentum then pivots decisively toward romance and scandal.

The bio scandal sequence is explicit: "On altı yaşındayken o sırada evli olan şair Percy Bysshe Shelley ile sevgili oldu; beraber Avrupa'ya kaçtılar. Shelley'nin eşi Harriet'in intiharından sonra, çift 1816 yılında evlendi"⁵ (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). Factually, this is defensible as compressed biography; analytically, its threshold function is consequential. It primes the reader to approach Shelley through transgression, reputation, and consequence, routing women's authority through the long-standing cultural demand for propriety and reputational management. The hinge of the life story becomes relational and catastrophic, an author-image in which authorship is made legible through moralized romance rather than through deliberate intellectual labour.

The biography continues in the same tragic register, repeatedly organizing narrative rhythm around death and loss ("öldü... hayatını kaybetti... boğuldu...")⁶, including the deaths of children and Percy's drowning (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). Even when the biography narrates the genesis and publication of *Frankenstein*, agency remains structurally mediated: "Mary Shelley, Cenevre Gölü kıyısındaki Villa Diodati'de kocası Percy, aile dostları Lord Byron ve üvey kardeşi Claire Clairmont ile tatil yaparken *Frankenstein*'i yazmaya başladı"⁷ hints that she started writing the novel while holidaying within a social circle anchored by famous men, and the novel's publication is

³ "Following a long and difficult labor, her mother Mary Wollstonecraft, a writer and advocate of women's rights, died of puerperal fever."

⁴ "Her father was William Godwin, the author of *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793). Mary grew up amid her family's intellectual milieu, surrounded by figures such as William Hazlitt, Charles Lamb, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge."

⁵ "At sixteen, she became lovers with the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley, who was married at the time; they eloped to Europe together. After Shelley's wife Harriet's suicide, the couple married in 1816."

⁶ ("died... lost one's life... was drowned")

⁷ "Mary Shelley began writing *Frankenstein* while vacationing at Villa Diodati on the shores of Lake Geneva with her husband Percy, the family friend Lord Byron, and her stepsister Claire Clairmont."

explicitly routed through Percy's paratext: "Shelley'nin babası Godwin'e adanmış roman, Percy Shelley'nin imzasız bir önsözüyle 1818 yılında yayımlandı"⁸ (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). In effect, the biography teaches the reader to understand Shelley's authorship through relational proximity and paratextual mediation rather than through autonomous craft and intellectual intervention, narrowing the author-function into a set of institutionally legible coordinates.

Shelley's later writing career does appear, but largely as a list embedded within the same fate-driven arc: "Shelley ilerleyen yıllarda *Lodore* (1835) ve *Falkner* (1837) romanlarını kaleme aldı; diğer eserlerinin arasında 14. yüzyılda geçen bir romans olan *Valperga* (1823) ve insan medeniyetinin sonunun geldiği 21. yüzyılı anlatan *Son İnsan* (1826) bulunur"⁹ (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). The cumulative result is a form of biographical determinism: *Frankenstein* becomes legible as the natural outgrowth of Romantic turmoil and personal catastrophe, rather than as a consciously crafted intervention into political, philosophical, and gendered questions. Feminist critique has long shown how such scripts can domesticate women's authorship even when they appear to explain it by substituting pathos and moral biography for authority, argument, and craft (Poovey, 1984; Battersby, 1990).

Finally, the biography closes by re-coding the novel's cultural trajectory in genre terms: "*Frankenstein* Shelley'nin ölümünden sonra ün kazanmaya devam etti ve modern tarihin en önemli korku mitlerinden biri haline geldi"¹⁰ (Shelley, 2019, Author Biography, para. 1). This posthumous 'horror myth' framing further narrows the interpretive horizon, aligning the novel with popular genre identity at the very moment the edition claims it as a classic. In combination with Belge's prefatory stance, then, the biography (and the accompanying chronology) consolidates a coherent author-script: Mary Shelley becomes a tragic heroine in the orbit of famous men, her legitimacy anchored in proximity and catastrophe, and her author-function rendered culturally acceptable through precisely the kinds of paratextual mediation that classics packaging is designed to perform. Lastly, although a full item-by-item reading of the chronology exceeds the scope of this article, it is crucial to note that its sequencing largely sustains the same emphasis on relational milestones and losses, reinforcing the biographical weighting established in the author note.

3.2 Murat Belge's Preface: Evaluative Authorship Policing

With this romantic-tragic author-script already installed by the front-matter bio/chronology, Murat Belge's preface becomes the first extended interpretive voice the reader meets, and the first place where evaluative authority explicitly polices Shelley's authorial standing (Belge, 2019, pp. 19-28). This preface is a substantive essay

⁸ "The novel, which Shelley dedicated to her father Godwin, was published in 1818 with an unsigned preface by Percy Shelley."

⁹ "In the following years, Shelley wrote the novels *Lodore* (1835) and *Falkner* (1837); among her other works are *Valperga* (1823), a romance set in the fourteenth century, and *The Last Man* (1826), which depicts a twenty-first century in which human civilization has come to an end."

¹⁰ "*Frankenstein* continued to gain fame after Shelley's death and became one of the most important horror myths of modern history."

that moves confidently across cultural history, adaptation, and literary context: it opens with reflections on reproducibility and the circulation of iconic works, then turns to the novel's origin story, its afterlives in film and popular culture, and its place in Romantic-era literary landscapes. This broad scope performs a legitimizing function at the level of the threshold itself as it positions Belge as an authoritative presenter who can translate *Frankenstein* into the idiom of 'serious' culture and thereby participate in the edition's consecrating work. Yet embedded in this guidance is what I describe as 'evaluative authorship policing' because the preface does not only contextualize the work, but also periodically recalibrates Mary Shelley's authorial standing through evaluative cues that qualify, hedge, or delimit the terms under which her authorship becomes legitimate within the edition's institutional voice. The following analysis tracks these evaluative moves as a central mechanism through which paratextual guardianship operates in the 'first word' of the book.

One of the most telling moments of evaluative authorship policing occurs when Belge recounts the familiar Villa Diodati "ghost story" contest and then remarks that "Yarışı Mary Shelley kazanıyor herhalde 'açık farkla' diyebiliriz – diyebilir miyiz?"¹¹ (2019, p. 21). This rhetorical question – what I call the 'Belge verdict line' – introduces epistemic doubt at precisely the point where Shelley's achievement is typically celebrated. In discourse-analytic terms, the move works as a form of modalization/hedging: it does not directly deny Shelley's authorship, but it downgrades the certainty of her "win" and repositions it as contestable knowledge. Put simply, Belge's phrasing converts a celebratory claim into a question of credibility, shifting Shelley's achievement from something we can "know" to something we must still submit to evaluation. The performance of skepticism itself matters, because it resonates with longer gendered histories of how women's literary authority has been made precarious – recognized, yet immediately re-subjected to qualification and external arbitration. This is not merely an opinion about Shelley; it is a micro-level act of framing through which the preface participates in regulating Shelley's author-function, understood as the mode by which an author-name organizes the classification, reception, and status of discourse (Foucault, 1998, pp. 210-211).

Belge's evaluative stance is reinforced by a second, quieter mechanism: naming practices that encode hierarchy. Percy Bysshe Shelley is repeatedly referred to by the authoritative surname "Shelley," while Mary appears as "Mary," suggesting a first-name familiarity that can function as an informalizing move in critical discourse (Belge, 2019, pp. 20-21). Such nomination is not neutral: Critical Discourse Analysis has shown that how social actors are named (first name, surname, title, honorific) is a consequential representational choice that organizes distance, status, and legitimacy (van Leeuwen, 1996; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Read through Bourdieu's (1991, pp. 239, 241-242) account of symbolic capital as recognized distinction, this naming pattern matters because names can carry different degrees of social and institutional weight. In this preface, the surname "Shelley" helps stabilize Percy as the already-recognized literary figure, while the repeated first-naming of "Mary" shifts Mary Shelley toward a more

¹¹ "Mary Shelley wins the contest, apparently by a wide margin – or can we say she does?"

biographical and anecdotal register, even though the edition otherwise fixes “Mary Shelley” on the cover as the author of a classic. The effect, then, is not simply stylistic as the preface’s internal address system subtly stabilizes Percy as the already-canonical “Shelley,” while producing “Mary” as a more containable figure within the consecrating frame.

The preface relies more overtly on sensational and tragic biographical details, forming what I treat as the ‘bio-scandal sequence’. Belge (2019, pp. 20-21) compresses Mary Shelley’s life into a rapid chain of elopement, pregnancies and infant deaths, suicides, and drowning. The accumulation risks turning context into a spectacle of suffering rather than a historically situated frame for authorship. His aside, “gerçek hayat Frankenstein’dan beterdir, diyebiliriz,”¹² is especially revealing because it converts biography into a dramatic supplement, priming the reader to approach the novel through tragedy and scandal as interpretive keys (Belge, 2019, p. 21). From the perspective of feminist authorship criticism, this is a recognizable technique: women’s cultural authority is repeatedly made legible through propriety, affect, romance, and moral biography, genres that can domesticate authorship even as they appear to explain it (Poovey, 1984; Battersby, 1990).

A particularly consequential moment occurs when Belge (2019, p. 21) discusses Mary’s circle and refers to Harriet as Mary Shelley’s “öbür üvey kızkardeş,” adding that “o da Percy Shelley ile sevişmiş” and then committed suicide. Whether this is simply an error or an imprecise phrasing, the passage shows how easily women around a male literary figure can be collapsed into a sensationalized script of sexual entanglement and moral drama, where female figures become exchangeable carriers of scandal rather than differentiated historical actors. Even if read as a slip rather than an intention, its discursive effect is to re-center the scene around sexual scandal and to make women’s proximity to Percy Shelley legible as moral drama. In line with feminist critical discourse analysis, which attends to the reproduction of gendered power relations in discourse (Lazar, 2005), this representational pattern matters because it turns biography into a disciplinary frame. Mary’s authorial identity is made legible through impropriety, scandal, and consequence, a pattern that resonates with Poovey’s (1984, pp. 143-144, 160) account of Mary Shelley’s negotiation of feminine propriety, public scrutiny, and the unacceptable aspects of her earlier life. This produces a marked asymmetry as the women around Percy are drawn into a moralized story of sexual entanglement, while male sexual nonconformity is folded into the familiar scenery of Romantic sociability rather than made the object of comparable judgment.

This policing is not limited to representational slips; it also appears in the preface’s moralizing narration. Belge writes: “Shelley bir iki yıl önce Mary ile sevişmeye başlamış, ama hâlen evli. ... 1816’da Villa Diodati’ye giderken henüz 18 yaşında değil. ... Evli adamla böyle yaşadığı için radikal feylesof Godwin kızına küsmüştür, konuşmazlar”¹³

¹² “real life was worse than *Frankenstein*, we could say”

¹³ “Shelley had begun sleeping with Mary a year or two earlier, but he was still married. ... When she goes to Villa Diodati in 1816, she is not yet eighteen. ... Because she lived like this with a married man, the radical philosopher Godwin had fallen out with his daughter; they did not speak.”

(2019, pp. 20-21). Here we can observe how the preface introduces a form of moral surveillance: by foregrounding Mary's involvement with a married man at "not yet eighteen" and emphasizing Godwin's disapproval, Belge primes the reader to interpret Shelley's life through transgression and punishment. The asymmetry is telling. Male libertinism (Byron's, Percy's) is narrated as familiar Romantic ambience, while Mary's desire and agency become the focal point of disciplinary storytelling, an interpretive economy that aligns closely with the historical demand that women's public authority be routed through modesty, propriety, and reputational management. Even when Belge (2019, p. 21) later signals "Biz Godwin'leri, Shelley'leri bırakalım, romanımıza dönelim,"¹⁴ the preface has already established what counts as relevant "context" and has already done the cultural work of producing a gendered Mary Shelley at the threshold precisely through the discursive regulation of sex, reputation, and legitimacy that modern institutions so often treat as explanatory truth rather than as a mode of power.

This critique should not be read as a dismissal of Belge's preface. His essay also offers genuine literary insight: Belge (2019, pp. 19-20) notes, for instance, that many screen adaptations reduce the Creature's moral and affective complexity, whereas Shelley's novel grants the Creature far greater interiority and pathos. He sketches intertextual genealogies and proposes contextual frames that can enrich readers' appreciation of the novel's cultural afterlives (2019, pp. 21-28). Yet within the economy of the threshold, the preface's overall effect remains double. It performs consecrating work by installing *Frankenstein* as a 'serious' classic at the point of entry, while also tempering Mary Shelley's authorial standing by routing her legitimacy through an older male critic's evaluative narration, as if her triumph must be framed and managed before the reader reaches her text.

In summary, Belge's preface functions as the first-word component of the edition's guardianship apparatus: it grants Mary Shelley a place in the canon while hedging the terms of that elevation. Across the micro-moves traced above, Shelley is acknowledged yet made contestable (through modalized doubt), named yet linguistically diminished (through hierarchical nomination), and contextualized yet repeatedly reabsorbed into a moralized romance-tragedy script that disciplines the conditions under which 'Mary Shelley' becomes legible as an author at the threshold. The preface thus sets interpretive boundaries before the novel even begins; boundaries that the afterword will not simply follow, but rearticulate from the other end of the book's authority architecture.

3.3 Walter Scott's Afterword: Attribution Politics

The edition's authority architecture culminates at the point of exit. After its front-matter bio/chronology and Belge's preface have prepared the reader's approach to Mary Shelley, the book closes by granting the last major interpretive voice to Walter Scott, a historically prestigious male critic whose review arrives as a final frame (Scott, 2019, pp. 285-300). This last-word placement matters because it reactivates what I call *attribution*

¹⁴ "Let's leave the Godwins and Shelleys and return our novel"

politics: the early reception disputes and assumptions about who ‘really’ authored *Frankenstein*, disputes that circulated under anonymity and were entangled with gendered expectations about literary creation and authority. In paratextual terms, the afterword does not merely add reception history, it also participates in managing the author-function at the point of closure, especially because Foucault (1998, p. 213) notes that literary texts are conventionally received through questions of attribution, origin, date, authorship, and authorial value.

The afterword is presented in the edition as a Turkish translation of Walter Scott’s 1818 review, appended as an afterword (“Walter Scott’in sonsözü”). As a curatorial choice, using an early reception document can serve a canonical function: it offers a period ‘expert’ response and lends historical weight to the edition’s classics apparatus, inviting the reader to register *Frankenstein* as a text already legible to authoritative nineteenth-century criticism. Yet this authority is inseparable from the publication conditions under which such reception was produced.

Most strikingly, Scott’s review reproduces early attribution uncertainty by reporting that the novel is ‘said’ to have been written by Percy Bysshe Shelley, and by aligning it affiliatively with Godwin and St. Leon through a chain of paternal and marital connection. In the Turkish afterword, this appears as: “*Frankenstein* da St. Leon’la aynı plana sahip olan bir roman; yanılmıyorsam Godwin’in damadı olan Percy Bysshe Shelley tarafından yazıldığı ve Godwin’e (bu parlak yazara) ithaf edildiği söyleniyor”¹⁵ (2019, p. 288). Even if this attribution is historically contextual, its placement as the closing frame is not neutral. The edition ends not with Mary Shelley’s own retrospective self-framing, but with a prestige-bearing male critic restaging early doubt about authorship, precisely the kind of external arbitration through which women’s authorial authority has historically been made more contestable and more dependent on legitimation by consecrating voices.

At this juncture, the corrective footnote becomes analytically decisive, especially because it is not written by the translator of the novel. The afterword’s translator and footnote-writer is Barış Özkul, who is also listed among the volume’s editors. Özkul’s note reads: “Walter Scott’in bu makaleyi yazdığı 1818 yılında *Frankenstein*’in yazarının Percy Bysshe Shelley olduğuna dair rivayetler mevcuttu – ç.n.”¹⁶ (2019, p. 288). The wording matters: by framing the attribution as “rivayetler” (rumours), the note explicitly downgrades the epistemic status of Scott’s claim and contains its authority. The “- ç.n.” tag also marks the intervention as a translator’s note, foregrounding that the attribution is being actively managed at the peritextual level rather than simply reproduced as historical fact.

At the same time, the location and authorship of this correction matter for the edition’s authority architecture. The counter-frame is not granted as a sustained

¹⁵ “*Frankenstein*, too, is a novel built on the same plan as *St. Leon*; if I’m not mistaken, it is said to have been written by Percy Bysshe Shelley, Godwin’s son-in-law, and dedicated to Godwin (that brilliant writer).”

¹⁶ “In 1818, when Walter Scott wrote this article, there were rumours going around that the author of *Frankenstein* was Percy Bysshe Shelley — translator’s note (ç.n.).”

interpretive voice from the woman author or from the translator of the novel; it appears as a localized editorial intervention performed from within the edition-making apparatus itself. In other words, even the act of protecting Mary Shelley's authorial credit is mediated through the same institutional threshold structures that otherwise organize the book's framing around male authority. The result is a characteristic asymmetry of guardianship: correction is permitted, but it remains marginal, while the "last word" remains anchored in a prestige-bearing male voice. In other words, the threshold apparatus corrects itself without redistributing authority as the rumor is contained, but the structure that grants the "last word" to male prestige remains intact.

The afterword's inclusion therefore performs two functions simultaneously. It canonizes the text by attaching Scott's historical authority as a consecrating document, while also reinscribing a gendered history of authorship doubt at the point of exit, contained only briefly by a translator/editorial note. In the terms developed in this article, guardianship operates not only through what the peritext explains, but through which voices are authorized to close the interpretive horizon and which interventions appear only as small corrective margins.

This becomes especially clear when we consider what is not included. The edition could have closed with Mary Shelley's own 1831 Introduction, which is an authorial paratext that narrates composition and reclaims interpretive authority in Shelley's voice. Instead, the volume closes with a male historical review and a brief containment note supplied by the edition-making apparatus, leaving Shelley without an authorial last word in the book's peritextual architecture. This is a decisive act of closure: it privileges male critical authority over female self-representation at the most consequential point of exit.

To sum up, Scott's afterword functions as the capstone of the edition's authority architecture. It brings the weight of historical reception and consecrating prestige, but along with it the weight of historically gendered attribution uncertainty. Özkul's "ç.n." footnote contains that uncertainty by naming it as rumour, yet it does not undo the broader structure in which the last major discourse remains a male authority's voice: past (Scott) and present (the edition-making apparatus that translates and frames him). In this threshold economy, the classic is authorized, but the woman author's legitimacy remains managed through paratextual mediation rather than anchored in her own self-representation.

4. Discussion: Canonization vs. Feminist Horizon

Taken together, the peritexts of the İletişim 2019 edition of *Frankenstein* constitute a coherent apparatus of canonization. Read on their own terms, they register as the familiar toolkit of classics publishing: critical and historical accompaniment (biography, chronology, preface, afterword,) and a paratextual economy that anchors value in recognizable names, genres of commentary, and claims to pedagogical seriousness. In this sense, the edition successfully integrates the novel into the prestige economy of "proper classics" packaging, a tool designed to signal legitimacy, context, and cultural weight at the threshold. Canonization and contextual accompaniment are not, in

themselves, the problem; the question is how they are performed and whose authority they require in order to make a woman-authored classic legible.

The analytic question, however, is not whether canonization is being performed, but what kind, and at what cost. From a feminist translation perspective, the edition is a missed opportunity. Its starting configuration (a woman author, a woman translator, and a text whose reception history is itself entangled with gendered doubt and patriarchal mediation) makes a different horizon of reading available at the threshold. Yet the edition's authority architecture repeatedly routes prestige through men while routing Mary Shelley's intelligibility through romance-tragedy and certification frames.

The effects are cumulative. The front cover's authority line foregrounds male frames as value-added guarantees; the author biography consolidates a romantic-tragic narrative in which scandal and loss do more explanatory work than intellectual agency; the chronology sustains similar weighting; Belge's preface functions as a critical gateway that performs evaluative authorship policing; and the afterword closes with a historically prestigious male critic whose review reintroduces early attribution uncertainty under the conditions of anonymity. In the terms developed in this article, this is paratextual guardianship in action: a threshold system that admits Mary Shelley into the canon, but on terms that keep patriarchal legitimation structurally central – at the entrance and again at the point of exit.

At the same time, the edition's paratexts also contain small counter-movements that complicate any totalizing reading. The translator's name (Serpil Çağlayan) is printed on the cover, and localized notes within the edition can, at points, function as clarifications that contain misinformation or stabilize Shelley's authorial credit. Yet it matters where and how such interventions appear. In the Scott afterword, for example, the corrective note is supplied by the afterword's translator and one of the editors (Barış Özkul), which means the containment of misattribution is itself administered from within the edition-making apparatus rather than granted as a sustained interpretive voice for the woman author or the woman translator of the novel. The edition thus distributes 'translator visibility' across different roles (Çağlayan as the named translator of the novel, Özkul as translator/footnote-writer of the afterword within the editorial team) without granting either role an equivalent threshold authority to the consecrating male frames. Translator visibility thus coexists with translator containment: naming occurs, but interpretive authority at scale, and at the book's consequential thresholds, remains disproportionately allocated to prestige-bearing male frames.

A feminist horizon of reading also sharpens the asymmetries of what is emphasized versus what is backgrounded. Mary Wollstonecraft's feminist legacy is named, but it does not organize the biographical narrative; the dominant affect is not feminist genealogy but bereavement, scandal, and fate. The historical and intellectual particularity of a young woman author writing a foundational novel about creation, responsibility, and social abandonment is acknowledged, yet repeatedly re-encoded as an almost accidental outgrowth of catastrophe and proximity to famous men. What

emerges is a Mary Shelley who is canonized as exceptional, yet persistently mediated, spoken for, framed, and stabilized through patriarchal authority at the threshold.

5. Conclusion

In examining the İletişim (2019) edition of *Frankenstein*, this article has argued that classics peritexts can participate in the production of a gendered author-function: a patterned set of threshold choices through which “Mary Shelley” is produced for readers while simultaneously being constrained within patriarchally legible terms. In this edition, Shelley is admitted into the canon through an authority architecture that repeatedly routes legitimacy through prestige-bearing male voices and stabilizes her intelligibility through familiar scripts such as the youthful scandal, the tragic heroine, the author whose standing is persistently adjacent to male endorsement. The point is not that these peritexts ‘erase’ Shelley, but that they manage the conditions under which her authorship becomes credible and culturally acceptable at the threshold.

This case clarifies why paratext is central to feminist translation studies. Paratexts are not secondary ornaments to translation; they are key sites where authority, ethics, and agency are distributed and made legible. The İletişim (2019) edition shows how translator visibility can coexist with structural restrictions on interpretive agency: the translator’s name appears on the cover, localized notes can correct misinformation, and yet the scale and placement of interpretive authority remain disproportionately allocated to consecrating frames authored by recognized male authorities. In this sense, canonization proceeds alongside containment. The peritexts do not overtly deny Shelley’s authorship; rather, they modulate it through calibrated skepticism, moralized biography, and the reproduction (and partial containment) of historically sanctioned attribution doubt within an apparatus that simultaneously claims pedagogical seriousness and classic status.

Finally, the analysis suggests a broader implication for translation and classics publishing in Turkey. Standard prestige markers such as prominent introductions, reception documents, famous intellectual names do not operate neutrally when the author is a woman whose cultural authority has historically been gendered and contested. Under such conditions, good classics editing can also structure reception in ways that canonize and contain at once. A feminist reading is therefore not an external imposition on this edition’s project; it is necessary for apprehending what the edition does at the threshold: who is authorized to speak first and last, which lives and authorships become narratable as ‘context,’ and which forms of authority are presumed credible.

By naming these mechanisms as ‘paratextual guardianship’, the article offers a transferable analytic for studying how classics packaging structures reception: not only by what it includes, but by the distribution of voice, sequence, and authority through which texts, and authors, are made legible. Beyond this single edition, the analysis invites comparison across Turkish classics series where similar prestige markers recur. ‘Paratextual guardianship’ offers a method for tracking how these ‘standard’ devices

shift meaning when the author is a woman and when authorship itself has a gendered reception history.

Author Contributions

First Author: Merve Sevtap Süren 100%

Conflict of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Financial Support: The author declares that she received no financial support for this study.

Use of Artificial Intelligence: No artificial intelligence (AI)-based or generative AI tools were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

Yazar Katkıları

Birinci Yazar: Merve Sevtap Süren %100

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

Yapay Zekâ Kullanımı: Bu makalenin hazırlanması sürecinde herhangi bir yapay zekâ tabanlı araç veya üretken yapay zekâ sistemi kullanılmamıştır.

References

- Altıntaş, Ö. (2020). Bir çeviri eylemi olarak romanlaştırma yoluyla Frankenstein'in Türk okurlarla buluşması. *Amasya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Çeviribilim Özel Sayısı*, 1-16. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1066495>
- Arslan, D. U. (2018). Çeviri İntihaline Okur Odaklı Bir Yaklaşım: Sosyal Medyada Frankenstein Vakasının Alımlanması. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(1), 159-185. <https://izlik.org/JA38JC46RK>
- Ayhan, A. (2022). Türkçede Frankenstein Çevirileri ve Bir Kültürel Aracı Olarak Yazar-Çevirmen Giovanni Scognamillo. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 31, 1731-1747. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1222092>
- Batchelor, K. (2018). *Translation and paratexts*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351110112>
- Battersby, C. (1990). *Gender and genius: Towards a feminist aesthetics*. Indiana University Press.
- Belge, M. (2019). Frankenstein [Önsöz]. In M. Shelley, *Frankenstein ya da Modern Prometheus* (S. Çağlayan, Trans.) (pp. 19-28). İletişim Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1982)
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field* (S. Emanuel, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1992)
- Castro, O., & Ergun, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Feminist translation studies: Local and transnational perspectives*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315679624>
- Chamberlain, L. (1988). Gender and the metaphors of translation. *Signs*, 13(3), 454-472. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174168>

- Foucault, M. (1998). What is an author? (J. V. Harari, Trans.). In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Aesthetics, method, and epistemology* (pp. 205-222). The New Press. (Original lecture presented 1969).
- Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation* (J. E. Lewin, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1987)
- Godard, B. (1989). Theorizing feminist discourse / translation. *Tessera*, 6, 43-53.
- İletişim Yayınları. (n.d.). *Neden "iletişim" var?* Retrieved January 3, 2026, from <https://iletisim.com.tr/neden-iletisim-var?>
- Lazar, M. M. (Ed.). (2005). *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315458496>
- Lotbinière-Harwood, S. de. (1991). *Re-belle et infidèle / The Body Bilingual: Translation as a Re-writing in the Feminine*. Women's Press / Éditions du remue-ménage.
- Miller, N. K. (1986). Changing the subject: Authorship, writing, and the reader. In T. de Lauretis (Ed.), *Feminist studies/critical studies* (pp. 102-120). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Poovey, M. (1984). *The proper lady and the woman writer: Ideology as style in the works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen*. University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, W. (2019). Frankenstein üzerine [Sonsöz] (B. Özkul, Trans.). In M. Shelley, *Frankenstein ya da modern Prometheus* (S. Çağlayan, Trans., pp. 285-300). İletişim Yayınları.
- Shelley, M. (2019). *Frankenstein ya da Modern Prometheus* (S. Çağlayan, Trans.; 2nd Ed.). İletişim Yayınları. (Original work published 1818)
- Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in translation: Cultural identity and the politics of transmission*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203202890>
- van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32-70). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431382>
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203360064>
- von Flotow, L. (1991). Feminist translation: Contexts, practices and theories. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 4(2), 69-84. <https://doi.org/10.7202/037094ar>
- von Flotow, L. (1997). *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism"*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315538563>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>