

PROMOTING SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR AND *LE DEUXIEME SEXE*
THROUGH THE MALE IN TURKEY

Ayşenaz Koş
Yeditepe University, Turkey



A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Diploma of Advanced Studies

PhD program in Translation and Intercultural Studies
Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Spain

Supervisors:

Associate Professor Michaela Wolf, University of Graz, Austria
Professor Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu, Yeditepe University, Turkey

2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to thank my supervisor Michaela Wolf for her unlimited support and encouragement. Without her meticulous reading, suggestions and excellent guidance, I would not have completed this study.

I would also like to thank Professor Nedret Kuran-Burçoğlu for kindly accepting to be the external supervisor of this study, and for always encouraging me.

I have discussed many ideas in this thesis with various translation scholars during our tutorials in 2005 in Tarragona; Anthony Pym, Daniel Simeoni, Gideon Toury, Michael Cronin, José Lambert, Rosemary Arrojo, Daniel Gile gave me valuable feedback for my research.

I am gratefully indebted to my colleagues Filiz Öğüt, Ayça Şapçı and Olcay Öztunalı for their warm support.

And to Kubilay, my husband, I am grateful for sharing this adventure with me.

ABSTRACT

The present study is concerned with the way metatexts and paratexts are used, in Turkey, in shaping the authorial image of Simone de Beauvoir, and in promoting the Turkish translations of her work *Le deuxième sexe*, and particularly the way they reflect the ideological stance towards “the woman question” and feminism within the Turkish cultural climate.

The study of metatexts and paratexts accompanying a translated text is particularly important because they offer valuable insights into the presentation and reception of translated texts within the target historical and cultural climate. The study emphasizes that it is necessary to examine the function of the metatextual and paratextual material within the wider cultural context (Kovala 1996; Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002).

The methodological framework builds on the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu, which enables me to analyze “the text as a production in the process of being carried out, of the product itself and of its consumption in the social fields, the whole seen in a relational manner” (Gouanvic 2005: 148). Therefore, the objective structure of the target field of cultural production will be explored hand-in-hand with the subjective actions of the agents. The metatextual and paratextual elements are treated as modes of rewriting that necessarily involve mediation and appropriation. These two forms of rewriting are dealt with from the perspective of “gender-conscious translation criticism” (von Flotow 1997: 49)

My material consists of all the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* —three excerpt translations and a complete translation— and 14 indigenous short texts on Beauvoir published in various Turkish periodicals.

Keywords: Feminist approach to translation, paratext, metatext, Simone de Beauvoir, *Le deuxième sexe*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
ABSTRACT	3
INTRODUCTION	5
1. The Aim of the Study	5
2. Theoretical and Methodological Framework	7
3. Collection of data	9
CHAPTER I	10
1.1. “Cultural Turn” in Translation Studies	10
1.2. Translation Studies and Gender Studies	10
1.2.1. The First Paradigm	12
1.2.2. The Second Paradigm	18
1.3. Summary and Conclusion	20
CHAPTER II	21
2.1. Key Concepts of Pierre Bourdieu’s Sociology	21
2.2. The Adoption of Bourdieu’s Key Concepts in Translation Studies	24
2.3. Summary and Conclusion	26
CHAPTER III	27
3.1. A Short Biography of Simone de Beauvoir	27
3.2. An Overview of Beauvoir’s Work	28
3.3. Beauvoir’s Model of Feminism	29
3.4. Reception of Beauvoir’s Work	29
3.5. Summary and Conclusion	32
CHAPTER IV	33
4.1. Le deuxième sexe in English	34
4.2. Simone de Beauvoir in Turkey	36
4.2.1. Simone de Beauvoir’s Oeuvre in Turkish	37
4.2.2. Metatextual Data: Short Texts on Simone de Beauvoir	38
4.3. Summary and Conclusion	41
CHAPTER V	43
5.1. Paratexts in Action	44
5.1.1. Paratexts of <i>Kadın Nedir</i> [Appendix 1]	44
5.1.2. Paratexts of <i>Kadın Bu Meçhul</i> [Appendix 2]	46
5.1.3. Paratexts of <i>Kadınlığın Kaderi</i> [Appendix 3]	47
5.1.4. Paratexts of <i>Kadın: İkinci Cins</i> [Appendixes 4, 5, 6, 7]	48
5.2. Promoting Le deuxième sexe Through the Male	52
5.2.1. Düşün Yayınevi	55
5.2.2. Altın Kitaplar	56
5.2.3. Payel Yayınevi	57
5.3. Summary and Conclusion	58
CONCLUSION	60
REFERENCES	62

INTRODUCTION

1. The Aim of the Study

Ideas move across language boundaries under the form of texts through translation. However, as Pierre Bourdieu states, “the international circulation of ideas” generate misunderstandings, because

(...) texts circulate without their context, that — to use my terms — they don’t bring with them the field of production of which they are a product, and (...) the recipients, who are themselves in a different field of production, re-interpret the texts in accordance with the structure of the field of reception (1999: 221).

Therefore, “the field of reception” as well as “the field of origin” plays a significant role in determining “the sense and function of a foreign work”, because “the process of transfer from a domestic field to a foreign one is made up of a series of social operations” (222). Likewise, Theo Hermans argues that “translators never ‘just translate’”, local concerns in the receiving systems always produce a triggering effect on the product and the process of translation (1999: 96). In that sense, the foreign text is domesticated, appropriated by cultural mediators, including translators, editors, publishers, and critics who contribute to the “rewriting” of literature for its new destination. According to André Lefevere, of all other types of rewriting such as commentaries, reviews, anthologies etc., translation is the most influential “because it is able to project the image of an author and /or (series of) work(s) in another culture, lifting that author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin” (1992: 9). As Lefevere posits, rewriting reflects a certain ideology; it manipulates the foreign text by editing out those features that do not fit the reader expectations at a certain time in the target socio-cultural context (ibid: 9). These observable aspects of rewriting process, in turn, offer us clues about the nature of the reception of a certain foreign work and its author within their new space.

The present study deals with two forms of rewriting, rather than the actual translated text: metatexts which are presented independently and which comment on the work and/or author, such as reviews, statements, comments by critics, writers, translators, editors etc., and paratexts which present the translated text and which are situated somewhere “between the inside and outside of the text” (Genette 1997: 2), such

as prefaces, postfaces, titles, dedications, illustrations etc. These two types of textual material serve as a bridge between the foreign text and/or author and the target reader, or to put it another way, they bind the foreign text to its new context (Harvey 2003: 177). The metatextual, and particularly paratextual elements may exert a considerable influence on the target reader's reception of the foreign text, since they reach the reader even before the actual text does (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002: 45).

I am interested in this study the way the metatextual sources published in Turkish periodicals on Simone de Beauvoir and/or her work, and paratextual elements accompanying Turkish translations of her work *Le deuxième sexe* —which is considered as the “feminist bible”— have shaped her authorial image, and thus the reception of her work in the Turkish socio-cultural context. Emphasis is also placed on the relationship between the authorial image, as evidenced in metatexts and especially in verbal and iconic paratexts accompanying the translations, and the factual paratexts such as the author's sex and kinship with Jean Paul Sartre who was a better-known person in Turkey when *Le deuxième sexe* first appeared in Turkish translation in the 1960s. It is my contention that the foreignness of Simone de Beauvoir does not only stem from her nationality, but also from her sex, as a woman writer in the Turkish field of cultural production which, in contrast to French, lacks a distinct feminist tradition especially before the 1980s, when feminism, both as an ideology and a social movement, was not accepted as a legitimate discourse (Çağatay & Nuhoglu-Soysal 1995: 263). The central concern of the study is, thus, to reveal how the Turkish male-dominated field of cultural production reacted to Simone de Beauvoir as a woman writer and how these metatextual and paratextual elements reflect the changing stances towards the woman question and feminism before and after the 1980s in Turkey.

The corpus of the study includes all Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* (three excerpt translations published in book form and one complete translation published in three volumes) and indigenous texts on the author published in various Turkish periodicals.

2. Theoretical and Methodological Framework

The “cultural turn” that translation studies underwent in the 1980s allowed the discipline to expand its boundaries and to bring together work from different fields such as linguistics, literary study, history, anthropology, psychology and economics (Bassnett 1995: ix). With the move of the cultural study of translation into the realm of large-scale political and social systems, the concept of “ideology” in translation came on the agenda of translation studies in the late 1980s and 1990s: translation, as a form of rewriting would reflect a certain ideology (ibid: ix). The interest in cultural differences, identity issues (including gender), power differentials and ideology led some groups of scholars to approach translation from a gender-studies perspective (Munday 2001: 127-133). Since language constructs meaning rather than reflecting the reality, translation which is an interlinguistic transfer of meaning cannot be expected to simply mirror the meaning of the original text which would be inevitably “rewritten” and manipulated by cultural mediators.

The combination of gender and translation continues to be a fruitful area of research dealing with a large range of areas such as historical studies, theoretical considerations, issues of identity and more general questions of cultural transfer (von Flotow 2002: 1-2). One of the main areas of research is re-reading of the translations of women writers and rewriting existing translations under which a set of principles guiding “feminist translation” is promoted (von Flotow 1999: 276; Simon 2000). With researches conducted under this area, it was discovered that much writing by women has never been translated at all, or existing translations have misinterpreted the author or her work (von Flotow 1997: 49). Criticisms about the English translation of Simone de Beauvoir’s *Le deuxième sexe* provide “a good example of gender-conscious translation criticism” (ibid: 49). Cuts and omissions, mistranslations in the single English translation, and misrepresentations of work and author have been discussed by Margaret A. Simons (1983), Anna Alexander (1997), Toril Moi (2002), and Elizabeth Fallaize (2002). In “Translation Effects” (2000), von Flotow analyzes the sexual terminology in the English translations of Beauvoir’s works, referring also to the third chapter of the second volume of *Le deuxième sexe*. This study, then, dealing with the paratexts of Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* and the indigenous texts written on Beauvoir in the Turkish periodicals finds its place under this realm of research within the feminist translation studies, and discusses misrepresentations of work and author in the light of these observable data in the Turkish cultural milieu, from a feminist perspective.

Needless to say, the scope of this study outreaches the boundaries of the literary system, and encompasses, in a wider perspective, the social system with its cultural mediators including translators, editors, publishers, and critics. At this point, the French sociologist and philosopher Pierre Bourdieu's social theory enables me to analyze "the text as a production in the process of being carried out, of the product itself and of its consumption in the social fields, the whole seen in a relational manner" (Gouanvic 2005: 148). I will try to explore misrepresentations of Beauvoir and her work within the framework of Bourdieu's social theory which, embracing objectivity and subjectivity, approaches the social world both from a "structuralist" perspective that attempts to uncover the objective sets of relations and forces "operating behind the backs of the agents", and a "constructivist" one that "probes the commonsense perceptions and actions of the individual" (Wacquant 2006: 6). The metatextual and paratextual data in the Turkish translations of Beauvoir's *Le deuxième sexe* will be investigated in the process of the (cultural) production of the translated text and its consumption in the social fields in the light of the notions of capital (symbolic versus economic capital) and field (men's versus women's field). When trying to reconstruct the connections by locating the text and the author in the target literary field which would be a space of possibilities different from the source field, both objective accounts of the structure and subjective accounts of the agents will be taken into consideration. This analysis will allow me to see, behind the field of cultural production, the larger field of forces which may be simply reduced to male/female opposition. This time, I will refer to Bourdieu's work on masculine domination in which he analyzes power asymmetries and domination between the sexes, arguing that —not surprisingly— in the social world, men are primarily dominant and women dominated agents (2001). In that sense, the image-shaping process of Beauvoir as a woman writer by her male mediators in the Turkish cultural milieu will be explored.

The study consists of five chapters. Chapter I is devoted to an overview of the combination of gender and translation, and a literature review on feminist approaches to translation studies. Chapter II presents an overview of the basic concepts of Pierre Bourdieu's social theory (habitus, field, capital) and their adoption in translation studies. Chapter III concentrates on Simone de Beauvoir's biography, ideology, works, and position in the world literature. Criticisms on the English translation of *Le deuxième sexe*, and Beauvoir's position in Turkey are explored in Chapter IV, with a focus on her authorial image in Turkey as shaped by the metatextual data, i.e. indigenous texts on the

author and her work published in Turkish periodicals. The paratextual data provided with the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* are described and analyzed in the light of the publishers' concerns in Chapter V.

3. Collection of data

My main source of reference for the Turkish translations of Beauvoir's works published in book form is the records of Beyazıt Devlet Kütüphanesi (Beyazıt State Library) in İstanbul. I collected additional data from Boğaziçi University library and from ideefixe.com on the Internet. As for the indigenous texts on Beauvoir and her work, and short texts by her that appeared in Turkish translation in periodicals, I inspected almost all the published issues of several prominent Turkish periodicals on liberal arts: *Birikim* (1975-1980), *Defter* (1987-2002), *Düşün* (1984-1986), *E Dergisi* (1999-2004), *Forum* (1954-1969), *Gergedan* (1987-1988), *Hisar* (1950-1957, 1964-1980), *Metis Çeviri* (1987-1993), *Milliyet Sanat* (1972-2006), *Papirüs* (1966-1971), *Saçak* (1984-1987), *Tercüme* (1948-1966), *Türk Dili* (1954-2006), *Varlık* (1949-2007), *Yazko Çeviri* (1981-1984), *Yazko Edebiyat* (1980-1985), *Yazko Felsefe* (1981-1983), *Yeditepe* (1962-1976), *Yeni Dergi* (1964-1975), *Yeni Ufuklar* (1962-1976), *Yordam* (1966-1969), *Yön* (1962-1967); and of four feminist journals: *Feminist* (1987-1990), *Feminist Çerçeve* (2000-2005), *Kaktüs* (1988-1990), *Pazartesi* (1995-2005).

CHAPTER I

1.1. “Cultural Turn” in Translation Studies

Even though discussions on the practice of translating date back to the first century BCE, it is only in the 1970s that translation studies emerged as an independent discipline. The late 1970s witnessed the shift from prescriptive to descriptive perspective on translation, which paved the way to the contextualization of translation. In this respect, the new approach added cultural and sociological dimensions to the previous linguistic conception of translation; translations are now to be assessed as they are, not as they should be (Martín 2005: 29). As a result, translation studies underwent a “cultural turn” in the 1980s, which allowed the discipline to expand its boundaries and to bring together work from different fields such as linguistics, literary study, history, anthropology, psychology and economics (Bassnett 1995: ix). The interaction between translation and culture further brought with it the concept of “ideology” in translation in the late 1980s and 1990s: translation, as a form of rewriting would reflect a certain ideology (ibid: ix). The interest in cultural differences, identity issues (including gender), power differentials and ideology led scholars to approach translation from different angles; while some groups of scholars began to explore the impact of colonization on translation from a postcolonial-studies angle, others, approaching translation from a gender-studies perspective saw a parallel between the status of translation and that of woman (Munday 2001: 127-133). These two trends, namely feminist and postcolonial approaches to translation, have had a major impact on translation studies, replacing the descriptivists’ neutral, dispassionate and scientifically objective translators and scholars of translation with those who “are politically committed to the overthrow of patriarchy, colonialism, and capitalism” (Robinson 1999: 233).

1.2. Translation Studies and Gender Studies

The issue of gender has its roots in the women’s movement that began in the late 1960s in North America and Western Europe. The term “gender” is used to refer to a socially constructed role, instead of an inherent identity which is determined by the biological sex (Simon 1996: 7). Gender was regarded as the key factor in “women’s subordination

in public and private life” (von Flotow 1997: 6), as implied in Beauvoir’s dictum “on ne naît pas femme, on le devient”. Issues of gender impacted first social sciences; the term then “entered the realms of language and literature” (ibid: 8). As Sherry Simon indicates, “the entry of gender into translation theory has a lot to do with the renewed prestige of translation as ‘re-writing’” (1996: viii). In other words, the cultural turn in translation studies created an opportunity for translation and gender studies—which are both interdisciplinary academic fields—to get encountered (ibid: 8). Liberation from language on which patriarchy left its stamp was considered a crucial step towards women’s liberation in the 1970s (ibid: 8), because language is not transparent, it does not reflect reality, but it constructs meaning. As translation deals with interlinguistic transfer of meaning, issues of gender would necessarily impact the field of translation studies; because it is widely accepted that translators cannot be expected to simply mirror the meaning, which was constructed in a certain language, in another language; translators thus “communicate, re-write, manipulate a text” (ibid: 9). It is not a coincidence that gender studies and translation studies intersect when the former began to problematize the use of language, and that translation practices began to be questioned in the latter. Besides the definition of fidelity, the hierarchal status of translation/woman is among the common concerns of translation and feminist studies; they problematize the traditionally accepted ‘secondariness’ of translation/woman (Simon 2000).

As Luise von Flotow points out, the combination of gender and translation continues to be a fruitful area of research bringing together a large range of areas such as historical studies, theoretical considerations, issues of identity and more general questions of cultural transfer (2002: 1-2). Von Flotow identifies two main paradigms in approaching gender issues in translation; the first paradigm deals with feminist theory and practice working on the ‘conventional’ notions of gender, whereas under the second paradigm, traditional ideas about two genders are questioned (1999: 275). In the first paradigm, the focus is on “women as a special, minority group that has a particular history within ‘patriarchal’ society, and has received special, usually biased, treatment in the area of translation as well” (ibid: 275). In the second paradigm, on the other hand, gender issues are dealt with from the perspective of gay or lesbian identities among others, and as far as translation is concerned, translation of works questioning traditional ideas about two genders are analyzed (ibid: 275).

1.2.1. The First Paradigm

Work produced in the first paradigm can be categorized under four main areas of research (von Flotow 1999: 276; Simon 2000): the invisibility of women translators under which the historical and contemporary role of women as translators are investigated; formulation of a feminist practice of translation under which a set of principles guiding “feminist translation” is promoted; re-reading of the translations of women writers and rewriting existing translations under which existing translations are analyzed from a feminist perspective; and patriarchal aspects of translation theory and the discourse about translation under which the language traditionally used to refer to translation and especially the metaphors of translation which feminize the translator and translation are criticized.¹

1.2.1.1. Invisibility of Women Translators. “Invisibility” is the term used by Lawrence Venuti to refer to “the translator’s situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture” (1995: 1). In the opinion of Venuti, this invisibility has two aspects: on the one hand, it is the result of the translator’s own manipulation of the source text with the aim to create an “illusion of transparency”; on the other hand, it stems from the way the translated texts are read and evaluated in the target culture. This attempt at making the translation appear as “original”, by rendering the translation and translator more invisible, and the source text and author more visible, reflects the prevailing view that translation has a lower status than the original, and it gives translation a secondary, derivative status: translation as a reproduction is just a copy of the original (1995: 6-7).

In this regard, if we consider the social role of woman as a degraded version of man, the translator’s invisibility and his/her secondary position with respect to the author seem to fit woman’s way of expressing herself, as imposed by the patriarchal society. In other words, “their common historical position of inferiority” makes ‘translation’ and ‘woman’ to fit together (Simon 1996: 39). During the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, translation was indeed “a strong form of expression for women” for whom the only access to the world of letters was translation. In other words, translation was the only means for them “to contribute to the intellectual and political life of their times”, since authorship was regarded as a male activity (Simon 2000). Religion was perhaps the only area in which women were encouraged to become involved in the

¹ Simon puts forward another area of concern which is “analysis of the particular technical difficulties and ideological questions involved in translating gendered language” (2000), which will be taken under the practice of feminist translation.

production of texts at that time, as exemplified by a collection of essays on “lost” women translators in the Reformation period of England, edited by Margaret Patterson Hannay in *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works* (1985).

With the development of feminist translation theory, a lot of work has been produced from the perspective of feminist historical research with the aim to render this double invisibility visible, this double silence audible, and recover the neglected and lost history of women as translators, theorists of translation and cultural mediators. This happened in parallel with “the recognition of the translator’s ‘visibility’ in the texts she or he translates”; the translator would be now regarded as a rewriter, just like the source author, since every text is the translation of another (Arrojo 1994: 150). In *Oppositional voices : women as writers and translators of literature in the English Renaissance* (1992), Tina Krontiris examines the translations by women of English Renaissance and their contribution to intellectual life. Research in this area has brought to light the work of early women writers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of whom Aphra Behn is the most famous and prolific (Simon 1996: 52). Michaela Wolf discusses in her article “The Creation of A ‘Room of One’s Own’. Feminist Translators as Mediators between Cultures and Genders” the way in which women translators contributed to the creation of a female literary discourse through their translations, on the specific examples of two German translators Luise Gottsched and Therese Huber in the eighteenth century (2005: 15-21). Another inspiring work in this area is *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women’s Writing* by a group of scholars under the direction of Doris Kadish and Françoise Massardier-Kenney (1994). This work, consisting of eighteenth-century French anti-slavery writings by Olympe de Gouges, Claire de Duras and Germaine de Staël and their translations, demonstrates that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, translation had played a significant role in the anti-slavery movement to which women’s contribution cannot be neglected.

In her work *Gender in Translation*, Simon cites Constance Garnett (1862-1946) who had translated Russia’s most notable modern writers into English, and whose name was known in British literary environment of her time, in contrary to many other women translators (1996: 68-71). Simon further cites three examples in which the relationships between the (women) translators and the (male) writers have been documented: Jean Starr Untermeyer’s *Private Collection* (1965), John Thirlwall’s *In Another Language* (1966), and Willa Muir’s *Belonging* (1968). These documents

illustrate “the unequal positions of writer and translator” which “are intensified by their gendered identities” (ibid: 71). In the same line, in “Theorizing Translation in a Woman’s Voice”, Douglas Robinson (1995) examines the comments on translation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries women translators Margaret Tyler, Suzanne de Vegerre, Katherine Philips and Aphra Behn, and the ways in which they tried to be heard in prefaces, letters and essays.

All these accounts are attempts at making women translators who had been neglected so far in the translation history better known, by examining their roles as women translators in relation to their respective social, political and intellectual framework.

1.2.1.2. Formulation of a Feminist Practice of Translation. As language was regarded as an instrument of women’s oppression, it was attacked in the radical feminist writing of the 1970s (von Flotow 1997: 17). Investigations on the processes of meaning creation and on the symbolic power of the feminine in language inspired a lot of practices of language-centered writing by feminists such as Nicole Brossard and Mary Daly (Simon 1996: 22). On the other hand, feminist experiments with language such as culture-specific puns (as in the work of Daly), wordplay on grammatical gender (as in the work of Brossard), or sound associations and alliterations have created further problems for the translator (ibid: 22). These texts have challenged translators who “have had to develop creative methods similar to those of the source-text writers” (ibid: 24). However, as already mentioned, translation is traditionally considered an act of reproduction, and hence the translator is normally expected to be invisible, to be a servant of the author. Feminist practice of translation can be seen then as a rebellion against this historical subservient figure of the translator, because the feminist translator does not hesitate to intervene in the text and reflect her female subjectivity in the reproduction of meaning, in the name of her ideology, “in the name of feminist ‘truths’” (ibid: 24). For instance, Sherry Simon, Luise von Flotow, Barbara Godard, and Susanne Lotbinière-Harwood—all from Canada where most of translation’s gender theory has emerged—have used translation as a means to correct patriarchal language (Wheeler 2003: 426).

According to von Flotow, “when feminist translators intervene in a text for political reasons, they draw attention to their action” (1997: 25). Von Flotow defines three interventionist practices of feminist translation: supplementing, prefacing and

footnoting, and “hijacking” (1991: 74). By supplementing, the translator attempts to compensate for the differences between languages; one of von Flotow’s examples for this technique is from Scott’s translation of Bersianik’s *L’Euguélionne*: The sentence “Le ou la coupable doit être punie” occurs on the subject of abortion, and it is translated into English as “The guilty one must be punished, whether she is a man or a woman”. The extra ‘e’ on the past participle ‘punie’ shows that it is always the woman who is punished; this nuance is reflected by the use of ‘she’ in English which lacks gender agreements (ibid: 75). Prefacing and footnoting are commonly used methods in feminist translations; prefaces and footnotes are the channels through which the feminist translator explains her translation strategies to her intended reader (ibid: 76). The third practice “hijacking” refers to “the translator’s deliberate feminizing of the target text” (ibid: 79), in other words, to the appropriation of a text, which is not necessarily written with feminist intentions, by the feminist translator to reflect her political intentions (Simon 1996: 15). Even though this technique seems to be problematic in that it challenges the authority of the original text and author, these practices are generally the outcome of collaboration between author and translator.

The “hijacking” strategies can be best illustrated by the translations of two Canadian feminist translators “writing between the lines”: Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood and Barbara Godard. Lotbinière-Harwood explains her translation strategies and translation tactic in her bilingual work *Re-belle et infidèle: La traduction comme pratique de réécriture au féminin / The Body Bilingual: Translation as a Rewriting in the Feminine* (1991), and defines her translation practice as “a rewriting in the feminine” (1991: 100). For her, feminist writing and translation are political activities; since she is a feminist, she will remain loyal to her ideology, the feminist cause, and will rewrite the target text so as to reveal sexism in language (ibid: 113). As a co-author, the feminist translator will leave her signature on the text and she will speak through the footnotes, endnotes and prefaces (ibid: 157). In a similar way, Barbara Godard names the feminist way of translation as “womanhandling the text in translation” (1995: 94), which involves the substitution of the invisible hand of the translator by the brush strokes of the painter who interprets the model in her own way. Hence, like her colleague de Lotbinière-Harwood, Godard is visible in her translations and subjective; she speaks through prefaces in which “she situates the text she is translating” (Mezei 2006: 209).

One of the severe critiques to the feminist way of translation has come from Rosemary Arrojo who sees all translation as “a grab for power” to determine and possess meaning (von Flotow 1999: 277). Arrojo accuses feminist translators of applying a double standard (1994: 149); in her opinion, feminist translation project is as violent as “masculine” theories and conceptions of translation (ibid: 149). Gayatri Chakrovorty Spivak criticizes English-speaking feminist translators from another perspective; she is against ‘the happy universalism’ which renders Third World’s women’s texts in similar styles in translation (2000: 400). Her ethic of translation is based on the surrender of the translator to the foreign text (ibid: 405).

The feminist project of translation is more than an attempt at rendering the invisible woman translator visible; it is an attempt of conquest of the text by the woman translator who wants to take her revenge from patriarchal language and to leave her feminine stamp on the text.

1.2.1.3. Re-reading of the Translations of Women Writers and Rewriting Existing Translations. Besides the neglected history of women translators as mentioned above, feminist initiatives of the 1970s stimulated interest in texts by women writers from other cultures than the Anglo-American as well. And it was soon discovered that much writing by women has never been translated at all, or existing translations have misrepresented the author or her work (von Flotow 1997: 49).

Criticisms about the English translation of Simone de Beauvoir’s *Le deuxième sexe* form “a good example of gender-conscious translation criticism” (ibid: 49). *Le deuxième sexe*, referred to as the ‘feminist bible’, was translated into English by American professor of zoology Howard Parshley, and published in 1952 three years after its publication in France. Cuts and omissions, mistranslations in the single English translation, and misrepresentations of work and author have been discussed by Margaret A. Simons (1983), Anna Alexander (1997), Toril Moi (2002), and Elizabeth Fallaize (2002). Furthermore, Anne Cordero’s (1995) analysis on gender terminology in the English translation of *La femme rompue* and Terry Keefe’s (1994) brief analysis of Beauvoir’s 1972 interview with Alice Schwarzer reveal a manipulation of the texts by the translators. In “Translation Effects” (2000), von Flotow analyzes the sexual terminology in the English translations of Beauvoir’s works.

Sherry Simon points to another misrepresentation; she contends that the writings of the French feminists Luce Irigaray, Julia Kristeva, and Hélène Cixous are to a large

extent distorted during their travel to the United States (2000) due to the “gaps and lags in translation” which exerted a profound influence in the reception of especially Hélène Cixous’ and Luce Irigaray’s thoughts by the Anglo-American culture (1996: 107).

Another area under this topic is the feminist revisions of the Bible; a number of Biblical texts have been re-translated from the feminist perspective (von Flotow 1997: 52). However, we can not talk about a single feminist approach to Bible translation (Simon 1996: 112). As earlier versions of the Bible were written within a patriarchal frame, they are full of male-biased language, male imagery, metaphors implying the male character of God (von Flotow 1997: 52). Hence, the focus of most of these re-translations is on the inclusive or non-sexist language; by simply revising the language, by eliminating non-motivated uses of masculine vocabulary, the tone and meaning of the stories in these versions can be changed (Simon 1996: 124-125).²

1.2.1.4. Patriarchal Aspects of Translation Theory and the Discourse about Translation. The gendered character of the tropes of translation led feminist translators to revise the metaphors used to describe translation from the male point of view (von Flotow 1997: 41). The discourse formed around translation has been to a large extent based on the difference in value between the original and its copy, its “reproduction”; translation has been coded as a passive, secondary activity that reproduces the active original work (von Flotow 1991: 81). In other words, just like the traditional power relations between the sexes, the original is identified with “the strong generative male”, whereas the translation with “the weaker and derivative female” (Simon 2000). The analogy between translations and “reputed females” by John Florio in the 1603 preface to his translation of Montaigne is a typical example that demonstrates the tradition to place both translations/translators and women on the lower ladders of their respective hierarchies (ibid).

Lori Chamberlain’s (2000) article on the metaphors of translation offers an analysis of patriarchal ideology and its subsequent metaphors used to describe translation for centuries. According to Chamberlain, the distinction between writing and translating lies in the fact that writing refers to be original and masculine, whereas translating refers to be derivative and feminine (2000: 314). The tag *les belles infidèles* is a pertinent example of the imagery of feminine in translation (ibid: 315). Introduced

² There are much more studies on the feminist Biblical translation which are not referred to here, since this study will concentrate especially on the misrepresentation of Simone de Beauvoir and her work through translation.

by the French critic Gilles Ménage in the seventeenth century, this statement assumes that the relationship between a text and its translation is similar to that between a man and a woman; in complete accordance with cultural stereotypes of women, the adage admits that translations are either beautiful or faithful, just like women (Simon 2000).

Chamberlain further shows how the discourse on translation has used metaphors of rape and violence against women; for example, in the preface to his translation a sixteenth century English translator of Horace compares translation to “the proper way to make a captive woman a wife” by shaving her head and paring her nails (2000: 318). This description of translation demonstrates how the politics of colonialism overlap with the politics of gender; the foreign woman must be transformed into a member of the family by the colonizer, just like the foreign text which must be conquered and domesticated (ibid: 318). The third factor of Chamberlain’s argument is her criticism towards twentieth century theorists such as George Steiner and Serge Gavronsky who have described translation in terms of ejaculation and the Oedipus complex, ignoring the contribution of women in the field (ibid: 319-322).

In view of these historical prejudices on the role of the translator, feminist translation “reopens the dilemma of fidelity” (Simon 2000). According to feminist post-structuralist textual theory and writing, “no text is neutral or universally meaningful, nor ‘original’” (von Flotow 1997: 43). In the theory of feminist discourse, translation is no longer seen as a reproduction; it is a production, a rewriting project (ibid: 44).

1.2.2. The Second Paradigm

The certainties of the first paradigm are undermined by the second “performativity” paradigm which expands gender boundaries in translation studies and which gives room to the discourse of alternative genders in relation with ideas about translation as performance (von Flotow 1999: 285).

Publications by two American translation scholars, Anne Massardier-Kenney and Carol Maier can be placed under this paradigm (ibid: 281) whose understanding of gender is not restricted to femininity, but it also includes masculinity (Maier and Massardier-Kenney 1996: 225). Their main argument is based on the fact that “gender definitions are neither universal nor absolute manifestations of inherent differences but relatively local, constantly changing constructions contingent on multiple historical and cultural factors” (Maier and Massardier-Kenney 1996: 230). Their views on translation are mainly inspired by the ideas of Judith Butler who argues that sex and gender are

discursively constructed through social norms to conform to the heterosexual matrix, and that we cannot talk about gender identities in a straightforward way (ibid: 230; Maier 1998: 102-103; Massardier-Kenney 1997: 56). This is the reason why gender is something “performative” for Butler; everyone is continuously performing his or her gender identity as it is determined by the social norms (Butler cited in Salih 2002: 63).

Again in parallel with Butler’s ideas, Maier argues that, as there is not an absolute definition of woman, “woman” cannot be taken as a reliable point of departure for translation (1998: 97). In this sense, she does not feel comfortable with the notion “feminist (translation/translator)”, and prefers the term “woman-identified (translation/translator)” (ibid: 100). She argues that this term is more convenient in this context, first because it may include both extremes, i.e. no deliberate feminist approach or method and a feminist approach to woman; and second, it offers a more precise definition to the work of a translator or author when this work is identified with his or her gender (ibid: 100). She then defines her approach as “woman-interrogated” which involves questioning conventional gender definitions with the aim to contribute to re-definitions (Maier 1998: 102). For Maier, performance “associated less with definitiveness than with change” and representation are inherent in translation; and performance here is closely related to the performativity as discussed by Butler with respect to gender (ibid: 102-103).

A “redefinition” of the first paradigm comes from Françoise Massardier-Kenney in 1997. Like Maier, she thinks that the use “feminist” or “woman” or “feminine” for translation practice is problematic, because their definitions are not absolute, but constructed (1997: 55). She further argues that feminist translators “should be aware that they are adapting existing translation strategies rather than inventing new ones” (ibid: 58). Massardier-Kenney classifies the major “feminist” translation strategies as author-centred and translator-centred. Author-centred strategies, by which the translator aims to make the reader understand the source text, include recovery, commentary and resistancy. Translator-centred strategies, which seek to make the source text accessible to the reader, on the other hand, include commentary, use of parallel texts and collaboration (ibid: 58).

As for the work on gay/lesbian identities/interests and the translation analyses, there are several studies on gay writing and its translation —such as Keith Harvey’s *Intercultural Movements. American Gay in French Translation* (2003)— expanding gender boundaries in translation studies. Lesbian texts, on the other hand, are mostly put

under the same category of texts dealing with women's writing. However, as observed by von Flotow for the Canadian case, still we cannot talk about "lesbian, or even queer translation theories/studies" (2006: 18).

1.3. Summary and Conclusion

"Cultural turn" in translation studies in the 1980s has revealed the interdisciplinary nature of the discipline; this view later brought about a new definition of translation as "a rewriting reflecting a certain ideology". This would lead some scholars to a feminist approach to translation, having explored the parallelism between the status of translation and that of woman. Von Flotow identifies two main paradigms in approaching gender issues in translation (1999: 275). In the first paradigm, the focus is on women as a special group in patriarchal society; the main areas of research include the invisibility of women translators in the translation history, the formulation of a feminist practice of translation, re-reading of the translations of women writers and rewriting existing translations, and patriarchal aspects of translation theory and the discourse about translation. In the second paradigm, on the other hand, gender issues are dealt with from the perspectives of gay or lesbian identities among others; under this research area, translation of works questioning conventional gender definitions are analyzed (ibid: 275).

CHAPTER II

2.1. Key Concepts of Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology

In what follows, an overview of the key concepts of Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of culture will be given, as this study attempts to adapt, from a feminist perspective to translation, Bourdieu's sociological theory of cultural production to the practice of translation. Since Bourdieu's theory is "not only a sociology of the institution but also of its agents" (Gouanvic 2005: 148), the present study might serve as "a sociology of the text as a production in the process of being carried out, of the product itself and of its consumption in the social fields, the whole seen in a relational manner" (ibid: 148). I will analyze the metatextual and paratextual data in the Turkish translations of Beauvoir's *Le deuxième sexe* in the process of the (cultural) production of the translated text and its consumption in the social fields in the light of the notions of capital (symbolic versus economic capital) and field (men's versus women's field), and try to reconstruct the connections by locating the text and the author in the target literary field which would be a space of possibilities different from the source field.

One of the central criticisms by the French sociologist and philosopher Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) about the present social theories is that they construct abstract systems without showing much concern on how to understand the real world. Bourdieu's studies thus differ from other sociological theories in that they are simultaneously empirical and theoretical; they deal with various empirical data, but they also contain theoretical considerations (Krais 2000: 60; Gouanvic 2005: 149). His theory aims to transcend the dichotomies of objectivism/subjectivism and of structure/action that have reigned in the social sciences, and to demonstrate how each pole is inextricably linked to another. Bourdieu was influenced by structuralism that attempted to understand the meaning of cultural oppositions from an objective, "scientific" perspective standing outside the action (Johnson 1993: 2); with the notion of field, he refers to "the objective, external structure" (Bourdieu 1991: 20). But at the same time, he has seen the necessity to take into account, besides the external forces, the knowledge of the actors about their social world (Johnson 1993: 2), and he introduces the notion of habitus which is "an internal, subjective structure born from the incorporation of the objective structures" (Bourdieu 1991: 20). In short, it can be said that Bourdieu's theory challenges, and at the same time, combines objectivism and

subjectivism; because while “objective accounts can help us understand structure, subjective accounts can help us understand action” (Calhoun et al. 2003: 260). His attempt is to develop a “genetic structuralism” in which action and structure go hand in hand, in the sense that structures are “structuring” and also “structured”; they are “structuring” because they guide and restrict action, and “structured” because they are reproduced by actors (ibid: 260). Hence, culture which plays a crucial role in the reproduction of social structures and unequal power relations which are embedded in this system and accepted as such, form one of the central concerns of Bourdieu’s theory (Johnson: 1993: 2). In his opinion, cultural practices fulfill a social function in legitimating social differences, since they have symbolic power which is closely related with political and economic powers (ibid: 2).

Bourdieu builds his social theory on the central concepts of habitus, field and capital. Before going into the details of Bourdieu’s key concepts, it is worth mentioning that Bourdieu “is a nominalist rather than a realist”, in the sense that “he believes that names have reality and do not simply refer to reality” (Robbins 2000: 25). In other words, he has developed his concepts to define and classify phenomena and not to give them definitive meanings (ibid: 26).

As mentioned before, Bourdieu introduces the concept of habitus as a reaction against structuralism which failed to recognize the importance of individual experience in social reality (Johnson 1993: 4-5). Habitus is described by Bourdieu as the system of

durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively ‘regulated’ and ‘regular’ without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor (Bourdieu in Johnson 1993: 5).

People living in a social system inherit dispositions, i.e. values, norms, thoughts, perceptions, expressions and actions, to act in certain ways. These dispositions are later modified with a freedom that is limited by the historical and social conditions of the structure in question to generate new dispositions which will be apt for actors’ conditions and experiences (Robbins 2000: 26-27), or for different positions actors occupy in the social structure. Bourdieu sometimes uses the metaphor of the game to describe the habitus as a “feel for the game”; as a player you know the rules of the

game, but you have to use your creativity and make strategic calculations in specific situations (Johnson 1993: 5). The habitus may be thus identified by two principles: the relational principle defines the agent's relationship to certain social objects and to other agents, whereas the generative principle involves the creation of new aspects of the habitus (Wolf 2006: 134). As a result, people occupying similar positions in the social structure will tend to have the same habitus which may be defined as "the site of the interplay between structure and practice" (Calhoun et al. 2003: 261). However, in Bourdieu's opinion, there is no direct or mechanical relation between these positions and the practices of the actors (Bourdieu 1983: 345). In other words, even though the space of possible positions can give you an idea about a specific field, the perception of these positions and the value attached to each of them depend on the dispositions of the agents at a given moment.

Social agents do not act in a vacuum, but they enter in objective social relations in concrete social situations (Johnson 1993: 6). A field is "understood as the system of objective relations between these agents or institutions and as the site of the struggles for the monopoly of the power to consecrate" (Bourdieu 1980: 265). The field is the space of positions and position-takings, in which "every position, even the dominant one, depends for its very existence, and for the determinations it imposes on its occupants, on the other positions constituting the field" (Bourdieu 1983: 312). In brief, the field is a structured system of social positions occupied either by individuals or institutions on the basis of power relations between them, which thus makes it a site of struggles where agents struggle to control interests or resources that are at stake (Jenkins 2002: 85). It is an autonomous social domain having its own rules of organization, a set of positions and related practices (the economic field, the educational field, the political field, the cultural field, etc.) (Johnson 1993: 6). Hence, the nature of interests or resources does change according to the field in question. For instance, while agents compete for economic capital in the economic field, competition in the cultural (e.g. literary) field is based on recognition and prestige (Johnson 1993: 6-7). Furthermore, the structure of the field is subject to change in accordance with the relations between social positions occupied by individuals and institutions (Johnson 1993: 6).

The structure of the field is shaped by "the distribution of the capital of specific properties which governs success in the field and the winning of the external or specific profits (such as literary prestige) which are at stake in the field" (Bourdieu 1983: 312).

Bourdieu defines capital as “accumulated labor (...) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e. exclusive basis by agents or group of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor” (1997: 46). Hence, human action is motivated by the maximization of material and symbolic capital (Mottier 2002: 349). Bourdieu distinguishes four types of capital: economic capital (material property), social capital (networks of social connections), cultural capital (education, titles, etc) and symbolic capital (prestige) that are at stake in social fields (Bourdieu 1997: 47). All forms of capital are unequally distributed among social classes, and possession of any form of capital does not necessarily imply possession of another (Bourdieu 1980: 279). The way in which these different types of capital are distributed in the society at a given moment represents the structure of the social world (Bourdieu 1997: 46). In other words, it is the unequal distribution of capital which will determine “the specific effects of capital, i.e., the appropriation of profits and the power to impose the laws of functioning of the field most favourable to capital and its reproduction” (Bourdieu 1997: 49).

Bourdieu developed the concepts of habitus and field particularly in his analysis of the field of cultural production (Johnson 1993: 8). His theory of cultural field is a radical contextualization; artistic works cannot only be analyzed internally, they cannot be isolated from the social conditions of their production, circulation and consumption, they have to be situated within the history and structure of the field itself which will be further situated within the social life on the basis of the relationship between that field and the broader field of power (ibid: 9-11). In brief, Bourdieu sees an artistic work (e.g. a literary text) as a product of an individual agent's, an author's strategies and trajectories based on his/her habitus in the field of cultural production which is further placed in the field of power.

2.2. The Adoption of Bourdieu's Key Concepts in Translation Studies

“Cultural turn” in Translation Studies in the 1980s paved way, especially in the past decade, for new concerns in translation research; translation scholars have seen that people and acts are as relevant as texts and words to the study of translation. This shift of concern led to a sociological view of translation practice as a social activity, and to the introduction of models and concepts from disciplines such as sociology and anthropology to translation studies. Among these sociological approaches to translation

phenomena, Bourdieu's work has made a valuable contribution to this new perspective. Recently some of Bourdieu's key concepts (*habitus*, *field*, *capital*) have been used in the writings of translation scholars such as Daniel Simeoni, Jean-Marc Gouanvic, Moira Inghilleri, Rakefet Sela-Sheffy, Hélène Buzelin and Michaela Wolf; and these attempts can be considered as part of the re-evaluation of descriptive and polysystemic approaches in the light of Bourdieu's theoretical insights (Inghilleri 2005: 125-126). As seen in all these articles, the adaptation of Bourdieu's concepts in the study of translation has contributed to a shift of focus on translators themselves acting as social and cultural agents within particular historical and socio-cultural contexts and "encouraged a greater interest in the role of agents and of institutions involved in translation and interpreting activity" (Inghilleri 2005: 126). For instance, Simeoni discusses in his 1998 article—which is among the first attempts to mobilize Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* for explaining the translator as an agent—the issue of "subservience" as a universal component of "translational *habitus*". Gouanvic, on the other hand, has dealt with translation as a form of written production and focused his analysis, "on the one hand, on the interventions by agents who are producers of the texts under discussion, and, on the other, on the structural and institutional conditions which are at the origin of the production in question" (2002: 95). As he argues, the adaptation or adoption of Bourdieu's insights in the study of translation "sheds lights on aspects which are frequently overlooked in translation" (*ibid*: 94), and allows us to see the whole picture in a relational manner.

Accordingly, in her article "The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies" (2005), Inghilleri explores the ways in which Bourdieu's concepts may be adapted empirically to translation and interpreting research. In the light of Bourdieu's approach to subject/object relation, she suggests that any attempt to objectify translation should start with an empirical investigation of the relevant social practices, their location within particular fields, different types of capital that are at stake in the act of translation, the related academic activity, and the relationship of all this to the broader field of power (2005: 129). Such an investigation would thus include an account of the dispositions of the individuals and institutions involved in these specific social practices (*ibid*: 129).

In these moves towards the foundation of a sociology of translation, one aspect, however, seems to be missing, as argued by Wolf (2006: 129-130); it is "the correlation between social implications and the question of gender" (*ibid*: 130). If we accept that

gender is present in all social relationships and embedded in social structures, then we have to admit that “gender is a fundamental dimension of the habitus which modifies, as do the sharp or the clef in music, all social features connected to fundamental social factors” (Bourdieu in Krais 2000: 58). Bourdieu draws attention to masculine domination in society in his book *Masculine Domination* (2001), since the phenomena of power and domination are the focal aspects of his work. In her article “The Female State of the Art. Women in the ‘Translation Field’”, Wolf points out that “this subservience is not always gender-related and it has also been applied to male translators” (2006: 137), and focuses on the doubled subservience of female/feminist translators.

2.3. Summary and Conclusion

Pierre Bourdieu’s central categories such as habitus, field and capital will be referred to in this study with the aim to analyze the process of reproduction and consumption of the metatextual and paratextual data in the Turkish translations of Beauvoir’s *Le deuxième sexe*. Bourdieu’s social theory will allow us to study, on the one hand, the objective, external structure that is field, and on the other, the internal, subjective structure that is habitus. The shifts that will be observed in the image of the author and the paratextual data of the book in the translation process will offer us an insight as to how various forms of capital were at stake in the source and target literary fields, and they will be further analyzed in relation with the habitus of translation agents (publishers, editors, translators etc.).

This study is another attempt, among others, to view translation practice as a social activity, and to use some of Bourdieu’s key concepts (habitus, field, capital) in translation studies, with the aim to contribute to a sociology of translation.

CHAPTER III

Simone de Beauvoir is considered a “miraculée” of the twentieth century in a number of writings on her. Beauvoir who succeeded in a men’s world and proved to become a famous philosopher and writer, was indeed a “miraculous exception among the women of her generation” (Holmes 1996: 147). She belonged to the first generation of European women who received a formal education on an equal footing with men (Moi 1994: 38), and “was only the ninth woman in France to pass the prestigious *agrégation* examination in philosophy, and the youngest *agrégée* ever in that discipline” (ibid: 1). Beauvoir was the first writer on the subject of women who analyzed patriarchal myths of femininity through the philosophical methodology of Existentialism (Bair 1986: 153).

3.1. A Short Biography of Simone de Beauvoir

Simone de Beauvoir was born in Paris in 1908 as the eldest of two daughters of a middle-class bourgeois family. She received a classical education in a private Catholic school for girls. A decline in the family fortunes following World War I determined the need for her and her sisters to have a profession. After passing her *baccalauréat* in 1925 in Latin and literature, and basic mathematics, she pursued three *licences*: in literature, philosophy and mathematics. She studied mathematics at the Catholic Institute. Her courses in literature, including Greek and Latin, were at the private Ecole Normale Libre in Neuilly. She then studied philosophy at the Sorbonne where she met Jean-Paul Sartre with whom her name would be linked for the rest of their lives (Simons 1995: 1-3). In 1929, she became the youngest person ever to obtain the *agrégation*, the difficult final examination, in philosophy at the Sorbonne.

Beauvoir went on to teach philosophy in several schools in Marseilles, Rouen and Paris; from 1941 to 1943, until she was dismissed by German authorities during World War II, she was professor at the Sorbonne. After the war, in 1945, Beauvoir and Sartre launched *Les temps modernes*, an intellectual journal which was largely read by left-wing intellectuals (Moi 1994: 186). Beauvoir wrote fiction, theatre, philosophical and political essays, and a multivolumed autobiography, and died in Paris, on April 14, 1986.

3.2. An Overview of Beauvoir's Work

Beauvoir started to write at the age of eight; even though her first novel appeared in 1943, she had been writing fiction for over ten years (Moi 1994: 34). Beauvoir's first book, *L'invitée*, was published in 1943.

Her only play *Les bouches inutiles* (1945) was written during the postwar period that "she described as the 'moral period' in her writing" (Simons 1995: 4), as were her novels *Le sang des autres* (1945), *Tous les hommes sont mortels* (1946), and several essays on ethics, politics and social philosophy published in *Pyrrhus et Cinéas* (1944), *L'existentialisme et la sagesse des nations* (1945), *Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté* (1947) and *Privilèges* (1955) (ibid: 4).

Le deuxième sexe, published in France in 1949 is Beauvoir's most influential and most original work. This philosophical treatise on women's situation in mid-twentieth-century Western society which is considered the Bible of modern feminism "has inspired many of the women writers who followed Beauvoir not only in France but all over the world" (Holmes 1996: 148); in the 1960's, during the era of post-war feminism, it was the book of reference of Anglo-American feminist writers and theorists (von Flotow 1997: 5). Deirdre Bair assumes it as "a preliminary source for the study of European women's history and the historical development of feminism" (1986: 154). The importance of this book lies in that it discusses women's everyday experience, from menstruation to housework, from an intellectual perspective providing a vocabulary to issues which were till then "relegated to the domain of the personal and the trivial" (Holmes 1996: 149), and that it tries to destroy patriarchal myths of femininity.

Her semi-autobiographical work, *Les Mandarins* (1954) won the Prix Goncourt. The book is a critic to the elitist "mandarin" status of the leftist intellectuals who do not participate in the real world political struggle.

Beauvoir's political commitments are reflected in *La longue marche* (1957), her book on China, and in *Djamila Boupacha* (1962), her writings during the Algerian war.

In *Mémoires d'une jeune fille rangée* (1958), the first of four volumes of autobiographical memoirs, she describes her happy childhood and her intellectual development. It was followed by *La force de l'âge* (1960), *La force des choses* (1963), and *Tout compte fait* (1972).

Her two novels published in the 1960s, *Les belles images* (1966) and *La femme rompue* (1968) expose the pain in the lives of bourgeois women. And *Une mort très douce* (1964) tells of the death of her mother.

In her later works such as *La vieillesse* (1970), she focused on the problems of ageing and society's indifference to the elderly.

La Cérémonie des adieux suivi de Entretiens avec Jean-Paul Sartre appeared in 1981, following Sartre's death in 1980.

3.3. Beauvoir's Model of Feminism

In studying women Beauvoir takes the existentialist philosophy as her point of departure. The key term in the existentialism is existence; "existence, for Beauvoir as for Sartre, precedes essence" (Holmes 1996: 151). Human existence is distinguished from all that is non-human, because human have consciousness and thus exist for-themselves (*pour-soi*), whereas physical objects exist in the mode of the in-themselves (*en-soi*) (ibid: 151). Even though human beings are conscious of their existence, they are at the same time subject to the perceptions of others who tend to convert them into objects, i.e. into in-themselves, by describing them. In other words, others tend to reduce "the other" to the level of an object by limiting his/her freedom (ibid: 151). Beauvoir argues that men have succeeded in the fight of sovereignty between two human categories because of women's physical disadvantage, and they have constructed women as their "Other", or the "second sex" (ibid: 152). Furthermore, "this sense of being the object of the gaze, being defined and evaluated in terms of the desires and needs of another, remains central to women's self-perception" (ibid: 161).

According to Beauvoir's account of history, women's biology, i.e. their reproductive capacity, was negatively used against them, because women were "biologically destined for the repetition of Life", while men were "transcending Life through Existence" (Beauvoir in Holmes 1996: 156). In accordance with existentialist philosophy, Beauvoir refuses any notion of feminine nature or essence. Therefore, the difference between men and women "will be viewed not as natural and eternal but rather as historical and open to change" (Holmes 1996: 152). Her formulation "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" in *Le deuxième sexe* demonstrates "her view of woman's Otherness as fabricated, imposed by culture rather than biology" (Kaufmann 1986: 121).

3.4. Reception of Beauvoir's Work

Simone de Beauvoir was a significantly popular writer; all her major works were read by mass audiences, provoking responses ranging from profound admiration to violent hostility (Moi 1994: 74). However, as stated by Toril Moi, "the reception of Beauvoir's

work remains far more hostile than might reasonably be expected” (ibid: 77). The reason for such a reception is explained by Mary Ellmann as the tendency to reduce the book to the woman; as she notes, “Books by women are treated as though they themselves were women, and criticism embarks, at its happiest, upon an intellectual measuring of butts and hips” (Ellmann in Moi 1994: 78). In the case of Simone de Beauvoir, her character, private life or morality, in brief her femaleness, blocked any further discussion on the philosophical, literary, theoretical or political issues in her writings (ibid: 78). “Many critics first reduce every text by Beauvoir to her own *persona*” (ibid: 78), “to a woman with personal problems” (Moi 1990: 33).

Beauvoir maintained a relationship with Sartre, “refusing monogamy, marriage and motherhood and thus providing a public model of an alternative way of living as a woman” (Holmes 1996: 148). However, she is accused of being too dependent on Sartre by some feminists (Moi 1994: 125). But particularly on political issues, she was content with the role of follower and keeping her political opinions to herself (Bair 1986: 151). Furthermore, even though Sartre defined himself as a philosopher, she did not (Moi 1994: 126). This may be the reason why patriarchal critics assumed Sartre as being intellectually superior to Beauvoir, and “the reverse, of course, never applies: according to patriarchal critical opinion no male intellectual ever learnt anything from a female lover” (ibid: 126). Moi argues that “because she defines herself as philosophically inferior to Sartre, Beauvoir chooses to give priority to literature” (1994: 126). As a result, her name is not mentioned at all in Walter Kaufmann’s popular text, *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre* (1956) (Simons 1995: 6). In this male domain of philosophy, Beauvoir is generally ignored or reduced to Sartre, as also evidenced by some of the references to Beauvoir in texts by American philosophers (ibid: 7).

Beauvoir has been much criticized by feminists of the post-1968 period for her treatment of female sexuality and reproduction in *Le deuxième sexe* (Holmes 1996: 153). She was accused of adhering to “a gendered philosophy which privileges the masculine” (ibid: 153). However “Beauvoir’s existentialist model of reality is a positive one for feminism”; “women are the ‘weaker’ sex only within a specific social and economic framework” (ibid: 153-154). In her opinion, women should not struggle to become like men and take their place, but to change this men-made world (Kaufmann 1986: 130).

In her article which “is a ‘review of reviews,’ a study of the critical response to Simone de Beauvoir’s book, *The Second Sex (Le deuxième sexe)*”, Jo-Ann Pilardi states

that Beauvoir was severely attacked in France after the publication of the book which did not merit the attention of scholarly analysis for many years (1993: 52). In fact, until the emergence of the feminist movement in the 1970s, “Beauvoir’s ideas were largely ignored” (ibid: 51). Even some feminists inspired by the so-called French feminist theory tended to ignore her in the 1970s; for instance, Hélène Cixous makes no reference to the author of *Le deuxième sexe* in her essay on *écriture féminine*, “The Laugh of the Medusa”, and Luce Irigaray never alludes to “the founding figure of feminist philosophy in France” in her study of philosophy and femininity, *Speculum of the Other Woman* (Moi 1994: 182). According to Dorothy Kaufmann, the gap between Simone de Beauvoir’s feminism and that of Cixous and Irigaray lies in that “the starting point for Cixous and Irigaray is the poststructuralist theoretical model that foregrounds language and deconstructs the notion of a coherent self”, whereas Beauvoir’s work is informed by the existentialist humanism (1986: 121).

Dorothy Kaufmann argues that Beauvoir’s feminism “does not take into account the role of language” in the same way as the new feminine discourse of today treats texts; Beauvoir’s feminism is more concerned with “the referential suffering of women in the social order”, simply because “she is the product of her generation” (ibid: 129). Much later, Beauvoir paid little attention to those who advocate the creation of a new language which would not be gender-biased (Bair 1986: 153); she notes:

I am not sure that I understand exactly what those [gender-related] terms are, or even what they should be. It is difficult to describe new concepts and actions in existing words, but it is even more difficult to invent new ones. And yet, words must be put to the service of action, either real or contemplated; words are crucial weapons for feminism and must be chosen carefully and used wisely (Beauvoir 1974 in ibid: 151).

In her 1981 essay “Women’s Time” in which she examines two generations of European feminist movements, Julia Kristeva argues that existential feminists belong to the first generation, when women were attempting to have an equal place to men in social institutions (Kaufmann 1986: 123). However, for Irigaray, who belongs to the second generation, “the ideology of equality is necessary but insufficient” (ibid: 122).

According to Moi, “it would be wrong, however, to take such responses to be representative of all French feminists” (1994: 183); it is *Le deuxième sexe* where “contemporary feminism begins”, and it is ironic that she is not considered as a feminist now by some feminists (Kaufmann 1986: 128).

Before 1980, Beauvoir critics were mostly French; Moi states that “only five out of an estimated twenty-one full-length studies were published in English” (1990: 25). However, in the 1980s, Beauvoir studies have shifted from France as well as from political and philosophical themes (ibid: 25); the 1980s are the decade of Anglo-American feminism in Beauvoir feminism (ibid: 26).

3.5. Summary and Conclusion

Simone de Beauvoir has played a pioneering role in the contemporary feminism; she demonstrated that the woman is a subject worth of philosophical study. She has further provided a source of inspiration for many women either by her writings ranging from novels to autobiographies, philosophical and political essays, or her way of life, her attitude and success in a men’s world. In her philosophical treatise, *Le deuxième sexe*, she turned upside down the myth of femininity, saying that “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman”; in other words, she argued that women were historically and culturally fabricated by men, since there was no such thing as the female essence. However, as her way of thinking was ahead of its time, she became the focus of severe criticisms, partly because of her gender; she had to wait for a while to be duly appreciated. Her works are rediscovered in the second-wave feminist movement in France in the 1970s, and by her Anglo-American colleagues in the 1980s. Nevertheless, she is as well criticized by some feminists for not being a ‘real’ feminist.

CHAPTER IV

A literary work moves across linguistic and cultural boundaries not on its own but through cultural mediators, including translators, editors, publishers, and critics who contribute to the “rewriting” of literature for its new destination. And these rewriters create “images of a writer, a work, a period, a genre, sometimes even a whole literature” that exist alongside the realities (Lefevere 1992: 5). Interestingly enough, these constructed images tend to reach more people than the corresponding realities do on the target side (ibid: 5).

According to Bourdieu, the misunderstandings, or shifts, in international exchanges stem mainly from the fact that “texts circulate without their context” (1999: 221). As a result, these texts are re-interpreted “in accordance with the structure of the field of reception”, i.e. a field of production different from that of which they are a product (ibid: 221).³ Consequently, “the field of reception” as well as “the field of origin” plays a role in determining “the sense and function of a foreign work”, as the transfer of a foreign text from its domestic field to a foreign one is the outcome of a set of social operations, generally on the target side (ibid: 222). Bourdieu lists these operations as follows:

There is a process of selection (what it is to be translated, what it is to be published, who it will be translated by, who will publish it), a process of labeling and classification (often the placing of a label on a product that previously has no label at all) by the publishers, the question of the series in which it is to be inserted, the choice of the translator and the writer of the preface (who in presenting the work will take some sort of possession of it, and slant it with his own point of view, and explain how it fits into the field of reception, only rarely going so far as to explain where and how it fits into the field of origin, as the difficulties presented by such an enterprise are too large); and finally the reading process itself, as foreign readers are bound to perceive the text

³ In her article “Tracing the Context of Translation. The Example of Gender”, von Flotow draws attention to the importance of another context besides that of translation, which is the context concerning a research in translation studies realm (2005: 39-40). She argues that, just like different contexts will have an impact on the translated versions of an original text, different contexts within which a research on gender issues in translation studies is carried out will have an impact on the gender topics addressed and the outcomes of the research (ibid: 40).

in different ways, since the issues which are of interest to them in the text are inevitably the result of a different field of production. (ibid: 222)

These operations will be examined, from a feminist perspective, in this study with regard to the Turkish translation of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le deuxième sexe*, in the light of the metatextual and paratextual data.⁴

Le deuxième sexe, which is widely acknowledged as the founding text of modern feminism, created a considerable stir from the moment it was first published in France in 1949 in two thick volumes; it attracted heavy criticisms from literary, political and religious circles. The book sold more than 20,000 copies in its first week, and was soon translated and read by millions of Western women (Chaperon 1999: 27). In Franco's Spain people had to read the book clandestinely from a version published in Argentina (ibid: 27). In Russia and East Germany the book was not translated until the fall of the communists (ibid: 27). *Le deuxième sexe*'s translation into different foreign languages (for instance, German in 1951, English in 1952, and Japanese in 1953) gave the book a new trajectory on its own (ibid: 27). Before investigating *Le deuxième sexe*'s new life in Turkish, let us look more closely at its journey in English, as observed in the articles written on the English version of the text.

4.1. *Le deuxième sexe in English*

The English translation of *Le deuxième sexe*, *The Second Sex*, was first published in 1952 in the United States by Alfred A. Knopf. It made *The New York Times* bestseller list in the spring of 1953, and, as mentioned by Beauvoir in her autobiography *Force of Circumstance* (1965), “appeared in America with a success unspoiled by any salacious comment” (Gillman 1988). This version is still the only version in print in the United States. Yet, as evidenced in a number of articles criticizing this version, the US-American audience may not have been reading the “real” *Second Sex*. Even the initiative stage of the book's introduction to the American context yields clues about how the book would be misrepresented to the American reader. On one of her frequent trips to Paris, when Blanche Knopf, wife of the publisher Alfred A. Knopf and an editor on her own, was apprised of the book by the members of Beauvoir's French publisher

⁴ In his seminal work *Intercultural Movements. American Gay in French Translation*, Keith Harvey points out that paratexts and metatexts are among the ways in which literary texts bind to their contexts (2003: 177).

Gallimard, she conceived *Le deuxième sexe* to be “a modern-day sex manual” akin to the Kinsey report (Bair 1987: 24). In this regard, her husband decided to commission the translation work to Howard Madison Parshley, a retired professor of zoology who had written a book on human reproduction and regularly reviewed books on sex for *The New York Herald Tribune* (Bair 1987: 24-25).

A great part of criticisms of the American edition focuses on the unmarked deletions of more than ten percent of the original French text, destroying the continuity of the author’s thought and often leading to considerable confusion (Simons 1983; Fallaize 2002; Moi 2002). Large sections dealing with women’s literature and history, and especially references to lesbian relationship and social feminism, and to description of the tedious work of a housewife’s day, are cut from the English edition (Simons 1983: 560-562), probably due to ideological bias according to some of Beauvoir scholars (Simons 1983; Cordero 1995; Alexander 1997; von Flotow 2000; Fallaize 2002; Moi 2002). Furthermore, the fact that Parshley had no training in philosophy and was not sufficiently informed on existentialism (Glazer 2004) leads to the philosophical misinterpretation of marxist and existentialist concepts in Beauvoir’s work (Simons 1983: 563; Alexander 1997: 114). Another analysis on the English version has been made by von Flotow focusing on the descriptions of sexuality in the third chapter of volume two (2000). Von Flotow concludes that mistranslations and deletions in the translation amend the discourse and produce a different text (2000: 25).

In her article “The Eclipse of Gender. Simone de Beauvoir and the *Différance* of Translation”, on the other hand, Anna Alexander problematizes the English translation focusing on the difference between the French and American contexts, and argues that Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* is a stillborn child in the American social and ideological milieu of the early 1950s, where not only “feminine existence” but philosophy was not destined for appeal (1997: 114-115).

What is then the opinion of Beauvoir on the English translation of her work? In his introduction, Parshley remarks that “modifications” in the English version “have been made with the author’s express permission” (Simons 1983: 564). But according to Deirdre Bair, Beauvoir was upset about the changes and requested from the publisher to add a statement dissociating herself from them, which was unfortunately ignored by the publisher (1987: 27-28). As for the translation errors, she was not aware of them until Margaret Simons wrote an article about it in 1983 (Simons 1983: 564).

In May 2000, Beauvoir's adopted daughter and literary heir, Sylvie le Bon de Beauvoir, called for a new translation in a letter to Gallimard, whereupon Gallimard approached Knopf (the original hardback publishers) and Vintage (responsible for the paperback), but they declined to act on it (Glazer 2004). Knopf and Vintage are aware of the translation problems in the English text since the early 1980s with Simons' efforts; however, they have refused to do anything (Moi 2002). In their letter to Toril Moi who requested a new, complete translation of *Le deuxième sexe*, Knopf and Vintage imply that a new translation will cost too much (ibid). Moi claims that a new scholarly edition is needed to "advance the study of Beauvoir, of feminist theory and philosophy, and of French postwar culture all over the English-speaking world" (2002).

Von Flotow, referring to the commentaries and analyses that exist on Beauvoir translations, argues that "Beauvoir's oeuvre in English would doubtless benefit from a thorough contextualizing and analysis" (2000: 15). Such an analysis in which the translations of her work will be dealt with as materials produced at a specific moment and for a specific purpose, "might investigate how Beauvoir's almost exclusively male translators have consciously or unconsciously manipulated her texts, changing the voice and the perspective to reflect their own positions" (2000: 15-16).

4.2. Simone de Beauvoir in Turkey

Especially during the 1960s and 1970s, when Jean-Paul Sartre exerted a profound influence on Turkey's intellectual community, Turkish people started to hear Simone de Beauvoir's name. She soon became popular, as the number of her works in Turkish indicates. However, her popularity to a great extent came to her as "the woman who gives love and inspiration to Jean Paul Sartre" on the covers of two translations in the early 1960s. But the situation has changed in the 1980s when Beauvoir was regarded as a feminist writer by the Turkish feminist circles. Şirin Tekeli, a Turkish feminist activist, draws attention to the translations published by Payel Yayınevi (Payel Publishing) one after the other in the 1970s. She argues that the impact of these translations was only felt in the 1980s, because those women who were within the feminist movement in the 1970s were dealing with the woman question from the Marxist perspective (1989: 36). For instance, in 1983 the weekly periodical *Somut* devoted a page to feminist writings where interviews with Simone de Beauvoir and translations of her articles occupied a significant place (Çaha 1996: 145). As a matter of fact, for the symposium which was organized by feminist groups in İstanbul in 1982, in

which “feminism” as a concept was discussed for the first time, the organizers had even thought to invite Beauvoir as a keynote speaker; but they had then considered this idea too daring (Tekeli 1989: 37). Beauvoir’s popularity still seems to prevail in Turkey; Michèle Le Doeuff was in İstanbul in May 2005 to give a conference on Simone de Beauvoir, organized for the 100th birthday of Sartre.

4.2.1. Simone de Beauvoir’s Oeuvre in Turkish

So far, twenty of her works have been translated into Turkish and published in book form.⁵ The number of the translations and retranslations in book form since 1962 are thirty-one and their re-editions thirty-nine. These thirty-one translations include three retranslations of some parts of and four excerpts from her work *Le deuxième sexe*. Twenty-two of these translations and/or retranslations were first published between 1962 and 1980, eight of them between 1980 and 2000, and one in 2001. Eighteen re-editions were published in the 1970s, twelve in the 1980s, and nine in the 1990s.

Besides the translations published in book form, there are a small number of short texts by Beauvoir which appeared in various Turkish periodicals. The earliest translation is an abridged translation from her essay “Roman et théâtre” (1945), which appeared in the 19 May 1946 special issue on existentialism of *Tercüme*, the journal of the Translation Office, a state institution established to promote translation. The pieces published in the 1960s were excerpts translated from Beauvoir’s essays “Pour une morale de l’ambiguïté” (1946) and “Brigitte Bardot” (1959), both of which would be later published in book form, the former in *Pyrrhus ile Cinéas* (1963), and the latter in *Brigitte Bardot* (1966). Two excerpts—one from the Turkish translation of *L’invitée*, *Konuk Kız* (1971), and the other from a debate between Beauvoir and Evelyne Sullerot—and an interview with her conducted by Catherine David appeared in Turkish translation in the late 1970s. An excerpt from the Turkish translation of *Le sang des autres*, *Başkalarının Kanı* (1966) appeared in a special issue devoted to existentialism of *Türk Dili* in 1981. In 1983, the translation of an interview with her conducted by Christiane Chombeau and Josyane Savigneau published in *Le Monde* in 1981, “Simone

⁵ *Pyrrhus et Cinéas*, *Le deuxième sexe*, *Faut-il brûler Sade?*, *La pensée de droite aujourd’hui*, *Le sang des autres*, *Les Mandarins*, *Une mort très douce*, “Brigitte Bardot”, *La force de l’âge*, *La force des choses*, *La vieillesse*, *Tous les hommes sont mortels*, *Les mémoires d’une jeune fille rangée*, *L’invitée*, *La femme rompue*, *La cérémonie des adieux suivi de Entretiens avec Jean-Paul Sartre*, *Août-Septembre 1974*, *Simone de Beauvoir aujourd’hui: Six entretiens*, by Alice Schwartz, *Les belles images*, *Lettres à Sartre I*, *Lettres à Nelson Algren*.

de Beauvoir et le 8 Mars: Le Féminisme n'est pas menacé", appeared in the weekly *Somut*, in three parts in three subsequent issues. An interview with her conducted by Alice Schwarzer appeared in 1987 in the third issue of *Feminist*, one of the leading feminist journals of the 1980s' Turkey. One more translation from her was published in the literary magazine *E* in 1999: an excerpt from *Lettres à Nelson Algren* of which full translation appeared in book form in 2001 under the title *Aşk Mektupları*.

4.2.2. Metatextual Data: Short Texts on Simone de Beauvoir

Metatexts are texts presented independently, which comment on the work and/or author; they can be reviews, statements, comments by critics, writers, translators, editors etc. (Hermans 1999: 85). This section is concerned with the way the metatextual data shape the authorial image, and thus the reception of the author's work. By the image of the author, it is meant here the traits attributed to the author by the agents in the Turkish field of cultural production (Linn 2003: 57). Of course, the authorial image is not only shaped by the metatextual and the paratextual data, but also by the self-presentation of the author through his/her works, or through his/her appearances in public etc. (Linn 2003: 57). However, in the case of translation, external information given by the target agents about the source text author plays a more crucial role in this image-shaping process (ibid: 58). In other words, the representation of the author and his/her work through translations and metatextual or paratextual commentaries, such as prefaces and notes by the translator, the editor, or another authoritative source, contributes significantly to the image-shaping process of the author in the target culture. Furthermore, it is possible to view this process in a double perspective; the authorial image created in the target culture, in turn, may influence the selection of source texts, and translation strategies as well (ibid: 58).

I am interested in this study in the relationship between the authorial image, as evidenced in metatextual sources, and the paratexts accompanying the translations — which I will investigate in the following chapter— in the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe*. The relationship between the metatextual and paratextual data, and the translation strategy as revealed in the translation itself is, on the other hand, the subject of another study.

While Beauvoir's oeuvre has been extensively translated and read since the 1960s, to my knowledge, not a single monograph has been published on Beauvoir or her work, in Turkish. Furthermore, there is not a single critical article on the Turkish

translations of any of her works. Therefore, I have confined myself here to the 14 indigenous short texts on Beauvoir herself, found in prominent Turkish periodicals.⁶ Based on my analysis so far, I have divided these into two periods. The first five pieces were published between 1955 and 1978, i.e. before the 1980s. The second part covers the period from the 1980s onward, thus corresponding to the time when feminism is on the agenda of Turkey. Even though the 1980s was not the first time feminism came onto the agenda in Turkey⁷, only during this decade we see “a self-contingent women’s movement” (Öztürkmen 1998: 276). Therefore, a women’s movement under the influence of feminist movements in the West emerged in Turkey (Arat 1993: 125) with a fifteen or twenty-year delay (Tekeli 1989: 39). As a result of this feminist awakening along with its feminist activism, publications and panels, women’s issues emerged as an important point of focus (Arat 1993: 125-126).

Şerif Mardin —a Turkish sociologist and political scientist— who wrote the first indigenous article on Simone de Beauvoir, on the occasion of her novel *Les mandarins*⁸, refers to Beauvoir as “an ingenious writer” and “a close friend to Sartre”, and states that her novel *Les mandarins* reveals another aspect of Beauvoir, her ability to make an in-depth sociological analysis of the French intelligentsia (1955: 19). There are two reviews published in the late 1960s, one written on the occasion of her work *Faut-il brûler Sade?*, and the other on the occasion of “Brigitte Bardot”, which had appeared in translation in Turkish, without a comment on the author. Another comment on Beauvoir came from Cemal Süreya —a Turkish poet, writer and critic— in 1975 in the literary magazine *Milliyet Sanat*, in an overview of women writers of world literature; Süreya argues that, especially in her works such as *L’invitée*, *Tous les hommes sont mortels*, and *Le sang des autres*, Beauvoir problematizes the status of woman in the society (12). In another article, written by Selim İleri —a Turkish writer and critic— in 1978 on the occasion of her 70th birthday, Beauvoir is referred to as an existentialist writer “in search of eternal freedom” (7). In this article, İleri discusses her literary experience, stating that her relationship with Sartre had a considerable impact on it, and concludes that she is “one of the most significant and outstanding writers of our age” (ibid: 7). With respect to *Le deuxième sexe*, he further argues that Beauvoir is the leading

⁶ I inspected almost all the published issues of 22 prominent Turkish periodicals on liberal arts, and of 4 Turkish feminist periodicals.

⁷ Actually it has its roots in the late 19th century-Ottoman society (Sirman 1989; Arat 1991; Tekeli 1995).

⁸ *Les mandarins* has been translated twice into Turkish, first in 1966, and then in 1991.

defender of women of the 20th century, who has questioned the role of the woman in relation to the man in the society (ibid: 8). İleri has also a few words to say on the reception of Beauvoir's oeuvre in Turkey in the same article; he affirms that Beauvoir is a popular writer in Turkey, but "when compared to Sartre and Camus her influence on our literature is minimal"; furthermore, "her explicit taking side in favor of women has provoked a reaction among our intelligentsia, and indirectly created a debate on whether there is such a thing as female writing" (ibid: 9).

Indigenous writings on Simone de Beauvoir increased in number from the 1980s onward, in parallel with the feminist awakening in Turkey. On May 1, 1986 the literary magazine *Milliyet Sanat* devoted a portion of the issue to Beauvoir under the title "A Woman: Simone de Beauvoir", in which appeared three indigenous studies on her life and philosophy. The first piece written by Zeynep Oral —a well-known Turkish woman columnist and theatre critic, who has conducted researches on women issues, human rights issues and cultural issues— offers biographical information on Beauvoir, with a special focus on her relationship with Sartre, as indicated in the title of the text literally meaning "the story of a woman who proved to be Simone de Beauvoir with Sartre, in spite of Sartre" (1986: 2-7). In the second text, Şirin Tekeli —a Turkish feminist activist— summarizes the intellectual phases of Beauvoir's feminist approach, mainly referring to her works *Le deuxième sexe* and *La force des choses* (1986: 8-11). This text which is the third part of the eighteen-page preface to the second edition of the translation of *La femme rompue* published in 1983, presents a new Simone de Beauvoir to the Turkish reader, as the title, "a humanist feminist", indicates. The third text on Beauvoir in the same issue is written by Selim İleri, once again. In this essay, İleri analyzes the intellectual journey of Beauvoir, with a special focus on the notions of "death" and "life" especially in her works *Une mort très douce*, *L'invitée*, *Le sang des autres*, and *La cérémonie des adieux*. He argues that Beauvoir has received various reactions from the audience, just like many other authors who dealt with the conditions of human existence. He goes on to say that Beauvoir may be placed among the authors who could not express their ideas with clarity (1986: 12). However, his typical masculine stance to Beauvoir in his previous text and his uneasiness about the fact that she is proud of her femininity (1978: 9) are replaced by a more positive stance to her in this essay.

As for the pieces which appeared in the 1990s, "Simone de Beauvoir'ı Anarken" is an article on Beauvoir's literary career, written by a professor of French literature,

Tanju İnal (1991: 135-141); “Sade’ı Yakmalı mı?” is written by Süreyya Evren on the occasion of the publication of the second edition of the translation of *Faut-il brûler Sade?* (1991: 62); “Cafe Flore ve ‘Beauvoir’” is an essay written by Uğur Kökden on his impressions in Cafe Flore while reading Beauvoir’s *La force des choses* (1997: 30-31). An article of note appeared in *Milliyet Sanat* in March 1999, written by Server Tanilli —a well-known Turkish columnist and constitutional law professor— on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of Rosa Luxemburg’s death and the 50th anniversary of the publication of *Le deuxième sexe*. In Tanilli’s opinion, Luxemburg and Beauvoir, both of them “philosophers” and “militants”, are among the most distinguished minds of the century (1999: 22-23). He further remarks that Beauvoir has played a leading role in the emancipation of women, referring to her work *Le deuxième sexe* (ibid: 23).

There are four more articles published in the literary journal *Türk Dili Dergisi* in 1998 and 2002, all of them written by Ahmet Miskioğlu —a professor of Turkish literature— on the occasion of *Lettres à Sartre* and *Lettres à Nelson Algren* which had appeared in translation in Turkish, in 1996 and 2001 respectively. The first two articles focus on the “eternal” love of Sartre and Beauvoir (1998a; 1998b), and the other two on the love of Beauvoir and Nelson Algren (2002a ; 2002b).

As it can be deduced from the metatextual material that appeared before the 1980s, all written by men, Simone de Beauvoir is appreciated as a woman writer; her ties with existentialism are often implied given that her relationship to Sartre has made her name known in Turkey to a great extent; there is nearly no mention of her feminism. Her taking side in favor of women is even a matter of criticism by İleri. This one-sided image prevailed roughly until the 1980s; the turning point seems to be marked by the movement of feminism in Turkey in the 1980s, and this effectively demonstrates the time-lag in the reception of Beauvoir in Turkey due to the contextual differences between the source and target fields of cultural production. As far as the pieces published in the 1980s and later are concerned, Beauvoir seems to be appropriated by women such as Zeynep Oral, Şirin Tekeli, or Tanju İnal; and there is a tendency to highlight her feminist aspect.

4.3. Summary and Conclusion

When a literary work moves across linguistic and cultural borders, it starts to lead a new life shaped by the contextual features of the target field of cultural production; its new shape, its reflection on the target side, is based on what the target agents can perceive of

it. This is what happened to the English version of *Le deuxième sexe*. It was published in the United States solely with financial concerns; and as argued by Simons, “neither the publisher, who apparently insisted on the deletions, nor Mr. Parshley, who considered a careful study of existentialism unnecessary (...) anticipated the women’s studies movement and the seriousness with which women would study feminist philosophy” (1983: 564). Thus, all the symbolic capital that *Le deuxième sexe* has for Gallimard in the French field has been replaced by an economic capital in the American field; and the English version has been shaped according to the financial concerns of the publisher. All the gender-conscious translation criticisms on *The Second Sex* that started to appear in the early 1980s are attempts of attributing to this work the symbolic capital it deserves.

A similar case can be observed in the travel of the authorial image of Simone de Beauvoir to Turkey. Her first reflected image into the Turkish field of cultural production was just a woman writer and the partner of Sartre; and this image has been constructed probably by the same “male” agents who introduced Sartre into the Turkish field in the 1960s, and was confined to the male reception of her. Economic concerns of the publishers also contributed to the creation of such an image, as we will see in the next chapter in which paratextual material of the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* will be examined. However, we observe a shift in this image in the early 1980s, when Beauvoir is appropriated by the feminist circles within the feminist movement in Turkey. And she finally seems to find the place she deserves in the Turkish field.

CHAPTER V

As mentioned earlier, following the cultural turn in translation studies, it is widely accepted that the translated text is not a transparent copy of the original, but is loaded in some way with the values of the domestic culture; or, to put it another way, “translations never simply communicate foreign texts”, but only offer “a domesticated understanding” of them (Venuti 2000: 469). Borrowing the term “remainder” from Jean-Jacques Lecercle, Lawrence Venuti uses it to refer to “the irreducible difference introduced by the translation” (1998: 116). Lawrence Venuti argues that

translating is always ideological because it releases a domestic remainder, an inscription of values, beliefs, and representations linked to historical moments and social positions in the domestic culture. In serving the domestic interests, a translation provides an ideological resolution for the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text. (...) In the remainder lies the hope that the translation will establish a domestic readership, an imagined community that shares an interest in the foreign, possibly a market form the publisher’s point of view. And it is only through the remainder, when inscribed with part of the foreign context, that the translation can establish a common understanding between domestic and foreign readers (2000: 485).

Thus, when texts move across cultural boundaries, “the problematic of the crossing” is inscribed in the texture of translations (Harvey 2003: 4).

One immediate remainder in the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* is the paratextual material —situated somewhere “between the inside and outside of the text” (Genette 1997: 2)— which differs significantly from that of the original text. The concept of “paratext” as used by Gérard Genette refers to the verbal or other materials (prefaces, postfaces, titles, dedications, illustrations etc.) accompanying a text and presenting it (Genette 1997: 1). In other words, the paratextual elements reach the reader even before the actual text does. For this reason they may exert a considerable influence on the reader’s reception of the text (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002: 45). Accordingly, the rewriting process covers not only the translated text but also the paratextual elements which both surround and present it as a book. The study of the paratexts of a translated text is particularly important because paratexts offer valuable insights into the presentation and reception of translated texts within the target historical and cultural climate. They reflect the conventions of the target culture at a certain time (Kovala

1996: 120), because they bind translations to their context (Harvey 2003: 177). This study emphasizes that we need to study the function of the paratextual material within a wider cultural context (Kovala 1996; Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002).

In this chapter, I will explore the uses of paratexts in the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* and their connections to the cultural context, with a special emphasis on the stance towards “the woman question” in Turkey.

5.1. Paratexts in Action

In what follows, we can observe how various editions of the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* differ from one another paratextually and how these paratexts reflect the stances towards the woman question and Simone de Beauvoir in Turkey. Special focus will be on the visual lay-out of covers, titles, series, prefaces and blurbs.

Le deuxième sexe enjoyed a large number of retranslations and editions between 1970 and 1990. Some excerpts were first translated in the 1960s. Later on, in 1970, this work, originally in two volumes, appeared in Turkish in three volumes.

5.1.1. Paratexts of *Kadın Nedir* [Appendix 1]

The first partial translation of *Le deuxième sexe* is published in 1962 by Düşün Yayınevi (Düşün Publishing House), established by two prominent “men” writers. Düşün Yayınevi published translations from Sartre and Camus as well in the lively intellectual climate of Turkey in the 1960s. The translation is made by Orhan Suda who was a sports journalist as well as a translator. As mentioned in the preface by the translator, “this is the translation of the second volume of the original text”.⁹

A wish to stress mysterious aspects of women —from men’s perspective— is detectable in the very use of an interrogative sentence as a title, “Kadın Nedir?” (What Is Woman?), which does not reflect at all the connotative meanings of “the second sex”. The name of the author, Simone de Beauvoir, appears just under the title, in smaller font. According to Genette, the name of the author may be printed in varying sizes on the cover, “depending on the author’s reputation” (1997: 39); this principle seems to work in this case, because the translator himself states in the preface that “Simone de Beauvoir is not well-known in Turkey”. On the front cover of this book there is a “modern” black-and-white picture depicting almost the arms, hands and the right breast of a woman; her hands lay gently folded in her lap. It seems like she is trying to figure

⁹ However, it is not a complete translation of the second volume.

out what she is supposed to do, or she is struggling to establish her identity, or maybe deep and dark thoughts are crossing her mind, as evoked by the black background of the front cover. In any case, this picture is likely to be associated with the “modern” woman.

The blurb on the back cover is divided into two parts. In the first part, the bestseller status of the original text is emphasized; “it made 97 editions within two years in France, and four editions in one year in the United States; and it has been translated into all major languages”. In the second part, under a black-and-white close-up photograph of Beauvoir, there is a short biography of her with stress placed on her relationship with Sartre; “Sartre had a strong impact on Beauvoir; they attempted together to develop and spread existentialism, and got involved in politics”. This photograph of her might be there to draw attention to the sex of the author, to reinforce that the writer of this book is a woman. The blurb on the back cover further presents the book as “a clear, brave and wise act of rebellion on the way of women’s liberation from economic and sexual oppression, which provoked debate all over the world”. And the last paragraph attempts to give Beauvoir an enhanced literary stature by mentioning that she won the Prix Goncourt in 1954.

According to Genette, the preface fulfills the function “to ensure that the text is read properly” (1997: 197). In the preface, the translator, Orhan Suda, introduces the text situating it in the existentialist tradition, and states that Simone de Beauvoir, not as famous as Jean-Paul Sartre in Turkey, is also an advocate of existentialism which he himself does not adopt in principle as an ideology. However, “the fact that he finds this movement misleading does not prevent him from appreciating some good points of Sartre’s and Beauvoir’s works or acts”. Even though he goes on to praise the book — “in spite of the specific nature of the subject, the book is written in a very decent language”— he sounds surprised by the fact that it is written by a woman — “besides, the writer is a woman who is among few leading woman writers in the West”.

Thus, the paratextual strategies observed in this book present Simone de Beauvoir as an existentialist woman writer who rather stands in the shade of Sartre. The fact that the publishers and translator of the book are all men leads to the presentation of Simone de Beauvoir from a male perspective, which is very clear and dominant in the paratexts of the book.

5.1.2. Paratexts of *Kadın Bu Meçhul* [Appendix 2]

The second excerpt translation from *Le deuxième sexe* is published in 1965 by Altın Kitaplar (Golden Books), a publishing company active mainly in the field of translated bestsellers. The translator is Canset Unan.¹⁰ The translation covers selected chapters from the second volume of the original text.

The paratextual features of this book differ from the first book in that it presents another Simone de Beauvoir to the potential reader. However, a wish to stress mysterious aspects of women is detectable in the very title as well: “Kadın Bu Meçhul” (Woman, the Unknown). The name of the author appears this time on the bottom left corner of the front cover, again in smaller font than the title, under the statement “the woman writer who gives love and inspiration to J.P. Sartre”. The front cover is dominated by a color picture of an “attractive” woman who has raised her naked arm over her forehead, and who is holding a flower between her slightly separated red lips, all evoking sensuality. The back cover just includes the title once again on a colored background, as a reminder of the title of the work (Genette 1997: 25).

As for the introductory texts “consisting of a discourse produced on the subject of the text that follows” (Genette 1997: 161), a short note on Beauvoir precedes a preface written probably by the publisher.¹¹ This introductory note associates “the famous writer” Beauvoir clearly with existentialism and states that she is a friend of Sartre who is “the founding father” of this movement. The second paragraph on Beauvoir’s literary career presents *Les Mandarins* as her most famous novel with which she won the Prix Goncourt, and ends with a quotation from Philip Wylie, an American author, who says that “*Le deuxième sexe* is one of the most important books of our era”. Hence, the potential reader is reminded that Beauvoir is the author of *Les Mandarins*, and Wylie is used as guarantor of the book’s importance. We might say that this paragraph functions as a guarantor of the book’s quality and as a reassurance to the potential buyer that he/she is not just buying a cheap read. Turning to the preface titled “Kadınların Dünyası” (The Realm of Women), this begins with an interrogative sentence: “Have men ever understood women?” In the next paragraph, the original text is presented as the most intimate book ever written on women, in which “every phase of a woman, including maidenhood, marriage, lesbian relationship, prostitution, woman in love,

¹⁰ I could not find any information about him or her; according to the information I got from the publishing house, it is probably a pseudonym.

¹¹ There is not a clear indication as to who wrote it.

independent woman, is explained in details”. The author of the preface goes on to quote from Beauvoir: “A relationship to a man is the most important thing in a woman’s life. While a man can think of himself without a woman, a woman cannot think of herself without man.” He or she further argues: “Simone de Beauvoir believes that women have a lower status than men simply because they are created like this”. These statements bear clear traces of a male point of view, and are totally in contradiction with what Beauvoir attempted to say in this work; actually these are the facts that Beauvoir criticizes. Suffice it to say that this preface is written either by someone who has not read the book or who has read but not understood it. We can also assume that it is written by a “resisting reader” —a term suggested by Judith Fetterley (1978) but used in a different context by Valerie Henitiuk (1999) — because the male mediators of a woman’s text may be “resisting readers” who are “resistant to subversive meanings and characterizations in texts that may threaten the patriarchy and its view of the world” (Henitiuk 1999: 476). Whatever the reason, those readers who approach *Le deuxième sexe* via an introduction like this are led to read Beauvoir in a negative, phallogocentric way.

Another aspect of the novel emphasized by the preface is that “the famous Simone de Beauvoir does not hesitate to reveal all the biological experiences of women, because she is a typical French woman”. The message seems clearly to be that this text is distinctly un-Turkish, but its very foreignness makes it an object of desire, just like the picture on the front cover which seems to be associated with the French model of woman, perhaps with Simone de Beauvoir herself. It is worth remarking that this paragraph distances the book’s themes from the preoccupations of the target audience, especially from the Turkish woman, and positions the author in a cultural other.

In sum, different strategies are used by the publisher in this case, which appear to be: first, to grab the attention through an appeal to the text’s sensuality; second, to position the book’s themes and author as foreign; finally, to insist on the seriousness of the book.

5.1.3. Paratexts of *Kadınlığın Kaderi* [Appendix 3]

Another excerpt translation from *Le deuxième sexe* is published one year later in 1966 by Altın Kitaplar and translated by Canset Unan once again. This book includes the translation of selected chapters from the first volume of the original text, and it is

published within the “Woman’s Books Series” as indicated on the top of the front cover.¹²

The paratextual features look similar to the previous book, since the publisher is the same. The title of the translation evokes this time something dark and despairing: “Kadınlığın Kaderi” (The Fate of Femininity). The name of the author appears on the bottom of the front cover, again in smaller font than the title, under the statement “the woman writer who gives love and inspiration to J.P. Sartre”, just like in the previous translation. The front cover includes a profile color picture of an “attractive” woman again, this time lied down; her head, her naked arms, her hands with long red nails and some part of her breast can be seen; she has raised her left hand, and her right hand is over her forehead; her eyes are nearly closed and her lips are slightly separated. Her appearance evokes sensuality, just like the picture of the previous book.

The back cover contains on the top mention of *Kadın Bu Meçhul* —the previous excerpt translation from *Le deuxième sexe* published by the same house— which is presented as “a work shedding light to the depths of the woman world”. Then the potential reader is reminded of the title of the present book which “depicts the social status and peculiar destiny of woman, and the reasons behind these”. One last statement on the back cover presents the book as “the best intellectual novel ever written about women”.

The translation is this time promoted by the publisher as a book describing the social status of woman which seems a more serious subject than that of the previous translation; this is the reason why the book is presented as an intellectual novel and published within the “Woman’s Books Series”. However, the picture and the statement “the woman writer who gives love and inspiration to J.P. Sartre” on the front cover contradict this strategy.

5.1.4. Paratexts of *Kadın: İkinci Cins* [Appendixes 4, 5, 6, 7]

In the early 1970s Payel Yayınevi —which published a number of translations from Jean-Paul Sartre’s works as well— produced the complete translation of *Le deuxième sexe* in three volumes. Each volume has a different subtitle —the first volume being

¹² The publication of translated literature under various series names was a common practice in the 1960s Turkey. These series names were used as a marketing strategy informing the reader about the genre to which the book belongs, because the reader of popular literature was making his/her choice not on the basis of the author but of the genre (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2005: 149).

“Genç Kızlık Çağı” (Maidenhood), the second “Evlilik Çağı” (Marriage) and the third “Bağımsızlığa Doğru” (Towards Liberation)— and a general title which is “Kadın: İkinci Cins” (Woman: The Second Sex).¹³ Actually it was the third volume which appeared first in March 1969 in Turkey by Payel; it was the decision of the publisher, Ahmet Öztürk, who had thought that “the entire book was hard to be understood by the Turkish reader”, as he mentions in his e-mail message to me dated 23 May 2007. However, the book generated a wide interest especially among women; as Öztürk states in his message, even one of the most famous Turkish actresses, Türkan Şoray, had described it as “the book that changed her life”. This volume was translated by Bertan Onaran —a prolific translator who was the most productive translator of Sartre in the 1960s (Koş 2004: 84) — as other two volumes of the set.¹⁴

This unexpected interest led the publisher to launch in April 1970 the second edition of the first excerpt translation made by Orhan Suda in 1962, but with another title “Kadın. Genç Kızlık Çağı” (“Woman” being the general title, and “Maidenhood” the subtitle) and cover [Appendix 4]. In the meantime, the publisher Öztürk and the translator Onaran decided to publish a complete Turkish translation of *Le deuxième sexe* in three volumes.¹⁵ The front cover of this edition contains on the top the titles, and the name of the author which is this time more visible. Three silhouettes of a young girl figure with pony tail within a frame dominate the cover; the young girl appears to be willing to fly in spite of the frame which surrounds her. It is worth remarking that the name of the translator is mentioned on the front cover as well, perhaps with the aim, on the part of the publisher, to make clear that the translator is not the same as the first book published by Payel in March 1969. The blurb on the back cover is the same in all three volumes, which will be taken up later when analyzing their paratextual features.

¹³ The first book includes the first volume plus the first part of the second volume of the original text. The second book includes the second part except the last chapter of the second volume of the original text. And the third book includes the last chapter of the second part, the third and fourth parts, and conclusion of the second volume of the original text.

¹⁴ In a telephone conversation with Öztürk on the 24th of May, 2007, I asked him if he deliberately commissioned the translation to Onaran because he was the translator of Sartre; his answer was negative; Onaran is a friend of him, and that was something they decided together.

¹⁵ Öztürk decided to publish the book in three volumes just for practical reasons, he was thinking that there were not enough feminists in Turkey to be able to read the entire book. Moreover, he thought it would be better to divide the content of the book into three main parts.

Let us now analyze the paratextual features of these three volumes. It is worth remarking that, even though there is no difference in the front covers of the editions from the 1970s to the 1980s and later, the series title changes in the latter editions; the publishing house no longer promotes the book within the “Knowledge Series” as it was in the 1970s, but within the “Contemporary Woman’s Books Series”.¹⁶ This is a significant clue about how Simone de Beauvoir’s works were marketed and received in the 1980s, against the background of an increasing awareness towards what feminism is.

As already mentioned, the general title of the set is “Kadın: İkinci Cins” (Woman: The Second Sex); it is in the title of this complete translation that we see for the first time in Turkish the literal translation of “le deuxième sexe”. Moreover, each volume has a different subtitle in accordance with its content. As stated in the blurb on the back cover, “these three books might be either read as the volumes of an entire book or as three separate books since they are divided in such a way that each book treats a specific subject matter”. We might say that this is the most obvious remainder in the Turkish translation of *Le deuxième sexe* when the paratextual features are concerned; it demonstrates to what extent the publication form of a foreign text is subject to change in accordance with the concerns of the target readership.

As for the name of the author, it appears on the top of the front cover just under the titles, in all three volumes, in a roughly similar font in size, because Simone de Beauvoir is a better known author this time, at least by the publisher. Öztürk argues that Simone de Beauvoir is one the most ingenious women of the century, as evidenced by her works and lifestyle; in his opinion, she is even ahead of Sartre. Another motive for him in publishing the translation of *Le deuxième sexe* is related with his own political views: he is against all types of oppression and exploitation, based on sex, race or class.¹⁷

Turning to the front cover of these three volumes, each contains a color photograph of a different woman in accordance with the subtitle of the volume. On the front cover of the first volume entitled *Genç Kızlık Çağı* (Maidenhood), there is a beautiful young girl with long dark hair wearing a blue short dress; she is sitting on the floor, inclined to her raised right leg, and caressing a cat with her left hand; we can only

¹⁶ The first volume, which was first published in 1969, had eight impressions till 1993, and the second and third volumes first published in 1970 had seven impressions till 1993.

¹⁷ As mentioned in Öztürk’s e-mail message to me dated 23 May 2007.

see her face from profile [Appendix 5]. Although she looks somewhat sexy and at the same time melancholic, in the telephone conversation dated 24 May 2007 with Öztürk, he said that he had chosen this photo because there is an air of innocence about the young girl. However, even though the photograph seems relevant to the subtitle, neither the subtitle nor the photograph reflects this volume adequately. As already mentioned, this volume includes the first volume —subtitled *Les faits et les mythes* (the facts and myths) in which Beauvoir analyzes the facts and myths about women through history from different perspectives including biological, psychoanalytic, materialistic, literary, ethnographical— plus the first part of the second volume of the original text. “The maidenhood” is a chapter in this part of the second volume —subtitled *L’expérience vécue* (the lived experience) in which Beauvoir explores the oppression of women in the modern age and traces a general history of women’s existential evolution from childhood to independent womanhood— or to put it another way, the photograph represents just a chapter of the whole volume, eliminating all reference to women’s historical analysis by Beauvoir.

The color photograph on the front cover of the second volume *Evlilik Çağı* (Marriage) is of a beautiful woman looking in her thirties; she is lying naked on a bed; we can only see her head with short dark hair, shoulders and a part of her breasts; her lips are slightly open, and allow us to see her teeth which are as white as the sheet on which she is lying [Appendix 6]. She is looking straight into the lens; her eyes fix the observer with a gaze driven by lust. The subtitle of this volume makes clear that she exemplifies the married woman who has been sexually initiated.

As for the photograph on the third volume, it differs from the first two in that there is something very melancholic on her face which we see just from profile [Appendix 7]. She is a young woman in her thirties, with a beautiful face and long blond hair. We might observe that she is standing behind bars and longing for freedom. She is associated with the modern woman on the way of her emancipation, as the subtitle of this volume, “Bağımsızlığa Doğru” (Towards Liberation), indicates. The message seems clearly to be that she differs from the first two women in such a way that she seems to be aware of her situation; her eyes appear to have focused on her target, whereas the young girl and the married woman seem to be enslaved by their situation.

There is no preface by the translator/publisher in any of the volumes, but a short, very neutral biographical and bibliographical notice on Beauvoir.

The blurb on the back cover —under a photograph of Beauvoir and mention of her family name— is the same in all three volumes, and its focus is the work itself. It presents *Le deuxième sexe* as “a work which turns the conventional approaches to woman upside down”, and “a must-read for every man and woman, as suggested by all authors”. The text demonstrates that the publisher’s marketing strategy relies on the shock value and the bestseller status of the work; “it made 97 editions in France within two years and provoked debates among writers, intellectuals and readers”, “it made four editions in the United States in its first year of publication, and its translations into the major languages were printed over and over again”, “the book generated a similar interest in Turkey, as evidenced by the number of new editions”. The implicit invitation to a target reader is both to experience some of the scandal and also to read the book because it is a must-read —men of letters are used as guarantors of the book’s importance.

In sum, the strategy of the different elements of the books’ paratexts appear to be: first, to grab the attention through an appeal to the text’s scandalous impact in its original setting and in other countries, this is implied in the front covers by the use of the photos,¹⁸ and expressed in the blurb; second, to insist on the seriousness which the book represents. As for the splitting of the original text into three volumes with “relevant” subtitles, it is made just on the basis of the second volume of the original text in which the experience of the modern woman is treated. Therefore, this publishing strategy has diminished the entire book, which is a philosophical treatise, just to its second volume.

5.2. Promoting *Le deuxième sexe* Through the Male

As already stated at the beginning of this chapter, any translation process will involve domestication of the original text in one way or another. The translator will deal with the foreign text on linguistic, cultural, spatial and chronological levels. In the case of a male translator of a woman’s text, on the other hand, there is another foreignness that the translator encounters: sexual difference which “may frequently and severely distort genuine communication” (Henitiuk 1999: 482); in the hands of a male translator, the voice of a woman author always runs the risk of being distorted by the patriarchal language (Henitiuk 1999: 475). This “man-handling” strategy either on the part of the

¹⁸ These front covers were criticized by a number of Turkish marxist feminist women on the grounds that they were reflecting “bourgeois” values, as told by the publisher.

translator or publisher might result in patriarchal misrepresentations that trivialize or distort the woman author's work (Henitiuk 1999: 474). Hence, all the diverse textual rewritings of *Le deuxième sexe* in Turkish translations analyzed in this chapter and in the previous one provide an interesting basis for the consideration of translation as a gendered activity, and as an example of male domination on the part of the mediators over the work and authorial image of a woman writer. Besides they are "the elements involved in the shuttle between the domestic reader's perception and the foreign text's otherness" (Harvey 2003: 181), they respond to the expectations of anticipated target readerships faced with a "feminist" woman writer and to target thinking in general about the notion of "woman writing".

According to the feminist literary criticism, our understanding of meaning relies heavily on the gender of both author and audience (Henitiuk 1999: 469). By the same token, Genette states that the value of a paratext may be verbal, iconic, material, or factual. By factual, he means a fact which is known to the public and has an impact on the reception of the text by the reader. One of the examples he gives for the factual value is the sex of the author (1997: 7). "Do we ever read 'a novel by a woman' exactly as we read 'a novel' plain and simple, that is, a novel by a man?" (ibid: 7). We might further give the author's nationality or kinship with some better-known person as examples of the factual value. Across all the verbal and iconic paratexts of the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* described above and the metatextual material explored in the previous chapter, we can perceive an emphasis on the factual paratexts such as Simone de Beauvoir's sex, her relationship with Sartre, and even her nationality. Would this have happened, if Beauvoir had been a "man" writer? Is it because her publishers and translators in Turkey are all men that her sex played a significant importance in the promotion of her work *Le deuxième sexe* in Turkish? Is it because she is a woman writer that the paratexts of *Le deuxième sexe* in Turkish do not reflect the "seriousness" they have in the original French edition by Gallimard? Is it because the field of cultural production which is to a great extent in the hands of men in Turkey cannot accept that a woman is able to write a philosophical treatise?

I will try to explore such questions within the framework of Bourdieu's social theory which, embracing objectivity and subjectivity, approaches the social world both from a "structuralist" perspective that attempts to uncover the objective sets of relations and forces "operating behind the backs of the agents", and a "constructivist" one that "probes the commonsense perceptions and actions of the individual" (Wacquant 2006:

6). In what follows, using “masculine domination” in the social order as a frame of reference (Bourdieu 2001), I will try to situate the paratextual and metatextual data explored above in their respective socio-cultural contexts. My focus will be on the individual characteristics of the publishers as well, “since each publishing house occupies, at a given moment, a position in the publishing field. This position depends on the distribution of rare resources (economic, symbolic, technical, etc.) and the power of those resources confer on the field” (Bourdieu 1999). It is this position in the publishing field that determines the publication strategies of each individual publisher; and the representation of the various publishing houses, in turn, “guides the behavior of all the actors, including the publishers themselves and the critics” (ibid).

In what follows, I will use Bourdieu’s term “the field of cultural production” which includes producers (e.g. writers, artists) as well as artistic mediators who contribute to the works’ meaning and value (e.g. publishers, critics, agents, galleries, academies and so forth) (Johnson 1993: 9). Bourdieu defines the literary and artistic field as “a field of forces” but also as “a field of struggles tending to transform or conserve this field of forces” (1993: 30), which is contained within the larger field of power (ibid: 37). In his work on masculine domination, Bourdieu analyzes power asymmetries and domination between the sexes, and argues that in the social world, men are primarily dominant and women dominated agents (2001). To get a better sense of the Turkish field of cultural production in this regard, let us first have a general idea about the balance of forces between male and female agents in the Turkish society in general.¹⁹ In the introduction titled “Women in Turkey in the 1980s” to the book *Women in Modern Society. A Reader*, Şirin Tekeli explores the place of women in modern Turkish society on the basis of different attitude studies among men and women carried out between 1985 and 1989 (1995). The results of these studies demonstrate that “most groups uniformly agreed on one thing, and that was the necessary continuation of the patriarchal domination of men over women” (ibid: 11). In parallel with this, it is worth remarking that it is only after 1970 that the increasing number of women authors in Turkish literature introduced new concepts as “women literature” and “women authors” in Turkish contemporary literature studies. This is not to say that there were not women writers until 1970 in Turkey; there were, but they had tried to obey to men’s

¹⁹ In her seminal article “Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist Theory and Pierre Bourdieu’s Sociology of Culture”, Toril Moi argues that gender, like class, is part of the general social field (1991: 1034).

rules in expressing themselves in order to win recognition at that time (Sezer 1993: 148). They were supposed to match the expectations of the reader in tune with the image of woman being constructed by man over centuries (ibid: 148). Thus, it can be said that before the emergence of the feminist discourse in the early 1980s, the Turkish field of cultural production was to a great extent male-dominated. Actually the entrance of women with a certain female consciousness to the field happened in the late 1970s and the 1980s first with the publication of periodicals —the women’s magazine *Kadınca* in 1978, and literary and academic feminist journals such as *Somut*, *Feminist*, and *Kaktüs* in the 1980s. “In 1984, İstanbul feminist groups created their first organization, a publishing company called Kadın Çevresi (Women’s Circle)” which published translations of classics of feminist literature (Tekeli 1995: 14). It is in 1987 that “feminists set up their own stand in an İstanbul book fair where they sold feminist publications ranging from translations of Western classics to feminist novels written by Turkish and foreign writers” (Sirman 1989: 17). To have an insight about the situation today, at least in the publishing field, I visited the webpage of the Turkish Publishers Association (<http://www.turkyaybir.org.tr/>) and checked the names of the members; out of 262 members, 67 publishing houses are owned by women and/or have women chief editors; we can, thus, say that the rate of women who contribute to the decision to publish in the Turkish publishing field today is approximately 25 percent.

Let us now look more closely at the characteristics of the publishers of *Le deuxième sexe* in Turkish.

5.2.1. Düşün Yayınevi

As already stated, the first partial translation of *Le deuxième sexe* was published by Düşün Yayınevi. This publishing house was established in 1956 by two prominent Turkish “men” writers and intellectuals of the time, namely Aziz Nesin and Kemal Tahir, not for the sake of financial profit but with the aim to publish their own works and works of other Turkish writers maintaining the same political stance as they were. They were both radical left-wingers and had difficulties in finding publishers for their works in the late 1950s when the freedom of thought was scarcely tolerated at all in Turkey (Ceyhun 2005). Later, in the lively intellectual climate of Turkey in the early 1960s, Nesin and Tahir published a number of translations from Sartre and Camus as well. It is worth remarking that Sartre was an idol for the Turkish intelligentsia of the 1960s (Koş 2004: 38), and it is thanks to her kinship with Sartre that Simone de

Beauvoir's name started to be heard in the Turkish intellectual milieu at that time. We can clearly observe this in the preface by the translator and in the blurb of this edition; even though "Sartre and Beauvoir attempted together to develop and spread existentialism, and got involved in politics", "Simone de Beauvoir is not well-known in Turkey". In other words, the Turkish reader knows Beauvoir only as a colleague to Sartre at that time, as a woman writer whose identity is based primarily on that of the male to whom she is related. Thus, one who wants to take a prominent position as a writer has to abide by the regulations enforced by the intellectual milieu of that time: one has to be a man for the beginning to be able to struggle in this male-dominated field. The kinship to a known male might be an advantage for a woman to gain access to the field, but once she enters the field, then, since almost all the publishers were male, she would have no option but have her works promoted through the male. As neither Nesin nor Tahir is alive today, we can just speculate that they published this book out of concern for the intellectual aspect of *Le deuxième sexe*, or to put it another way for the symbolic capital it represents, as it might be observed by the paratexts of the book. However, this was not enough to save Beauvoir from the shadow of Sartre in Turkey.

5.2.2. Altın Kitaplar

Two excerpt translations from *Le deuxième sexe* were published by Altın Kitaplar in 1965 and 1966. Altın Kitaplar is a publishing company established in 1956 and active mainly in the field of translated bestsellers which are marketed and received as popular literature (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2005: 133). The company is owned and run today by men, as it was in the 1960s. The paratextual strategies in these two editions launched the work as popular literature, especially as a romance novel and tried to attract the reader by presenting the author as "the woman writer who gives love and inspiration to Jean Paul Sartre", in conformity with the publication strategies of Altın Kitaplar in the 1960s (ibid: 134-135). These verbal and iconic paratextual strategies reflect the amount of attention the author's person receives, and are in perfect line with the factual paratexts, i.e. the fact that the author is a woman and at the same time Sartre's lover. Again, we observe here that Sartre serves as a pass for her to be published. The launching of these two books as romances by the publisher and the emphasis of Simone de Beauvoir's feminine status on the front covers also bring to mind the patriarchal belief that "a woman can just write romances".

In sum, the publisher's approach to *Le deuxième sexe* was primarily commercial as it was with other bestsellers which appeared in translation by Altın Kitaplar. Indeed, since the earlier years of the publishing house, the success has been defined in commercial terms (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2005: 136). Thus, we might conclude that Altın Kitaplar published the translations of *Le deuxième sexe* probably with the aim to accumulate economic capital; this shift from the symbolic value that the work had with Gallimard to an economic one, combined with the image of woman in the domestic culture amended completely the nature of the original work, and launched it as a romance written by a woman.

5.2.3. Payel Yayınevi

Payel Yayınevi published the first complete Turkish translation of *Le deuxième sexe* in three volumes. This version is still the only version in print in Turkey. Payel is established on the 1st of May, 1966 by Ahmet Öztürk who still runs the company. Öztürk defines their mission as “to provide the Turkish reader with the necessary insight about a wide range of subject matters such as science, art, woman, literature, cinema, and classic and contemporary novels”; for this reason, they try to publish the entire oeuvre of the author they are interested in.²⁰ Among the authors whose works are translated and published by Payel, Sigmund Freud (17 works), Wilhelm Reich (14 works), Simone de Beauvoir (12 works), Elias Canetti (10 works), Georg Lukacs (7 works) can be mentioned.

The motive in publishing translations of Beauvoir's work is to a great extent related to the symbolic value that Beauvoir's oeuvre represents for the publisher; as already stated, in his opinion “Beauvoir is one of the most ingenious women of the century”, and “she is even ahead of Sartre”. The bestseller status and the shock value of *Le deuxième sexe* —as stated in the blurb on the back cover of each volume— i.e. its commercial aspect, must have contributed as well to the decision to publish this work in translation, yet the general publication strategy and the discourse of the publisher demonstrate that this work seems to carry more weight for the publisher from the symbolic capital point of view. As for the photographs on the front covers which seem to reflect a marketing strategy to grab the attention of the potential (male) reader, Öztürk argues that, since the work of Beauvoir is about women, they thought that these photographs each of which was in accordance with the subtitle of the respective volume

²⁰ As mentioned in Öztürk's e-mail message to me dated 23 May 2007.

would not contrast with the content of the book.²¹ However, in spite of the good faith on the part of the publisher and translator, these photographs reduce women to the status of objects, and evidence the “masculine domination which constitutes women as symbolic objects whose being is a being-perceived” (Bourdieu 2001: 66). They represent the figure that the human female presents in the patriarchal minds: beautiful and sexy; they represent in a sense the male agent’s “incorporated experience with the social world” as far as the relation between man and woman is concerned, i.e. his gender-related habitus (Krais 2000: 56).

We can therefore conclude that, even though these three publishing houses occupied different positions in the Turkish cultural field, their approach to Beauvoir and *Le deuxième sexe* was somewhat similar as far as the paratextual features of different editions are concerned; they all could not have escaped the patriarchal point of view towards woman, and they even benefited unconsciously or deliberately from this perspective in promoting the book.

5.3. Summary and Conclusion

As criticism and literature in Turkey are predominantly male, Beauvoir has been mediated by male critics, and male publishers and translators for the Turkish readership, especially before the 1980s. What effect does such mediation have on her authorial image in Turkey at a time when little account has been taken of a woman’s point of view, commonly misrepresented according to a male interpretation?

As far as the metatextual and paratextual materials are concerned, almost all the mediators expressed their respect for the authorial skill of Beauvoir; “she is an ingenious writer” for Mardin (1955), “she is among few leading women writers in the West” for her translator Suda (1962), she is a winner of the Prix Goncourt and Philip Wylie praises her work as mentioned in the preface to *Kadın Bu Meçhul* (1965), she is among the well-known women writers of world literature for Süreya (1975), and “one of the most significant and outstanding writer of our age” for İleri (1978), and she is the most ingenious woman of the century, as evidenced by her works and lifestyle according Öztürk who decided to publish a complete translation of *Le deuxième sex* in the early 1970s.

²¹ As mentioned in Öztürk’s e-mail message to me dated 23 May 2007.

The metatexts and paratexts written before the 1980s nonetheless insist on Beauvoir's kinship with Sartre, in conformity with the patriarchal view of woman as someone whose identity is based primarily on that of the males to whom she is related; Mardin (1955) and İleri (1978) mention it; it is mentioned in the blurb on the back cover of the first excerpt translation (1962), and on the front covers other two excerpt translations (1965 and 1966). It is also present in the short biographical and bibliographical notice on Beauvoir in three volumes by Payel. It can be assumed that by concentrating on her kinship with Sartre, her male mediators, who were not familiar with female writings, might seek to rationalize Beauvoir's authorial success and to imply that she owes her success to Sartre. In the metatextual material which appeared in the 1980s and onwards, on the other hand, her relationship with Sartre is dealt with in different contexts; Oral's article questions the role of Sartre in Beauvoir's life (1986), and Miskioğlu focuses on the love between them (1998). Thus, Sartre does not serve anymore as a guarantor of her authorial success.

It is also in the 1980s that the feminist aspect of Beauvoir has become apparent in the metatexts. There is no mention of her feminism in any paratexts of the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe*. Until the 1980s, feminism was not accepted as a legitimate discourse in Turkey; for this reason, Turkish interpretations of Beauvoir have even sometimes governed by a mild hostility toward her because of her stance in favor of women, as we see in the article by İleri (1978). However, later, she is "a humanist feminist" for Tekeli (1986), "she played a leading role in the emancipation of women" according to Tanilli (1999).

We may assume that all these paratexts and metatexts influenced the author's reception in Turkey and helped to construct an image for her, which completely contrasts, at least until the 1980s, with her image in France. By concentrating on her relationship with Sartre, critics, publishers, and translators have aligned themselves along a patriarchal front that distorts the philosophical nature of the text, just from the very beginning, just in the paratexts and metatexts. Their attitude has trivialized the work, thus discouraging potential readers from discovering its strong feminist message.

CONCLUSION

This study considers how a feminist woman writer travels from one cultural and linguistic system to another which has little or no feminist tradition. As we cannot consider translation outside the socio-cultural space in which it emerges, it is likely that her cultural mediators either consciously or subconsciously will screen out feminist propositions of her work to match the target reader expectations in such a journey. The level of appropriation is doubled, on the other hand, when the cultural mediators of the author are male; this time, the message of the woman writer runs the risk of being oversimplified and communicated by a male critical vision, and her voice being silenced. This change of perspective, then, displays a “remainder” —an “irreducible difference introduced by the translation” (Venuti 1998: 116) — to the translated text. Lawrence Venuti argues that

translating is always ideological because it releases a domestic remainder, an inscription of values, beliefs, and representations linked to historical moments and social positions in the domestic culture. In serving the domestic interests, a translation provides an ideological resolution for the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text (2000: 485).

In this study, I have explored the remainder in the metatextual and paratextual elements, rather than the actual text. I have analyzed, within the Turkish context, the authorial image as shaped by the metatextual sources on Simone de Beauvoir on the one hand, and the (mis)presentation of her work *Le deuxième sexe* in Turkish translation by the paratextual strategies on the other. These metatexts written about Simone de Beauvoir and/or her work, and paratexts accompanying the Turkish translations of *Le deuxième sexe* have been further contextualized to uncover the messages, i.e. to shed light on the target system itself.

The analysis of the metatextual and paratextual elements has furnished us with interesting information on how the metatextual and paratextual data mirror the shift in the authorial image of Beauvoir in parallel with the changing stance towards the woman question and feminism in Turkey in the 1980s. While the metatexts and paratexts written before the 1980s —when feminism and women writing were peripheral issues in Turkey— insist on Beauvoir’s kinship with Sartre, in conformity with the patriarchal view of woman as someone whose identity is based primarily on that of the males to

whom she is related, it is only in the 1980s and onwards that texts questioning this relationship appeared in Turkish periodicals. Furthermore, it is also in the 1980s that the feminist aspect of Beauvoir has become apparent in the metatexts.

This material, especially the paratextual one, has been further analyzed from a feminist perspective, since it can provide insight into the views of publishers and translators. Given that almost all the Turkish mediators of Beauvoir are male, Beauvoir and her work have been presented to the Turkish audience from a male perspective. The mediators have aligned themselves along a patriarchal front that distorts the philosophical nature of her work, at least on the paratextual level.

The clues the paratextual level offers might pave the way for further questions in the translations themselves. Within my case study it would have been useful to have at hand a further analysis on the translated text itself. Translations produced by male translators may silence parts of a woman author's message, leading to the fact that the woman reader who is forced to read with the male interpretive stance would have a limited understanding of the text (Henitiuk 1999: 476). In that sense, can we trust male readings of *Le deuxième sexe* to have provided the full story in Turkish, or have they instead ignored or misread fundamental elements? When *Le deuxième sexe* is mediated by translators insensitive to the female voice, is it likely that both text and readers suffer a significant loss? These are some of the questions waiting to be explored in a further study.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, Anna. 1997. "The Eclipse of Gender. Simone de Beauvoir and the *Différance* of Translation". *Philosophy Today* 41 (1): 112-122.
- Arat, Yeşim. 1993. "Women's Studies in Turkey: From Kemalism to Feminism". *New Perspectives on Turkey* 9: 119-135.
- Arrojo, Rosemary. 1994. "Fidelity and the Gendered Translation". *TTR* 7 (2): 147-163.
- Bair, Deirdre. 1987. "'Madly Sensible and Brilliantly Confused': From *Le Deuxième sexe* to *The Second Sex*". *Dalhousie French Studies* 13: 23-35.
- . 1986. "Simone de Beauvoir: Politics, Language, and Feminist Identity". *Yale French Studies* 72: 149-162.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1995. "Preface". In *Translation, History & Culture*, Susan Bassnett & Andre Lefevere, eds. New York: Cassell. ix.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. 1999. "Beauvoir. Mektuplar", Şule Demirkol (trans.). *E Dergisi* 6: 44-46. [Excerpt translation from *Lettres à Nelson Algren*, 1997]
- . 1987. "Bu Dünyaya Karşı Bir Oy" (trans. not mentioned). *Feminist* 3: 24-26. [Translation of an interview with Beauvoir conducted by Alice Schwarzer]
- . 1983. "Feminizm Tehdit Edilmiyor", Serpil Erçetin & Feyza Tolga (trans.). *Somut* 36: 4, 37: 4, 38: 4. [Translation of an interview with Beauvoir conducted Christiane Chombeau and Josyane Savigneau published in *Le Monde* in 1981, "Simone de Beauvoir et le 8 Mars: Le Féminisme n'est pas menacé"]
- . 1981. "Başkalarının Kanı'ndan", İpek Tümerdem (trans.). *Türk Dili* 349: 342-344. [Excerpt translation from the Turkish translation of *Le sang des autres, Başkalarının Kanı*, 1966]
- . 1979. "Simone de Beauvoir", Bertan Onaran (trans.). *Milliyet Sanat* 308: 3-4. [Excerpt translation from an interview with Beauvoir conducted by Catherine David]
- . 1979. "Kadın mı üstün Erkek mi", İnci Gürel (trans.). *Varlık* 859: 16-17. [Excerpt translation from a debate between Beauvoir and Evelyne Sullerot]
- . 1978. "Konuk Kız'dan", Bertan Onaran (trans.). *Türk Dili* 322: 232-236. [Excerpt the Turkish translation of *L'invitée, Konuk Kız*, 1971]
- . 1970. *Kadın : Evlilik Çağı*, Bertan Onaran (trans.). İstanbul: Payel Yayınevi;

- 2nd ed. in 1972; 3rd ed. in 1974; 4th ed. in 1976; 5th ed. in 1981; 6th ed. in 1986; 7th ed. in 1993 under the title *Kadın: İkinci Cins. Evlilik Çağı*. [Excerpt from *Le deuxième sexe*, 1949]
- 1970. *Kadın: Genç Kızlık Çağı*, Bertan Onaran (trans.). İstanbul: Payel Yayınevi; 2nd ed. in 1971; 3rd ed. in 1974; 4th ed. in 1976; 5th ed. in 1980; 6th ed. in 1986; 7th ed. in 1993 under the title *Kadın: İkinci Cins. Genç Kızlık Çağı*. [Excerpt from *Le deuxième sexe*, 1949]
- 1969. *Kadın: İkinci Cins. Bağımsızlığa Doğru*, Bertan Onaran (trans.). İstanbul: Payel Yayınevi; 2nd ed. in 1970; 3rd ed. in 1972; 4th ed. in 1975; 5th ed. in 1978; 6th ed. in 1981; 7th ed. in 1986; 8th ed. in 1993. [Excerpt from *Le deuxième sexe*, 1949]
- 1966. *Kadınlığın Kaderi*, Canset Unan (trans.). İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar. [Excerpt from *Le deuxième sexe*, 1949]
- 1965. *Kadın Bu Meçhul*, Canset Unan (trans.). İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar. [Excerpt from *Le deuxième sexe*, 1949]
- 1964. “Brigitte Bardot”, Ülkü Tamer (trans.). *Yeditepe* 96: 9-10. [Excerpt translation from “Brigitte Bardot”, 1959]
- 1962. *Kadın Nedir*, Orhan Suda (trans.). İstanbul: Düşün Yayınevi. 2nd ed. in 1970 by Payel. [Excerpt from *Le deuxième sexe*, 1949]
- 1961. “Bağlaşma”, Asım Bezirci (trans.). *Türk Dili* 118: 772-780. [Excerpt translation from “Pour une morale de l’ambiguïté”, 1946]
- 1949. *Le deuxième sexe II. L’Expérience vécue*. Paris: Gallimard.
- 1949. *Le deuxième sexe I. Les faits et les mythes*. Paris: Gallimard.
- 1946. “‘Existentialiste’lerde Felsefe ve Roman”, Erol Güney (trans.). *Tercüme* 37: 50-51. [Abridged translation from “Roman et théâtre”, 1945]
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2002. “Les conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées”. *Actes* 145: 3-8.
- 2001. *Masculine Domination*, Richard Nice, trans. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- 1999. “A Conservative Revolution in French Publishing”, Mieranda Vlot (trans.). http://isg.urv.es/library/papers/bourdieu_dec_2006.pdf
- 1999. “The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas”. In *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*, Richard Shusterman, ed. Oxford: Blackwell. 220-228.

- 1997. “The Forms of Capital”, Richard Nice (trans.). In *Education: Culture, Economy, and Society*, A.H. Halsey et al., eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 46-58.
- 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production* (edited and introduced by Randal Johnson). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 1991. “Questions of Method”. In *Empirical Studies of Literature: Proceedings of the Second IGEL-Conference, Amsterdam 1989*, Elrud Ibsch, Dick Schram & Gerard Steen, eds. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi. 19-36.
- 1983. “The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed”, Richard Nice, trans. *Poetics* 12: 311-356.
- 1980. “The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods”, Richard Nice, trans. *Media, Culture and Society* 2: 261-293.
- Buzelin, Hélène. 2005. “Unexpected Allies. How Latour’s Network Theory Could Complement Bourdieusian Analyses in Translation Studies”. *The Translator* 11 (2): 193-218.
- Calhoun, Craig et al., eds. 2003. “The Sociological Theory of Pierre Bourdieu”. In *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell. 257-304.
- Card, Claudia, ed. 2003. *The Cambridge Companion to Simone de Beauvoir*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ceyhun, Demirtaş. 2005. “Yayıncılar Cesaret Edemedi”. <http://www.aypa.net/Aziz-Nesin/>. Visited in June 2007.
- Chamberlain, Lori. 2000. “Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation”. In *Translation Studies Reader*, Lawrence Venuti, ed. London: Routledge. 314-329.
- Chaperon, Sylvie. 1999. “Le deuxième sexe en héritage”. http://www.mshs.univ-poitiers.fr/Forell/cabal/artMD99/DS_MDj99.htm. Visited May 2007.
- Cordero, Anne. 1995. “Gender Terminology in Simone de Beauvoir and her Translators”. *The Platte Valley Review* 23 (2): 51-61.
- Çaha, Ömer. 1996. *Sivil Kadın*, Ertan Özensel (trans.). Ankara: Vadi.
- Çağatay, Nilüfer & Nuhoglu-Soysal, Yasemin. 1995. “Comparative Observations on Feminism and the Nation-building Process”. In *Women in Modern Turkish Society. A Reader*, Şirin Tekeli, ed. London & New Jersey: Zed Books. 263-272.
- Evren, Süreyya. 1991. “Sade’ı Yakmalı mı?”. *Varlık* 1010: 62.

- Fallaize, Elizabeth. 2002. "Le destin de la femme au foyer: traduire 'la femme mariée' de Simone de Beauvoir". In *Cinquantenaire du Deuxième Sexe*, C. Delphy & S. Chaperon, eds. Paris: Syllepse. 468-474.
- Flotow, Luise von. 2006. "Feminism in Translation: the Canadian Factor". *Quaederns. Revista de traducció* 13: 11-20.
- . 2005. "Tracing the Context of Translation. The Example of Gender". In *Gender, Sex and Translation. The Manipulation of Identities*, José Santaemilia, ed. Manchester: St. Jerome. 39-51.
- . 2002. "Gender in Translation: The Issues Goes on". *Orées 2* (on-line journal). <http://orees.concordia.ca/numero2/essai/Von%20Flotow.html>. Visited October 2006.
- . 2000. "Translation Effects. How Beauvoir Talks Sex in English". In *Contingent Loves. Simone de Beauvoir and Sexuality*, Melanie Hawthorne, ed. Richmond: University Press Virginia. 13-33.
- . 1999. "Genders and the Translated Text: Developments in 'Transformance'". *Textus* XII: 275-288.
- . 1997. *Translation and Gender. Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- . 1991. "Feminist Translation: Contexts, Practices and Theories". *TTR* 4 (2): 69-85.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997 *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gillman, Richard. 1988. "The Man Behind the Feminist Bible". *The New York Times*, May 22. <http://select.nytimes.com/search/restricted/article?res=FB0710FA3B5C0C718EDDAC0894D0484D81>. Visited December 2006.
- Glazer, Sarah. 2004. "Lost in Translation". *The New York Times*, August 22. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9402EED6163FF931A1575BC0A9629C8B63>. Visited May 2007.
- Godard, Barbara. 1995. "Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation". In *Translation, History & Culture*, Susan Bassnett & Andre Lefevere, eds. New York: Cassell. 87-96.
- Gouanvic, Jean-Marc. 2005. "A Bourdieusian Theory of Translation, or the Coincidence of Practical Instances. Field, 'Habitus', Capital, and 'Illusio'". *The Translator* 11 (2): 147-166.

- . 2002. “The Stakes of Translation in Literary Fields”. *Across Languages and Cultures* 3 (2): 159-168.
- . 1997. “Translation and the Shape of Things to Come. The Emergence of American Science Fiction in Post-War France”. *The Translator* 3 (2): 125-152.
- . 1995. “Pour une sociologie de la traduction: le cas de la littérature américaine traduite en France après la Seconde Guerre mondiale (1945-1960)”. In *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarová & Klaus Kaindl, eds. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Harvey, Keith. 2003. *Intercultural Movements. American Gay in French Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Henitiuk, Valerie. 1999. “Translating Woman: Reading the Female Through the Male”. *Meta* 44 (3): 469-484.
- Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translating in Systems*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Holmes, Diana. 1996. “Simone de Beauvoir (1908-86) and *The Second Sex*”. In *French Women's Writing. 1848-1994*. London & Atlantic Highlands: Athlone. 147-166.
- Inghilleri, Moira. 2005. “The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the ‘Object’ in Translation and Interpreting Studies”. *The Translator* 11 (2): 125-145.
- . 2005. “Mediating Zones of Uncertainty. Interpreter Agency, the Interpreting Habitus and Political Asylum Adjudication”. *The Translator* 11 (1): 69-85.
- . 2003. “Habitus, Field and Discourse. Interpreting as a Socially Situated Activity”. *Target* 15 (2): 243-268.
- İnal, Tanju. 1991. “Simone de Beauvoir’ı Anarken”. *Littera Edebiyat Yazıları* 2: 135-141.
- İleri, Selim. 1986. “Simone de Beauvoir: Hayata Bir İç Gezi”. *Milliyet Sanat* 143: 11-12.
- . 1978. “Sürekli Bilinç Yoklamasıyla Sonsuz Özgürlüğe Giden Yolu Arayan Yazar: Simone de Beauvoir”. *Milliyet Sanat* 259: 7-9.
- Jenkins, Richard. 2002. *Pierre Bourdieu*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, Randal. 1993. “Editor’s Introduction. Pierre Bourdieu on Art, Literature and Culture”. In *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1-25.
- Kadish, Doris Y. & Françoise Massardier-Kenney, eds. 1994. *Translating Slavery. Gender & Race in French Women's Writing, 1783-1823*. Kent & London: The Kent University Press.

- Kaufmann, Dorothy. 1986. "Simone de Beauvoir: Questions of Difference and Generation". *Yale French Studies* 72: 121-131.
- Keefe, Terry. 1994. "Another 'Silencing of Beauvoir'? Guess What's Missing This Time". *French Studies* 50 (Spring Supplement): 18-20.
- Krais, Beate. 2000. "The Gender Relationship in Bourdieu's Sociology". *SubStance* 93: 53-67.
- Kovala, Urpo. 1996. "Translations, Paratextual Mediation, and Ideological Closure". *Target* 8 (1): 119-147.
- Koş, Ayşenaz. 2004. "An Analytical Study on the Migration of Sartrean Existentialism into Turkey Through Translation". Unpublished thesis of Master of Arts, Boğaziçi University.
- Kökden, Uğur. 1997. "Cafe Flore ve 'Beauvoir'". *Milliyet Sanat* 400: 30-31.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Linn, Stella. 2003. "Translation and the Authorial Image: the Case of Federico García Lorca's *Romancero gitano*". *TTR* 16 (1): 55-91.
- Lotbinière-Harwood, Susanne de. 1991. *Re-belle et infidèle: La traduction comme pratique de réécriture au féminin / The Body Bilingual: Translation as a Rewriting in the Feminine*. Montréal: Les éditions du remue-ménage.
- Maier, Carol. 1998. "Issues in the Practice of Translating Women's Fiction". *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 75 (1): 95-108.
- Maier, Carol S. & Françoise Massardier Kenney. 1996. "Gender in/and Literary Translation". In *Translation Perspectives IX*. Binghamton: SUNY Binghamton, Center for Research in Translation. 225-242.
- Mardin, Şerif. 1955. "*Les Mandarins* ve Fransız Aydını". *Forum* 23: 19-20.
- Martín, M. Rosario. 2005 "Gender(ing) Theory: Rethinking the Targets of Translation Studies in Parallel with Recent Developments in Feminism". In *Gender, Sex and Translation. The Manipulation of Identities*, José Santaemilia, ed. Manchester: St. Jerome. 27-37.
- Massardier-Kenney, Françoise. 1997. "Towards a Redefinition of Feminist Translation Practice". *The Translator* 3 (1): 55-69.
- Mezei, Kathy. 2006. "Transformations of Barbara Godard". In *Writing Between the Lines: Portraits of Canadian Anglophone Translators*, Agnes Whitfield, ed. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press. 203-224.

- Miskioğlu, Ahmet. 2002b. "Simone de Beauvoir'ın Jean-Paul Sartre Destanı". *Türk Dili Dergisi* 92. <http://www.turkdilidergisi.com/92/>. Visited October 2006.
- 2002a. "Simone de Beauvoir ve Görünenin Arka Yüzü". *Türk Dili Dergisi* 91. <http://www.turkdilidergisi.com/91/>. Visited October 2006.
- 1998b. "Sonsuz Sevgi II". *Türk Dili Dergisi* 66: 1-2.
- 1998a. "Sonsuz Sevgi I". *Türk Dili Dergisi* 65: 1-2.
- Moi, Toril. 2002. "While we wait: the English translation of *The Second Sex*". *Signs* 27.4 (Summer 2002): 1005(33). *InfoTrac OneFile*. Thomson Gale. Bogazici Universitesi. 21 Dec. 2006. <<http://0-find.galegroup.com.seyhan.library.boun.edu.tr:80/ips/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC-Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=IPS&docId=A90980159&source=gale&srcprod=ITOF&userGroupName=bogazici&version=1.0>>.
- 1994. *Simone de Beauvoir. The Making of an Intellectual Woman*. Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell.
- 1991. "Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist Theory and Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture". *New Literary History* 22 (4): 1017-1049.
- 1990. *Feminist Theory & Simone de Beauvoir*. Oxford & Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
- Mottier, Véronique. 2002. "Masculine Domination. Gender and Power in Bourdieu's Writings". *Feminist Theory* 3 (3): 345-359.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Oral, Zeynep. 1986. "Sartre'la Beraber, Sartre'a Rağmen Simone de Beauvoir Olmuş Bir Kadının Öyküsü". *Milliyet Sanat* 143: 2-7.
- Özdemir, Seyfettin. 1967. "Brigitte Bardot". *Yordam* 15: 67.
- Öztürkmen, Arzu. 1998. "A Short History of *Kadınca* Magazine and its Feminism". In *Deconstructing Images of 'the Turkish Woman'*, Zehra F. Arat, ed. New York: St. Martin's Press. 275-293.
- Pilardi, Jo-Ann. 1993. "The Changing Critical Fortunes of the Second Sex". *History and Theory* 32 (1): 51-73.
- Robbins, Derek. 2000. *Bourdieu & Culture*. London: Sage.
- Robinson, Douglas. 1999. *Becoming a Translator. An Accelerated Course*. London & New York: Routledge.

- 1995. “Theorizing Translation in a Woman’s Voice. Subverting the Rhetoric of Patronage, Courtly Love and Morality”. *The Translator* 1 (2): 153-175.
- Salih, Sara. 2002. *Judith Butler*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. 2005. “How to be a (recognized) Translator. Rethinking Habitus, Norms, and the Field of Translation”. *Target* 17 (1): 1-26.
- Sezer, Sennur. 1993. “Türk Kadın Edebiyatından Söz Edilebilir mi?”. In *Théma Larousse. Tematik Ansiklopedi*, vol. 6. İstanbul: Milliyet. 148-149.
- Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. “The Pivotal Status of the Translator’s Habitus”. *Target* 10 (1): 1-39.
- Simon, Sherry. 2000. "Gender in Translation". In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Peter France, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. Bogazici University Library. 5 January 2007
<<http://0-www.oxfordreference.com.seyhan.library.boun.edu.tr:80/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t194.e41>>
- 1996. *Gender in Translation. Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Simons, Margaret A. 1995. “Introduction”. In *Feminist Interpretations of Simone de Beauvoir*, Margaret A. Simons, ed. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press. 1-28.
- 1983. “The Silencing of Simone de Beauvoir. Guess What’s Missing from *The Second Sex*”. *Women’s Studies International Forum* 6 (5): 559-564.
- Sirman, Nükhet. 1989. “Feminism in Turkey: A Short History”. *New Perspectives on Turkey* 3 (1): 1-34.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2000. “The Politics of Translation”. In *Translation Studies Reader*, Lawrence Venuti, ed. London: Routledge. 397-416.
- Süreya, Cemal. 1975. “1975 - Kadın Yılı (5): Edebiyatta Kadın”. *Milliyet Sanat* 128: 11-13.
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2005. *Kapılar. Çeviri Tarihine Yaklaşımlar*. İstanbul: Scala Yayıncılık.
- 2002 “What Texts Don’t Tell: The Uses of Paratexts in Translation Research”. In *Crosscultural Transgressions*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing. 44-60.
- Tanilli, Server. 1999. “Rosa Luxemburg ile Simone de Beauvoir”. *Milliyet Sanat* 451: 22-23.

- Tekeli, Şirin. 1995. "Introduction: Women in Turkey in the 1980s". In *Women in Modern Turkish Society. A Reader*, Şirin Tekeli, ed. London & New Jersey: Zed Books. 1-21.
- 1989. "'80'lerde Türkiye'de Kadınların Kurtuluşu Hareketinin Gelişmesi". *Birikim* 3: 34-41.
- 1986. "Hümanist Bir Feminist". *Milliyet Sanat* 143: 8-11.
- Tomris, R. 1966. "Sade ve İki Yazar". *Papirüs* 7: 35-38.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2006. "Pierre Bourdieu".
http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/wacquant/wacquant_pdf/PIERREBOURDIEU-KEYTHINK-REV2006.pdf. Visited May 2007.
- Wheeler, Anne-Marie. 2003. "Issues of Translation in the Works of Nicole Brossard". *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 16 (2): 425-454.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2006. "The female state of the art. Women in the 'translation field'". In *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger & Zuzana Jettmarová, eds. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 129-141.
- 2005. "The Creation of A 'Room of One's Own'. Feminist Translators as Mediators Between Cultures and Genders". In *Gender, Sex and Translation. The Manipulation of Identities*, José Santaemilia, ed. Manchester: St. Jerome. 15-25.
- 2005. "'Der Kritiker muß ein Verandlungsmensch sein, ein... Schlangemensch des Geistes'. Ein Beitrag zur Dynamisierung der Feldtheorie von Pierre Bourdieu am Biespiel von Hermann Bahr". In *Ent-grentze Räume. Kulturelle Transfers um 1900 und in der Gegenwart*, Mitterbauer, Helga & Katharina Scherke, eds. Wien: Passagen. 157-171.