

## Marxist feminist discourse in a Turkish novel with Eugene Nida's concept of "equivalence" applied on translation evaluation of the novel

Mesut KULELİ<sup>1</sup>

**APA:** Kuleli, M. (2019). Marxist feminist discourse in a Turkish novel with Eugene Nida's concept of "equivalence" applied on translation evaluation of the novel. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (16), 703-720. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.621178

### Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze the novel *Kürk Mantolu Madonna (Madonna in a Fur Coat)* by Sabahattin Ali based on Marxist feminist theory and evaluate the translation of those contexts with Marxist feminist discourse based on Nida's (2000) concept of "equivalence". The source text was analyzed to find out how the contexts with such discourse conform to Marxist feminist theory and it was found that the patriarchal family structure was the main reason underlying the oppression of women in a family. Besides forming the oppressed class in a family structure, some other contexts were found to show the oppression of women in social life and business life. Translation evaluation of the contexts with Marxist feminist discourse showed that this translation was in compliance with Nida's (2000) concept of 'dynamic equivalence'. The contexts analyzed in this study were translated into the target language with a focus on conveying the relationship between the source text message and its reader to the target text and its reader. Certain grammar modifications were found to be made in translation of the contexts in the novel analyzed in this study to make it sound natural to the target language reader, an important aspect of Nida's (2000) equivalence model.

**Keywords:** Marxist feminist theory, equivalence, dynamic equivalence, translation, *Madonna in a Fur Coat*.

## Türkçe bir romandaki Marksist feminist söylem ve romanın çevirisinin değerlendirmesinde Eugene Nida'nın "eşdeğerlik" kavramının uygulanması

### Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Sabahattin Ali'nin *Kürk Mantolu Madonna* başlıklı romanını Marksist feminist kurama dayalı olarak çözümlenmek ve Marksist feminist söylem içeren bağlamların İngilizce çevirisini Nida'nın (2000) "eşdeğerlik" kavramına dayanarak değerlendirmektir. Kaynak metin, söylemlerin Marksist feminist kuramın hangi yönlerine uyduğunu bulmak için çözümlenmiştir. Çözümleme bulgularına göre kadınların bir aile ortamında ezilen sınıfı oluşturmasının altında ataerkil aile yapısı bulunmaktadır. Aile içinde ezilen sınıfı oluşturmanın yanı sıra, romanda kadınların toplumsal hayat ve iş hayatında da ezilen sınıfı oluşturduğuna dair söylemler bulunmuştur. Marksist feminist söylem içeren bağlamların çeviri değerlendirmesi sonucunda, romanın İngilizce çevirisinin Nida'nın (2000) 'devingen eşdeğerlik' kavramına uyduğu bulunmuştur. Bu çalışmada çözümlenen söylemlerin, kaynak metin ve okuru arasındaki ilişkinin hedef metin ve okuru arasında da aktarılacağı bir biçimde çevrildiği bulunmuştur. Çalışmada çözümlenen romana ait söylemlerin çevirisinde, kaynak metindeki söylemlerin dilbilgisel değişiklikler yapılarak hedef dile çevrildiği bulunurken, bu durum

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Bandırma Onyedü Eylül Üniversitesi, Bandırma Meslek Yüksekokulu, Yabancı Diller ve Kültürler, Uygulamalı İngilizce ve Çevirmenlik (Balıkesir, Türkiye), mkuleli@bandirma.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3477-0412 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 18.08.2019-kabul tarihi: 20.09.2019; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.621178]

Nida'nın (2000) eşdeğerlik modelinde önemli bir yer tutan hedef metin okuruna doğal söylemle çevrilmesine uyumlu olarak görülmektedir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Marksist feminist kuram, eşdeğerlik, devingen eşdeğerlik, çeviri, *Kürk Mantolu Madonna*.

## 1. Introduction

Feminism, as a movement that traditionally endeavors to put an end to the dominance of men over women, has been around for some time with a view to providing rights for women that men already possess, rendering equality to women compared to men. Simply put, the term 'feminism' can be defined as "the belief in social, economic, and political equality of the sexes" (Brunell and Burkett, 2019). In this definition, the key point can be shown as 'equality', but it is also important to stress the various domains the equality must be established in. This term has been so commonly used since the late 1800s that it has found its place in daily use in most languages, as well. Oxford Online Dictionary defines this term as "the belief and aim that women should have the same rights and opportunities as men; the struggle to achieve this aim" (Retrieved on 09/08/2019). This definition points to the equality of rights between men and women, alike. For Ferree 'feminism' is characterized by "the activism for the purpose of challenging and changing women's subordination to men" (Ferree, 2006: 6). Therefore, the term feminism concerns the struggle for equality of women to men in all fields ranging from household issues to politics.

From 1960s onwards, the term 'feminism' took a leap in popular culture. A great many strides have been taken by particular nations or internationally to protect and expand the rights of women through acts like The Equal Pay Act or Sex Discrimination Act (Snell, 1979: 37) to name a few. Such were the efforts to ensure the equality between men and women in legal domain. As in most other spheres, an extensive investigation of feminism inevitably brought divisions in the study of the term from different perspectives, as a result of which different theories of feminism emerged. Of different feminism theories, those most reflective of the modernist idea are liberal feminism, Marxist feminism and radical feminism (Donovan 2005: 7). According to Moran (2017), some adopt Marxist feminism; others may take psychoanalysis; still others might build on author-oriented or reader-oriented theories in their studies of feminism. Therefore, with such variety in theories of feminism, it would also be plausible to take feminist literary theory/criticism into consideration for the analysis of literary texts.

It would be useful to consider and elaborate on the theories of feminism in modernist sense briefly. Liberalist views in politics and social life can be considered to have paved the way for liberal feminism. As its name suggests, liberalist thinkers give priority to reason, the trait that distinguishes human beings from other organisms. Groenhout (2002) confirms this proposition stating that:

"Liberal political theory begins with rights, autonomy and reason. Humans have rights ... humans, whatever their other differences, share some basic qualities that make them properly bearers of rights... The nature of rationality is a central one for liberal thinkers... Because liberal political thought bases rights on what would seem to be a gender-neutral concept such as rationality, it has been a traditional resource for feminist thinkers." (Groenhout, 2002: 51).

As is clear from the Groenhout's (2002) proposition, since liberal thinkers focus on reason and rationality as the key concepts to humanity, and since this quality of rationality can be found both in men and women, it wouldn't be far from reality to suggest that women should bear the same rights as men. Feminist thinkers could easily benefit from this idea of rationality in both genders, and so emerged the theory of liberal feminism. Groenhout (2002: 51) further states that "if women can be shown to

possess this quality [of rationality], then women are possessors of rights, and any infringements of those rights is morally unacceptable". Therefore, liberal feminism takes the view that women must obtain the same rights as men in all realms of social life because the quality of rationality, the sine qua non of being a human, is not something unique to men, but rather both genders possess this quality equally. This is the underlying view of liberal feminism. On the other hand, radical feminism regards women as a political class because of their biological functions. Atkinson (2000: 85) states that "women are a political class characterized by a sexual function... women... have the capacity to bear children". According to Atkinson (2000), radical feminism sprung from the dilemma of traditional feminism asking for equal rights between men and women, but ignoring the fact that it is the women who give birth, as different from men, therefore women should have their own rights rather than only equal rights to those of men's. Atkinson (2000: 85) posits that women must be considered a political group because the term 'political group' is defined as "classes treated by other classes in some special manner distinct from the way other classes are treated". According to Shulman (1980: 590), the 'declaration of personality as political' owes much to radical feminists, and Raising awareness in women of their biological qualities could be the key to organizing women to refuse patriarchy and to decide on their organisms for themselves. Therefore, radical feminism adopts the view that any bad issue related to women is due to the patriarchal system in the society, and women must come together to do away with patriarchy and decide their lives themselves.

Feminist literary criticism is another theory of feminism that could be mentioned in this study briefly. According to Kolodny (1980: 1), Mary Ellman's *Thinking About Women* was one of the pioneering studies for feminist literary criticism, and this kind of criticism "involved exposing the sexual stereotyping of women in both our literature and our literary criticism". Plain (2007: 6) states that feminist literary criticism began approximately 1960s with the second wave of feminism. Kolodny (1975: 75), in a quest to define feminist criticism, suggests that the application of feminist criticism in literature covers "a) any criticism written by a woman, no matter what the subject; b) any criticism written by a woman about a man's book which treats that book from a 'political' or 'feminist' perspective; and c) any criticism written by a woman about a woman's book or about female authors in general". Therefore, feminist criticism in literature deals with the criticism on male of female authors by a woman. According to Moran (2017), in the first phase of feminist literary criticism, the works of male authors are analyzed and ideologically discussed in the light of atrocity against women besides abuse of women in those works. Moreover, the attitude towards women in male authors' works is compared to real-life women in patriarchal societies, thereby coming up with conclusions regarding the attitudes of males towards women in literary world. On the other hand, suggests Moran (2017), the second phase of feminist literary criticism deals with the woman as an author, and it is also possible to divide this phase into two in that the first approach of this phase investigates women as authors in literary history while the second approach investigates the possibilities and potential for a novel women discourse.

Thus far, liberal feminist theory, radical feminist theory and feminist literary criticism theory have been explained based on the key elements of those feminism theories. In this study, Marxist feminism theory has been adopted in data collection procedure in the analysis of a novel. Therefore, Marxist feminism will be explained in detail from now on, and the rationale for the employment of this theory will be discussed.

Prior to the discussion on Marxist feminism, it would be convenient to explain the facts and thoughts Karl Marx gathered on the place and condition of women in socio-economic life in his prominent series *Das Kapital*. According to Marx (2011: 379), the number of child labor and working mothers increased

dramatically in industry in the 19th century, however a certain amount of housework, such as child-care or feeding children, can on no account be oppressed by industries, and therefore working mothers dominated by capital must compensate for such work through ready-made meta, which means that the labor women spend at home decreases while the expenditure increases. Citing from a study conducted in 1861, Marx (2011: 382) points out that the major reason for high mortality rates is women working outside home, as a result of which malnutrition emerges, besides women working outside home easily get alienated from their kids at home. Therefore, Marx can be considered to have disfavored the working conditions for women in factories assuming that they are deprived of the luxury of looking after their kids at home, and the more effort they make to earn money in factories, the more money they need to spend to make up for the crucial housework left undone at home while they are away on factories, which points to the fact that the meta women work to obtain as offered by the capital has made them slaves of capital; ignorant of their household duties. It is through those observations and thoughts of Marx that Marxist feminism could have found ground.

A great many scholars have studied on Marxist feminism from theoretical or practical perspectives or tried to define and establish the grounds for this theory of feminism.

"Marxist [feminist] perspective argues that poverty is a structural feature of a capitalist system that prioritizes profits over human needs. Women's oppression is regarded as inextricably linked with class oppression, precluding the liberation of women within the prevailing capitalist world system" (Bandarage, 1984: 495).

This proposition seems to be based on Marx's (2011) proposition that capital has oppressed women and caused them to work outside their homes, thereby making them ignorant of the household work, the real need of the family structure. Indeed, what women consider as profit is just the meta they must use to compensate for the misconduct of family needs, that is, child care or child feeding.

"Marxist feminist theory identifies the origins of women's oppression in the introduction of private property... Capitalism is viewed as having created a unique social and economic class for women, which is maintained primarily through economic exploitation of women's labor in the family, industry, and marketing" (Chinn and Wheeler, 1985: 74).

According to this proposition, capitalism created the need for private property, which led to the must-have mentality in the society. With this mentality in question, women, besides men in a family environment, were obliged to go to work in factories and they were underpaid by capital-owners as was the case with child-laborers, as a result of which women constituted the oppressed group.

"Marxist feminists often refer to Capital to justify their explanation of women's (un-)productive domestic labor in a capitalist, patriarchal society... Although he [Marx] claims to work toward 'a higher form of the family and relations between the sexes,' he occasionally conflates patriarchy and capitalism [as the oppression of women]" (Weeks, 2011: 31).

In this view, it can also be seen that capital is to blame for the interruption of housework by women. Besides capital, patriarchal structure of the society is also shown as one of the reasons for uncompleted housework. As women are the sole individuals responsible for housework and males do not contribute to child-rearing practices or cleaning and cooking in patriarchal societies, all those domestic duties fall to women, who also have to work outside of their home unlike men who only work outside. For Gimenez and Vogel (2005: 5), despite many criticisms to Marx's views as such they fail to explain the contemporary globalization and postmodernity issues, "it is impossible adequately to theorize exploitation and oppression, including the exploitation and oppression of women, outside the framework of Marxist theory. Marx's work ... [provides] theoretical and methodological insights ...to

understand [how] capitalism oppresses people on the basis of gender and sexual preference". Therefore, issues like globalization or postmodernity cannot discard the importance of Marx's thoughts to understand why, how and the extent to which women are oppressed. In explaining the object and scope of Marxist feminism, Barrett (2014) maintains that:

"In the most general terms, [the goal of Marxist feminism] must be to identify the operation of gender relations as and where they may be distinct from, or connected with, the processes of production and reproduction... Thus, it falls to Marxist feminism to explore the relations between the organization of sexuality, domestic production, household, and so on... Such questions are now being addressed by Marxist feminists" (Barrett, 2014: 9).

As can be understood from the statement above, Marxist feminism is linked to the investigation of the role of women in production and reproduction in different domains in the society relative to men. Thus far, all studies in relevant literature stated here consider Marxist feminism as the ideal medium to investigate the condition of women in the society, and there is a general tendency to associate the oppression of women with patriarchal and capitalism-driven society. Hartmann (2012) divides Marxist feminist thought into three stages:

"Initially, the first Marxists including Marx, Engels, Kautsky and Lenin thought that capitalism attracted all women into wage labor, and this process was destroying the division of labor based on gender. Second, contemporary Marxists included women in the analysis of everyday life in capitalism. According to this view, all elements of our lives are seen as reproducing the capitalist system, and we are all workers in the system. Third, the Marxist feminists have focused on the relationship between housework and capital, some of them arguing that housework creates added value, and housewives work directly for capitalists". (Hartmann, 2012: 161-162)

According to Hartmann (2012), the first stage of Marxist feminism accuses capitalism of taking women outside their homes for work, thereby eliminating the division of labor while the second stage regards women in the workplace as reproducers of the capitalist system with the effort they make. The third stage, on the other hand, considers housework as an added value, which means that the housewives doing daily chores at home are of no less significance than men working outside, and goes on to see women as the slaves of the capitalist system. This last remark might also allude to men as the capitalists of domestic area. This can be supported with Donovan's (2005) reading of Marxism that considers the division of labor at home, in which men are the dominant individuals while women and children are the slaves, as the basis of unfair allocation of goods and services in society. As a solution to this problem of slavery of women within the house, Marxist feminists suggest that women be paid money for their housework (Işık, 1998: 43-44). This payment would take women out of capital's hands and their production or contribution to the production within the house would be considered a valuable service on its own, as a result of which women wouldn't be compelled to work in factories and the crucial chores at home would not be ignored, moreover the need for meta to compensate the neglected chores at home would come to an end, cutting the resources of the capitalist and thereby bringing the capitalist's insatiable greed to an end. This would, of course, bring an end to the class system in the society raised by the capitalist. Engels (1979: 71-72) states that the housework performed by women used to be considered a valuable service; however, partly because of a turn into patriarchal family structure, this service fell into disfavor and lost its importance for the society, and as a result, housework was considered as a private service of women. It is through this process that women began to be considered slaves to men at home. Engels (1979) adds that women are, in a sense, the prisoners left at home all the time for work like cooking or child-feeding, therefore the duty of child-care must take on a social stand. Sevim (2005) confirms this arguing that Marxist feminists refer to the role of women as the oppressed working class while men symbolize the bourgeoisie class, and this class distinction can only be solved if

the private housework performed by women can be transformed into a public industry. According to Michel (1995: 92-96), Marxist feminism holds that the women performing every type of housework must be paid by the state, not by the man at home, and in this way women would not be forced to work out of home environment, and they would not have to perform two different jobs.

Concluding from what is in relevant literature about Marxist feminism, the adherents of this theory believe that the freedom of women lies in wiping out the social and economic 'class' structure within the society raised by capital. They assume that patriarchal society leads to class distinctions between men and women. With the support of the state in financing the housework of women, they would no longer need the meta produced by the capitalist and could also take active part in the inevitable fight against capital. With the fall of the capital, the artificial 'class' structure in the society would also come to an end, rendering women free individuals in the end.

In this study, a novel written in Turkish was analyzed from Marxist feminist perspective. The characters and the plot in the novel are suitable for this type of reading since the character of a housewife, living in Turkey, is recounted as an oppressed individual restricted to the home environment due to chores at home, financially supported by her husband, the protagonist of the novel. Also, another woman, living in Germany and one of the leading characters in the novel, is occasionally recounted as a worker, compelled to work at a club that she hates only to make a living. The contexts involving discourses that can be associated with Marxist feminism assumptions were analyzed to see how they can be related to Marxist feminism theory.

## 2. Sabahattin Ali and *Madonna in a Fur Coat*

Sabahattin Ali, born in 1907, was sent to Germany by the Ministry of National Education after serving as a teacher in Turkey in 1928 and returned to Turkey two years later, after which he worked as a German teacher and then as a civil servant in Publishing Management department of Ministry of National Education (Ali, 2009). He was better known for his stories than novels, and *Kürk Mantolu Madonna* (*Madonna in a Fur Coat*), written in 1943, is one of his prominent novels even though it can be called a 'novella', bearing the associations of 19th century Russian literature, particularly that of Dostoievski and Gogol's (Akathl, 2002: 6). Akathl (2002: 6) also states that the author might have been inspired to write that novel during his education in Berlin, Germany for two years between 1928 and 1930. According to Karaca (1993), Sabahattin Ali was a societal writer who focused on the issues in the countryside rather than urban areas, charging the governors with the unfavorable conditions of countryside besides adopting a romantic style in his narration. However, Sabahattin Ali was not restricted to rural issues in his short stories and novels.

"Ali's novels and short stories cover a diverse range of subject matters, from the social fabric of rural Anatolian life to the intellectual and bohemian circles of pre-World War II Istanbul. Well read in Marxist literature, Ali was a committed socialist, and was often imprisoned for his criticism of the state and the single party system, yet his literary texts rarely contained outright political commentary" (Dickinson, 2013: 2).

Based on this proposition, this novel should contain quite some contexts with Marxist (feminist) focus. The novel begins with the narrator seeking a job and finally finding one as a contact person between banks and companies with the help of an old friend. In the office room, the narrator gets to know his roommate Raif Efendi, working as a German translator in that company. This translator has a unique personality the narrator feels curious about. In the course of time, they get closer, but not so close as might be expected of two people working in the same office room. Raif Efendi frequently gets sick and

does not come to the company when he is sick. In one of such situations, when his sickness gets longer than usual, the narrator goes to visit him. It is through the description of such visits that the reader can understand Raif Efendi's family life, an oppressed wife who has to do house chores through the day, some other relatives living in the same house but not contributing to family budget at all. Unfortunately, Raif Efendi cannot recover from this sickness and dies. The day before he dies, he asks the narrator to bring home everything in his drawer in the office room. The narrator agrees, but also finds a notebook, with the handwriting of Raif Efendi, and asks Raif Efendi to read that notebook to learn about his life. Despite initial objections, Raif Efendi agrees the narrator goes home to read that notebook. It recounts the days when Raif Efendi lived in Germany and was written years ago. The narrator learns from the notebook that Raif Efendi fell in love with a girl whose self-portrait he had seen in an exhibition. After the details about the relationship between Raif Efendi and that girl, Raif Efendi has to return to Turkey as he learns his father's death through a telegram. That girl, feeling quite sick in those days, goes to her mother's house and they promise to come together in Turkey. They write letters to each other after they depart, but some time later, the girl does not write any letters and Raif Efendi loses her trace. Mistakenly believing that she found another man, he gets married. Years later in Ankara, he encounters a common acquaintance from Germany with a little girl, but that acquaintance does not know anything about their relationship. When Raif Efendi hesitantly asks about the girl that he loved in Germany, the acquaintance says she died. She goes on to say that she learnt from the girl's mother that she was in love with a Turkish man when she was in Germany, but could not get married to that man because of her untimely death, leaving the little girl behind accompanying her while Raif Efendi is talking. At that time Raif Efendi learns that the little girl is his daughter, but that girl and the acquaintance from Germany get on train and get away before Raif Efendi can say anything.

Since its first publication in 1943, this novel has been reprinted by different publishing houses and has been translated into several languages. It is still one of the bestsellers and has been read by a wide community in Turkey. In this study, 2009 edition of the novel was used for as source text for analysis based on Marxist feminist theory while its English translation by Maureen Freely and Alexander Dawe, translators of plenty of Turkish stories or novels, published in 2016, was used as the target text to evaluate the translation of the contexts analyzed in terms of Marxist feminist discourse. In translation evaluation, the 'principles of correspondence' as coined by Eugene Nida was used.

### 3. The principles of correspondence and equivalence

In this study, the translation of contexts interpreted based on Marxist feminist theory was evaluated according to Nida's (2000 [originally posited in 1964]) term of 'equivalence'. According to Nida (2000: 126), an absolute correspondence between two languages is far from reality in translation due to the distinctly different natures of those two languages. Therefore, Nida (2000) does not believe in the possibility of an exact translation. Nida (2000: 127) suggests three reasons for the impossibility of an exact correspondence between two languages: "a) the nature of the message; b) the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator, and c) the type of audience". The reasons Nida (2000) suggests do not only concern the source text and the target text, but also may be associated with two different target texts of the same source text since the purpose of two different translators, besides their target audience, might differ from one another greatly. Moreover, concerning the correspondence between the target text and the source text, the purpose of the author might not be parallel to that of the translator's.

Considering the propositions of Nida (2000) regarding translation so far, two different types of equivalence are suggested: 'formal equivalence' and 'dynamic equivalence'. First, the term 'formal equivalence' will be explained with reference to Nida (2000).

"Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept... one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language" (Nida, 2000: 129).

It is important to note that Nida uses the term 'receptor language' for target text language. According to this proposition, a translator tries to reproduce a text in the target language that closely matches the form and meaning in the source text. Therefore, 'formal equivalence' can be thought of as source-oriented translation. Nida (2000: 134) adds that 'formal equivalence' is an attempt to reproduce a target text preserving "a) grammatical units; b) consistency in word usage, and c) meanings in terms of the source text". Preserving 'grammatical units' refers to translation of nouns in the source text as nouns or verbs as verbs in the target text. Moreover, the phrases in the source text are translated conforming to the splitting or non-splitting rules of those phrases in the source text, and finally, punctuation or paragraph structure is even preserved as in the source text (Nida, 2000: 134). Consistency in word usage refers to conformity to the terminology in the source text while preserving meaning is associated with sticking to the idioms as they are used in the source text so that the reader of the target text may conceive the local usage of cultural elements in the source language (Nida, 2000: 134).

"A consistent [formal equivalence] translation will obviously contain much that is not readily intelligible to the average reader. One must therefore usually supplement such translations with marginal notes, not only to explain some of the formal features which could not be adequately represented, but also to make intelligible some of the formal equivalents employed, for such expressions may have significance only in terms of the source language or culture" (Nida, 2000: 135).

According to this proposition, this source-oriented equivalence type might not trigger feelings or remind the experiences in target text readers that were the case with source text readers as certain contexts in the target text might not be fully comprehensible to the reader. In order to overcome this incomprehensibility, Nida (2000) suggests that a translator employ footnotes that are not part of the main text.

On the other hand, the term 'dynamic equivalence' refers to "a translation [that] is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship, that the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message" (Nida, 2000: 129). This definition, in its essence, tends towards target-oriented translation as opposed to 'formal equivalence' as 'dynamic equivalence' aims at reproducing the same feelings or comprehension in the target text reader that the source text reader obtained. Nida (2000: 129) further adds that "A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture". In this statement, the terms like the cultural modes or local usage of the source language are left out, and the target text reader is not compelled to read footnotes or make extra extensive reading in order to understand certain points in the source text language, but rather everything in the source text is reproduced in the naturalness of the target text. To clarify 'dynamic equivalence', Nida (2000: 136) goes on to state that in this type of equivalence in a translation, the aim should not be to reproduce an expression that closely matches the meaning in the source text, but to "reflect the meaning and intent of the source". Nida (2000) frequently uses the term 'natural' in definition and explanation of dynamic equivalence. According to Nida (2000: 136), this naturalness

"must fit a) the receptor language and culture as a whole, b) the context of the particular message, and c) the receptor-language audience". As is clear from this proposition, naturalness concerns the receptor (target) language. Therefore, the grammatical units in the source language could be modified to the benefit of the target language as in rendering a verb in source language as a noun in target language or using pronouns instead of proper or common nouns in the target text, or even the syntax structure could be modified with word order changes. The word usage of the target text language might also differ from that of source language like using a cultural item from the target text culture for a cultural item in the source text since the aim is to reproduce a similar response in the target text reader. In the quest to reproduce such a response in the target text reader, Nida (2000: 139) considers it unavoidable that "special literary forms, semantically exocentric expressions, and intraorganismic meanings" are modified by the translator. In modification of special literary forms, Nida (2000) states that this is much more frequently employed in poetry translation than in prose as the rhythmic value of a poem might be substituted by the rhythmic value that is dominant in the target text culture. However, this does not mean that modification of literary forms in prose cannot be employed; it is only not so frequent as poetry. Concerning the modification on semantically exocentric expressions, it is suggested that an idiom in the source text might not have much of value or sense in the target text, and therefore this idiom could be converted into an endocentric meaning. As an example to this, the Turkish idiom 'etekleri zil çalmak' refers to a great joy or happiness, but there is no constituent in the idiom referring to happiness, therefore this is a semantically exocentric expression. A literal translation of this idiom into English would be 'the skirts ringing\*' if this were a translation with formal equivalence in order to convey the cultural expressions in the source culture to target culture; however, this would necessitate a marginal note by the translator. If the aim is to bring out a similar feeling in the target text culture, then this idiomatic expression could be translated as 'be overjoyed', with an endocentric meaning as there is a constituent (overjoyed) to refer to happiness, or it could also be translated as 'walk on air' with an exocentric expression but still inciting the feeling of happiness in target text culture. Finally, what Nida (2000) addresses as modification on 'intraorganismic meanings' refers to items or signs that are culturally loaded and can only be signified in the culture they are used in. For instance, particularly theological words in a language are translated into the target culture with the signs carrying similar emotions the source text item might arouse in its readers.

To conclude, Nida (2000) believes in the impossibility of exact translation and proposes the terms 'formal equivalence' and 'dynamic equivalence'. Nida (2000) seems to refrain from making objective judgments on which equivalence type would fit better in a literary translation, however states that there has been a shift towards 'dynamic equivalence' in literary translation.

In this study, the correspondence, and so 'equivalence' principles by Nida (2000) were used to evaluate the English translation of the contexts with Marxists feminist analysis in the source text. Following the analysis of each context based on Marxist feminist theory, its translation was also analyzed to see whether the translator(s) tended towards formal equivalence or dynamic equivalence in this literary translation.

#### 4. Contexts with Marxist feminist discourse in the novel and their translation

In this part, the contexts with Marxist feminist discourse are given in the source text language, that is Turkish. Following the source text language, their English translation is also provided. In statement of analysis, first the source context is interpreted based on how it can be associated with Marxist feminist

theory, and then the evaluation of English translation is provided with a final remark on what equivalence type that translation would be categorized under.

#### Context 1:

A. "Geleceğimi eve telgrafla bildirmiştim, herhalde hazırlık yapmışlardır. Yoksa seni davet etmeye cesaret edemezdim!" (Ali, 2009: 13).

B. "Fakat bu sırada beyaz önlüklü, başörtülü, yaşlı bir köylü kadın, yamalı siyah çoraplarıyla, hiç ses çıkarmadan kahve getirdi." (Ali, 2009: 14).

A. "I sent a telegram back to the house to let them know when to expect me. So they'll have the place ready for me. Otherwise I'd never have dared to invite you over!" (Ali, 2016: 3).

B. "But at just this moment an old village woman padded in, wearing a headscarf, a white apron and much-darned black socks, and bearing coffee." (Ali, 2016: 4).

In context 1A, an old friend of the narrator states that he sent home a telegram stating that he would return home tonight and expects the other members of home to make some preparations for him. Since he invites the narrator to his house for that night, the sign 'hazırlık yapmak' (make preparations) should refer to making food ready. Here, the other members of the house could be his wife, his children or his grandparents. In the following contexts, we learn that this man lives in a nucleus family, and so the one who should make the food cannot be anyone other than his wife. Or if possible, it could only be the servant at home. From context 1B, we learn that a woman looking quite poor brings the coffee, and so the one who should make the preparation should be the old woman working for the man's house. A class distinction is easily seen in this context because there is a woman worker who wears 'much-darned socks', showing the extent of her poverty, and the man who works outside as the manager of a company is the capital exploiting the woman from the working class. It is doubtless that this woman should also have her own housework when she leaves for home. Or, even if she stays in this house as a permanent servant, she still has much to do at home to make a living, no matter how little money she is paid for this job. From Marxist feminist point of view, this poor woman from the working class is exploited by the owner of the capital, and class distinction still persists. It is only through the defeat of the working class over the bourgeoisie that the distinction between classes in the society can be overcome, thereby providing freedom to this poor woman and valuing only the production that she creates at her own home environment. In English translation of context 1, the phrase 'hazırlık yapmışlardır', which indeed refers to preparing meal in Turkish context, was translated as 'have the place ready' in the target text. From Nida's (2000) concepts, a cultural idiomatic expression with endocentric meaning was translated with another endocentric meaning in the target language. In this translation, the target text reader was not compelled to think over the meaning of the idiom in the source text, but rather was provided with an idiom that would arouse feelings or response to the context similar to the one the source text reader has. Therefore, this translation could be regarded as dynamic equivalence based on Nida's (2000) terms.

#### Context 2:

"Küçük kız birkaç dakika sonra kahve getirdi." (Ali, 2009: 25).

"A few minutes later, the girl returned with coffee." (Ali, 2016: 17).

In context 2, the one who brings coffee is a little girl (küçük kız). It can be understood that the oppression of women in house environment starts as of childhood since it is from early years of their lives on that little boys and little girls grow up learning the expectations of the society from either gender. The little girl bringing coffee in context 2 will go on to serve in the house when they grow older as they did in their

childhood. From Marxist feminist point of view, it is always the young girls or women who prepare drinks for guests at home, and there is no division of labor between genders; with the women in the oppressed class all the time. In translation of this context, 'küçük kız' was translated as 'the girl', with the adjective 'küçük' (little) omitted from the sentence though it is important in this sentence to show how the oppression of women starts from early years. However, in the sentences prior to this sentence both in the source text and the target text, we already read about the little girl. In English, rather than repeating a noun with its adjective for the second or third time, it is linguistically possible to use a pronoun or 'the' article with the noun to refer to this antecedent noun. Nida (2000) states that in dynamic equivalence, the grammar units could be modified like omitting some words with different parts of speech or using a pronoun for nouns. In this translation, rather than conveying the meaning of the whole source text sentence, the reader response is made similar to source text reader, therefore this translation is also a good example for dynamic equivalence.

### Context 3:

"Sonra karısına dönerek: 'Ceketimin cebinden al!' dedi.... 'Ayol, para için gelmedim, kim gidip alacak...Sen de bir türlü kalkamadın!'" (Ali, 2009: 26).

"Turning to his wife, he said, 'Take it out of my jacket pocket!...' 'I didn't come for money, for goodness' sake! Who is going to go and get the bread? Here you are, still in bed!'" (Ali, 2016: 18).

In context 3, the protagonist of the novel, Raif efendi turns to his wife when she approaches and asks her to take [money] out of his pocket. This context shows us that even if his wife works at home the whole day and busy with housework all the time, she does not have even a penny to spend at her will. From Marxist feminism perspective, the woman at home is a member of the oppressed class. While Raif efendi is also from the working class, working at a company as a translator for little money as we learn from the novel, he is at least the dominant character over his wife as can be understood from his use of imperative structure. Marxist feminists also believe that women are restricted to home environment with no division of labor. The woman's statement 'kim gidip alacak?' (who is going to go and get the bread?) supports this idea of Marxist feminism. Because the woman is restricted to home doing chores all day without any money, she can be considered a member of the oppressed class, as well. The exclamation 'ayol' is generally used by women and in Turkish culture, men tend not to use this word, emphasizing the distinction of women from men. In translation of this context, the culturally loaded meaning of the sign 'ayol', with an 'intraorganismic meaning based on Nida's (2000) terms, was translated as 'for goodness' sake'. These two intraorganismic meanings are not exact translations of one another; however, as its very nature implies, a source sign with intraorganismic meanings can only be translated as another sign that arouses similar response in target text reader. Another phrase, 'daha kalkamadın' which refers to the sickness of the man was translated as 'Here you are, still in bed!'. With this translation, rather than the meaning of the source text context, the relationship between the source text and source reader is conveyed to the target reader. Therefore, the translation of this context can be shown as an example to dynamic equivalence, as well.

### Context 4:

"Raif efendinin baldızı Ferhunde Hanım, üç ve dört yaşlarındaki iki çocuğu ile uğraşmaktan ve bunları ablasına bırakmak fırsatı bulur bulmaz, sırtına bir ipekli elbise geçirip alalacele boyanarak gezmeye gitmekten başka bir şey düşüncecek halde değildi." (Ali, 2009: 28).

"Meanwhile, Raif Efendi's sister-in-law Ferhunde Hanım had no other aim in life than to care for her two children, aged three and four, and (if she could get her older sister to babysit) to put on a lot of make-up, throw on a silk dress and head out for the evening." (Ali, 2016: 21).

The woman living in the same house with Raif efendi, his wife's sister, is stated to deal with her children all the time, and whenever her sister has the chance to look after her two children, she puts on make-up and goes out. Even if she can go out at times, she is still portrayed as a woman busy with child care all the time. Moreover, the one to substitute her at times is her sister, another woman. This context also shows that women do not receive any help from men in child care and there is no division of labor at home, that's why Marxist feminists consider women as oppressed beings, slave to their husbands. From another perspective, the word 'boyanmak' is used to state how unfavorable putting on make-up is considered for women, deprecating this popular procedure of women. In translation of this context with Marxist feminist discourse, the sign 'baldız', meaning the sister of one's wife, was translated as 'sister-in-law'. Though 'sister-in-law' involves the sign 'baldız', it has a more generic meaning in English to refer to women considered relatives after one's marriage. The sign 'baldız' is of intraorganismic meaning loaded with cultural phenomena in Turkish. Moreover, the phrase 'gezmeye gitmek' (go out to hang out with someone or alone) was translated as 'head out for the evening'. In the source text, we do not know if that woman goes out at night or during the day, therefore, rather than the message in the source text, the relationship between the text and reader is conveyed to the target text reader through natural expression, rendering this translation as dynamic equivalence.

#### Context 5:

"Raif efendinin...karısı Mihriye hanım, bütün gününü mutfakta yemek pişirmek, boş zamanlarında yığın yığın çocuk çorabı yamamak ve kız kardeşinin birbirinden haşarı 'yumurcaklarına' bakmakla geçirdiği halde, bir türlü ev halkına yaranamıyordu... 'Ben bu yemeği sevmedim, bana yumurta pişir...' yahut: 'Ben doymadım, bana sucuk kızartiver!' diye Mihriye ablalarını sofradan kaldırıp mutfaka yollamaktan hiç çekinmiyorlar," (Ali, 2009: 30).

"...Raif's wife, Mihriye Hanım...spent most of her day cooking in the kitchen, devoting any free time that remained to darning pile after pile of children's socks, or caring for her sister's 'brats'... 'I don't like this, go and make me some eggs!' Or, 'I'm still hungry, go and make me some sausages!' They had no qualms about sending Mihriye Hanım back to the kitchen," (Ali, 2016: 22-23).

In context 5, we learn about how busy Raif efendi's wife is, cooking in kitchen all day, looking after her sister's children and darning torn socks. While there are men living with her in the same house, all housework falls to that woman. Besides, if someone in the house does not like the food or does not feel full after the meal, they can easily ask her to cook other meals. When compared to men at home, that women can be considered to be in oppressed class as there is no division of labor and she literally fell slave to other family members as argued by Marxist feminism adherents. The inequality stemming from class distinctions in the society can really be seen to arise in home environment. In translation of this context, word order and syntax (paragraph) structure seem to have been modified since the part 'bir türlü ev halkına yaranamıyordu' in the source text was not translated within this whole context in the target text. Moreover, the phrase 'bütün gün' was translated as 'most of her day' in the target text. If it were translated as 'all day', than this woman would not have any time left for other chores recounted in this context. In Turkish, when we read 'bütün gün' we do not understand 'all day' as in English culture, but rather we understand 'most of the day'. Therefore, rather than the exact meaning in the source text, a reader response similar to the one in the source text was reproduced in the target text. This could be thought as dynamic equivalence by Nida's (2000) terms.

#### Context 6:

"Raif efendinin de karısına karşı garip bir rikkati vardı. Aylardan beri sırtına bir kere bile mutfak elbisesinden başka bir şey giymeye vakit bulamayan bu kadına hakikaten acır gibiydi." (Ali, 2009: 31-32).

"Raif Efendi treated her with an odd sort of tenderness. It was almost as if he pitied this woman who could go for months without taking off her housecoat." (Ali, 2016: 24).

In context 6, as in context 5, we learn that Raif efendi's wife cannot wear anything but housecoat to wear in kitchen for months (to exaggerate *for a long time* as she cannot go to bed with those clothes every night), which also serves to show how busy she is with cooking work. A woman restricted to kitchen (house) to cook for family members is considered a member of the oppressed class by Marxist feminists. This context alludes to the fact that she performs her housework as a private duty, underestimated by other family members. This context about the oppression of the woman was translated not in a sentence-to-sentence sense since the sign 'mutfak elbisesi' was translated as 'housecoat'. While the former one is a special type of clothing in Turkish culture, the latter one refers to a more general type of clothing that women can wear on their clothes at home as casual clothes. Moreover, the phrase 'vakit bulamamak' in the source text was not translated but given that feeling with the structure 'could go for months' in the target text. Therefore, the relationship of the message with the source text reader was provided for target text reader through natural expressions in the target text language culture, which makes it possible to think that the translation of this context is based on dynamic equivalence.

Context 7:

" 'Pazara çamaşır yıkanacak...'... Şimdi kafası eskisi gibi ev dertleri, yemek ve çamaşır işleriyle doluydu." (Ali, 2009: 40).

" 'We're sending out the washing.'... Now she was her old self, busy with housework, cooking and laundry." (Ali, 2016: 34).

In context 7, after Raif efendi gets better, his wife turns to her routine housework, that is cooking or laundry. The phrase 'kafası doluydu' (have a lot on mind) points to how busy she is with housework. As the only thing that woman can do is to do housework at home, she can be considered one from oppressed class. Therefore, the sentence 'Pazara çamaşır yıkanacak' (there is laundry work on Sunday) should also refer to housework at home. This sentence also illustrates that women do not think of anything but housework. This restriction in her life (maybe self-restriction, or maybe restriction incurred by the society) can also be considered in line with Marxist feminism. In translation of this context, the sentence 'pazara çamaşır yıkanacak' was translated as 'We're sending out the washing'. Even though there is no clear evidence as to whether the laundry will be done at home or sent to a laundry shop in the original context as there is a passive voice sentence with no agent or place, it can be inferred from the meaning universe of the novel that it should be done at home because the woman of the house works like a slave at home. The time-marker, 'Pazar' (Sunday) is omitted in the target text while the laundry work is to be sent out to a laundry shop, granting the woman some rights to get certain chores done out of home. However, as going to laundry is a popular act in Western world, particularly on Sundays when they do not have to go to work and can find time only on that day, the translation was conducted with target culture orientation. Even though the target text reader may not feel the same as source text reader does in this context regarding the laundry work, this context in general still implies the hard housework of the woman with target culture orientation. The naturalness of the expression can easily be felt in the target text, tending the context towards target culture rather than trying to convey the source message with its cultural aspects. Therefore, the translation of this context can be regarded under Nida's (2000) term of 'dynamic equivalence'.

So far in this part, the contexts discussed in terms of Marxist feminist discourses are about the condition (oppression) of women living in Turkey. From context 8 onwards, all contexts are about the condition

of women in a western country, Germany. The oppression of women in Turkey as analyzed from the contexts in this novel mostly stems from the lack of division of labor at home and underestimation of this contribution of women, thereby not seeing their production and work within the house as an added value, but rather as a private duty as argued by Marxist feminism supporters.

#### Context 8:

"Dünyada sizden, yani bütün erkeklerden niçin bu kadar çok nefret ediyorum biliyor musunuz? Sırf böyle en tabii haklarıymış gibi insandan birçok şey istedikleri için... Beni yanlış anlamayın, bu taleplerin muhakkak söz haline gelmesi şart değil... Erkeklerin öyle bir bakışları, öyle bir gülüşleri, ellerini kaldırışları, hulasa kadınlara öyle bir muamele edişleri var ki... Kendilerini daima bir avcı, bizi zavallı birer av olarak düşünmekten asla vazgeçmiyorlar. Bizim vazifemiz sadece tabi olmak, itaat etmek, istenilen şeyleri vermek..." (Ali, 2009: 81-82).

"Do you know why I hate you? You and every other man in the world? Because you ask so much of us, as if it were your natural right... Mark my words, for it can happen without a single word being uttered... it's how men look at us and smile at us. It's how they raise their hands. To put it simply, it's how they treat us... They are the hunters, you see. And we their miserable prey. And our duties? To bow down and obey, and give them whatever they want..." (Ali, 2016: 80).

In context 8, a woman living in Germany complains about the social oppression of women as can be understood from the sentences 'Kendilerini daima bir avcı, bizi zavallı birer av olarak düşünmekten asla vazgeçmiyorlar' (They are the hunters, you see. And we their miserable prey) and 'Bizim vazifemiz sadece tabi olmak, itaat etmek' (And our duties? To bow down and obey). While there is no reference to family life or job life in this context unlike the condition of women living in Turkey, this can still be discussed based on Marxist feminist theory. Besides job life and home, women are also oppressed in social life by men as the latter consider the former as their slaves compelled to obey. Another thing that attracts attention is that the oppressed women described in the first seven contexts are not aware of their oppression; we can only understand their oppression from the narrator's statements while the woman from context 8 on is aware of her oppression. In the target text, the word order and syntax structure are modified to render the quality of natural expression as can be seen in the sentence 'Bizim vazifemiz sadece tabi olmak...' translated as 'And our duties? To bow down...'. As another example, the sentence 'Kendilerini daima bir avcı, bizi zavallı birer av olarak düşünmekten asla vazgeçmiyorlar' is translated as 'They are the hunters, you see. And we their miserable prey'. With grammar modification in certain sentences was achieved naturalness and equivalence of message-recipient relationship in the target text. Therefore, the translation of this context could be regarded 'dynamic equivalence' by Nida's (2000) terms.

#### Context 9:

"Dün akşam sarhoşun biri sırtımı öperken oradaydınız değil mi? Öpecek tabii... Hakkıdır... Para sarf ediyor... Ve benim sırtımın da cazip olduğunu söylüyorlar... Siz de öpmek ister misiniz? Paranız var mı?" (Ali, 2009: 93).

"You were there last night when that drunkard kissed my back, weren't you? Why wouldn't he... he has every right... he's spending money... and they say that my back is very enticing... Would you like to kiss it, too? Do you have the money?" (Ali, 2016: 91).

Context 9, as different from other contexts, deals with the economic oppression of women in job life besides socio-economic conditions. This context is about the job life of Raif efendi's beloved. She works at a club in which she sings in front of drunken men. While she has to take care of her house, she also has to work at that club to support herself besides drawing self-portraits. In Marxist feminist terms, her housework is not valued by the society or state. Even though she is single and not a slave to a husband,

she is slave to drunken men as customers of the club she works in. On the night Raif efendi follows her for the first time and gets in that club after her, he sees a drunken man kissing her back. That woman thinks it is men's right to kiss her back as they pay money in that club. In this way, she can be considered the oppressed working class woman on whose bodily integrity men with money has the rights. In Marxist feminism, it is only after the class system is demolished that women can be free individuals. As an oppressed woman exploited by men, she works for little money as can be understood from the description of her house and her lifestyle, but it is the owner of the club who earns most money. In translation of this context, the sentence 'Öpecek tabi' was translated as 'Why wouldn't he...'. The source text reader can gather from this sentence that the woman feels it is quite natural for men to kiss her back, likewise the sentence 'Why wouldn't he...' in the target text could also arouse a similar feeling in target text reader. This translation of the sentence in question sounds quite natural in target text language, therefore dynamic equivalence is also the case in translation of this context.

Context 10:

- “ -‘Kocamın sıcak memleket mahsulleri üzerinde ihtisası var. Bağdat’ta hurma üzerine iş yapıyor!’  
 - ‘Kamerun’da da hurma ticareti mi yapıyordun?’  
 - ‘Bilmiyorum, kendisine mektup yazın ve sorun! Kadınları ticaret işlerine karıştırmıyor!’” (Ali, 2009: 152).  
 “ -‘But my husband specializes in food from the warmer climates. He’s in Baghdad to deal in dates!’  
 - ‘Was he trading dates in Cameroon as well?’  
 - ‘I don’t know, why don’t you write him a letter and ask for yourself. He doesn’t like women meddling in his business affairs.’” (Ali, 2016: 158).

In context 10, Raif efendi encounters an acquaintance from Germany in Turkey. The woman says her husband is involved in date trade. With the sentence 'Kadınları ticaret işine karıştırmıyor' (He doesn't like women meddling in his business affairs), it is implied that besides home life and social life, women are also oppressed in business life. The woman's husband believes that trade is a business only men can do. This could be attributed to the thought that men are more active than women, and because trade requires a mathematical mind, men are also perceived as more analytical than women in this context. While there is no oppression in terms of a job that women do in this context, the oppression comes from the thought that women are inferior to men in business world. Moreover, while men earn the money, women do not have economic freedom, and so this might also be reflected within the house with the men dominant over women as they have the money. Considering the translation of this context with Marxist feminist discourse, the sentence 'Kadınları ticaret işlerine karıştırmıyor!' is translated as 'He doesn't like women meddling in his business affairs'. As stated by Nida (2000), the target sentence is not an exact equivalent of the message in the source text, but the relationship between the message and the source text reader is conveyed to target text reader with a natural expression in the target language. Therefore, this can also be considered dynamic equivalence.

## 5. Conclusion

In this study, the novel *Kürk Mantolu Madonna (Madonna in a Fur Coat)* by Sabahattin Ali was analyzed based on Marxist Feminist theory. In 10 contexts, Marxist feminist discourse was found in the source text. While most of those contexts are about the oppression of women in home environment, there are also contexts showing the oppression of women in workplace and social life. The oppression in family life can be attributed to patriarchal family structure widely exercised in most communities.

Moreover, the woman portrayed in the first seven contexts in this study does not have any economic or social freedom. The housework performed within home environment is not valued and not considered an added value, which is one of the focal points in Marxist feminist theory. On the other hand, the women portrayed in eighth, ninth and tenth contexts in this study can be considered in oppressed class due to economic, social and business reasons. For Marxist feminists, if the class distinctions can be overcome in the society through unity of the working (oppressed) class, then women can be free, and their housework should be valued by the state and society. Moreover, add Marxist feminists that, women must take an active part in the unity of oppressed class against the bourgeoisie. The way to this unity is all about raising awareness according to Marxist feminism.

As a result of translation evaluation based on Nida's (2000) equivalence types, in 10 contexts analyzed in terms of Marxist feminist discourse, it was found that translation of those contexts tended towards dynamic equivalence rather than formal equivalence because the target text conveyed the relationship between the message and the source text reader to the target text reader. The most common modification on the source text contexts turned out to be grammar modification with word order change or syntax structure change. Moreover, culturally-loaded signs or phrases in the source text were translated with cultural phenomena existent in the target text language to reproduce a natural expression for target text readers. Rather than a quest for reproducing the exact meaning of the context in the source text, a quest for reproducing a similar reader response was found in translations of the 10 contexts analyzed in this study. Shakernia (2013) conducted a study on translations of two short stories to see the applicability of Nida's equivalence types and Newmark's semantic and communicative translation and came up with the finding that dynamic equivalence was frequently used in translation of short stories. Shakernia (2013: 2) states that "dynamic equivalence is an approach to translation in which the original language is translated "thought for thought" rather than "word for word" as in formal equivalence". Shakernia (2013: 2) adds that "dynamic equivalence involves taking each sentence (or thought) from the original text and rendering it into a sentence in the target language that conveys the same meaning, but does not necessarily use the exact phrasing or idioms of the original". The results of this present study are parallel to the findings of the study by Shakernia (2013). According to Earle Ellis (2003: 7), "dynamic equivalence translation [in which] the translator takes on the role of interpreter and commentator, is more pleasing and understandable to the modern ear".

In the present study, rather than a subjective view of the acceptability or unacceptability of dynamic equivalence, this concept was investigated in terms of how it was employed by translator(s) in translation of contexts with Marxist feminist discourse in a novel. In translation of a literary text including contexts with feminist discourse, particular attention must be paid to those contexts to render dynamic equivalence. Whether the author might have aimed at producing feminist discourses or not, it falls to the translator to make the target text readers that they are dealing with a feminist discourse to reach the meaning universe of the text.

### References

- Akatlı, F. (2002). Önsöz. In Sabahattin Ali *Kürk mantolu Madonna* (2009 edition). 5-8. İstanbul: YKY.
- Ali, S. (2009). *Kürk mantolu Madonna*. İstanbul: YKY.
- Ali, S. (2016). *Kürk mantolu Madonna*. (M. Freely and A. Dawe, Trans.). London: Penguin Classics.
- Atkinson, T-G. (2000). Radical feminism. In B. A. Crow (Ed.), *Radical feminism: A documentary reader* (pp. 82-89). New York and London: NYU Press.

- Bandarage, A. (1984). Women in development: Liberalism Marxism and Marxist-feminism. *Enzymologia*, 15(4), 495-515.
- Barrett, M. (2014). *Women's oppression today: The Marxist/feminist encounter*. London and New York: Verso.
- Brunell, L. and Burkett, E. (2019). Feminism. *Encyclopædia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/feminism> Retrieved: 09/ 08/2019.
- Chinn, P. L., and Wheeler, C. E. (1985). Feminism and nursing. *Nursing Outlook*, 33(2), 74-77.
- Dickinson, K. (2013). Translating surfaces: A dual critique of modernity in Sabahattin Ali's *Kürk Mantolu Madonna*. *Transit*, 9(1), 2-9.
- Donovan, J. (2005). *Feminist teori*, (A. Bora, M. Ağduk Gevrek and F. Saylan, Trans.), İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Earle Ellis, E. (2003). Dynamic equivalence theory, feminist ideology and three recent Bible translations. *The Expository Times*, 115(1), 7-12.
- Engels, F. (1979). *Ailenin, özel mülkiyetin ve devletin kökeni* (K. Somer, Trans.). Ankara: Sol Yayınları.
- Ferree, M. M. (2006). Globalization and feminism. In M.M. Ferree and A. M. Tripp (Ed.), *Global feminism: Transnational women's activism, organizing, and human rights* (pp. 3-23). New York and London: New York University Press.
- Gimenez, M., and Vogel, L. (2005). Marxist-feminist thought today. *Science & Society*, 69(1), 5-10.
- Groenhout, R.E. (2002). Essentialist challenges to liberal feminism. *Social Theory and Practice* 28(1), 51-75.
- Hartmann, H. (2012). Marksizmle feminizmin mutsuz evliliği. In G. A. Savran and N. T. Demiryontan (Ed.), *Kadının görünmeyen emeği* (pp. 157-206). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap Yayınlar.
- Işık, E. (1998). *Beden ve toplum kuramı*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Karaca, A. (1993). Sabahattin Ali'nin öykülerinde toplumsal konular. *Türkoloji Dergisi*, 11(1), 221-232.
- Kolodny, A. (1975). Some notes on defining a "feminist literary criticism". *Critical Inquiry*, 2(1), 75-92.
- Kolodny, A. (1980). Dancing through the minefield: Some observations on the theory, practice and politics of a feminist literary criticism. *Feminist Studies*, 6(1), 1-25.
- Marx, K. (2011). *Kapital*. (Volume I). (M. Selik and N. Satlıgan, Trans.). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.
- Michel, A. (1995). *Feminizm*. (Ş. Tekeli, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Moran, B. (2017). *Edebiyat kuramları ve eleştirisi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Nida, E. (2000). Principles of correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 126-140). London and New York: Routledge.
- Oxford Online Dictionary. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/feminism?q=feminism>. Retrieved 09/08/2019.
- Plain, G. (2007). Introduction to part I. In G. Plain and S. Sellers (Ed.), *A history of feminist literary criticism* (pp. 6-10). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sevim, A. (2005). *Feminizm*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.
- Shakernia, S. (2013). Study of Nida's (formal and dynamic equivalence) and Newmark's (semantic and communicative translation) translating theories on two short stories. *Merit Research Journal of Education and Review*, 2(1), 1-7.
- Shulman, A. K. (1980). Sex and power: Sexual bases of radical feminism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 5(4), 590-604.

Marxist feminist discourse in a Turkish novel with Eugene Nida's concept of "equivalence" applied on translation evaluation of the novel / M. Kuleli (p. 703-720)

Snell, M. (1979). The equal pay and sex discrimination acts: Their impact in the workplace. *Feminist Review*, 1(1), 37-57.

Weeks, J. (2011). Un-/Re-productive maternal labor: Marxist feminism and chapter fifteen of Marx's capital. *Rethinking Marxism*, 23(1), 31-40.