DOI No: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/Joh.45577>

Makale Türü: Araştırma makalesi
Geliş Tarihi: 04.08.2020
Kabul Tarihi: 24.08.2020
On-line Yayın: 31.08.2020

Article Type: Research article
Submitted: 04.08.2020
Accepted: 24.08.2020
Published Online: 31.08.2020

Atıf Bilgisi / Reference Information

Yılmaz Kutlay, S. (2020). Discursive Constraints of Fantastic Literature. *Journal of History School*, 47, 2739-2755.

DISCOURSIVE CONSTRAINTS OF TRANSLATING FANTASTIC LITERATURE

Sevcan YILMAZ KUTLAY¹

Abstract

In Translation Studies, discourse has generally been discussed as a part of the binary opposition of “form versus content” or “structure versus meaning” and at the end of this discussion, challenging discourse elements of some genres (especially poetic discourse) have been often considered untranslatable. With the goal of arousing uncanny, fantastic literature as a literary genre needs hesitation and a familiar kind of strangeness. While discursive elements such as idiolects, sociolects, fictional constructed languages (conLang) and specifically designed proper names, special terminology of fantastic can help construct this strangeness, they evoke some challenges for translators. Although discursive elements can be constraints or challenges for translators; as Anthony Pym (1992) offers translation is a potential tool, “a discovery procedure of intercultural Discourse Analysis” (p.235). This article aims to question the discursive constraints and Discourse Analysis in translation of fantastic literature after discussing the scope and nature of fantastic literature.

Keywords: Translation, Discourse, Fantastic Literature, Sociolect, Idiolect.

¹Öğr. Gör. Dr., Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu, Modern Diller Bölümü, sevcankutlay@gmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-7841-3513

Fantastik Edebiyat Çevirilerinde Söylem Kısıtları

Öz

Çeviribilimde söylem genellikle “biçem-içerik” ya da “yapı-anlam” ikili zıtlığının bir parçası olarak tartışılmış ve bu tartışmanın sonunda bazı edebi türlerin zorlu söylem öğeleri (özellikle şiirsel söylem) çevrilemez olarak kabul edilmiştir. Tekinsizlik uyandırma amacı taşıyan fantastik edebiyat tedirginliğe ve “tanıdık bir biçimde yabancı” olacak öğelere ihtiyaç duymaktadır. İdyolekt (bireydil), sosyolekt (özel-grup dil), kurmaca diller, özel bir amaçla seçilmiş özel isimler ve fantastiğin terminolojisi bir yandan bu yabancılığı kurmaya yararken diğer yandan çevirmenlere bazı zorluklar teşkil eder. Her ne kadar söylemsel öğeler çevirmenler için kısıtlayıcı ya da zorlayıcı olsa da çeviri Anthony Pym’in de (1992) önerdiği gibi “kültürlerarası söylem çözümlemesinin bir keşif yordamı” olarak olası bir araç görevi üstlenebilir (s. 235). Bu makale fantastik edebiyatın doğası ve sınırlarını tartıştıktan sonra çeviride söylemsel kısıtlar ve söylem çözümlemesinin yerini sorgulamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çeviri, Söylem, Fantastik Edebiyat, Sosyolekt, İdyolekt.

INTRODUCTION

The main functions of literary genres are classifying literary texts and by doing so determining the norms of reading and interpreting them (Ayar, 2018: 17). Because these reading habits affect the expectations from prospective literary texts, genre is also a determining factor in the construction of a literary text. It should be noted that above mentioned norms, habits and expectations are generally culture-specific. Accordingly, Basil Hatim and Ian Mason claim “the interrelationship between genre and discourse is also culturally determined and there are constraints on which discourses go with which genres and vice versa” (1990: 71). It can be deduced that there are some cultural patterns of discourse for each genre.

Another significant point about genres is their originality or interrelation. As Tzvetan Todorov claims, new literary genres derive from the transformation of the characters of the previous genres (2004: 197). Thus, genre is not only a determining factor but also it is determined by previous genres. About this interrelation of genres, Jacques Derrida’s approach is –not surprisingly– deconstructive as follows: “every text participates in one or several genres, there is no genreless text; there is always a genre and genres, yet such participation never amounts to belonging” (as cited in Ryan Vu, 2017: 275). Combined with Todorov’s claim above, it can be said that there is an intertextuality of genres which may be subjective and manipulative in some cases. As another critical approach to the term of genre, Fredric Jameson claims literary genres can also be

seen as the covert signs of ideologies, so they can be analyzed in their historical context (2008: 173-5). It is clear that genres are both determining and determined culturally and ideologically.

If we leave the critical, deconstructive approaches to genres for practical reasons and try to define fantastic as a literary genre, fantastic literature comes from *fantasticum* in Latin and *phantasein* in Greek, which means “to appear or make something visible” (Steinmetz, 2006: 7). In Japan, the term used for fantasy is *genso*, which means the story of the ghost (Steinmetz, 2006: 10). There are different conceptualizations of fantastic literature such as “the literature of subversion,” or “the liberation of the imagination” (Rayment, 2014: 1). Also, the distinction between the *fantastic element in a work* and *fantastic as a genre* can be confused because the limits are not clearly set. Even though there is no agreement on the definition of fantasy and the scope of fantastic literature, literary critics reach a consensus about the role of “uncanny” as a differentiating element in fantastic literature. One thing in common in various definitions is twisting the daily reality by using imagination.

Todorov’s work named *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre* (1970) is the starting point of the interest in fantastic as a literary genre. According to him, fantastic is “a liminal state of the supernatural” which “leaves the reader with a sense of confusion about the work, and whether or not the phenomenon was real or imagined” and includes “an unresolved hesitation” (Fantastic, n.d.). His term *hesitation* is closely related to uncanny and ambivalence (Fantastic, n.d.). As a structuralist theoretician, Todorov classifies three conditions for the storyline of the fantastic:

- “the text must oblige the reader to consider the world of the characters as a world of living persons and to hesitate between a natural or supernatural explanation of the events described”
- “this hesitation may also be experienced by a character; thus [...] the actual reader identifies himself with the character”,
- “the reader [...] will reject allegorical as well as "poetic" interpretations” (as cited in Üstün, 2012: 27”).

Sigmund Freud, who thinks the basic feature of fantastic narrative is arousing uncanny, claims that fairy tales start when we agree to leave this real world in the very beginning (1999: 356). Fantastic can no longer fulfill its purpose if readers start explaining the events which create this hesitation (Borghart&Madelein, 2003: 1). Freud also divides the experiences which create uncanny into two: “those generated by events in everyday life (most of the

examples in the essay are taken from this group), and those generated while reading (literary) texts (this could be expanded to the experience of art in general)” (Borghart&Madelein, 2003: 1). Thus, he gives a special place for hesitation created in literature.

Apart from the uncanny and hesitation fantastic creates, the feeling of escaping from the real world is another effect attached to fantastic literature (sometimes as a reason for not considering it as high literature but as a part of children’s literature). According to John R. R. Tolkien, fantastic is “a narration based on producing second worlds and belief systems to escape from the reality through amazing the reader”, by doing so it overcomes “the superiority of the observable truth” (as cited in Ayar, 2018: 26-27). Fantastic literature makes alternative worlds more attractive compared to our ordinary world by the feelings of excitement fear and curiosity (Rabkin, 1979: 3-5). Moreover, censored topics and cultural taboos can be expressed under the guise of fantastic. Also, in our postmodernist, capitalist world the need of fantastic can be considered “as the story of the individual who is chasing the impossible even though s/he knows that it is impossible and destroys herself/himself at the end of this process” (Ayar, 2018: 53). These are the potential functions of fantastic for readers.

To define what fantastic is, reading about *what it is not* can be helpful. Fantastic is generally compared to science fiction due to being labeled as low literature standing in the periphery with unrealistic elements. As Pierre Jourde and Paolo Tortorese (2003) claims, even though they have in common, science fiction does not represent impossible but a prospection about a better future and it uses scientific elements which have the possibility to happen/be invented (as cited in Ayar, 2018: 32). Science fiction has its roots in Hugo Gernsback’s magazines namely *Modern Electrics*, *Wonder Stories*, *The Magazine of Prophetic Fiction* and *Scientifiction* (Baudou, 2005: 7-8). In science fiction, science is at the center whereas in fantastic literature supernatural elements have the main focus. Jacques Baudou suggests that whereas fantastic chases magic and encourages irrational, science fiction questions the world via scientific discoveries and it does not leave its relation to the reality (Baudou, 2005: 126). However, it should be noted that there are controversies about this distinction. For instance, Mario Paul Martínez Fabre and Fran Mateu consider fantasy, science fiction and horror as subgenres of the fantastic genre (Martínez Fabre and Mateu, 2019: 8). They question using the term “fantasy” as a synonym of “fantastic” because “although if a content belongs to the subgenre of fantasy, it will inevitably be part of the fantastic field” (Martínez Fabre and Mateu, 2019: 8). According to Fabre and Mateu, fantasy has a connection with mythology and folklore unlike horror or science fiction and it is in a “stranger field” in-between as a literary genre

(Martínez Fabre and Mateu, 2019: 8). In addition to horror and science fiction, fantastic literature has a connection with history as above mentioned. John Clute and John Grant (1997) argue that referring fantastic elements from the past such as dragons, goblins, and elves is a common technique in fantastic literature (as cited in Martínez Fabre & Mateu, 2019: 10-11). Fantastic literature with historical, mythological elements can be considered as subgenres. For instance, Tolkien can be considered in the subgenre of epic fantasy or medieval fantasy (as cited in Martínez Fabre & Mateu, 2019: 10-11)".

Last but not the least, roleplaying games and power of the discourse of the fans should not be ignored. In addition to social media platforms, these games encourage a paratextual discourse. Beyond being a simulation of alternative world experience, the paratextual discourse of roleplaying games construct the reality sense through "in-character dialogue, argument over rules, and discussion of the finer points of the setting" (Vu, 2017: 283-284). To conclude, even though there are controversies about the boundaries, categories/subgenres of fantastic, one thing is for sure that its discourse elements can be an indispensable part of the ultimate goal of its genre, namely hesitation and uncanny.

Discursive Constraints of Translating Fantastic Literature

Defining the term "discourse" is as challenging as defining "fantastic". Definitions of discourse vary from 'anything beyond the sentence' to 'language use' (from sociolinguistics) and "a broad range of social practices that construct power, ideology, etc." (as cited in Munday and Zhang, 2017: 1). Different fields and paradigms can have different conceptualizations of discourse due to their focus of study. Hatim and Mason define discourses as "modes of speaking which involve the participants in adopting a particular stance on certain areas of socio-cultural activity: racial discourse, scientific discourse, domestic discourse etc." (1990: 141). This perspective of Hatim and Mason covering socio-cultural elements is generally accepted despite some criticisms. Discourse Analysis studies the relationship between language patterns and these elements of "socio-cultural context". It also focuses on the traces of social identity and ideology in the use of language by analyzing relationships and power relations between participants. By doing so, Discourse Analysis shows "how views of the world and identities are constructed through the use of discourse" (Munday and Zhang, 2017: 1-2).

Having its roots in applied linguistics, the application of Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies became significant in the 1990s (Munday, 2012:

137). Discourse has generally been discussed as a part of binary opposition of “form versus content” or “structure versus meaning” and at the end of this discussion, poetic discourse has been often considered untranslatable. However, Pym questions whether there is *one* discourse to which both source and target texts belong in a translation process (1992: 227). He claims that “most theories cannot describe the limits of any particular discourse within or across different tongues” (Pym, 1992: 227). Pym also finds Hatim and Mason’s approach “normative” because of listing terms from linguistics such as “discourse, genre, and speech act and text type” (1992: 228). He accuses Hatim’s description of discourses of saying “nothing about the limits and remains unclear as to the discursive status of the translator’s thinking and talking” (Pym, 1992: 233). Hatim and Mason’s seminal work is one of the first steps combining Discourse Analysis with Translation Studies; however, it is overwhelmingly linguistic and does not give any space for subjective, individualistic feature of translators’ role, which makes Pym’s criticism right. Thus, there are two points of discussion: if translation process contains one or two discourses and what the limits of these discourses are (Pym, 1992: 232). Pym’s solution is recognizing translation “as a possible index of intercultural discursive constraints” (1992: 227). He offers “regarding translation as the active movement by which discourse may be extended from one cultural setting to another”, by doing so “translation could become a discovery procedure of some importance to intercultural Discourse Analysis” (Pym, 1992: 235). However, it should not be ignored that translation is more than a procedure/technique of Discourse Analysis. Indeed, Discourse Analysis can be both a part of translation process and also descriptive studies on translation.

Translation of Proper Names and Terms

After defining fantastic and discourse, the article aims to focus on parts of fantastic discourse making translation problematic. Translating proper names and terms in fantastic literature is one of them. Analyzing names (may be with the help of *onomastics*-the science of studying names) can be helpful for translating fantastic literature “where names have a fundamental role in creating comic effects and portraying characters’ personality traits” (Fernandes, 2006: 44). Proper names can be consciously selected in fantastic narrative. Fernandes even suggests that sometimes the differentiation of common and proper names becomes disfunctional (Fernandes, 2006: 45). In addition to semantic meanings, “names in many cultures act as signs, generating ancient or more recent historical associations, indicating gender, class, nationality, religious identity,

intertextuality, mythology and so on” (Fernandes, 2006: 46). The strategies about translating names he has observed so far are techniques such as rendition, copy, transcription, substitution, recreation, deletion, addition, transposition, phonological replacement and conventionality (Fernandes, 2006: 50-55). Ayşe Ş. Okyayuz and Volkan Dalkılıç classify the fantastic terms generally used in fantastic literature into fourteen subcategories:

- creatures (*mindflayer*) and other forms of being (*water elemental*),
- social (*Lord Mayor*) and titles and appellations (*jordain*)
- spells (*fire permutation spell*), magical tools, arms and arm equipment (*teeter boards*),
- natural disasters and geographical places (*Elemental Plane of Fire, Water*),
- clothes (*robe of invisibility*), ornaments and facings (*wizards’ amulet*),
- shelters (*floating tower*) and structures (*houses of coral*),
- food (*rothe*) and beverages (*firewine*),
- transportation vehicles (*skyships*),
- religious items (*Temple of Azuth*),
- terms (*Dragon at the gate, May Mystra smile upon thee*),
- behaviours (*warding off evil*),
- social (*Jordain College, Council of Elders*) and commercial (*skie coins, falcon culture*) (2002: 82, translation is mine)

The nuances between them can be significant because if a translator translates “*sprite*” as “*cin*” into Turkish, s/he will have difficulty in finding another term for “*genie*” (Okyayuz & Dalkılıç, 2002: 82). Okyayuz and Dalkılıç claim that using “*sihirşah*” instead of “*büyücüler başı*” or “*meczip büyüci*” instead of “*deli büyüci*” and “*derdest zinciri*” instead of “*bağlayıcı zincir*” can create a strangely-familiar effect (2002: 82). This helps create uncanny and hesitation in readers’ minds, which is a necessity of fantastic literature as discussed before. They also suggest getting help from fans and using relatively old words for creating strangely-familiar nuances, which is quite acceptable (Okyayuz & Dalkılıç, 2002: 82).

In addition to the proper names and terms, authors themselves can create a special terminology for their own fantastic universe as George Saunders does in his work named *Escape from Spiderhead*. It is categorized as a dystopian short story which narrates “a controlled pharmacological environment in which scientists experimentally manipulate the desires and emotions of human subjects” (Goldberg, n.d.). The story focuses on what makes us human and questions humanity and questions “the emotional, moral and physical limits of human beings” (Reeder, n.d.). The author discusses that humans are “innately empathetic and are against inflicting pain and discomfort on another innocent human”

(Reeder, n.d.). There is an alternative prison in the story and a convict named Jeff narrates the story from this prison. The goal of scientific experiments conducted there is proving “the effects of various serums with mind altering capabilities” (Reeder, n.d.). The author does not give the details of time and place in the story but only implies that it happens in the future (Reeder, n.d.). Saunders creates his own terminology for his dystopian universe. Below are some examples and their Turkish translations:

NatuGlide: *DoğaSüz*
ErthAdmire: *ToprakSev*
Verbaluce: *DilÇöz*
Vivistif: *TamSert*
Darkenfloxx: *Dark Influx –KaraAkın*
VeriTalk : *Very Talk – ÇokKonuş/BolKonuş*
Peace4All: *HepB4rış*
LuvInclyned: *AşkaMeil*
ChatEase: *At ease word play – RahatOl*
Docilryde: *UsluEder*
TemperBest: *KıpKızgın*
InstaRaje: *AniHiddet*
LifeRooner: *KayanHayat*
Bonviv: *İyiYaşa*
BlissTyme : *KeyifZmanı*
SpeedErUp : *GazlaBeni* (Kulaksız, 2019: 67)

As seen above, names and terminology can be neologisms in fantastic literature, so translators analyze the role of these in the discourse of the text and search for their common usage in target culture if there is any (by reading translations from this author or genre or asking fans and game players). If not, they need transcreation for their translation process, which helps the prospective translations in the same field. However, except Okyayuz’s works there are few academic works and discussions about translation of fantastic literature in Turkey, which makes depicting the norms and scene in our country difficult.

Imaginary Sociolects, Idiolects, ConLangs in Fantastic Literature

In addition to proper names and terms, imaginary sociolects and idiolects in fantastic literature can pose difficulties for translators. Firstly, defining *sociolect* and *idiolect* can be useful. In a narrative or discourse, sociolects can be observed in relation with socio-economic, geographical or gender position of a character. John R. Firth (1951) categorizes a number of levels of meaning which translator faces with: “phonological, grammatical, collocational and situational”

(Hatim & Mason, 1990: 37). These levels of meaning derive from social positioning of a character. As Hatim and Mason propose, not only the geographical and temporal dimensions but also social differentiation can be projected in language use and social dialects are parts of social stratification (1990: 42). Translator takes the role of a mediator in this “dynamic process of communication” and acts “between different cultures, each of which has its own visions of reality, ideologies, and myths and so on” (Hatim and Mason: 236). These differences make the process of communication and translation a dynamic one, which needs mediation.

As another related term, Saussurean concept *grapholect* means the dialects from a social context (particular time, place and social group) (as cited in Üstün: 2012: 25). Eric S. Rabkin claims that “the fantastic fiction, [...] proposes a universe which only claims coherence in its own ground rules, in its own *grapholect* yet decipherable by all the lenses, as one would make sense of a dissimilar dialect than their owns” (as cited in Üstün: 2012: 25). It is like another language in the same language and readers even in the same speech community have to decipher it. In this sense, fantastic narrative is both strange and still meaningful for readers. It is both impossible/imaginary and somehow realistic due to having elements from our daily lives.

As an example of imaginary sociolects, in Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings*, the language of the hobbits has some discursive constraints for the translators. Hobbits (also referred as halflings) are “a fictional human-like race in the novels of Tolkien (Hobbit, n.d.). Tolkien portrays them “fond of an unadventurous, bucolic and simple life of farming, eating, and socializing, although capable of defending their homes courageously if the need arises” (Hobbit, n.d.). Hobbits of Tolkien have Cockney accents which is “a pejorative term for the accent or dialect of English traditionally spoken by working-class Londoners” (Cockney, n.d.). Additionally, Tolkien chooses hard consonants, guttural vowels and alliterations, which aid their pejorative position. Thus, translators can have a dilemma (also a binary opposition) about whether to keep the sound or the meaning (Broadway, 2013).

Example 1

Source text:

“Bilbo Baggins, a bur a hobbit, said poor Bilbo, shaking all over, and wondering how to make owl-noises before they throttled him. A burrahobbit? said they a bit startled. Trolls are slow in the uptake, and mighty suspicious about anything new to them. Whats a burrahobbit got to do with my pocket, anyways? said William. And can yer cook em? said Tom. Yer can try, said Bert, picking up a skewer. He wouldnt make above a mouthful, said William, who had already had a fine supper,

not when he was skinned and boned. Praps there are more like him round about, and we might make a pie, said Bert.” (Tolkien, 2012: 30)

Target text 1 (translated by Emel İzmirli):

«Bilbo Baggins, bir hırsı-şey-hobbit,» dedi zavalı Bilbo tümüyle titreyerek ve onlar kendisini boğazlamadan önce baykuş seslerini nasıl çıkartabileceğini merak etti.

«Bil hırsı-şey-hobbit mi?» diye sordular bir an şaşkın.

«Onları pişirebilir miyiz?» dedi Tom.

«Deneliz,» dedi bert eline bir şiş alıp.

«Bil lokmadan fasla etmes!» dedi William.

«Belki etyafta onun kibileri vardıy ve pide, böyek falan yapabiliyiz!» (Tolkien, 1996. p. 30)

Target text 2 (translated by Gamze Sarı):

“Bilbo Baggins, bir hırs-hobbitim,” dedi tepeden tırnağa titremekte vet roller boğazını sıkmadan once nasıl baykuş sesi çıkarabileceğini merak etmekte olan zavalı Bilbo.

“Hırshobbit mi?” dediler biraz şaşırarak. Troller biraz durgun zekalı ve yeni şeylere karşı hayli kuşkucudur.

“Hem bi hırshobbitin cebimde ni şi ola?” dedi William.

“Ya onları pişirebilir misin?”

“Deneyebilirsin” dedi Bert eline bir şiş alarak.

“Adamın dişinin kovu ’una gitmez,” dedi zaten iyi bir yemek yemiş olan William,

“derisiynen gemiglerini ayıkladıktan sona.”

“Belki etrafta onun gibi başkaları da vardır da dırta yaparız,” dedi Bert. (Tolkien, 2017: 72)

Example 2

Source Text:

“Shut up! said they, or well never have done. And yer can fetch the water yerself, if yer say any more. Shut up yerself! said Tom, who thought it was Williams voice. Whos arguing but you. Id like to know. Youre a booby, said William. Booby yerself! said Tom.” (Tolkien, 2012: 30)

Target text 1 (translated by Emel İzmirli):

«Kes sesini'» dediler, «Yoksa bu işi hiç bitilemeyeceğiz. Ve eğer bil sös daha edelsen suyu gidip kendin alabilirsın.»

«Sen kes sesini'» dedi sesin William'ın olduğunu sanan Tom «Senden başka kim tartışıyo ki, bilmek isterim»

«Sen biy mankafasın.» dedi William

«Mankafa sensin'» dedi Tom.

«Gapa ağzını!'' dediler. (Tolkien, 1996: 30)

Discursive Constraints of Translating Fantastic Literature

Target text 2 (translated by Gamze Sarı):

“Kapa çeneni!” dediler, “yoksa işi hic bitiremeyiz. Tek laf daha edersen de suyu gendin getirirsin.”

“Asıl sen ceneni gapa!” dedi konuşanın William olduğunu sanan Tom. “Senden başka kim gavga ediyor, acaba.”

“Dangalak,” dedi William.

“Sensin dangalak!” dedi Tom. (Tolkien, 2017: 78)

Generally, translators feel the urge to mark the differentiation between the specific discourses of the characters. However, it is really challenging to find *specifically wrong* usages in Turkish. As in the examples above, creating a *strangely familiar* effect, domestication can be an effective strategy for sociolects despite the harsh criticism sometimes coming from the readers.

Apart from sociolects, there can be some constructed languages, namely *conLangs* or *artLangs*, in a fantastic novel or story. ConLang or artLang means a created, imaginative language such as Esperanto or Dothraki from HBO's Game of Thrones (www.conlang.org). According to the reason of construction, there are some types of constructed languages such as “engineered languages, auxiliary languages and artistic languages” and fictional constructed language is a category of among them (Mäkelä, 2015: 25). Fictional constructed languages or artLangs can be also categorized into three types in itself: fictional constructed languages spoken by imagined races/nations, idiolects and religious or mystical languages (Rhiemeier, 2012). No matter which category it belongs to, conLang is not just a linguistic tool, but it needs a metalinguistic observation (Tan, 2018). The challenge for translators is that the fictional language they are translating “exists only within the context of that specific written work [...] as a product of the author’s imagination” (Mäkelä, 2015: 25). Butnaru criticizes academicians about “overseeing the ever-growing popularity conlangs have experienced over the past few decades” and ignoring the relationship between Discourse Analysis and Translation Studies in terms of conLangs (Butnaru, 2016: 91). Translators of fantastic literature can face with the task of translating a conLang (which is also considered a translation) and they end up with constructing another language in/from the target language. At this point, metalinguistic observation of a critical discourse analysis gains utmost significance.

In addition to the imaginary sociolects and constructed languages, “the individuality of a text user” namely idiolect can create challenges for translators. Idiolects can be defined as “‘idiosyncratic’ ways of using language-favourite expressions, different pronunciations of particular words as well as tendency to over-use specific syntactic structures” (Hatim and Mason, 1990: 43-44). As an

example, in his series named *Discworld*, Terry Pratchett creates a character called “Death”, who has an idiolect. *Discworld* takes place in “a world shaped like a flat disc balanced on the backs of four enormous elephants who ride on the shell of an even larger sea-turtle as it travels through space” (Britton, 2018: 2). In the series, Pratchett combines social criticism, via satire and laughter surprisingly as a self-reflection process for his readers. As Kirk Boyle (2017) puts it, his narrative voice or tone is generally “Horatian satire”, which includes “lighthearted mockery” (as cited in Britton, 2018: 5). The character named “Death” in the series is quite sarcastic and his speaking is presented by writing his speech in all small caps. “Death’s lines are also not enclosed by quotation marks”, which shows Death has no vocal chords but his voice is inside characters’ heads (Britton, 2018: 9). As Sarah Britton observes, “the lack of enclosure and size of the lettering visually reinforces the power and lack of boundaries surrounding Death” (Britton, 2018: 9). In Turkish translation of the book *Mort* by Pratchett, translator Niran Elçi translates and writes Death’s speeches in capital letters like in the source text as it can be seen in the example:

*Mort, Ölüm ’ün elini tutu ve soğukluğunu duymazdan gelerek sıktı.
“Bakın” dedi. “Ne zaman birkaç gün dinlenmek isterseniz, bilirsiniz, tatil falan yapmak için...”
TEKLİFİN İÇİN ÇOK TEŞEKKÜR EDERİM, dedi Ölüm zarıfçe. CİDDİ BİR
ŞEKİLDE DÜŞÜNÜRÜM. ŞİMDİ...
“Elveda,” dedi Mort ve boğazına bir yumru oturmuş olduğunu fark edince şaşırdı.
“Ne tatsız bir ifade, değil mi?”
KESİNLİKLE. Ölüm sırttı, çünkü sık sık işaret edildiği gibi, başka seçeneği yoktu.
Ama muhtemelen içtendi.
BEN GÖRÜŞÜRÜZ DEMEYİ TERCİH EDİYORUM, dedi. (Pratchett, 2015: 280)*

As seen in the extracts above, translators are generally aware of discursive characteristics of both the genre and the source text. Accordingly, they search for solutions and each translator can choose a different stance in terms of visibility and target-orientedness, which is more complicated than choosing one side of the binary opposition of form and content. In fantastic literature, not only the genre and the discourse but also the discourse and the function of characters can be intertwined, which deconstructs the binary opposition of form and content. Thus, translators need a detailed discourse analysis process before their translation process to overcome challenges of translation no matter which techniques, methods or approaches they choose (especially if they have to translate a constructed language). Last but not the least, it should be reminded that translators of fantastic literature have an extraordinary community of readers who may be also game players (LARP: live action role-playing community) and these are critics whose comments cannot be ignored by translators. Thus, their

reactions, expectations and preferences are parts of this discourse analysis process inevitably.

CONCLUSION

Discourses reflect both idiosyncrasies and the differences related to socio-economic, gender and other positioning of a person in daily communication or a character in a literary narrative. Discourse has been generally discussed as an obstacle/challenge preventing translation from being possible in the binary opposition of “form vs. content”. In fact, translation process can be seen as a test for intercultural Discourse Analysis because translators confront with different discourses not only in the source text but also in the prospective discourse of the text in the target culture.

The definition of the fantastic as a literary genre is as unclear as the one of discourse. However, fantastic literature, as an indispensable part of its genre, carries discursive varieties in itself. Fantastic as a text/discourse/context, which is *strangely* familiar, deconstructs the opposition of strange and familiar. Whereas it uses some elements of real daily life, fantastic twists them through supernatural and magical components. Actually, some authors of fantastic create their own universes with constructed nations, creatures, places and language. An extraordinary use of language aids creating a stranger reality and hesitation. Even in one source text there can be various examples of constructed sociolects and idiolects. ConLangs are the ultimate examples of these specific discourses. In addition to them, terminology and proper names can pose an obstacle. With this perspective, the translation of fantastic literature involves a critical comparative process of Discourse Analysis. The aim of this analysis is not to show that the translation is impossible but it is possible with various ways and strategies which are not restricted to binary oppositions of source vs. target orientedness or domestication versus foreignization. So far, translation of fantastic literature is just an accumulation of individual efforts of translators and there has been not much discussion on its challenges and solutions or descriptive studies about current norms in Turkey (except the ones in popular films). The secondary position of fantastic literature as a genre in literary polysystem can be one of the reasons and also the secondary position of translation aggravates the situation. However, new advances such as conLang/artLang technologies can attract attention of readers, game players or cinema audience and may offer prospective, innovative solutions.

REFERENCES

- Armando, L. (n.d.) Terror, fascination, uncertainty: a reading of Freud's paper 'das unheimliche'. *Academia*. https://www.academia.edu/8840606/terror_fascination_uncertainty_a_reading_of_Freud_s_paper_das_unheimliche_. Access date: 19.05.2020.
- Aslan Ayar, P. (2018). *Türkçe Edebiyatta Varla Yok Arası bir Tür: Fantastik Roman (1876-1960)*. İletişim.
- Baudou, J. (2005). *Bilim Kurgu*. Dost yayinevi.
- Broadway, C.Q. (2013). What's in a name: translating proper nouns in the Hobbit. *The One Ring*. <https://www.theonering.net/torwp/2013/05/05/71399-whats-in-a-name-translating-proper-nouns-in-the-hobbit/>. Access date: 19.05.2020.
- Borghart, P. & Madelein, C. (2003). The return of the key: the uncanny in the Fantastic. *Image & Narrative*. <http://www.imageandnarrative.be/inarchive/uncanny/borghartmadelein.htm>. Access date: 12.03.2020.
- Boyle, K. (2017). *The Rhetoric of Humor: a Bedford Spotlight Reader*. St. Martin's.
- Britton, S. (2018). *Thoughtful Laughter: Fantasy and Satire as Social Commentary in Terry Pratchett's Discworld*. The University of North Carolina at Asheville.
- Butnaru, N.L. (2016). Means of preserving intentionality and functionality in constructed language translation analyses: a study on Kálmán Kalocsay's Esperanto poem "Somernokto". *Interstudia (Revista Centrului Interdisciplinar de Studiu al Formelor Discursive Contemporane Interstud)* (19), 91-100.
- Clute, J. & Grant, J. (Eds.) (1997). *The Encyclopedia of Fantasy*. Orbit Books.
- Cockney. (n.d.). in *Wikipedia*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cockney>. Access date: 10.06.2020.
- Derrida, J. (1980). The law of genre. *Glyph*, 1(7), 202-232.
- Fabre Martinez, M.P. & Matou, F. (Ed) (2019). *In a Stranger Field. Studies of Art, Audiovisuals and New Technologies On Fantasy, Sci-fi and Horror Genres*. https://www.academia.edu/41347070/In_a_Stranger_Field_Studies_of_Art_Audiovisuals_and_New_Technologies. Access date: 19.05.2020.

- Fantastic Literature. (n.d.). in *Art and Popular Culture*. http://www.artandpopularculture.com/Fantastic_literature. Access date: 10.05.2020.
- Fernandes, L. (2006). Translation of names in children's fantasy literature: bringing young reader into play. *New Voices in Translation Studies* 1(2), 44-57.
- Firth, J. R. (1951). *Papers in Linguistics: 1934-1951*. Oxford University press.
- Freud, S. (2002). *Totem ve Tabu*. (K.Sahir Sel, Trans.). Sosyal yayınlar. (Original work published 1989).
- Goldberg, S. (n.d.). Escape from the spiderhead. *Plato*. <https://www.plato-philosophy.org/teachertoolkit/escape-from-spiderhead/>. Access date: 18.05.2020.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman.
- Hobbit. (n.d.). in *Wikipedia*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hobbit>. Access date: 11.06.2020.
- Irwin, W.R. (1976). *The Game of Impossible: a Rhetoric of Fantasy*. University of Illinois press.
- Jameson, F. (2008). *Modernizm Ideolojisi*. (K. Atakay & T. Birkan, Trans.). Metis. (Original work published 2007).
- Jourde, P. & Tortorese, P. (2005). Fantastik: Mantık için bir skandal (E. Özdoğan, Trans.). *Kitaplık*, 80, 79-81.
- Kim, M. & Matthiessen, C.M. (2017). Ways to move forward in translation studies. in J. Munday & M. Zhang (Eds.), *Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies* (p.11-26). John Benjamins.
- Kulaksız, M. N. (2019). *Translation of Saunders' 'Escape from the Spiderhead' into Turkish (Örümcekbaşından kaçış)*. Unpublished graduation thesis, Marmara University, Department of Translating and Interpreting.
- Mäkelä, O. (2015). *Constructed Fictional Language in Translation: Conveying Nadsat from A Clockwork Orange to Kellopeleappelsiini*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Vaasa, Department of English Studies.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 3rd ed. Routledge.
- Munday, J. & Zhang, M. (Eds.) (2017). *Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies*. John Benjamins.

- Okuyayuz Yener, Ş. & Dalkılıç, V. (2002). Fantastik eserlerin çevirisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Uygulamaları Dergisi*, 1(12), 77-92.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. (2nd ed). Bloomsbury.
- Pratchett, T. (2019). *Mort*. Harper Collins.
- Pratchett, T. (2015). *Mort*. (N. Elçi, Trans.). Deli Dolu yayinlari. (Original work published 1987).
- Pym, A. (1992). Limits and frustrations of discourse analysis in translation theory. *Revista de Filología de la Universidad de La Laguna*, 1(11), 227-239.
- Pyrhönen, H. (2007). Genre. in D. Herman (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative* (p.109-124), Cambridge University press.
- Rabkin, E. S. (1976). *The Fantastic in Literature*. Princeton University press.
- Rayment, A. (2014). *Fantasy, Politics, Postmodernity: Pratchett, Pullman Mieville and Stories of the Eye*. Rodopi.
- Rhiemeier, J. (2012). The Art of Conlang Classification. *Jörg Rhiemeier's ConLang Page*. <http://www.joerg-rhiemeier.de/Conlang/classification.html>. Access date: 31.07.2020.
- Reeder, C.T. (n.d.). Spiderhead. *Reeder the Man*. <https://reederman.wordpress.com/essay-1/>. Access date: 19.05.2020.
- Rzyman, A. (2017). *The Intertextuality of Terry Pratchett's Discworld as a Major Challenge for the Translator*. Cambridge Scholars publishing.
- Saunders, G. (2013). *Tenth of December*. Random House.
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. (2003). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Steinmetz, J. L. (2006). *Fantastik Edebiyat*. Dost yayinevi.
- Üstün, Z.G. (2012). *Desire of the Impossible: A Cultural Reading of Fantastic Cinema*. Unpublished MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, Department of Sociology.

- Tan, I.J. (2018). *Dothraki Language Change - Linguistic Implications and Paradigm Shift in Conlang Studies*. Unpublished graduation thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Department of Linguistics and Multilingual Studies. <https://dr.ntu.edu.sg/handle/10356/76540?mode=full>. Access date: 31.07.2020.
- Todorov, T. (1975). *The Fantastic: a Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. (R. Howard, Trans.). Cornell UP.
- Todorov, T. (2000). The origin of genres. in D. Duff (Ed.), *Modern Genre Theory* (p.193-209). Harlow.
- Todorov, T. (2004). *Fantastik: Edebi Türe Yapısal bir Yaklaşım*. (N. Öztokat, Trans.). Metis. (Original work published 1975).
- Tolkien, J.R.R. (1996). *Hobbit: Oradaydık ve Şimdi Buradayız*. (E. İzmirli, Trans.). Mitos Yayıncılık. (Original work published 1937).
- Tolkien, J.R.R. (2012). *The Hobbit; Or, There and Back Again*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Tolkien, J.R.R. (2017). *Hobbit ya da Gittik ve Döndük*. (G. Sarı, Trans.). İthaki Yayınları. (Original work published 1937).
- Vu, R. (2017). Fantasy after representation: D & D, Game of Thrones, and postmodern world-building. *Extrapolation*, 2(58), 273-301.