

The Change of Discursive Registers at Margaret Atwood

Daniela Monica Crăciun (Robu)¹

Abstract: The paper aims at exploring Margaret Atwood's vision in her books emphasized in an interview written by Bland Jared, "*It's 'scary' watching aspects of her fiction come to life, Margaret Atwood says*", August 24, 2013. We have chosen this interview because Margaret Atwood presents in detail her intentions with some of her books. The author has been drawn into the feminist camp, and she has been famously denying such involvement. In the interview she explains how aspects of her fiction came to life as a consequence of our past actions. The purpose of this article is to highlight the arguments that build up her belief and the roots of inspiration for some of her novels. The article can be useful to students focusing on the Canadian fictional novels with a particular interest in feminism.

Keywords: visionary imprints; the abyssal self; apocalypse; communication

When a writer reaches a certain degree of notoriety, he or she becomes a public person who courts the presse with a different intensity depending on the notoriety, positive or negative, which accompanies their existential path. The creative court is self-monitoring or resorting to human, social, cultural experiences, which it inserts in particular forms in its texts. The latter say something, never everything, about the person who generated them and who puts on paper / screen some of the abyssal self, obviously t only parts of it, that he had access to and wanted to explore. Dark, chaotic, unpredictable territory, the abyssal self is like the inferno in which it is easy to enter, but it is very difficult to find a way out.

This diving into the unknown is constituted by extensive sapiential and existential experiences, which leave deep traces in the creator's mind. In other words, the one who completes a book is different than the one who started thinking and writing it.

¹ PhD in progress, Dunarea de Jos University, Romania, Address: 47 Domnească Str., Galați 800008, Romania, Corresponding author: monacromie@gmail.com.

Perhaps that is why many authors refuse to return to the first form of the text, which carries emotional and visionary imprints, which cannot be retracted in the same way.

The inferno of the self demands its own functioning mechanisms that authors from different times or cultures are tempted to explore, either by contemplating them or by crying into its unpredictable becoming. A writer is a brave person diving into knowledge, even when he is skeptical on the results.

If we take into account the gender differences, the approach of the abyssal self nuances not in a hierarchical sense but rather into a personal seal. Beyond the borderline cases of the Geminist, Marxist or homosexual writing, displayed ostentatiously, nuances are sought to allow some specialization of the writing. The differences are not so great if we parallel a text of Orhan Pamuk with one of Margaret Atwood. It was different in the previous situation when between a Faulkner, a Proust or a Simone de Beauvoir were more than significant differences, starting with the theme and going towards the style. Postmodernism, especially post-postmodernism, have erased many of these gender differences, being difficult today to attribute a text to a woman or a man, if we do not have the express name. Other details can also help in attributing the writing to one author or another. The creative courts have blurred their personal marks without them disappearing completely, therefore any analytical approach can generate conclusions worthy of being taken into account.

Auctorial discourse changes when the writer no longer has in front the page-mirror, in which the narcissist is contemplated or not, with a person who reads his books, following his existential path of the creator. If that person is a woman or a man, the preliminary discussion, with its difficult function, takes place differently from one situation to another. There are differences in tone, subject or relationships when the two interlocutors are of the same gender or belong to different genres. A writer discusses differently with a woman and differently with a man. Even if the interviewer's questions are different depending on the curiosities of the person who asks, even when he has the express mandate to mediate for the audience to whom the press body is addressed. A journalist is not an innocent person, but rather a flatterer, sincere or pretended, who attracts his victim in the pitfalls of his questions. The most handy way for the newspaper hunter is the superlatives with which the interviewee overwhelms, a bait that few know how to avoid, being the "poisonous fruit" of communication. Radical feedback would be forbidden to use them in the speech, and the most treacherous way is to let your interlocutor exhaust their full range, judging then for their intrinsic naivety.

In the author's presentation, what should have been a *classic chapeau* turns into a supersaturated presentation of superlatives: "one of the most impressive achievements in contemporary literature", remarkable narrative, is "one of the best speculative-fiction writers alive." (Bland, 2019) A great document, so as not to invoke the peripheral or deductible ones from a context only apparently neutral.

The Margaret Atwood interview from August 2013 has all the necessary elements to observe with the text fabric (questions and answers) it is metamorphosed into an extremely fine texture that makes its debut with the first interruption of the interviewer's logo. It is unclear whether the initial sequence was recorded and played later in writing or whether it was written after the interview and actual meeting ended.

We opted for the second option, based on a clarification from the text "At other moments, she could be quasi-adversarial, pointedly ignoring questions that her interest her, answering instead those she wished had been posed" (Bland, 2019)

An author, a novelist, in our case, is and remains privileged by the very status of his creator, leaving the interlocutor the illusion of control, when in fact he is the coordinator, who gradually becomes an act of speech to what interests him to be transmitted to the reader. The interviewer is largely ignorant not because of intellectual disregard but because the game interviewing game has only one protagonist.

In his persuasive steps, the interviewer sets out three topics that he considers relevant for the creative personality of the interviewed "feminism, utopia and apocalypse". To this he is tempted to add a kind of authoritative prophetism: "She also stooped to weigh whether someone like her, whose books have predicted so much that she has come to pass, is a prophet." Only the author refuses to have such a Vatican status: "Atwood says not; future generations may beg to differ". (Bland, 2019)

If in the case of the stated themes the author does not have such categorical objections, it is because they are commercial options, folded according to the expectations of the contemporary reader, who needs to be commended for such easy recognitions. The reader of our days becomes a rarity, one reads less, but the quality of those who do it is different than those who once read novels in fascicles or popular novels.

Definitely Canada belongs to the new world that retains something of the archetypal European culture, but it is also distinguished from it. The subtext of the Canadian author's non-writing responses tends to articulate a discourse by pointing out, led to what would be jealousy as "pre-human" living or the fact that feminism is more authentic when practiced by men.

The fixation that the interviewer has regarding feminism determines from the author an extra categorical clarification. She knows and says it outright (the interlocutor hardly understands this) without emphasizing feminism and has remained a political doctrine whose intentions are fulfilled, so that obstinately resuming an anti-machismo discourse is as superfluous as is the case with the antifeminist. There are categorical explanations that deny any intention of militant feminism, as the interviewer tries obstinately to collect it. If the interviewer had the minimal insight, but necessary his questions about feminism would have been slipped to post the feminism that post modernism has transformed into discourse about difference and even difference. The playful aspect of the discussion is not to be ignored, which is why Margaret Atwood leads the game to something that suits her, shifting emphasis from appearance to essence.

The above statement is even more relevant when it comes to utopia and utopia as forms of discourse organization.

It traces from the beginning the terms of the visionary and visionary utopian ... "What do you do with the people who never fit in?" (Bland, 2019) A novelist is par excellence a utopian; it does not fit into the common patterns of existence, and the worlds created by it have an a priori utopian component. As a total model, utopia and visionarism overlap especially when literary utopias are taken into account, whose pattern the author feels is unsuitable for himself "Utopia is usually a total blueprint: This is how we're going to run everything; this is how everything fits. Typically in literary utopias you get a traveler to that place, or an observer within that place, who is shown the thing once it's already complete – you don't see it in the stages of evolving." (Bland, 2019)

The "touring the sewage system", the paradoxical phrase is the way in which the author lets common ideas flow into the public space, but also personalized visions about what they have, about being or not, about sacred and profane, in the last moment. In her utopian vision we have an attempt to describe the abyssal area, with the obsessions, fears, anxieties of a person who self-explores in writing, which is why the utopian comes as a pretext, as a preexisting pattern, beyond which a creative

personality shows its being profound. The surface structure is predominantly conventional and targets the reading comforts of the contemporary reader. Her interlocutor fails to overcome this crust or shell, under which we find a questioning being for whom the most accessible is to self-explore.

In the structure of depth, the utopian is void of an abyss, which is a discourse about writing and how to write a novel. A trilogy of ideological modernity seems nonsense, only that the author did not rely on a round construction on a reconstruction of other times, past or future, but rather on a confessional exercise about realities known before, but which in the incidence with his own soul is personalized. The gap through which she looks at the world and the possible worlds reveals unusual aspects to her, altered by this visionary fragmentation.

The utopian pattern demands a visionary continuity and that is why the apocalypse completes all this contrived scaffolding to embroider on the problem of a world that has faced the millenarian apocalypse as a world war or bombs. In order to understand the apocalypse, the author uses mechanical or animal parables, enough to answer the simple question, if such an apocalypse is possible and necessary that would not mind our world, which does not even resemble that of yesterday or with apocalypse drawn in emblematic texts of genius. In a world overwhelmed by technicality, consumables, globalism, a writer can be nothing more than a deafening resonator to the reality he cannot control. He can no longer be a consciousness of his time, because he understands endless parts of what is happening and even has no certainty that what he sees and hears is the reality itself or just his industrial processed packaging.

Conclusions

Metamorphosis of the interviewed writer has her risks that Margaret Atwood wants to minimize. The interviewer's questions are just the disgraceful shells of the essence of a writing that has been personalized through recourse to the abyssal being, ultimately the most authentic part of the creative identity. In all this second type writing there is a historical component, archetypal, easy to detect, but also a meditation on the human condition of the contemporary writer, obliged to recognize the paradox of the things already said.

Bibliography

Bland, J. (2019, 06 10). *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from It's 'scary' watching aspects of her fiction come to life, Margaret Atwood says: <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/is-apocalyptic-atwood-a-bona-fide-prophet-dont-even-go-there/article13934419/?page=3>