39. Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation[1]

Mehmet ERGUVAN[2]

Abstract

Reception of translated texts has thus far elicited uneven attention in Translation Studies (TS), despite the application of reception studies theories over recent decades, initially concentrated within literary translation and subsequently extending to encompass various text types. This paper, guided by Bourdieu's understanding of *taste*, *literary field*, and differentiated types of *capital*, aims to analyze the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire* by delineating its reader profile, elucidating the readers' role in determining meaning, and discussing their critiques and suggestions on macro and micro translational choices and strategies. Based on insights from authentic readers of *Pale Fire*, who integrate mental visualizations with their reservoir of experiences while engaging with the text, the study seeks to explore how authentic readers engage with both Vladimir Nabokov's innovative novel *Pale Fire* and its Turkish translation, examining if Turkish translator Yiğit Yavuz's translational decisions resonate with the cultural inclinations of the readers. The research findings illustrate that although the interviewed Turkish readers engage with literary works in diverse ways, their viewpoints on literary translation and assessments of translational decisions in *Pale Fire*'s Turkish translation exhibit notable uniformity. All in all, the readers tend to adopt a critical viewpoint towards translated literature, emphasizing the identification of translation issues over aesthetic enjoyment. Finally, this research proposes that Bourdieu's suggestion regarding the field of restricted production, involving a cohort of readers with exclusive tastes, might encounter challenge and warrant a more nuanced evaluation within the sphere of readers of translated literature, even among those who engage with what is conventionally perceived as high literature.

Keywords: Bourdieu's restricted production field, literary translation, *Pale Fire*, readers, reception studies

Adres	Address
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi	*RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com	**e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124	**phone:** +90 505 7958124

590 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

Edebi Sınırlarda Gezinmek: Solgun Ateş'in Çevirisiyle Türkçe Karşılaşması[3]

Öz

Çeviribilim alanında son dönemlerde alımlama odaklı yaklaşımlara ve kuramlara ilgi duyulsa da çeviri metinlerin okurlarca nasıl alımlandığı konusundaki çalışmalar süreklilik göstermez. Mevzu bahis ilgi, önceleri edebi çeviriye yoğunlaşmış olup akabinde farklı metin türlerini de kapsamıştır. Bu makale, Bourdieu'nün beğeni, edebi alan ve farklı sermaye türleri kavramlarından hareketle *Pale Fire*'ın Türkçe çevirisini eserin muhtemel okur profilini belirlemek, okurların anlam tayin etmede oynadığı rolü açıklamak, ayrıca okurların makro ve mikro çeviri tercihleri ile stratejileri üzerine eleştirilerini ve önerilerini tartışmaya açmak suretiyle sorunsallaştırır. *Pale Fire*'ın gerçek okurlarının içgörülerinden yola çıkan bu çalışma, zihinlerinde uyanan farklı görseller ve kendi deneyim rezervuarlarıyla metinle etkileşen okurların Vladimir Nabokov'un yenilikçi romanı *Pale Fire* ve eserin Türkçe çevirisiyle nasıl etkileşimde bulunduğunu, bilhassa da çevirmen Yiğit Yavuz'un çeviri tercihlerinin okurların kültürel eğilimleriyle uyumlu olup olmadığını sorgulayarak araştırmayı amaçlar. Okurlarla yapılan görüşmelerden elde edilen bulgulara göre, okurların edebi eserlere yaklaşımı çeşitlilik arz etse de çalışmaya katılan okurların *Pale Fire*'ın Türkçe çevirisindeki çeviri kararlarına dair görüşleri benzerlik taşır. Sonuç olarak, genel itibarıyla okurların çeviri edebiyata eleştirel yaklaştığı ve kimi zaman estetik keyif almaktan ziyade çeviri sorunlarına odaklandığı tespit edilmiştir. Bu çalışma, kendine ait edebi beğenileri olan okur grubuyla özdeşleştirebileceğimiz sınırlı kültürel üretim alanı kavramının, söz konusu çeviri edebiyat okurları, bilhassa yüksek edebiyat addedilen eserleri tüketen okurlar söz konusu olduğunda daha çetrefilli olabileceği ve alımlama evrenlerine dair nüansları kapsayacak şekilde yorumlanması gerektiği önerisinde bulunur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Bourdieu'nün sınırlı kültürel üretim alanı, edebi çeviri, *Pale Fire*, okurlar, alımlama çalışmaları

Adres	Address
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi	*RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com	**e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124	**phone:** +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2024.42 (Ekim)/ **591**

Edebi Sınırlarda Gezinmek: Solgun Ateş'in Çevirisiyle Türkçe Karşılaşması / Erguvan, M.

Introduction

Readers are expected to hold a prominent position in debates related to texts and their enjoyment. Translation scholars have perennially engaged with the notion of the reader, albeit with the translator assuming prominence as the operative reader, whose interpretative engagement with the source text (ST) is paramount in shaping the target text. Therefore, the neglect of involving "the reader as the re-interpreter of the translator's work" (Gambier, 2018, p.44) has long impeded the exploration of reader response in Translation Studies. Eugene Nida (1964) pioneered a reader-centric approach in Translation Studies, shifting from linguistic to communicative perspectives. He emphasized the translator's role as a mediator between author and recipient and introduced a three-step translation model, including *dynamic equivalence* to evoke the same effect in readers as the ST. However, this approach lacked empirical backing, leaving questions about measuring similarity and effects. Despite this, it highlighted the active role of recipients as "reviewers", stressed the translator's empathy with the target community, and utilized "fluency" to meet readers' needs.

Functional approaches in the 1980s built upon and validated Nida's concepts. Skopos theory, a significant framework, asserts that the primary factor guiding translation method and strategy is the purpose of the translational interaction among participants. Accordingly, the sender intends to convey information while the receiver utilizes the text for specific functions or purposes, imbuing the text with meaning. Relevance theory (Gutt 1991/2000) posits that communication requires effort from the sender to achieve maximum cognitive impact on the recipient, relying on shared knowledge and inferences. Both these approaches emphasize considering the functional needs and cultural expectations of the target reader for a successful or accepted translation. Descriptive TS (DTS) (Toury 1995/2012) methodologically and theoretically has contributed to reader-oriented research. Though DTS has made a remarkable contribution to reception-oriented questions in Translation Studies, it is not the target reader but the target text that was the focus of this descriptive approach. Chesterman (1993), like Toury, delves into translation norms, drawing insights from various disciplines. He categorizes these norms into social, ethical, and technical domains. Within technical norms, he distinguishes between product or expectancy norms and process or production norms. Expectancy norms revolve around the anticipations of readers encountering a translation, questioning whether readers are always aware that they are engaging with translated text. Also, Theo Hermans (1996) and Giulina Schiavi (1996) have engendered additional discourse, expressly alluding to an implied reader within the target culture[4]. Both scholars, adopting Toury's approach to translation, perceive translations as manifestations of the target culture, produced under its constraints and motivations, and consequently include target culture implied readers within this framework. This underscores that translation is not solely the translator's endeavor.

Recognizing the lacuna in the exploration of reader-oriented studies within Translation Studies, an area that merits further elucidation, certain scholars in the field have leveraged insights from literary theories that offer a spectrum of reader definitions. In the array of reader-oriented approaches, researchers' suggestions and definitons consistently reveal the polymorphism inherent in the concept of the reader. While a comprehensive examination of each definition exceeds the confines of this paper, a cursory

---

[4] Also, in the 1990s, André Lefevere underscored the significance of conducting reception studies on literary translations, citing their role in preserving the enduring masterpieces of world literature (1992, p. 1-2). In the Turkish context, Duygu Tekgül's Ph.D. thesis *Around the World in English: The Production and Consumption of Translated Fiction in the UK between Cosmopolitanism and Orientalism* explores discourses of identity construction in the production and consumption of translated fiction in the contemporary British book culture. The study concludes that "translated fiction illustrates the multilayered meaning structures regarding taste and identity in reading communities and in the publishing industry in contemporary Britain" (2012, p.3).

592 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

exploration of two primary categories of literary text readership is pertinent herein: the implied reader and the empirical or actual reader. The first type of reader, in line with the author's expectations, is an implied reader constructed within the text—a hypothetical entity designed to understand the author's intentions. According to Katie Wales (1989) and Geoffrey Leech and Mick Short (1981), conceptual reader is characterized by his/her shared background knowledge, presuppositions, sympathies, and standards with the author. In the realm of Translation Studies, the norms and how we practically define equivalence seem to be more influenced by the imagined readership—those implied readers—rather than the real-life reader/viewer. Concerning the pertinence of the concept of implied reader in the examination of translated literary texts, Alexandra Assis Rosa (2006) offers the following explication:

> The notion of implied reader is perhaps even more pertinent because it seems to be more the translator's expectations of the expectations of a given reading community that seems to play a role as motivation or constraint of his/her activity. It seems to be these expectations of the expectations of the interpretive community regarding translated texts that determine the norms the translator will consider-either to follow, alter or even discard (p.104).

Assis Rosa's assertion posits the concept of implied reader as a recipient profile discerned by the translator and embedded within the Target Text (TT). This delineation confers a substantial role upon this category of reader, as it is this anticipated profile that ultimately shapes the translation process and its output. In essence, the targeted readers' profile appears to influence or restrict a particular translation policy, specifically concerning the selection of text types and individual texts to undergo translation—a context encapsulating Toury's preliminary norms. According to Assis Rosa, this imaginary profile may also manifest itself in the translated text "as a set of regularities resulting from translation procedures, both in terms of fullness of translation, textual distribution and segmentation ([Toury's] operational matricial norms) and also in terms of actual textual-linguistic choices (operational textual-linguistic norms)" (2006, p.104).

This paper highlights the growing significance of the empirical/actual reader in Translation Studies. In contrast to the addressee or translator-as-reader, the actual reader, defined by Seymour Chatman as "the flesh-and-bones you or I sitting in our living rooms reading the book" (1978, p.150). The readers engaged in actively consuming literary texts, evidenced by behaviors such as page-turning, reading in coffee shops, book purchases, and research activities, are becoming increasingly prominent. Concerning this, two crucial frameworks—Hans Robert Jauss's (1982) *horizon of expectations* and Wolfgang Iser's (1978) *blanks and indeterminacy*—may also help underscore the role of readers in interpreting literary translations. Jauss's concept focuses on a work's contextual interpretation, suggesting a fluid rather than fixed meaning shaped by prior knowledge. Meanwhile, one can suggest that textual gaps proposed by Iser might enhance aesthetic effects in translations, engaging readers' imaginations and allowing diverse interpretations. Both highlight the reader's pivotal role in creating literary meaning, influenced by education and cultural backgrounds.

Given this context, the main focus of this research is to scrutinize how actual readers respond to both Vladimir Nabokov's unconventional novel *Pale Fire* and its Turkish translation. These readers engaged with the book as part of the CEV6053 Literary Translation and Criticism doctoral course, offered during the Fall Semester of 2016-2017 at Dokuz Eylül University. Ethical permission is not required for the set of interviews I conducted since the survey in electronic format (administered via Google Forms) was available for a span of 12 days in January 2017. Seven doctoral students participated in the survey, responding to a series of ten open-ended questions as part of their involvement.[5] These inquiries aimed

---

[5]   A group of seven doctoral students seems sufficient for this research because they represent a specialized, focused sample

to explore Bourdieu's arguments, particularly his differentiation between official culture—favoring specific tastes acquired through institutions like galleries and schools—and popular culture, which lacks "social legitimation or institutional support" (Fiske, 1992, p. 31). This distinction allowed for an examination of the dichotomy between "bourgeois aesthetics" and "popular aesthetics" as delineated by Bourdieu (1980, p. 237-9). In light of the above points, this paper combines Pierre Bourdieu's perspective with a focus on reader responses to extensively analyze readers' reactions to *Pale Fire* and its Turkish translation, *Solgun Ateş*. The aim is to investigate whether educated individuals with *tasteful* preferences exhibit a uniform cultural homogeneity, assuming they share similar or identical tastes. To accomplish this, the study delves into students' responses to the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*, examining both the text structures and readers' expectations regarding translation strategies while also investigating translation phenomena beyond the textual level.

Mapping *Pale Fire*' Turkish translation within restricted cultural circles

To delineate the reader profile of a literary work, it is imperative to understand and describe the cultural context in which the work is created and consumed. According to Bourdieu, the cultural production field is shaped by a conflict between restricted and large-scale production realms (1993, p.15). *Pale Fire* and its Turkish translation appear to align with the restricted production field, characterized by *high art* such as serious literature. This sub-field functions on cultural rather than economic capital, distinct from the commercial sphere, thus positioning neither the ST of *Pale Fire* nor its Turkish translation for the broader commercial audience. Given that the field of restricted production establishes distinct criteria for product evaluation (Bourdieu 1993, p.115), this study focuses on translational decisions influenced by the literary field, publishing house, translator, and other factors, both at textual and extratextual levels.

Bourdieu's cultural production approach, characterized by a hierarchical stance on agent relations, prompts consideration of a translation's publishing house size. This choice can unveil a work's standing in the literary field. The Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*[6] is undertaken by İletişim Publishing, a prominent entity in Turkey's literary landscape since the 1980s, known for its diverse interests and discerning selection criteria (Brief Presentation of İletişim Publishing, 2014). İletişim, as stated on its website, meticulously chooses high-quality works from Turkish and global literature[7]. İletişim's publication of the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire* contributes to the accumulation of symbolic capital, denoting the "degree of accumulated prestige" (Bourdieu 1993, p.7). This underscores the enduring significance of İletişim Publishing at the symbolic level, which often aligns with the prestige associated with the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*. Notably, the corrected edition of the ST was initially published

---

with relevant expertise in literary translation and criticism. Their advanced understanding of Nabokov's challenging text allows for in-depth responses. Given the qualitative nature of the open-ended questions, even a small, knowledgeable group can offer rich, insightful perspectives that are meaningful for the study's findings.

[6] Though Nabokov's *Pale Fire* was published in 1962, its first translation into Turkish was done by Fatih Özgüven in 1988. Özgüven did not translate the text completely, but he just attempted to translate the first canto of a long poem in the book which consists of a foreword, poem, commentary, and index. His translation entitled "Solgun Ateş Birinci Şarkı" was published in *Metis Çeviri*. In his explanatory note attached to his translation, Özgüven reports that he was anxious about translating the first canto and so he asked for help to his friend Lale Müldür, Turkish poet and author. Following this first attempt, Yaşar Günenç translated the book completely in 1994. Before İletişim Publishing released its translation, Yaba Publishing, known for introducing high-quality Turkish translations of literary works with specific aesthetic value, had Günenç's translation available for sale. Among the titles they introduced to Turkish literature are James Joyce's *Ulysses*, T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*, and Albert Camus's *The Just* (*Les Justes* in original).

[7] Over three decades, İletişim Books has evolved into an expansive library, encompassing significant titles across international and Turkish literature, human sciences, history, politics, and social studies. This extensive catalog prominently highlights contemporary Turkish literature, presenting works from established masters while nurturing emerging authors. Housing a collection of over 2,000 titles, it comprises complete works of renowned international authors and influential figures in Turkish literature and social sciences. (Brief Presentation of İletişim Publishing, 2014)

594 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

in 1989 by Vintage International, renowned for elegantly presenting the best twentieth-century writing globally. Vintage International offers readers a curated collection encompassing classic and contemporary fiction, as well as literary nonfiction, featuring enduring works by esteemed international authors.

Translator Yiğit Yavuz's "allographic preface"[8] (Genette, 1997) adds to the symbolic capital of the translation, in line with findings from various research (Chen, 2024; Norberg, 2012). While Genette asserts that a translator's role in a preface is limited to discussing their own translation, Yavuz, in the preface to the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*, surpasses this by assuming an authorial stance. He emphasizes the creative effort invested in the translation, providing detailed comments on both the source author, Vladimir Nabokov, and the ST, *Pale Fire*. Yavuz references the critical acclaim of *Pale Fire*, highlighting Mary McCarthy's laudatory review on the Vintage edition's back cover, where she hails it as "one of the great works of art of this century." (*Pale Fire*, back cover). Yavuz also notes the contributions of Priscilla Meyer and Brian Boyd, who extensively explored *Pale Fire* in their respective books. Subsequently, Yavuz acquaints the Turkish reader with various components of the book, elucidating that it comprises an extensive poem authored by John Shade, a poet and professor in the Frostian tradition. The composition is augmented by three supplementary elements: Charles Kinbote's foreword, commentary, and index. Also, in his preface, Yavuz delves into and rationalizes his translational decisions and strategies, particularly addressing the necessary compromises involved in translating a poem structured in heroic couplets—marked by rhyming pairs of lines in iambic pentameter. Yavuz's deliberate and justified preface remarks seem tailored for a specific reader profile with distinct cultural tastes, diverging from those inclined towards popular aesthetics. These aspects position *Pale Fire* within the restricted production field, as outlined by Bourdieu, which operates somewhat independently of consumers' educational levels (1993, p. 120). This distinction highlights the considerable difference between the reader profile for works within the restricted sphere and readers of literary works in *mass* or *popular* culture.

The Turkish translation of *Pale Fire* is perceived to align with *bourgeois aesthetics* due, in part, to Vladimir Nabokov's symbolic capital. Nabokov amassed this capital through enduring acclaim, establishing a reputation over time by producing literary works that adhere to a logic of long-term investment (Gouanvic, 2005, p.161). His solidified symbolic capital is evident, considering most of his literary creations have achieved classic status. Nabokov, a Russian-born American novelist and critic, ventured beyond novels to delve into short fiction, dramas, an autobiography, biographies, and letters. Raised trilingual, he developed an early passion for literature, languages, mathematics, and games. His family's fortunes dwindled after the Russian Revolution, leading to their relocation to London, where he pursued studies at Trinity College, Cambridge. Writing under the pseudonym "V. Sirin", Nabokov contributed to Russian-language newspapers in Berlin and Paris before settling in the United States in 1940. Teaching at Stanford University and Wellesley College, he became a naturalized American citizen in 1945 and later joined Cornell University as a professor in 1949. Nabokov's breakthrough occurred with *Lolita* in 1955, catapulting him into literary eminence. His translation of Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin* and subsequent works, including *Pale Fire*, notably bolstered his symbolic capital. Despite his death in 1977, publications like *Nabokov's Butterflies* continued to showcase his diverse literary repertoire.

---

[8]   Allographic prefaces are written by so-called "third persons" to translated literature, who are often cultural agents in the target field with a high degree of symbolic capital (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2013, p.1). According to Genette, translational prefaces are viewed as allographic. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, however, suggests that these prefaces form a new category on their own in the Genette's tripartite classification (consisting of authorial, auctorial and allographic prefaces).

Various biographical studies[9] and critiques[10] attest to Nabokov's enduring impact. His credibility is reinforced by numerous researchers, critics, and biographers, solidifying his status as one of the greatest writers of the twentieth century.

The habitus of translators, coupled with their elevated symbolic capital, has the potential to elevate the prestige of their translations, situating them within the confines of the restricted field of cultural production. Hence, acquiring familiarity with *Pale Fire*'s translator, Yiğit Yavuz, becomes essential, as it can offer insights into the impact of his habitus on the justification of both textual and paratextual translation strategies. In this instance, one could posit that for those acquainted with Yiğit Yavuz, the selection of *Pale Fire* for translation by him suggests the book's significance as a must-read. Yavuz (1970-) completed his high school education at İzmir Karataş High School, followed by studies at the Faculty of Political Sciences at Ankara University. He pursued his master's degree in the Department of Radio, Television, and Film at the same university. Since 1989, Yavuz has had an extensive career at TRT (Turkish Radio and Television Corporation), with additional roles in the then prime minister's press office and various private Turkish channels. Since 2003, Yavuz has been actively involved in translating articles, including works by Richard Thorn, Tim Parks, John Balville, and Francine Prose, published in literary magazines and scholarly journals like *İleti-ş-im* and *Duvar*. He has translated over ten books[11] for publishing houses such as İletişim, İmge, and Vadi. Additionally, he is the author of the book *Radyonun Abece'si* and has penned numerous notes and papers on Vladimir Nabokov and various aspects of literature and culture. Reevaluating Yavuz's position in the restricted field of cultural production suggests that his habitus and high symbolic capital can elevate the prestige of his translations. The discussion further delves into the impact of Yavuz's habitus on his translation choices at both textual and paratextual levels, offering a case study in the subsequent sections.

A brief overview of *Pale Fire*

Nabokov's *Pale Fire* stands as an early example of postmodern fiction, presenting a 999-line poem by John Shade, accompanied by a foreword, commentary, and index from colleague Charles Kinbote. Challenging conventional genre classifications, the novel blurs the lines between fiction and criticism, leaving readers to ponder its nature—whether as literary criticism, parody, a novel, or something beyond categorization. This ambiguity extends to questions about the reliability of Kinbote as a commentator and how readers engage with the interplay between the poem and commentary. Recognizing this unique interaction, it seems apparent that Kinbote's additions do not serve as academic supplements; rather, they attempt to impart meaning derived from the annotator's perceptions rather than the poem or its author.

To comprehend *Pale Fire*'s unconventional annotations and their influence on our interpretation, revisiting Nabokov's translation of Alexander Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin* (EO) proves essential. Nabokov's translation was noticeable in several ways. Nabokov vehemently critiques prior translations for prioritizing rhymes and phonetic play over the poem's intended meaning, accusing these translators of distorting the text for mere rhythmic pleasures. His translation aims for utmost literalness, a stark

---

[9]   Andrew Field's (1986) The Life and Art of Vladimir Nabokov, Stephan Jan Parker's (1987) Understanding Vladimir Nabokov, Brian Boyd's Vladimir Nabokov: The Russian Years (1990) and Vladimir Nabokov: The American Years (1991).

[10]   Julia Bader's (1972) Crystal Land: Artifice in Nabokov's English Novels and Stephen Blackwell's (2009) The Quill and the Scalpel: Nabokov's Art and the Worlds of Science.

[11]   Jack London's What Life Means to Me, Martin Eden, and White Fang; Vladimir Nabokov's Speak, Memory. An Autobiography Revisited, Nikolai Gogol, Lectures on Russian Literature, Pale Fire, Pieter Spierenburg's A History of Murder, Andrea Pitzer's Vladimir Nabokov, Mary Shelley's Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus are among the books translated by Yiğit Yavuz.

596 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

departure. What initially began as a plan for a straightforward translation with explanatory notes burgeoned into a monumental twelve hundred pages of the most voluminous work ever devoted to the study of EO. The distinct and thorough approach in Nabokov's EO annotations likely influenced *Pale Fire*, published five years after his EO translation. John Lyons observed that Nabokov worked on both simultaneously, suggesting the former significantly inspired the latter. Traditionally, literary annotation clarifies a text, but in *Pale Fire*, the commentator Kinbote uses the poem to express personal desires, opinions, and preferences, effectively overshadowing the poet and turning the work into a conduit for personal expression.

What complicates the reading of *Pale Fire* is its mixture of two storylines; one taking place in New Wye, and the other in a foreign land called Zembla. Within the narrative of *Pale Fire*, while John Shade composes the poem titled *Pale Fire*, Kinbote takes on the roles of both the author of the foreword and the commentator. Despite this, Kinbote's credibility as a literary professor is questioned due to a lack of academic qualifications and his portrayed psychological instability, hindering his ability to complete the work effectively. Kinbote asserts a close relationship with Shade, claiming unparalleled knowledge about the poem compared to anyone else. He contends that Shade's composition draws extensive inspiration from his life in Zembla.

Considering *Pale Fire*'s tripartite structure, the book prompts a reexamination of our roles as readers, urging scrutiny of the relationships between author, commentator, reader, and the text. The complexity deepens given that this analysis focuses on a translated work, demanding a reader profile actively engaged and participatory in nature. Considering *Pale Fire*, Nabokov's envisioned reader—one familiar with literary annotation conventions—must possess an avid interest in delving into the novel's intricate points to fully appreciate its depth.

Reader response and Bourdieu's lens: analyzing *Pale Fire*'s Turkish translation

Embracing an economic perspective on cultural existence, Bourdieu perceives social interactions through an economic lens, where individuals allocate resources into knowledge acquisition (choosing the pertinent literature), fostering social connections (networking and associating with influential figures), and cultivating cultural expertise (comprehending cultural artifacts and adeptly engaging with them) (Hills, 2002, p.21). Also, it can be suggested that within society, there is an unequal distribution of various forms of capital, stemming from Bourdieu's belief that an individual's actions are conditioned by different types of *capital*, like *social capital* and *cultural capital*. Viewed through Bourdieu's lens, the cultural system is initially bifurcated into two categories: the first being official culture, which elevates specific cultural preferences often acquired through formal education and institutions like galleries and museums; and the second, popular culture, lacking social validation or institutional backing (Hills, 2002, p.21). At the apex of Bourdieu's cultural taste hierarchy lie professions such as doctors, lawyers, and other cultivated individuals, while at the base reside those lacking both economic means and official cultural capital, labeled by Bourdieu as *the proletariat*.

The study posits that the Turkish version of *Pale Fire* appeals to a specific reader—a proactive participant engaged in a collaborative dialogue with the author. These readers see reading as an ongoing process, drawing inferences by connecting information with their experiences and perspectives. This idea stems from two key findings: first, both *Pale Fire* and its Turkish translation appear situated within the restricted sphere of cultural production, assuming a distinct reader profile primarily interested in what is categorized as high literature; second, Nabokov most often emphasizes the crucial role of an

active, perceptive reader, highlighting their contribution to literary success alongside the writer's artistry.

Yiğit Yavuz reinforces these arguments, suggesting that Nabokov intended the book for readers within a restricted literary sphere, those who approach literature from a distinct aesthetic viewpoint. Building on Nabokov's notion of an ideal reader, Yavuz underscores the notion that *Pale Fire* transcends a single reading; its depth necessitates multiple readings. While acknowledging the potential limitations of his translation in capturing the original essence, he advocates for Turkish readers to undertake a comparative analysis between *Pale Fire*'s source material and his translated version. The translator contends that this task is notably arduous, not only due to the scarcity of individuals proficient in English but also because Turkish readers are unfamiliar with many cultural references[12] within Nabokov's novel. Nevertheless, the translator urges readers of his translation to delve into the ST critically and appraise his translation. He invites perceptive and imaginative readers to embrace this task and thoroughly explore both the source material and its translated form. Ultimately, he looks forward to engaging with meticulous readers capable of identifying and communicating any shortcomings they perceive in his translated work.

As highlighted earlier, this research draws upon interviews held with doctoral students who engaged with *Pale Fire* and its translated version within the framework of the doctoral course. The researcher regards these readers as emblematic of the hypothetical reader profile aimed at by both the author of *Pale Fire* and its Turkish translator. This study endeavors to elucidate the horizon of expectations among Turkish readers through targeted inquiries, probing the extent to which the Turkish translator has successfully reproduced elements perceived as pivotal and challenging by these readers. Informed by Bourdieu's notion that taste reflects social divisions and conformity to dominant tastes fosters uniformity, this study also aims to examine whether readers of the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire* share similar preferences at both textual and extra-textual levels.

Readers of the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*

The selected Turkish readers for this study were specifically chosen based on their educational background, specializing in Translation and Interpreting, along with their adeptness in delving into literature to comprehend the sentiments and ideas from diverse cultures and historical periods. The findings derived from the email interviews conducted as part of this research demonstrate a gender distribution among the respondents, with four out of seven readers being female while the remaining three are male. These readers span an age range from 26 to 44 years old. The open-ended inquiries directed at these participants aim to gather insights regarding a) the reader profile concerning the novel and its translation, b) the overall expectations of readers from literary works, c) the perception of literary translation, and d) the readers' perspectives on translational decisions and strategies, specifically concerning the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*.

When asked to define their reader person, the Turkish readers displayed varying viewpoints. Merely two out of seven readers expressed contentment with merely grasping the message of a book. Conversely, the remaining readers articulated a desire to employ their imagination, personal experiences, and even individual aesthetic criteria to comprehend the essence of a literary work and appreciate its aesthetic

---

[10]   Though the main contributors of the Nabokov's *Pale Fire* are the works of William Wordsworth, Oliver Goldsmith, Alexander Pope, Thomas Stearns Eliot and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, most of them are not available in Turkish, which makes the Turkish readers' understanding even more difficult.

598 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

impact. This sentiment is echoed in the response of one reader:

> Reader 1: I am a kind of reader who enjoys stylistic and semantic richness that a literature provides for me. I don't like delving into literary works only to get the message and to gain a clear understanding. I'm not all about just figuring out the message and getting it all crystal clear. To me, reading's like vibing to a song or checking out art—it's not just about decoding meaning. The way literature hits you with its aesthetics? That's what really matters to me.

Considering the literary preferences of these readers, it seems apparent they share similar cultural tastes, gravitating toward what is typically deemed as serious literature. Authors like Victor Hugo, Toni Morrison, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Paul Auster, Cabrera Infante, Paul Celan, Oğuz Atay, and Orhan Pamuk make up their favorites. Yet, several readers also express interest in underground (also called "clandestine literature") and chick-lit genres, often associated with *low-brow* mass entertainment. When asked if their approach changes when reading translations compared to reading in the original language, most Turkish readers indicated a shift in their attitude, becoming markedly different and often biased. They reported that they tend to approach translated works with heightened scrutiny, aiming for a more critical evaluation. Also, they mentioned setting aside aesthetic enjoyment while delving into translations, focusing instead on identifying potential issues and gaps within the translated text.

> Reader 2: No doubt, I'm a whole different reader when it comes to translations. When Orhan Pamuk was awarded the Nobel Prize, there was this whole debate about who deserved it more—Pamuk or his translator. Personally, I feel like the translator becomes a sort of co-author in the translation game. As a reader, I try to keep my distance from the translation I'm reading and take a multi-angle view of it. If I spot any issues in the translation, I'm more inclined to point fingers at the translator.

In terms of their expectations from literary works and their translations, the Turkish readers in this study bring forth a horizon shaped by their previous readings, experiences, and values upon engaging with a text. With translations, they not only encounter familiar cultural elements but also appreciate encountering information that contrasts or is absent from their original expectations. Actively seeking textual gaps in the translation, these readers strive for creativity and a deeper understanding of foreign cultural references while reading. They emphasize the translator's dual role as a reader of the ST, blending their own expectations with those of both the author and the target reader during the translation process. Their expectation is for the translator to consider their horizon while remaining faithful to the intentions of the original author.

> Reader 3: ...In any book, those textual gaps are what let us readers jump in and join the story. They give us space to team up with the text, letting us make our own judgments about what's happening. Everyone's got the right to fill in those blanks and figure out the mysteries based on their own thoughts and ideas. But if a translator always tries to do it for us and doesn't believe in our ability to figure things out, then we'll end up with more lazy readers.

When reflecting on literary translation, the interviewed readers emphasize the importance of honoring the ST author and grasping the text's contextual background. While acknowledging the translator's duty to fill in gaps in background knowledge for the target reader, they argue against the necessity of making a text entirely reader-friendly or aligning it perfectly with the target reader. In support of this, two readers offer the following insights:

> Reader 4: What really matters to me in literary translation is the writer's style. A top-notch translation, in my opinion, keeps the source text writer's writing style as close as it can get.

> Reader 5: Translation is all about bringing together cultures, a direct channel for communication across different worlds. When it comes to literary translation, conveying the essence of the source culture to the target one holds immense significance. For example, if a translator tackles an Edgar Allan Poe story in Turkish, Turkish readers should sense Poe's distinct style and voice in the

Adres	Address
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi	*RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com	**e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124	**phone:** +90 505 7958124

RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi 2024.42 (Ekim)/ 599

Edebi Sınırlarda Gezinmek: Solgun Ateş'in Çevirisiyle Türkçe Karşılaşması / Erguvan, M.

translation. Similarly, when working on a Nabokov novel, the translation should echo Nabokov's essence. When faced with culture-specific elements, footnotes or endnotes can come in handy. To me, preserving the meaning outweighs maintaining the rhythm and melody. Moreover, translators should dig deep into the source text writer's other works and, if available, their own translations. Ultimately, contextual meaning and the emotions the source text aims to convey should never be disregarded.

From the collected insights, it's apparent that the surveyed Turkish readers predominantly lean towards bourgeois cultural preferences rather than those associated with low literature, often seen as secondary. These readers display a keen interest in literary works and their translations, equipped with a solid grasp of literature and its intricacies. However, the findings also uncover a discrepancy: while some Turkish readers possess literary awareness and knowledge, they do not uniformly prioritize literary books and their translations. Instead, they expect translators to offer supplementary information for better understanding references and foreign terms. This highlights that even within readers possessing high cultural capital, there exists a diversity of expectations, influencing various interpretations of literary works and their translations. These readers' disposition can thus be termed as omnivorousness (Peterson, 1992)—an engagement with a broad aesthetic range, reflecting a tolerance for diverse values.

To further delve into these arguments, the study's concluding section will explore readers' perspectives on micro translational decisions and strategies employed in the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*. This will specifically concentrate on: i) the translation of John Shade's poem, and ii) the extensive use of footnotes to clarify references, foreign terms, and polysemic expressions in the ST.

Exploring the nuances of poetry translation in *Pale Fire*

The Turkish readers interviewed for this research generally agree that the translation of the poem in this work requires quite a laborious process, yet beyond this, translating poetry itself, as Francis R. Jones (2011) puts it, is "a difficult task". However, they emphasize that, like other facets of literary creation, the intrinsic pleasure and cultural significance of poetry translation justify the effort. Regarding their perspective on translated poetry, these readers primarily prioritize engaging with the original poet's work because they recognize that poetry translators often face the dilemma of sacrificing either the source's essence or its poetic essence. Alongside the broader challenges of transferring content, form, and function inherent in all literary translations, poetry translation necessitates conveying elements like meter, repetition, and pattern. Moreover, in line with most definitions of poetry, the inherent ambiguity of meaning in any poem lies at the core of its essence, enabling diverse interpretations by different readers. In this section of the study, discussions have been based on interpretations that highlight the translation of the poem's poetic elements into the target language, and the translation of words from languages other than the source language, which have captured the readers' attention.

Nabokov, celebrated for his translation expertise, laid down meticulous guidelines governing the art of translation, delineating stringent criteria for translators. These criteria demand a blend of talent and profound understanding of cultures, languages, and the social context, including the historical evolution and period-specific associations of words. In his foreword to the translation of Aleksandr Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin* (1833), Nabokov outlines three modes of translation. These approaches are: the paraphrastic method, involving free adaptation with omissions and additions; the lexical or constructional method, focused on literal word meanings, achievable even by a proficient bilingual machine; and the literal method, aiming to mirror the precise contextual essence within the associative and syntactical boundaries of another language. Nabokov unequivocally champions this third method as the sole embodiment of true translation. (Pushkin, (1964), p. vii—viii). This stance notably signifies his complete disregard for free translation, emphasizing instead the fidelity and meticulousness

600 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

inherent in preserving the contextual and associative nuances of the original work.

Nabokov's emphasis on the poem's meaning over its poetic aspects contrasts with the stance of the Turkish translator Yavuz, situated between Talat Sait Halman's pursuit of the poem's poetic essence and Nabokov's focus on preserving source semantics. Within the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*, several instances illustrate the translator's ambivalence toward discarding essential poetic elements from the source poem. In the third stanza, the strategic repetition of the sound "w" in the original text through words like *whenever*, *whatever*, *was*, *where*, and *while* appears to undergo a phonological alteration in the Turkish translation, losing this systematic arrangement. Likewise, in the sixth stanza of the second canto, while the repetition of the letters "i" and "t" forms an alliteration thanks to their repetition in a series of words (*sit*, *lit*, *wrist* and *mist*), Yavuz does not attempt to create such an effect in his translation. As Yavuz notes himself, he, on the one hand, abandons to recreate the poetic features of the source-poem, on the other, he attempts to redress the balance between preserving meaning and incorporating poetic elements in its translation.

In the first canto of the original poem, Shade describes a mockingbird imitating sounds from the television, singing phrases like *chippo-chippo* and *to-wee, to-wee* while also saying *come here*, *come herrr*. Yavuz, in the Turkish translation, creatively translates the poem, aiming to mirror both the meaning and poetic essence of the original. Yavuz's choice of *çipo-çipo* and *tu-vi, tu-vi* for the phrases *chippo-chippo* and *to-wee, to-wee* in Turkish can be considered a form of phonetic transcription, preserving the sounds in the translated text. His translation of *come here*, *come herrr* as *gel buraya*, *gel buraaa* (an informal spoken variation of the Turkish word "buraya") also showcases creativity, recognizing the misspelling of *here* and opting for *buraaa* instead of the correct *buraya*.

It's evident that the author of *Pale Fire* enjoys playing with words and languages, notably seen using foreign, predominantly French, terms. While the Turkish translator typically retains these words, exceptions arise where reflecting characters' emotions or maintaining the source text's conversational tone becomes essential.

Examples[13]

		Backtranslation
She said she'd be ***de trop***, she would much prefer (p.47)	Kızımız artık burada **fazlalığım** demiş, (p.50)	She said, she'd no longer have a place there.
...although I have my moments of volatility and ***fou rire*** (p.173)	**...pek neşelenip kıkır kıkır güldüğüm** anlar olsa bile. (p.164)	...although there are moments when I cheer up and burst into laughter.

In the examples above, instead of substituting foreign words with archaic-sounding terms of Arabic or Persian origin, typically associated with elites, the Turkish translator prioritizes conveying precise contextual meaning. In the first example, Hazal, John Shade's melancholic daughter, expresses her feeling of being unwanted among her peers with the phrase *de trop*. Yet, aiming for a more explicit portrayal of Hazal's emotions, pivotal to her eventual suicide, the Turkish translator opts for *fazlalığım burada* (It seems like I shouldn't be here), a phrase that intimately captures Hazal's self-perception. Likewise, translating *fou rire* as *kıkır kıkır güldüğüm anlar* (moments when I laugh heartily) in Turkish

---

[13]   The researcher highlighted certain words in bold to facilitate easier comprehension of the examples.

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

Edebi Sınırlarda Gezinmek: Solgun Ateş'in Çevirisiyle Türkçe Karşılaşması / Erguvan, M.

underscores the Turkish translator's commitment to conveying the intended meaning faithfully.

Yigit Yavuz's footnotes

Nabokov's decade-long effort in translating and annotating Eugene Onegin seeks to introduce Pushkin to English-speaking readers, meticulously justifying each word, stanza, and chapter for a comprehensive grasp of the novel. Reflecting this dedication in the translation of *Pale Fire*, the Turkish translator included 190 footnotes to enrich understanding, providing background on allusions, references, and the multiple meanings of words in the ST. These notes aim to aid readers in bridging the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire* with their preexisting knowledge and intuition. In feedback gathered from Turkish readers, the majority expressed that the footnotes did not hinder their reading experience; rather, they emphasized the necessity of such annotations in decoding wordplays and nuanced terms in the novel. Consequently, Yavuz's use of footnotes in *Solgun Ateş* has emerged as an effective means of enriching literary translations by providing essential contextual details for wordplays and polysemic terms in the ST.

Examples

		Backtranslation
I was the shadow of the waxwing slain (33)	Ölen ipekkuyruk kuşunun gölgesiydim ben (37)	I was the shadow of the waxwing slain (33)
"Or dream in any sense. Later, perhaps,	"İnsan yanılsama ya da rüya göremezdi hiçbir şekilde.	"One couldn't experience illusion or dream in any sense. Later, perhaps,
But not during the actual collapse. No, Mr. Shade."	Belki sonra olabilir Bay Shade; ama asıl çöküş anında	But not during the actual collapse.
But, Doctor, I was dead!	Olamaz asla."	It can never be."
He smiled. "Not quite: just half a shade," he said. (60)	Ama doctor, ölmüştüm ben az önce! Gülümsedi. "Pek sayılmaz: hepi topu yarım bir gölge!" (62)	But, Doctor, I had died just a moment ago!
		He smiled. "Nothing but a half-shadow.," he said. (60)

In this instance, the terms *shadow* and the expression *half a shade* serve as subtle references to John Shade's surname. As Shade queries his doctor about his mortality, the doctor's wry reply, *Not quite: just half a shade*, creates a comedic moment for English-speaking readers. Regrettably, the Turkish translation may not capture this linguistic playfulness, thereby depriving Turkish readers of the comparable contextual amusement evident in the ST. Hence, employing explanatory footnotes in such contexts may serve as an apt remedy to ensure the retention of these nuanced effects.

Based on data from interviewed Turkish readers, the following example in the translation also demands the inclusion of footnotes.

		Backtranslation
But this transparent thingum does require Some moondrop title. Help me, Will! Pale Fire! (68)	Ama bu seffaf zımbırtıya ay damlası bir isim vermek Lazım, Yardım et ey **İrade**, ona Solgun Ateş desek! (71)	But to give a moon drop a name to this transparent gadget is necessary. Help me, oh Will, if we call it Pale Fire.

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

602 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

The word *Will* in the ST encompasses various connotations, such as testament, wish, resoluteness, desire, and even hints at a future tense and serves as an abbreviation for William Shakespeare. Additionally, in some references, *Will* is cited as the name of Shakespeare's lover. With its multifaceted associative meanings in the ST, its Turkish translation *irade* (will, freedom) appears to limit Turkish readers from leveraging contextual clues to ascertain the precise meaning in the text. Hence, according to Turkish readers, Yavuz's footnote in the Turkish translation (on page 71) becomes imperative to elucidate this example.

In certain parts of *Solgun Ateş*, the Turkish translator makes significant interventions in the ST, aiming to provide guidance to the Turkish reader through extensive footnotes. Here are two examples from the Turkish translation where such footnotes attempt to minimize the cognitive effort required by the Turkish reader.

Instances of Footnotes	Backtranslation
Yasemin ciçegi Amerika Birlesik Devletleri'nin sadece güney bölgesinde yetisebiliyor. Nabokov'un bu bölgedeki Zencileri linç eden ırkçılara göndermeyle, söz konusu bölgeye "yasemin kuşağı" demiş olması muhtemel. (p.204)	The jasmine flower can only be grown in the southern region of the United States. With Nabokov's reference to racists who lynched the Negros in this region, he likely refers to this area as the 'jasmine belt'.
Özgün metinde go berserk deyimi kullanılmış. [...] Nabokov'un bu deyimi seçmesini, romandaki Viking motiflerine bir gönderme ya da ipucu olarak algılamak lazım. (p.221)	In the original text, the expression 'go berserk' is used. [...] Nabokov's choice to use this expression should be interpreted as a reference or clue to the Viking motifs in the novel.

The footnotes in the Turkish translation might limit readers from connecting their own beliefs or knowledge to conclusions. Instead of facilitating comprehension, these footnotes excessively steer readers, obstructing their capacity to draw personal inferences while interacting with the translated text. Interviews with Turkish readers suggested that these footnotes might reveal the translator's lack of trust in readers' deduction abilities regarding references and words. The interviewed readers exhibited a preference for extracting contextual effects through mental processing, resulting in their predominant discomfort with the translator's overuse of footnotes in the Turkish translation.

Conclusion

This study aimed to illustrate how reader-oriented research within Translation Studies significantly contributes to unveiling the genuine reader profile of translated works and the expectations these readers have from translators, both within and beyond the text. By acknowledging that determining the reader profile of any literary piece is intertwined with the context in which it is created and consumed, this study initially explored the dynamics within the limited cultural production field to which the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire* appears to belong. The assertion of the Turkish translation's position within a restricted field was substantiated through several findings: İletişim Publishing House's selection of esteemed literary works from Turkish and global literature, Yigit Yavuz's allographic preface in the Turkish translation, Vladimir Nabokov's symbolic authority in the literary realm, and Yigit Yavuz's habitus and associated prestige.

Centered around Bourdieu's concept of *taste*, this study challenges his assertion that individuals with *good taste* are distinct from those interested in low literature, whose preferences are frequently marginalized. Investigating if readers of the Turkish translation of *Pale Fire*, presumed to possess refined taste and similar cultural inclinations, differ in their approach to the translation and in

Adres | Address
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | e-mail: editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | phone: +90 505 7958124

identifying discrepancies within it, the research reveals that while these Turkish readers exhibit diverse approaches to literary works, their perceptions of literary translation and critiques of translational decisions in *Pale Fire* are notably consistent, albeit to a certain extent.

Readers tend to take a critical approach to translated literary works, sacrificing some aesthetic pleasure to identify issues, especially concerning the reproduction of John Shade's poem and the extensive use of footnotes. While discussing the poem's translation, they acknowledge the difficulty of preserving both meaning and poetic essence. They note an ambivalent stance in the Turkish translator's approach, seen as lacking in faithfully recreating the source poem's poetic aspects while focusing on meaning. Additionally, readers repeatedly express concerns about the failure to capture emotional nuances from the original poem. The second point observed by surveyed readers concerns the Turkish translator's extensive footnotes, which they think did not greatly disrupt their reading pleasure. They acknowledge the necessity of these footnotes in translating wordplays and polysemic words, yet certain footnotes in the Turkish translation unfavorably affected their reading experience, reducing their anticipated impact.

This study posits that while readers with more literary capital generally maintain consistent views on translation and critiques, Bourdieu's concept of a restricted readership characterized by exclusive tastes appears to encounter challenges within the realm of translated literature, including among those engaging with highbrow works, providing a more nuanced understanding of readers. This points to the presence of an omnivorous consumption pattern, diverging from snobbery's exclusive taste symbols to embrace diversity, eclecticism, and desirable trendy elements. The broadening achieved through an omnivorous reading disposition is likely to replace the narrowly defined concept of high culture emphasized in Bourdieu's theory of cultural consumption. This research also underscores that Nida's mid-twentieth-century concept of dynamic equivalence can inform current reception-focused studies on translation, while also recognizing Hermans' assertion that translation needs to be thoroughly explored within the context of the target culture, especially with respect to the target readers in this research.

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

604 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2024.42 (October)

Navigating Literary Boundaries: The Turkish Encounter with *Pale Fire*'s Translation / Erguvan, M.

References

Assis Rosa, A. (2006). Defining Target Text Reader. Translation Studies and Literary Theory. In. J. Duarte, A. Assis Rosa and T. Seruya (Eds.). *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines* (pp. 99–109). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.68.10ass

Bader, J. (1972). *Crystal Land: Artifice in Nabokov's English Novels*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Blackwell, S. (2009). *The Quill and the Scalpel: Nabokov's art and the worlds of science*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1980). The aristocracy of culture (R. Nice, Trans.). *Media, Culture, and Society 2*, 225-254. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443780002003

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boyd, B. (1990). *Vladimir Nabokov: The Russian years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boyd, B. (1991). *Vladimir Nabokov: The American years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501741616

Chen, X. (2024). The role of spatial changes to paratext in literary translation reception: eleven Chinese editions of *Charlotte's Web*, *Translation Studies* 17 (2), 299-313. doi: 10.1080/14781700.2023.2231959

Chesterman, A. (1993). From 'is' to 'ought': Laws, norms and strategies in Translation Studies, *Target 5* (1), 1–20. doi: 10.1075/target.5.1.02che

Field, A. (1986). *The life and art of Vladimir Nabokov*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Fiske, J. (1992). The cultural economy of fandom. In L. A. Lewis (Eds.), *Adoring audience: Fan culture and popular media* (pp. 30-49). London/New York: Routledge.

Gambier, Y. (2018). Translation studies, audiovisual translation and reception. In: E. D. Giovanni and Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Reception studies and audiovisual translation* (pp. 43-66). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Threshold of interpretation*. Jane E. Lewin (Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gouanvic, J. M. (2005). A Bourdieusian theory of translation, or the coincidence of practical instances. *The Translator 11* (2), 147-166.

Gutt, E. A. (1991/2000). *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. Oxford: Blackwell/Manchester: St Jerome.

Hermans, T. (1996). The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative. *Target 8* (1), 23-48. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.8.1.03her

Hills, M. (2002). *Fan cultures*. London and New York: Routledge.

Iser. W. (1978). *The art of reading. A theory of aesthetic response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

İletişim Yayınları. (2014). *Brief presentation of Iletisim Publishing*. Retrieved from https://iletisim.com.tr/about-us

Jauss, H.R. (1982). *Toward an aesthetic of reception*. Timothy Bahti (Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jones, F.R. (2011). *Poetry translating as expert action*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leech, G.N. and Short, M.H. (1981). *Style in Fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. London and New York: Longman.

Lefevere, A. (1992/2017). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame.*

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

London/New York: Routledge.

Nabokov, V. (1989). *Pale Fire*. New York: Vintage International.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Norberg, U. (2012). Literary Translators' Comments on Their Translations in Prefaces and Afterwords: The Case of Contemporary Sweden. In A. Gil-Bardaji, P. Orero, and S. Rovira-Esteva (Eds.), *Translation Peripheries: Paratextual Elements in Translation*, (pp.101–116). Bern: Peter Lang.

Parker, S. J. (1987). *Understanding Vladimir Nabokov*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press

Peterson, Richard A. (1992) Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore, *Poetics 21* (4), 243-58.

Pushkin, A. (1964). *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse, Vol. 1*. (Vladimir Nabokov, Trans.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Schiavi, G. (1996). There is always a teller in a tale. *Target 8* (1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.8.1.02sch

Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. (2013). Agency in allographic prefaces to translated works: An initial exploration of the Turkish context, In H. Jansen and A. Wegener (Eds.), *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation 2- Editorial and Publishing Practices*. (pp.1-21). Montréal: Éditions québécoises de l'œuvre, collection Vita Traductiva,

Tekgül, D. (2012). *Around the World in English: The Production and Consumption of Translated Fiction in the UK between Cosmopolitanism and Orientalism*. (Doctoral Thesis). University of Exeter: Exeter.

Toury, G. (1995/2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.4

Wales, K. (1989). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. Harlow: Longman.