

## **Agency in Allographic Prefaces to Translated Works: An Initial Exploration of the Turkish Context**

Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar

The paper explores prefaces written by so-called “third persons” to translated literature, termed “allographic prefaces” by Genette. These preface writers are often important figures in the target field with a high degree of symbolic capital. The paper carries out a preliminary study on some examples of allographic prefaces in the Turkish context and discusses the links between the prefaces and the individual trajectories of their writers.

Keywords: paratexts, authorial prefaces, allographic prefaces, agency, Turkish literature

Cet article examine les préfaces de traductions, écrites par des tierces personnes, ce que Génette appelle les préfaces allographiques. Les auteur(e)s de telles préfaces sont souvent des personnalités importantes dans la culture cible, dotées d’un grand capital symbolique. Cet article constitue une étude préliminaire de quelques exemples de préfaces allographiques provenant du contexte turc et analyse les liens entre les préfaces et les trajectoires individuels de leurs auteurs.

Mots clés : paratextes, préfaces d’auteur(e), préfaces allographiques, capacité d’action, littérature turque

The present paper will explore the strategic role allographic preface writers play in mediating translated texts to target readers. Although prefaces constitute only one dimension of Gerard Genette’s larger framework on paratexts<sup>1</sup> they have proven to be fruitful sources of information for translation researchers. The topic of this paper is allographic prefaces written by cultural agents who are not directly involved in the translation or publication of a given translation. I will explore the cultural and ideological contexts which shape such prefaces and also trace the contexts the writers of such prefaces (re)create. This study is not exhaustive and does not include a large corpus of prefaces. Therefore it should be considered a preliminary meditation on the potential place of the allographic preface in translation research and the links between the writers of these prefaces and the general cultural and translational context in

which they operate. Where possible I will also attempt to create a dialogical relationship with Genette's ideas on prefaces, especially in as much as they relate to translations.

Genette defines the preface as "every type of introductory (preludial or postludial) text, authorial or allographic, consisting of a discourse produced on the subject of the text that follows or precedes it."<sup>2</sup> This paper will argue that in order to have a deeper understanding of prefaces, we need to question whether prefaces *only* deal with the subject of the text that they accompany. As the examples taken up in the paper will illustrate, some prefaces touch upon the main text marginally and follow a course of argumentation which make them autonomous texts, at times circulating independent of the main text. These prefaces and their writers will be the main focus of the present paper. Based on a limited corpus, I will question why allographic prefaces may have different implications and functions than prefaces written by translators or authors and argue that a study of the writers of allographic prefaces and their motives broadens the ground for a discussion of agency in translation.

### **Who Writes Prefaces to Translations?**

Prefaces created by translators are of special importance for translation history and research on translation in general. These prefaces offer the readers a rare moment of direct contact with the translator. It is in these instances that the agency of the translator becomes concrete and the translator addresses the readers directly. These prefaces present diverse forms of information, including biographical or critical information about the author of the source text, explanations regarding culture specific items, and occasionally information on the translation strategies implemented by the translator.

A recent study of translators' prefaces by Rodica Dimitriu identifies three main functions served by these prefaces: explaining the translation for the readership (the explanatory function), providing instructions or guidelines for other translators (the normative/prescriptive function) and offering information regarding the source text or the socio-cultural contexts (the informative/descriptive function).<sup>3</sup> Dimitriu argues that translators' prefaces can be used as a documentary source by translation researchers in their attempts to extrapolate information on the translation process, and the translation norms or ideological stance of the translators.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, these prefaces may offer information also regarding relatively more implicit aspects of the translator's agency. For example translators position the readers in specific ways through the type of information they offer in prefaces (assuming for the readers what they know or do not know) or offer clues regarding how they see their own cultural role (at times building cultural hierarchies between themselves and the readers). These prefaces have been subject to a series of studies by translation scholars and one can comfortably argue that translators' prefaces are the most widely studied form of paratexts surrounding translations.<sup>5</sup>

However, the most common preface writers in translated works are not translators, but source text authors or other cultural agents in the source or target cultures. Genette distinguishes among authorial, auctorial and allographic prefaces. Auctorial prefaces are written by "alleged authors" who "may be one of the characters in the action, when there are characters and action."<sup>6</sup> Since the present paper deals with authentic and not fictive prefaces, auctorial prefaces will not be discussed here. The most probable authentic preface in a translated work is by the author of the source text. Genette refers to these prefaces as the "original preface;" he argues that the main function of the original preface is "to get the book read and to get the book read

properly.”<sup>7</sup> He then elaborates on how the original prefaces set out to fulfill this function. He discusses the various themes taken up by prefaces regarding the questions of why and how a book in question should be read. Among many others, these themes include importance, novelty, truthfulness, genesis, intended readership, title, genre definitions (which include larger manifestos in favor of specific genres) or contextual information.<sup>8</sup> These prefaces are usually written for the original edition of the source text and are printed in both original and translated works, sometimes posthumously. However, there are also prefaces penned by source authors for specific translations of their works.

Allographic prefaces share the same functions as original prefaces but they can also include further functions which will be taken up in the following sections. These prefaces are authentic in that they are written by real persons and not fictional characters. Their defining feature is the fact that they are written by “a wholly different (third) person.”<sup>9</sup> These “third persons” are delegated the responsibility of writing the preface by the author and/or the publisher, whom Genette describes as “the two people responsible for the text and the paratext.”<sup>10</sup> In most cases allographic preface writers are visible agents who are conferred the responsibility or privilege of writing a preface due to their high socio-cultural status and who have not played a direct role in the publication of the book they are prefacing.

Are translators’ prefaces authorial or allographic? Genette defines translations as paratexts. Offering an extremely source-oriented view of translation he remarks that translations have “undeniable” paratextual relevance since they “serve as commentary on the original text.”<sup>11</sup> Elsewhere, he considers translation a type of hypertextual practice and writes that it consists of “transposing a text from one language into another.”<sup>12</sup> For Genette, translation is characterized by “problems” associated with the

Italian adage *traduttore traditore*.<sup>13</sup> He also mentions “inevitable flaws” in translation and the harm these can inflict on a literary text.<sup>14</sup> Given this background, it should not come as a surprise that in his scheme, translatorial prefaces are considered as allographic. In the only footnote he elaborates on the translatorial preface, Genette suggests that “the translator-preface-writer may possibly comment on, among other things, his own translation; on this point and in this sense, his preface then ceases to be allographic.”<sup>15</sup> This means that according to Genette translators only assume an authorial voice when they are discussing their own translations: self-referentiality in the preface is *the* prerequisite for seeing a translator as an author, only in as much as the comments relate to the translation, and not to the source author or text.

A source-oriented view of translation can also be detected in an interview where Genette expresses his admiration for translators who can hold back and not intervene in the text while translating. He says “Ah yes, self-effacement, self-forgetfulness, knowledge of non-intervention. I greatly admire translators who say this, all the more so that I know I would not be able to do it.”<sup>16</sup> An approach which values translatorial freedom and creativity and regards translation as consisting of inevitable interventions in the source text would contest to translatorial prefaces as being allographic. It can be suggested that translators are entitled to speak from an authorial position given the creative effort they exert in shaping a target text. On the other hand, there may also be methodological problems in considering prefaces written by translators as authorial too, since they can contain information regarding the translation process or the target context which is in general absent from the authorial preface. Therefore, in my view, these prefaces can be handled separately in a category of their own and be added as a fourth category to Genette’s tripartite classification.

Most allographic preface writers distinguish themselves by their high amount of symbolic capital. This may allow them to assume precedence over a translator or the translated work when they offer prefatorial commentary about the translated text. These visible agents often enter into a special type of interaction with translated texts as their prefaces not only present translations to the readers, but also help present the individual writers and translators behind them and their agendas. These allographic preface writers may have a host of different purposes in addressing readers, apart from presenting a book in question.

### **Agency and Power in Allographic Prefaces in Translated Works in the Turkish Context**

This section will introduce some cases from the Turkish context where “third persons” including other authors, translation critics or politicians take control over translated texts through their discursive power and lead the readership in a variety of ways. The key terms here seem to be discursive and symbolic power, for it is obvious that visibility and authority in and over translated texts can only come from a well-established position as a man or woman of letters. These agents often write their prefaces with well-known motives, such as presenting and creating value for the translation, the source author and the book, and sometimes also the translator, but the backdrop of the preface can occasionally be traced back to larger concerns which are closely linked to a political and poetic context. Needless to say, writers can also use their preface to assert their own position and status as experts alongside their presentation and promotion of the book in question. These cases challenge Genette’s statement that paratexts are always auxiliary and that they are dedicated to the service of the main text they accompany.<sup>17</sup>

In addition to sharing the same functions as the original preface, Genette associates two further functions with the allographic preface. The first one is presenting the text, that is, offering information about the work, the author and the place of the work in a literary genre or tradition. The second function is that of recommending the text, which is more or less implicitly done by writers “whose reputation is more firmly established than the author’s.”<sup>18</sup> These traditional functions of the allographic preface do not prevent preface-writers from digressing from the text and taking “advantage of the circumstances to go somewhat beyond the supposed subject of his discourse and argue in support of a cause that is broader or possibly wholly different. The prefaced work then becomes simply the pretext for a manifesto, a confidence, a settling of accounts, a digression.”<sup>19</sup> This is common for original prefaces too, especially when the authors are introducing a new genre, but also when they are trying to emphasize a moral or philosophical cause.<sup>20</sup> Genette is hardly interested in these digressions, that he terms “verbal hijacking,” while I will argue that they can be extremely relevant for the purposes of linking a translated work with outside cultural and ideological networks.

In what follows, I will focus on a limited number of allographic prefaces and discuss the contexts created by the cultural agents who penned them. Some of these prefaces are marked by digressions from the subject of the translated texts they help introduce. I will provide an overview of the possible goals of the preface writers and discuss how these goals and the resulting preface are an outcome of the individual preface writer’s professional/literary trajectory.

## **Hasan-Ali Yücel and Mina Urgan: Agents Striving for Ideological Recontextualisation**

The first example deals with an allographic preface written for translated works published by the state-sponsored Translation Bureau in Turkey during the period 1941-1946. Although this is a one-page, single text, it served as a preface to all works published in this specific series of translated literature. The text does not directly deal with the subject of the books it introduces, or their authors or translators. In that sense, it can be considered a digressive preface; yet it provides strong evidence for the way the books in the series were contextualized and presented.

The timing of the preface introduces an additional temporal category to Genette's classifications. Genette suggests that prefaces can be penned later (to address a new readership in second or subsequent editions) or written posthumously, namely, after the death of the author.<sup>21</sup> Paradoxically, the preface presenting the books by the Translation Bureau is in the form of a 'fore-preface.' The standard preface printed in all translated books (amounting to 471 volumes) published from 1941 to 1946 chronologically preceded the translation and publication of the works in question. The preface was written in 1941 and clearly aimed to present the ideological context in which a 'proper' reception of the works would take place. The preface was written by Hasan-Ali Yücel, then Minister of Education, who associated the task of translating and publishing Western classics with the efforts to create the Turkish humanism which defined the ideological background of the cultural institutions introduced in the late 1930s and early 1940s. The cultural and ideological context of the day made Yücel the perfect figure for introducing the series of translated classics by the Translation Bureau. His name was associated with the Translation Bureau starting



from the outset and to this day, he is considered to be the ‘founder’ of the Bureau. Some even mistake him for the chairman of the Bureau, although he was never personally a part of the translation efforts of the Bureau. Yücel’s commitment to the reforms carried out in the early republican period and the cultural institutions created to complement these reforms (such as the People’s Houses, the Village Institutes and the Translation Bureau<sup>22</sup>) meant that a preface written by him would be received in the context of the cultural reforms. Yücel is an interesting example for agents who are not directly involved in translation activity, but who, nevertheless, play a significant role in shaping the field of translation.<sup>23</sup>

In the preface, published immediately after the title page of the translations published by the Translation Bureau, Yücel wrote:

Hümanizma ruhunun ilk anlayış ve duyuş merhalesi, insan varlığının en müşahhas şekilde ifadesi olan sanat eserlerinin benimsenmesiyle başlar. Sanat şubeleri içinde edebiyat, bu ifadenin zihin unsurları en zengin olanıdır. Bunun içindir ki bir milletin, diğer milletler edebiyatını kendi dilinde, daha doğrusu kendi idrakinde tekrar etmesi; zeka ve anlama kudretini o eserler nispetinde artırması, canlandırması ve yeniden yaratmasıdır. İşte tercüme faaliyetini biz, bu bakımdan ehemmiyetli ve medeniyet davamız için müessir bellemekteyiz.

[The first understanding and feeling of the spirit of humanism starts with the adoption of works of art which are the most concrete expression of human existence. Among art forms, literature is the richest in terms of the intellectual elements of this expression. Therefore when a nation repeats the literatures of other nations in its own tongue, or rather in its own conception, it increases, revives and re-creates its intellect and power of understanding. This is why we consider translation activity so important and influential for our mission.]<sup>24</sup>

Yücel was thus defining the ideological context of the works published by the Translation Bureau, although many of them were not a part of the humanist tradition. Surely, the visibility of Yücel in the political arena offered a clear agenda with which the books would have to be associated. This association came automatically for the translations of Greek classics or foundational works of Western culture, but when it accompanied works like *Alice in Wonderland* or fairy tales by the Grimm Brothers, it built a new political context for these works. While these works were received as

children's classics, the preface did not address the child readership but rather called on to adults by inviting a political recontextualisation of the works in question.

The preface was not included in the books translated by the Translation Bureau after 1946, most likely due to a change in the ideological orientation of the government, a process I elsewhere have termed "cultural de-planning."<sup>25</sup> The preface has been included in some reprints of the books, not by the Ministry of Education, but by private institutions (such as volumes reprinted as a supplement by the daily newspaper *Cumhuriyet* or İşbankası Kültür Yayınları, a prestigious publishing house owned by a major bank) since the 1990s. This decision is also an ideological one, where the products of the Translation Bureau are seen "as the symbol of an ideal that was consumed in the past."<sup>26</sup>

Another example for ideological recontextualisation is the allographic preface written to the first Turkish translation of Thomas More's *Utopia* published in 1964.<sup>27</sup> Mina Urgan, who was a well-known professor of English literature, wrote the preface.<sup>28</sup> She was in fact credited as one of the translators of the work (presumably her academic position gave a more credible status to the translation); however, in a later period she corrected this presumption and stated that she was not the translator of the book, but the writer of the long critical essay that served as the preface to the first edition.<sup>29</sup> Urgan's preface has the typical introductory and recommending discourse; it presents both the work and the author and offers a detailed biography of More. It also presents a comparative analysis of *Utopia* and Plato's *Republic*. Urgan had a PhD in English literature and became full professor of English Literature at Istanbul University in 1960. There is no doubt that she was well-equipped to write an introduction about *Utopia* and its author. However, Urgan was not only an academic figure. She also had a strong political stance and was among the first members of the socialist Turkish

Labor Party, which was outlawed twice until it merged with the Turkish Communist Party in 1988.

Urgan's political allegiances explain the additional elements she included in the preface. Urgan offered what could be called a 'conventional' preface, focusing largely on the source work and its author. Yet she concluded the text on a more political note, by listing the prophecies of More which have become, in her own words, a reality in "advanced democracies." Among these prophecies she listed gender equality, regulation of working hours, free education, easy divorce, regulated health and tax systems and the abolishment of the capital punishment. To these, she also added a list of More's wishes that remain unfulfilled: putting an end to wars, ending religious intolerance, fair distribution of income and social justice. And she concluded her preface by stating that "the whole world has understood that if Sir Thomas More's vision remains unfulfilled, in other words, if it stays a mere utopia, the European civilization is bound to collapse."<sup>30</sup> The entire preface, and especially these final lines, contextualise the reading of *Utopia* in a socialist-humanist political perspective, one where both she, and the specific Turkish translators and publishers of *Utopia* felt at home.

In addition, the preface reflects the radical politically critical atmosphere of the 1960s which had also spread to Turkey. This is evident in several comments Urgan made earlier in the preface criticizing More's pious Catholicism and remarking that "he is not remembered for his works addressing Catholics but only for Utopia, which is today more relevant than ever."<sup>31</sup> Clearly this preface offers Urgan's idea of a 'proper' reading of *Utopia*, but perhaps more than that, it reflects the ideological stance and unfulfilled dreams of a handful of intellectuals who worked hard, but also paid dearly, for a just society throughout the early republican period in Turkey. Urgan

later developed the preface into a critical essay on More and his works and published it as a separate book, while the preface continues to be published as a part of *Utopia* in recent editions. This shows that apart from their function of linking the translated work to the outside cultural and ideological networks, allographic prefaces can also acquire a status of their own and start leading separate lives from the works they initially served to present. In the expanded version originally written in 1984, Urgan even placed *Utopia* in a Marxist context and suggested that although More is no Marx, he is to be appreciated for introducing many ideas which Marx revisited in his own time.<sup>32</sup>

### **Talat Sait Halman and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu: Warding off Criticism**

As the above examples illustrate, allographic prefaces are more likely to be written by people who have a more established literary position than the translators of the target texts. However, these prefaces may not only introduce the work, but also help ‘consecrate’ the translator and create some literary capital for him or her.<sup>33</sup> Preface writers may be found among autonomous critics who add or even create value for a translated work by their critical appraisal,<sup>34</sup> and the Turkish literary field provides various examples of this kind of preface as well.

The literary consecration function of the preface may be accompanied by another function in translated works, that of legitimizing a certain reading of the source text or a certain translation strategy. This latter function is often given in between the lines, rather than directly and creates a subtext for the preface. An example is the preface written by Talat Sait Halman to a collection of poems translated from Turkish into English by Murat Nemet-Nejat.<sup>35</sup> Although this preface was written in English for a book published in the USA by an American publisher, I have reasons to believe that it also addresses the Turkish literary field. Halman is one of the best-known

representatives of Turkish literature in the English-speaking world. He is a literary translator, with a long list of translations into both Turkish and English. He served as the first minister of culture in Turkey. He is a professor and also a poet, and was made a Knight Grand Cross by Queen Elizabeth II.

Given this impressive personal background, the choice of Halman as the preface writer to an anthology of Turkish poetry in English seems a wise move. In the preface Halman introduces Nemet-Nejat as poet, “principal translator” and critic and praises his translations as “refreshingly lyrical” and “inventive in all senses of the term.”<sup>36</sup>

Halman’s preface applauds the anthology as a “poet’s work” and anticipates that it will stimulate debate “especially among Turkey’s conservative literary critics.”<sup>37</sup>

From the way he involves Turkey’s literary critics and foregrounds the book’s provocative aspects, Halman’s preface seems to be written for the source culture, rather than the target culture. The anthology is in fact less provocative for the American readership, for which it was intended, than for the Turkish source context where Nemet-Nejat’s reading and translation of Turkish poetry has attracted significant attention since the publication of the book. Halman’s prefatorial presence legitimizes Nemet-Nejat’s interpretation of Turkish poetry and attempts to fend off potential criticisms of the work. His statement “For Nemet-Nejat, translation is an act of re-creation” foreshadows and offsets criticism regarding the rather unconventional and ‘inventive’ translation strategies employed by Nemet-Nejat.<sup>38</sup>

Preemptive defense seems to have been the goal of more than one preface writer. In a much earlier preface written in 1957, Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, a well-known translator of French and English literatures into Turkish, offered high praise for a young translator, Can Yücel (later one of the best-known and unique poets of 20<sup>th</sup> century Turkish literature), who was bringing out his first collection of translated poems.<sup>39</sup> In his

preface to the book consisting of an eclectic collection of translations from some of the best-known poets in the world, Eyuboğlu wrote very positive remarks about the young poet-translator, extending a type of literary consecration to him.

However, Eyuboğlu seemed to have a second goal in his preface, which was closely linked to his own translator personality. Yücel's translation strategy consisted of heavy domestication, bordering adaptation, which was bound to cause considerable stir among literary circles. Significantly, Yücel chose the term "Türkçe söyleyen" [teller in Turkish] rather than 'translator' for use on the cover of this work, making his approach clear from the start. This was a specific approach to translation defended and practiced by Eyuboğlu himself throughout the 1940s and 1950s, an approach for which he had been both criticized and praised. In his preface, Eyuboğlu wrote, ["Can Yücel translated these poems from different cultures of the world as if writing his own verse. He put his heart generously into what others wrote. It's as if he meant that it makes no difference who wrote these poems."] <sup>40</sup>

By writing these lines Eyuboğlu offered a specific way of reading the translations. The strategy he defined for poetry translation was 'transcreation,' or free rewriting. <sup>41</sup> His preface may have enabled him to anticipate and silence potential criticisms of this translation strategy. In his preface Eyuboğlu also re-contextualized the poems included in the anthology by embedding them in a familiar and domestic framework, presumably with the aim of making them more relevant for a flourishing readership.

### **Eyuboğlu and Orhan Pamuk: Metonymic Transposition**

Eyuboğlu's translation strategy had a specific goal. His goal was to bring the works he translated (which were mostly classical Western works) closer to the target readership and his way of doing this was using extremely fluent language in his translations, accompanied by everyday language and local idioms. His efforts need to

be contextualized within the general humanist movement in Turkey, and especially vis-à-vis his involvement in the village institutes which aimed to educate the local rural populations in Anatolia in the 1940s. He personally worked as a teacher in the village institutes and strongly recommended that the students read translated classics.<sup>42</sup> The local elements he added to his translations inevitably changed their reception by the readership and made them more familiar, erasing some of their foreign aspects.

Clearly, each translation recreates the source text in a new context, building a new network of metonymic relations. Translated poetry is often accepted to ‘represent’ or ‘stand for’ a certain foreign tradition, yet as soon as it is received by the target system it may also be consolidated in an existing local tradition. A prefatorial intervention can draw up a new metonymic context for the target text, where it enters into a series of new relations with a network of domestic texts and traditions. A metonymic relation of proximity and incorporation is thus created. In the preface he wrote to Yücel’s translations Eyuboğlu does precisely that, declaring that this collection of translated poems is a return to the roots of the Turkish folk tradition, with Aragon, Eluard or T.S. Elliot speaking in the language of the Turkish people, speaking in the universal language of the streets.<sup>43</sup>

A similar act of metonymic transposition can be observed in the prefaces written by Orhan Pamuk, Turkey’s only Nobel laureate, to translations of Dostoevsky. Pamuk was invited to make the selections and write the prefaces for a special series consisting of the translations of works by Dostoevsky to be published by İletişim, one of the leading presses in Turkey specializing in fiction and social sciences. In one specific preface Pamuk created an affinity between Turkish and Russian literatures and made Dostoevsky more relevant for the Turkish readership by identifying the

pains of modernization in his writing, this theme being extremely common and popular in Turkish literature. Pamuk is known to have confirmed that Dostoevsky was a major source of inspiration for his own writing and his own novels have also focused on issues of belated modernization and the pains inflicted by such on the ordinary person. Therefore when Pamuk writes about Dostoevsky, he very much speaks from the position of an authority, both as a Nobel prizewinner and a writer who belongs to the same literary lineage. This makes the reading he offers in the preface difficult to contest.

In his preface to *Yeraltından Notlar*, the Turkish translation of *Записки из подполья* (translated into English as *Notes from the Underground*), Pamuk contextualized the novel vis-à-vis the problems of westernization in a country living at the verge, but still outside, of Europe. He wrote that when he first read the novel at the age of eighteen, he enjoyed it because it gave expression to many things he had personally experienced in Istanbul.<sup>44</sup> However he acknowledges that at that age he failed to understand the real problem of the main protagonist: the failure to become European. He remarks: “Now in my second reading, I can identify the real theme of the novel and what really gives it its energy: the envy, rage and pride felt at the face of not being able to become European.”<sup>45</sup> He argues that he owed his early misinterpretation of the novel to the fact that at the age of eighteen he regarded himself as being more European than he really was, like all westernized Turks.<sup>46</sup> In this preface Pamuk represents reading *Notes from the Underground* as a process of problematizing Turkish self-identity and draws a clear parallel between the pangs of westernization in Russia and in Turkey.

Of particular note is the fact that Orhan Pamuk, who largely owes his international literary fame and partly his Nobel Prize to his translators, did not write a single word



about the fact that the book was a translation. He did not praise, criticize, or otherwise acknowledge the translator of the work at all.

### **Concluding Remarks and Points for Further Research**

Many more examples of allographic prefaces in the Turkish cultural context could be given. Yet even the limited selection offered here illustrates the diversity of motives behind allographic prefaces. The examples show that preface writers often digress from what is generally considered to be the main function of the preface, i.e. presenting and recommending the text, and that these digressions have special relevance for understanding the position of a translation in target literary and cultural networks. The digressions also offer clues about the ideological inclinations of the publishers, writers or translators, as well as serve as tools to legitimize their writing and translation strategies.

An area for future research could be to examine more examples of allographic prefaces and explore the nature of these prefaces more deeply. Such exploration would need to include the links between the agency of the preface writers, the translations they introduce and the new networks of reception they create. This field of inquiry should also include various aspects of power and agency and address questions such as the following: What are the distinguishing features of prefaces written by allographic writers as opposed to prefaces written by authors or translators? What are the specific ways in which allographic preface writers use their agentive power to attain goals that reach beyond presenting a work? How can alternative methodologies in addition to a conventional text-based approach be used in studying allographic prefaces? Can sociological or ethnographic methods of investigation be designed involving publishers, authors or readers? What are the actual responses of readers to these prefaces? These and many more questions could

help shed light on how voices beyond the translatorial/authorial position shape the production and reception of translations.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Gerard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

<sup>2</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 161.

<sup>3</sup> Rodica Dimitriu, "Translators' prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies," *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, vol.17, no. 3 (2009), pp. 195-201.

<sup>4</sup> Dimitriu, "Translators' prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies," pp. 201-203.

<sup>5</sup> A limited selection of recent works includes Dimitriu, "Translators' prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies"; Ellen McRae, "The Role of Translators' Prefaces to Contemporary Literary Translations into English: An Empirical Study" in *Translation Peripheries Paratextual Elements in Translation*, eds. Anna Gil-Bardají, Pilar Orero and Sara Rovira-Esteva (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), pp. 63-82; Ulf Norber, "Literary Translators' Comments on their Translations in Prefaces and Afterwords: The Case of Contemporary Sweden," in *Translation Peripheries Paratextual Elements in Translation*, eds. Anna Gil-Bardají, Pilar Orero and Sara Rovira-Esteva (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), pp. 101-116.

<sup>6</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 179.

<sup>7</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 197.

<sup>8</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, pp. 197-236.

<sup>9</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 179.

<sup>10</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 9.

<sup>11</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 405.

<sup>12</sup> Gerard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 214.

<sup>13</sup> Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, p. 214.

<sup>14</sup> Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, p. 215.

<sup>15</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 264.

<sup>16</sup> "Ah, oui, de retrait, d'oubli de soi, de savoir ne pas intervenir. J'admire beaucoup ces traducteurs qui disent cela, je les admire d'autant plus que moi, je sais que je serais incapable de le faire." Muguraş Constantinescu, "Gerard Genette Sur la Traduction et le Traducteur," *Atelier de Traduction*, no. 2 (2002), p. 15. Translation mine.

<sup>17</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 12.

<sup>18</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 268.

<sup>19</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 271.

<sup>20</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, p. 228.

<sup>21</sup> Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, pp. 239, 247.

<sup>22</sup> These three institutions embodied and reinforced various aspects of the cultural reforms in the early republican period in Turkey. People's Houses were community centres through which the policies of the government were disseminated to the public. Village Institutes were secondary schools and colleges which aimed to educate the

---

rural population. The Translation Bureau was founded in 1940 with a view to launching a mass translation movement, again with an educative function.

<sup>23</sup> Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, "A Cultural Agent against the Forces of Culture," in *Agents of Translation*, eds. John Milton and Paul Bandia (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009), pp. 161-188.

<sup>24</sup> Hasan-Ali Yücel, "Klâsiklere Birinci Önsöz," *Tercüme*, vol.15, no. 75-76, p. 12. My translation. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from Turkish are mine.

<sup>25</sup> Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2008).

<sup>26</sup> Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, "The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol," in *Apropos of Ideology*, ed. Maria Callada Perez (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2003), pp. 113-130.

<sup>27</sup> For a detailed study on this translation and retranslations of *Utopia* into Turkish see Ceyda Elgöl, *A Utopian Journey from Non-Translation to Re-Translation*, Unpublished MA thesis, submitted to Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 2011.

<sup>28</sup> Mina Urgan, "Önsöz," in Thomas More, *Utopia* (Istanbul: Çan Yayınları, 1964), pp. 5-48.

<sup>29</sup> Gencay Gürsoy, "Mina Urgan'la 'Ütopya' Üzerine," *Düşün*, no.13 (1985), pp. 3-5.

<sup>30</sup> Urgan, "Önsöz," p. 48.

<sup>31</sup> Urgan, "Önsöz," p. 47.

<sup>32</sup> Mina Urgan, *Edebiyatta Ütopya Kavramı ve Thomas More* (Istanbul: Adam Yayınları, 1984).

<sup>33</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge: Polity Press 1993), p. 38.

<sup>34</sup> Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004), pp. 126-127.

<sup>35</sup> Murat Nemet-Nejat, *Eda: An Anthology of Contemporary Turkish Poetry* (New Jersey: Talisman House, 2004).

<sup>36</sup> Talat Sait Halman, "Preface, on EDA" in *Eda: An Anthology of Contemporary Turkish Poetry*, ed. Murat Nemet-Nejat (New Jersey: Talisman House, 2004), pp. 2-3.

<sup>37</sup> Halman, "Preface, on EDA," p. 3.

<sup>38</sup> Halman, "Preface, on EDA," p. 2.

<sup>39</sup> Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, "Can Yücel'in Şiir Çevirileri" in *Her Boydan, Dünya Şiirinden Seçmeler*, ed. Can Yücel (Istanbul: Adam Yayıncılık, (1985) [1957]), pp 7-10.

<sup>40</sup> "Can Yücel, kendi şiirini söyler gibi çevirmiş bu Her Boydan şiirleri. Cömertçe canını komuş başkalarının söylediklerine. Ha sen söylemişsin ha ben der gibi." Eyuboğlu, "Can Yücel'in Şiir Çevirileri," p. 9.

<sup>41</sup> For a selection of Eyuboğlu's poetry translations see Magdi Rufer Eyuboğlu, ed. *Sabahattin Eyuboğlu: Şiir Çevirileri* (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1976).

<sup>42</sup> See Talip Apaydın, *Karanlığın Kuvveti* (Istanbul: Ararat Yayınevi, 1967), p. 163; Mehmet Başaran, *Sabahattin Eyuboğlu ve Köy Enstitüleri* (İstanbul, Papirüs, 2001), pp. 57-68.

<sup>43</sup> Eyuboğlu, "Can Yücel'in Şiir Çevirileri," p. 7.

<sup>44</sup> Orhan Pamuk, "Önsöz: Aşağılanmanın Zevkleri" in Fiyodor Mihailoviç Dostoyevski, *Yeraltından Notlar* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007). p.7.

<sup>45</sup> "Bugün ikinci okumamda, benim için asıl konunun ve kitaba enerjisini veren asıl şeyin ne olduğunu daha rahat söyleyebilirim artık: Avrupalı olamamak kıskançlığı, örkese ve gururdur bu." Pamuk, "Önsöz: Aşağılanmanın Zevkleri," p. 6.

---

<sup>46</sup> Pamuk, “Önsöz: Aşağılanmanın Zevkleri,” p. 7.

## Bibliography

APAYDIN, Talip. *Karanlığın Kuvveti* [The Power of Darkness]. Istanbul: Ararat Yayınevi, 1967.

BAŞARAN, Mehmet. *Sabahattin Eyuboğlu ve Köy Enstitüleri*. [Sabahattin Eyuboğlu and the Village Institutes] Istanbul: Papirüs, 2001.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Ed. Randal Johnson, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.

CASANOVA, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M. B. DeBevoise Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

CONSTANTINESCU, Muguraş. “Gérard Genette Sur la Traduction et le Traducteur.” *Atelier de Traduction*, no. 2 (2004): 11-16.

DIMITRIU, Rodica. “Translators’ prefaces as documentary sources for translation studies,” *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, vol. 17, no. 3 (2009): 193-206

EYUBOĞLU, Sabahattin. “Can Yücel’in Şiir Çevirileri.” In *Her Boydan, Dünya Şiirinden Seçmeler*. [From All Corners and In All Sizes, Selections from World Poetry] Ed. and Trans. Can Yücel. Istanbul: Adam Yayıncılık, 1985 [1957], pp. 7-10.

GENETTE, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

GÜRSOY, Gencay. “Mina Urgan’la ‘Ütopya’ Üzerine.” *Düşün*, [Thought] no.13 (1985): 3-5.

HALMAN, Talat Sait. “Preface, on EDA.” In *Eda: An Anthology of Contemporary Turkish Poetry*. Ed. and Trans. Murat Nemet-Nejat. New Jersey: Talisman House, 2004, pp. 1-3.

NEMET-NEJAT, Murat, ed. and trans. *Eda: An Anthology of Contemporary Turkish Poetry*. New Jersey: Talisman House, 2004.

PAMUK, Orhan. “Önsöz: Aşağılanmanın Zevkleri.” In Fiyodor Mihailoviç Dostoyevski, *Yeraltından Notlar*. [Notes from the Underground] Trans. Mehmet Özgül. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007, pp. 5-11.

---

RUFER EYUBOĞLU, Magdi, ed. *Sabahattin Eyuboğlu: Şiir Çevirileri*. [Sabahattin Eyuboğlu: Translations of Poetry] İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1976.

TAHIR GÜRÇAĞLAR, Şehnaz. "The Translation Bureau Revisited: Translation as Symbol." In *Apropos of Ideology*. Ed. Maria Callada Perez. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2003, pp. 113-130.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Politics and Poetics of Translation in Turkey, 1923-1960*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi Publishing, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Cultural Agent Against the Forces of Culture." In *Agents of Translation*. Eds. John Milton and Paul Bandia. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2009, pp. 161-188.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Önsöz." In Thomas More, *Utopia*. Trans. Sabahattin Eyuboğlu, Mina Urgan, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul: Çan Yayınları, 1964, pp. 5-48.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Edebiyatta Ütopya Kavramı ve Thomas More*. [The Concept of Utopia in Literature and Thomas Moore] İstanbul: Adam Yayınları, 1984.

YÜCEL, Hasan-Ali. "Klâsiklere Birinci Önsöz." *Tercüme*, [Translation] vol.15, no. 75-76 (1961): 12.